state of the Union message when they sought a balanced commission of experts to make recommendations on national emergency strike legislation.

The only real proposal the President has come up with has been House Joint Resolution 559 which his spokesmen have dubbed "mediation to finality" to meet the instant strike threat and defer it until safely after the 1968 presidential election. But "mediation to finality" is only a credibility gap for compulsory arbitration. And it is only supposed to be applicable to this one dispute—in spite of the fact that it could become a backdoor method of getting Congress to share the blame for setting a precedent that will become binding as the years go by.

In spite of that obvious danger and the personal repugnance of what is clearly compulsory arbitration in this case—no matter how temporary it would hopefully be—many Members, including myself, have been willing to support the President's proposal based on the clear and desperate statements from his administration concerning the national emergency crisis our Nation would face were there to be a rail strike at this time.

Within the last hours of the consideration of this legislation, the administration has even had the temerity to have various Cabinet officers call Members of Congress to advise them of the desirability of resolving this crisis temporarily, according to the President's suggestion. But, sadly, the urging has not always been with reference to the national interest. Occasionally, it has been with reference to the political interest of the individual Member of Congress because of the economic dangers to his particular District.

The responsibility of the Chief Executive, it seems to me, should not be merely to resolve the day-to-day crises of his own administration with reference to his own popularity or the political dominance of his own party. His responsibility should be broader-gauged and larger in view than that. It should be to seek lasting solutions to continuing problems.

If the President has avoided that responsibility, the Congress has abdicated its responsibility in this regard, also. Rather than bemoaning three miserable choices, leadership in the Congress should have been able to undertake consideration of some kind of legislation to provide a method for resolution of this continuing problem.

But this is a political hot potato Democratic Congresses and administrations have steadfastly avoided since the Wagner Act. Only the Taft-Hartley Act, born in a Republican Congress, and the Landrum-Griffin Act, born in a Congress with a slim Democratic majority under a Republican Administration, attempted to deal with our Nation's growing labor problems on a permanent basis. Attempts were made after the passage of both pieces of legislation to establish them as political issues, but both have stood the test of time and changing political winds. Sooner or later we must have the courage to tackle a permanent answer of some kind. While the substitute amendment of Representative BILL BROCK, of Tennessee, was properly ruled not to be germane to this immediate emergency measure, the germ of a solution may be found in it which could prevent such emergency legislation. Whether it is found in Mr. BROCK's legislation or not, it must be found. Today's congressional politicians seem reluctant to get involved in such touchy problems. But as a result, they find themselves facing sooner or later in this crisis, the impossible political choices of compulsory arbitration, seizure, or a nationwide rail strike.

With the most natural of human tendencies—unwillingness to face up to unpleasant choices—the House of Representatives Thursday did what it has twice before done, put off a decision in the hope that intransigent management and intransigent labor would somehow get together and revive collective bargaining which, if it was ever really alive in this case, died on April 25. I should be happy to be proven wrong, but after listening to weeks of testimony before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I am convinced that neither side will bargain in this case.

The obvious impossibility of segregating defense materials in our complex economy for handling during a rail strike which would halt everything else, makes a "partial strike" an impossibility. And, on the testimony of administration experts about our defense needs for Vietnam and other possible international commitments, a strike of even brief duration might be unduly damaging to our national interest in the world. It is easy to say that such statements are overdrawn, but this attitude is too risky a doubt to tolerate, in my view.

It is also easy to say, "if the Congress does nothing, there will be no strike"; but such assurances have no shred of evidence to back them and much to argue against them in the hearings before my committee.

Finally, to provide for seizure is to judge the case and penalize only the railroads for their intransigence. It does not even penalize the management much, because they are employees, too. Rather, it penalizes the owners of corporate stock throughout the Nation. It is a solution which presumes that arbitration in this case would be unfair to labor or anti-labor and promanagement. No evidence of this has been substantiated. For Congress to feel that arbitration would not be as fair to labor as it is to management in view of the complex problems facing both rail management and labor in this industry is to presume that the case of labor is the only case for consideration. To make such an irresponsible decision in the Congress is as much an abdication of responsibility as to make no decision at all.

But if there has been an abdication of congressional responsibility, there has also been an abdication of public responsibility on the part of the average citizen. Few letters will come in from the Main Street merchants on this strike until after the strike has begun and the goods for their stores fail to arrive. Few objections from the locals of the unions of other industries will be heard until after a record vote has been cast for compulsory arbitration. And few objections from management leaders of other industries will be heard until after the record vote for seizure is cast and they decide that if the U.S. Government can seize the rail industry it can seize their businesses, too, in the name of national interest.

And so, a portion of the abdication of responsibility must be borne also in this situation by the average American citizen and the public information media. The latter has sent more of its membership to Europe with the late President's widow on her vacation than were found in the Gallery at the moment the House voted on House Joint Resolution 559.

A brief strike could so clog the flow of needed supplies to Vietnam that some Americans will die there as a result of the accumulated irresponsibility of railroad labor, railroad management, the administration, the Congress and the people of this country.

If future historians write of the decay of the free American system, they will certainly not leave out a footnote about this crisis. If they write about the maintenance of free collective bargaining in America through this time of the growing complexity of the national economy, they can only do so if someone finds a permanent solution to such crises as this.

Labor, management, the administration, the Congress, and the American people must seek a solution, or this crisis will indeed have been an "American Tragedy."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 22, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Hensel E. Hendrickson, Trinity Evangelical Lutheran Church, Bismarck, N. Dak., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

Dear Heavenly Father, as a prelude to this day's labors, we would turn our thoughts to Thee.

Help us not to think higher than we ought of our own achievements, but learn to count as success that which is accomplished to bring glory to Thee and hope to fellow man.

Keep us in tune with Thee so that what we lack in faith, we will not make up in frenzied activity.

May each one of us, individually and corporately, be led by Thy Spirit to reflect the truth that as our Nation has been blessed so we have the mandate to be a blessing to the many of our Nation and of our one world who look to this place for guidance.

In the name of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communi-

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

cated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on June 13, 1967, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6950. An act to restore the investment credit and allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 81) entitled "A joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. MORSE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. PELL, Mr. NELSON, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. FANNIN, and Mr. GRIFFIN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE, COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will there be anyone here this afternoon for the debate on the pending legislation?

Mr. ALBERT. It is my understanding that most Members will be here.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Federal-Aid Highway Program of the Committee on Public Works may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS, EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968—APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 7501) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. STEED, PASSMAN, ADDABBO, COHELAN, YATES, MAHON, CONTE, ROBISON, BOW, and Mrs. REID of Illinois.

RUSSIAN BEAR

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, to have listened to the Soviet Union make use of infantile invective in the Security Council debate on the Middle East has been a most distressing experience. Surely it was to have been expected that a great power would have wanted to display to the world that it is capable of employing the accents of civilized exchange. It is incredible that a nation which seeks to influence world opinion should have adopted tactics of such low intellectual content as to alienate thinking men and women of good will. The world has been subjected to such a lack of finesse as to bring into the minds of all small nations a most frightening vision of the Russian Bear, who crushes even as he embraces. The U.S.S.R. fought the adoption of a cease-fire resolution until it became unmistakably clear that Israel was the indisputable victor.

I am not speaking of the Soviet's obvious bias. The bias looms so large as to hardly need comment. What I am speaking of is to my mind the tragic display—in full-blown view—of the raging, the vituperation, so like that of a child in a tantrum.

I speak in true sorrow because it is so disheartening that one of the major powers could have so little regard for the opinions and sensibilities of thoughtful people.

RESPONSIBILITY OF THE UNITED STATES IN SOUTH VIETNAM ELECTIONS

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the people of South Vietnam will go to the polls in September in the exercise of a fundamental right: the right to select in free elections the country's chief executive officers and legislators.

The United States has the unquestionable responsibility to support self-determination for the people of South Vietnam.

Therefore, I am introducing a resolution in Congress providing that six Representatives and three Senators go to Vietnam to observe the elections and protect the honesty and impartiality of the voting.

The presence of these representatives of Congress will serve as a deterrent to challenges to the freedom of the electorate, from without or from within.

Their presence will also reaffirm our responsibility to aid the people of South Vietnam in the protection of their right to self-determination.

FLAG DESECRATION BILL

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to make crystal clear my intent, and I believe the intent of most, if not all, of the membership in connection

with the passage on Tuesday of the flag desecration bill, H.R. 10480. As one of the sponsors of this legislation, I believe it is also no secret that in the committee I moved to add the word "burning" to the group of offenses against the American flag which the Congress intended to prohibit. In addition, the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union adopted another amendment on page 1 by adding the word "knowingly" on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BIESTER], so that the offenses which we intended to prohibit were described in the following language:

Whoever knowingly casts contempt upon any flag of the United States by publicly mutilating, defacing, defiling, burning, or trampling upon it shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.

The parliamentary situation which developed resulted in the words "knowingly" and "burning" being omitted from the final version of the bill as passed. As I stated to the membership immediately prior to the time when the Committee rose, I advocated and recommended a vote on the bill which included those two words. I am confident that most, if not all, of the Members of the House intended their vote to include that language. Certainly there was nothing said in the Committee or on the floor of the House prior to the passage of the bill which would have indicated to the membership that those words were not included.

Accordingly, it is my hope that in the consideration of this legislation by the other body due respect for this language will be given and that the intent of the membership of the House as I have described it will be recognized.

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLORY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the gentleman has made this statement and I wish to associate myself with his statement.

QUALIFICATIONS OF FEDERAL JUDGES

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, more and more people are complaining to their Congressman, and each other, about the nature of decisions being rendered by our courts.

The most recent decision of J. Skelly Wright, of the U.S. Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, has brought a new rash of demands by the public that "something be done about these goofy judges" who think they have the power to legislate by judicial mandate.

Everybody talks about the increase in crime, except Attorney General Ramsey Clark who merely tries to wish it away. It is becoming increasingly clear the preoccupation of protecting the "rights" of criminals has superseded the interest of the overwhelming number of the members of society that are respectable, law-abiding citizens. This philosophy seems to be "judicially inspired" by numerous split decisions by the U.S. Supreme Court and inferior courts.

About the only way to restore some semblance of reason in the thinking of the judges of this country is to try to apply some guidelines, or set basic qualifications for those who may serve in the judiciary in the future. Today, they are negligible.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, as I have in previous sessions, I am introducing legislation to accomplish this result and I trust the chairman of the Judiciary Committee will set prompt hearings.

A "MINI-LIFE" FOR THE "MINI-GRANT"

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the first day of summer, and it seems that the heat has already gotten to the Office of Education.

Yesterday I received a notice from the Office of Education announcing a new concept in Federal funding—the "mini-grant." Appropriately this great step forward is made through title III of ESEA, which is devoted to innovative projects.

When I first saw this announcement, I had a vision of "mini-grants" as very small grants for tiny programs to serve very little children—plagiarizing, of course, the modern educational styles of Carnaby Street.

I was glad to learn that this image is not accurate, but is only the product of a strained sense of humor. It seems that "mini-grants" are actually substantial projects with serious purposes. The four very welcome grants approved yesterday for my district total $70,443 and are for curriculum revision, science instruction, and aid for delinquent boys. They seem to be called mini-grants only because the Office of Education was able to process them without regard to the deadlines which larger applications must observe.

Mr. Speaker, it would be most unfortunate if such worthwhile projects were belittled by a foolish and misleading label. If this practice persists, we may soon have mini-highways, mini-schools, mini-dams, and even mini-missiles.

I urge my good friend, Commissioner Howe, to be sure that the term "mini-grant" will have mini-life.

POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMUNITY ACTION COMMITTEE OF THE OEO

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, on January 23, 1967, I wrote the Honorable Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, asking a question directed to me by one of my constituents about the propriety and legality of the local community action committee engaging in controversial political issues.

On March 3, I again wrote Sargent Shriver and asked him if he would respond to my initial letter.

On March 15, I received a letter from the Honorable Sargent Shriver telling me that personnel matters were local responsibilities. However, he would have the regional Great Lakes office look into the matter and report to me. Why it took him 7 weeks to give me that information I do not understand.

But here it is, June 22, 1967, Mr. Speaker, some 5 months after my initial request, and I still have not received a reply. This could hardly be called "running a tight ship."

FRAGRANCE OF ROSES IN THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, ordinarily I enjoy the fragrance of roses, and once in a while I untie the several knots of my purse strings and buy my wife a small bouquet. But the fragrance in the House yesterday during consideration of the debt ceiling was a little heavy—the fragrance from the rose garden over at the White House.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I am going to look around today in the House Chamber to check on the walking wounded. Yesterday, I tried to find the space in the Capitol where the arm splints were being applied, but I could not locate it.

I will be looking again today.

SETTLEMENT OF THE CURRENT RAILWAY LABOR MANAGEMENT DISPUTE—APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 81) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employeees, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. STAGGERS, FRIEDEL, DINGELL, PICKLE, RONAN, ADAMS, SPRINGER, DEVINE, CUNNINGHAM, and KUYKENDALL.

NOMINATION?

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD the following letter to the editor, printed in the June 18, 1967, issue of the Joplin, Mo., Globe:

NOMINATION?

To the GLOBE:

Seems like it is about time for Stokely Carmichael to be awarded the Nobel Peace Prize.

A. P. RUSSELL.

JOPLIN, MO.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A JUST PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I invite the attention of the House to the statesmanlike quality, the clearness, and the logical aspects of the address of our Ambassador to the United Nations, the Honorable Arthur Goldberg, which he so effectively delivered on June 20. In my opinion, his outline of our Government's plan for the successful institution of peace in the Middle East indelibly stamps upon our side of the controversy, our genuine desire for peace.

I think, Mr. Speaker, we should be grateful as a nation to be represented in the United Nations by a man of the superb statesmanship of Arthur Goldberg. We are deeply indebted to President Johnson for putting him there as our representative in that great assembly, which has upon its shoulders the responsibility for establishing peace in the world.

In this respect, Mr. Speaker, I am saddened by the fact that the Soviet Union evidently will not sincerely join in the establishment of a just peace, but from the words and actions of her Premier seeks to use the United Nations as a sounding board for propaganda which aims to advance, even if indirectly, her own selfish interests.

SECOND ANNUAL REPORT OF THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 136)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the Second Annual Report of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Poverty defies simple description. It is a cycle which begins with an infancy of deprivation, continues in a youth of hopelessness, extends to a jobless adulthood, and finally ends—for those who survive—in a bleak and despairing old age. At every stage, the conditions of life are poor housing, inadequate education and training, deficient health care, and often, gnawing hunger.

When we began our concentrated effort to eradicate poverty in America less than 3 years ago, we knew that no single program could accomplish so complicated a task. We knew that the campaign would have to be waged on many levels and in many ways.

We knew that a coordinated attack led by a single Office of Economic Opportunity would be necessary.

We knew that—if the cycle was to be broken—the keys would have to be opportunity and self-help.

We knew that the Federal Government could not undertake alone the programs which would offer opportunity and encourage self-help. Initiative would have to come from, and responsibility be shared by, the communities in which poverty festered.

The programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity are built upon these principles.

This report provides heartening evidence of the substantial progress this Nation is making on the entrenched patterns of poverty. In fiscal 1966—

Seven hundred and thirty-three thousand young children from poor families were given a chance to make a decent beginning in life through the Headstart program.

Five hundred and twenty-eight thousand jobs were made available by the Neighborhood Youth Corps, enabling disadvantaged youths to stay in school or prepare for meaningful employment.

Fifty-seven thousand four hundred and thirty young people, once lost and forgotten in our society, found new confidence and new skills with the Job Corps.

More than 20,000 high school students from poor homes received the educational help they needed to go on to college through Upward Bound.

More than 335,000 adults began to overcome illiteracy with basic educational instruction.

Three thousand five hundred and ninety-two VISTA volunteers helped communities across the land undertake needed self-help projects.

More than 1,000 lawyers provided legal services in 43 States, showing that the law can serve the poor as well as it serves the rest of society.

The list of statistics goes on. All point to the same basic fact. These programs are sturdy ladders in the deep well of poverty where millions of Americans have been trapped. And—despite the crippling effects of a lifetime of deprivation—many have been able to begin the long climb up. But the real story lies behind the statistics, in the individuals who have escaped from hopelessness and despair and are contributing to our society far more than they have received.

All Americans can take pride in the solid advances that have been made. As disease can be conquered, as space can be mastered, so too can poverty yield to our determined efforts to bring it to an end.

But our pride cannot obscure the job that remains to be done.

During the past 2½ years, these programs have reached some 8 million of America's poor. But some 24 million of our impoverished fellow citizens have not yet been reached.

The challenge that remains with us is to insure that all Americans share in the prosperity of our land.

A light has been turned on. We must keep it aglow.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 22, 1967.*

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 149]

Ashbrook	Fraser	Nichols
Ashley	Giaimo	O'Hara, Mich.
Bolling	Gibbons	Pool
Brock	Goodling	Rooney, N.Y.
Brown, Calif.	Hansen, Wash.	Roush
Burton, Utah	Hathaway	St. Onge
Cabell	Hawkins	Schneebeli
Carey	Hays	Skubitz
Carter	Herlong	Thompson, N.J.
Conable	Johnson, Calif.	Williams, Miss.
Dawson	Kee	Wyman
Diggs	Kluczynski	
Edmondson	Kuykendall	
Fino	Long, La.	
Ford, William D.	Meskill	
	Moore	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall 388 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SEVEN YOUNG LOUISIANA LADIES

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, this morning I had the pleasure of meeting personally in my office with seven young ladies from my congressional district who were recruited to work for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in Washington, and whose names and addresses are as follows:

Glynne Mouton, Lafayette, La.
Jeanne Klumpp, Lafayette, La.
Carmen Hebert, Lafayette, La.
Jerrilyn Guidry, Lafayette, La.
Janet Hebert, St. Martinville, La.
Sue Daigle, Lafayette, La.
Carole Wise, Lafayette, La.

Having successfully passed a civil service examination, these young ladies

are working for their Government, either as clerk-typists or clerk-stenographers.

I was tremendously impressed with the neat, charming, and attractive appearance of these young ladies and highly impressed with the fact that they are not only conscientious workers but that they are all taking advantage of their stay in Washington to visit places of interest in the Capital and to familiarize themselves with the operation of the functions of our Government, thereby preparing themselves not only to become future leaders in their respective communities but better and more dedicated citizens of our great country.

NATURAL RESOURCES OF THE SUBSOIL AND SEA BED OF THE CONTINENTAL SHELF

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, in 1945, President Truman, taking view of the growing value and future needs of the resources of the Continental Shelf, made the following proclamation:

> Having concern for the urgency of conserving and prudently utilizing its natural resources, the government of the United States regards the natural resources of the subsoil and sea bed of the continental shelf beneath the high seas but contiguous to the coasts of the United States as appertaining to the United States, subject to its jurisdiction and control.

This proclamation was followed by similar actions by other countries around the world with one glaring distinction: they also claimed the water above the Continental Shelf as appertaining to themselves.

Panama, in 1946, claimed sovereignty over its Continental Shelf, the air above it, and for fishery purposes, the water between. And Chile, a year later, with no appreciable Continental Shelf, simply laid claim to the sea bottom and the water and airspace above it for a distance of 200 miles from shore. Peru, Ecuador, Costa Rica, El Salvador, and Honduras made similar claims to sovereign control over a 200-mile offshore belt in 1947 also.

Our claim to the resources of the Continental Shelf, which gained quick international sanction, includes, in addition to minerals, sedentary creatures of the shelf—such as crabs. Why have we failed to extend our claim over the waters above the Continental Shelf? Why must we draw a line between creatures who swim above the shelf and those who crawl on it? They are both creatures of the ocean and are equally important to the future needs of this Nation. Both are worthy of protection from foreign exploitation.

Currently, the flood tide of exploitation by foreign fishermen of the fishing stocks of our coastal waters coupled with the growing world demand for fish and the diminishing status of our fish industry demands that we take effectual legislative action to assure this Nation of fulfillment of its future needs and proper place in the world fish industry.

While the fishing fleets and the catches of foreign nations continue to grow in accordance with the growing world demand for fish, the United States, since 1957, has dropped from second to fifth place among nations in total world catch, accounting for less than 6 percent of the world catch in 1963 as opposed to 13 percent in 1950. Not only have we failed to keep abreast of this growing world demand for fish, but we have also greatly contributed toward the mounting foreign dominance of this industry by allowing foreign fleets to exploit our coastal waters and by importing approximately 50 percent of the edible fish consumed in this country. In other words, Mr. Speaker, in many instances we are buying back from foreign nations—in various forms—the fish that they may have gathered from our coastal waters.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to amend the 12-Mile Fishing Zone Act to provide for an exclusive fishing zone over the entire Continental Shelf. I strongly believe that the time has long since arrived for this Nation to legally harness, for our own future use, the Continental Shelf, comprising some 10 million square miles of rich fishing area. If we are to regain our rightful status in the world fish industry and meet our future needs for food, we must take legislative action now to insure this.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS UNTIL MIDNIGHT TONIGHT

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS TO THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, and on behalf of the able gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY], I call up House Resolution 656 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 656

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10340) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the able gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 656 provides an open rule with 3 hours of generate debate for consideration of H.R. 10340 to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes.

The total authorization recommended in the bill is $4.9-plus billion—a reduction of $107,818,000 in NASA's request. The recommended authorizations for the three main categories of the bill are: research and development, $4.2-plus billion; construction of facilities, $66.9-plus million; and administrative operations, $648.2-plus million.

The largest single program in the research and development category is the Apollo lunar program for which $2,521,500,000 is authorized. This authorization is $25 million less than requested and $446 million less than was authorized for the program last year.

For the Apollo Applications program, $444.7 million is authorized, a reduction of $10 million from the request.

For advanced mission studies, $6.2 million is authorized, a reduction of $1.8 million from the request. For the balance of the programs under research and development a total of $1.3-plus billion is authorized.

The construction of facilities program is a small one by comparison with past years and the $66.9-plus million authorized is $9.72 million less than requested.

The $648.2-plus million authorized for the administrative operations is $23,094,000 less than the amount requested.

As we all know, it is essential that NASA go forward with the Nation's space program.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 656 in order that immediate consideration may be given to the bill H.R. 10340.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, today this House is faced with a request for approximately $5 billion for the space program. Having read the 194-page report of the committee, including some 34 pages of dissenting opinion, I have come to the conclusion that if this House really wants to do something about reducing spending during this Congress, this is our opportunity.

From reading the report and listening to the testimony before the Rules Committee, it has become very clear there is money in this requested authorization for programs NASA cannot even define.

With all of the problems facing us on earth today, with the war going on in

South Vietnam, with a war on poverty here at home, with needs increasing daily for education, health, et cetera, and with all the requests we have—including that of yesterday, increasing the debt limit to $365 billion, so we can pay our bills—it seems to me we must carefully scrutinize every single item in this space request. Today, we have an opportunity to reduce the spending in this Congress without hurting any existing or defined program carried on by NASA. If NASA cannot spell out for this Congress and the American people for what it is going to spend taxpayers' money, I do not believe we should appropriate it.

I am going to point out certain questionable items as I go along that appear in the committee's report. I now want to pay my respects to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN]. I want to call attention to his dissenting views on this bill, beginning on page 159 of the report.

I need not tell the Members, Mr. Speaker, that politically the gentleman from New York and I are poles apart in our thinking and voting. In fact, about the only time we ever vote together is on a motion to adjourn.

But today I say this gentleman deserves the attention and the gratitude of the House for his dissenting views and for going into this bill in the way he has.

I speak likewise of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], the ranking minority member on the committee, who has pointed out areas in which this bill can be cut without hurting the program one iota.

We learned yesterday before the Rules Committee that the Apollo program, if the authorizations and appropriations are made as requested in this bill, at the end of this fiscal year will have consumed $18 billion of the taxpayers' money. This is $18 billion on one single project, and we still are not even close to getting to the moon.

If this disturbs the Members, let me cite another request in the bill which may disturb you more. I refer to the Apollo applications program, $444 million.

Yes; I said $444 million, and NASA cannot even explain where the major portion of this money is going to be spent.

As I understand it, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] will offer an amendment at the proper time to strike some $250 million from this particular request and it will not slow down nor impede the space program in any way as NASA cannot even state what the money is to be used for, other than to say that it will be used for items needed after we reach the moon. I say, let us reach the moon first.

I should like to call attention to the dissenting views of the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] in which he says, with regard to the Apollo applications program:

> Another new request this year, with much larger immediate budget impact and equally questionable justification, is the Apollo applications program. This project, which according to conservative estimates will cost the Nation at least $5 billion in the next 5 years * * * In other words, the committee is recommending an experiment to determine not whether, but how we should thereafter proceed to spend, say, $200 billion for space missions which have not yet been determined to be in the national interest. In reviewing the basic information to be derived from Apollo applications, we may ask if much of the data collection could be less expensively performed by unmanned satellites, and if it otherwise duplicates information to be gathered by the Department of Defense's manned orbiting laboratories.

So says the gentleman from New York.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania says, on page 166 of the report, with regard to Apollo applications:

> I strongly oppose the request of $444,700,000 for NASA's Apollo applications programs for fiscal year 1968.

Now get this, Mr. Speaker:

> These are funds intended to support programs and missions not yet specifically defined.

"Not yet specifically defined." NASA cannot even tell you what it is going to spend that much money for, but here it is before the Congress and the American people asking for $444 million.

Mr. Speaker, I say it is high time for this Congress to say stop, look, and listen on these authorizations. I know Members of this Congress, when they were out in their districts seeking votes, were saying, "We are going to vote for economy in the Congress if you elect us." Well, today is the time to prove to the people back home that you meant it.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me at this point?

Mr. LATTA. Not at this point, but I will at the conclusion of my remarks.

Today you have an opportunity to tell the people back home—and they just happen to be the people paying the bills—that you are voting for economy in Government by supporting the amendment that will be proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Let us go on to another program. On page 160 the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN], at the bottom of that page, points out:

> As an example, in advanced research and technology, NASA requested, and the committee approved, $47 million for a major flight hardware program, the NERVA engine. In fact, just the engine program alone will cost the Nation $1.5 to $2.0 billion in 10 years; moreover, it is justified on the basis of an unspecified deep space mission which will probably cost 100 times the cost of the engine.

At that point let me point out to you how, in my humble judgment, we have gotten to the place we are today in the Apollo program. We learned yesterday before the Committee on Rules that Congress really cannot cut the request for the Apollo program for some $2.5 billion. Why? Well, the answer was given that contracts—contracts, if you please—have already been let on which your Government is obligated and these expenditures must be made. I say to you, how can NASA obligate this Congress in such a manner? If we proceed in the same way that we have been proceeding in the past, we will be finding ourselves in the same bind next year and the next year and the next year and we will have no control, absolutely no control, over these authorizations, because proponents will say to us contracts have already been let and Congress is obligated. Now, I did not come here to permit NASA to legislate for me, and I am sure you did not, either.

Let me speak about recouping some of the money lost by reason of the terrible fire which occurred last January 27, where we lost three brave and wonderful men. The Nation was deeply sorrowed, as was this Congress. Yesterday, we learned that some $75 million was also lost. Fires do not just happen, this fire did not just happen. There was negligence some place, or else we would not have had that fire. We have had numerous investigations, but it seems as though we cannot put our finger on who was responsible. But it seems with $75 million involved, somebody ought to put their finger on somebody, whoever that may be.

Speaking about the $75 million, are they requesting $75 million here to make up for that loss? No. They did not have to. Why? Because NASA just happened to find $75 million already in the program that it did not really need but which had been appropriated. So NASA did not make a $75 million request to make up the loss caused by the fire.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of fat in this authorization and it behooves you and me as Members of this Congress to cut it out.

Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that we ought to look upon this space program as something that we really cannot amend, that it is beyond our realm of thinking, that we cannot understand it; and that we cannot exercise our own judgment in the matter.

I think we ought to say to this agency, as we say to every other agency of Government, "Prove your case—prove your case—do not come in here with a lot of Moon hoopla and say give us the money and don't ask any questions."

It is my opinion that NASA ought to have to prove its case, and when it fails to do so—and I think it has failed to prove its case for all of the $444 million asked for in the Apollo Application section—I think we should reject it.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I would prefer to yield at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, just think what this Congress and this Nation could do with this $444 million.

I can remember as can you, that a couple of years ago President Johnson asked for and we were asked to support a so-called crash program in order to eliminate cancer, heart disease, and stroke. Do you remember that? To date, we have not gone very far in succeeding toward ridding ourselves of these illnesses—illnesses that cause a good many deaths in America.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me if we really had to spend that $444 million, we could spend it toward research and possible cure of cancer, stroke, and heart disease, rather than some nebulous, undefined program that will take place when—and I emphasize this point—

and after we get to the moon. This money is to be spent on hardware after we get to the moon. No one knows when we are going to get there. But we have heard now that that date has been put back a few more years, and I say, as the gentlemen from New York and Pennsylvania have pointed out, if we spend this money perfecting these vehicles and this hardware today, it might be out of date when we get to the moon.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I shall be pleased to yield to the chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics who has done an outstanding job in cutting down the request of the Department. He has cut the request to the extent of some $117 million, and I salute the gentleman for his efforts. However, I do feel that a lot more money could have been cut from this bill.

Mr. MILLER of California. Of course, Mr. Speaker, I wanted the gentleman from Ohio to yield to me at the particular time when the gentleman was very dramatically and forcefully making a statement to the effect that everyone of us last year went out and campaigned and said that we would like to save money.

I just want to tell the gentleman from Ohio, that if his statement is correct to the effect that 434 Members of the House of Representatives did that, I, for one, did not make such statement and that I do not like to be quoted by the gentleman to that effect.

Mr. LATTA. Well, I hope the gentleman from California leaves that remark in the RECORD.

Mr. MILLER of California. The gentleman from California will be very happy to leave that in the RECORD. What does the gentleman from Ohio think of that?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I do not think anything could be more unfair to the space program—Space Committee—than has been the statement of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman from Texas very much. If pointing out where several millions of the taxpayers' dollars can be saved is being unfair, then I choose to be unfair to the space program and not to the taxpayers.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What figure did the gentleman use as to the total appropriation for NASA from 1959 to the present time?

Mr. LATTA. The figure I used was for the Apollo program only, and that was given to the Committee on Rules yesterday, including the $3 billion for expenditures during this proposed period, it will add up to $18 billion.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations places the price tag on NASA expenditures, from 1959 to the present time, at $27,644,226,300.

Does the gentleman know whether that is an accurate figure?

Mr. LATTA. Is the gentleman speaking only of the Apollo program?

Mr. GROSS. No, I am speaking of the appropriations to this sacrosanct organization, or what was once a sacred bull in the order of things around here.

Mr. LATTA. Those figures are not comparable with the ones I used, as my remarks pertained solely to the Apollo program.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman mentioned the Apollo disaster, and wondered why no one has been held responsible. There is an individual known as the Director or the Administrator of NASA by the name of James E. Webb.

Is there any reason why he should not be held accountable for the Apollo disaster?

Mr. LATTA. If the gentleman is directing the question to me, and apparently he is, I would not want to point my finger at Mr. Webb or anyone else in the program, or any particular contractor, but it seems to me that with all the testimony that has been given somebody or some company was negligent. It has been reported that prior to the fire there were a lot of defective pieces of equipment assigned to the ill-fated spacecraft. If this is true, then somebody was negligent. and the finger ought to be pointed at somebody, but apparently it has not been.

Mr. GROSS. Articles have been published stating there were literally thousands of malfunctions and outright failures in the Apollo program leading to the tragedy last January.

But I want to go back to the question of responsibility. It seems to me that the alleged directing genius of this NASA operation ought to be held responsible for the disaster that occurred on January 27, 1967, when as my friend from Ohio said, three brave and competent men unnecessarily lost their lives in that space capsule.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for his comments.

Let me just say that I am not alone in questioning some of these expenditures, because the President's Science Advisory Committee reported in February of this year:

> The President states in the introduction that the opportunities in space are great, but the costs are high. Our space planning deserves the thoughtful consideration of all thoughtful Americans.

That does not, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, mean buying a pig in a poke. Unless we can define what the requested money is going to be used for, I do not believe this Congress in these times should be authorizing such expenditures.

Let me say to my friend from Texas—and I have always supported the space program because it was heretofore sufficiently spelled out on what NASA was going to do with the money, but when NASA cannot come before this Congress and spell out what it is going to do with the money, then I do not believe I can in good conscience vote for its authorization.

I would hope this Congress could work its will on this piece of legislation today, and cut out some of these undefined items so that we can all support it.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I could not repeat all that took place in the hearings before the Committee on Rules yesterday, but I can state that the members of the Committee on Science and Astronautics know what this money is going to be used for. I would also state that this bill was reported out of the committee with but one vote against it, if my memory serves me correctly. The gentleman is not being fair to come up here and say we do not know what this money is going to be spent for, and I would say to the gentleman that it can be spelled out for him.

If the gentleman does not want to believe or to accept the committee's word, then that is one thing. I believe we have a good space agency. I believe we have a wonderful chairman, and I believe we have wonderful astronauts, and I would say that they know where the money is going because they are right in the middle of this thing.

I believe there is plenty of proof on where this money is going.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman for his comment.

I have been through these dissenting opinions that have been put in here on both sides——

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Does the gentleman respect the majority's opinion, or the minority's opinion, or which does the gentleman respect the most?

Mr. LATTA. Just because there was only one dissenting vote cast against reporting the bill does not mean that the individuals on this committee are for every single item contained in the bill.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am sure that nobody is.

Mr. LATTA. Likewise, I am for the greatest share of the money that you are requesting, but for the items that I have indicated, items that cannot be defined, then I am not for them.

If you can prove to my satisfaction this afternoon that these individuals are wrong when they say they cannot be defined and you can define it, then you will have my support.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I hope before this afternoon is over that items such as the laying of a foundation for a building—I believe it was in Cambridge, Mass.—at a cost of $1 or $2 million—I hope somebody will explain to the House how they could lay a foundation for a building when they did not have the money to pay for the building that was to be erected on the foundation.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman if he wants to respond to that question.

Mr. DADDARIO. I have not asked the gentleman to yield to me for that purpose. But I am rising to call the attention of the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, to what I believe to be a very reasonable

change in his position. In commenting on the dissenting points, he commented that we could not define our programs; and then changing from that, he said, that if during the course of this afternoon we could define what these programs were that he would be careful to pay attention to those arguments.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is a proper and objective adjustment, and I am glad to see that the gentleman has taken that position.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WIGGINS. I am one of the Members here who did not participate in the original decisions on the institution of the space program.

I would agree with the gentleman from Texas that the report reasonably explains the items of what the money is going for.

But it is not specific at all as to why. I would hope that the distinguished chairman, my friend the gentleman from California, and the gentleman from Texas would devote some time to bringing that out to the committee and explaining why—why it is necessary in the order of things that we spend this kind of money to get to the Moon; and why it is necessary in the order of things that we should go beyond the Moon to Mars later on.

I think I could support this bill if I could get it justified in my mind that there is good reason for doing this—when there are other matters to command our attention at this time.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA] has consumed 22 minutes.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I believe we should have a statement about some of the various positions held on this bill so that we know where we stand.

I voted for the bill to be reported out of committee. I have favored the manned lunar mission, that is, the Apollo program. Likewise I supported the Mercury program and the Gemini program. For the Mercury program, which was a one-man in orbit program, we spent $240 million to begin this space mission.

For Gemini we spent $1.3 billion. As you have heard, for the Apollo program, they will have already spent $12.64 billion by the end of this fiscal year, June 30, 1967. If you add the new amount proposed in this bill, it is going to run up to about $15.2 billion.

It was estimated most recently by NASA that to operate the Apollo three-man moon flight program, it will cost a total $22,700,000,000.

That is a lot of money.

This House, however—and I am recalling the record—after President Kennedy said that the manned lunar flight was a national program and a national target during this decade, voted unanimously—every Democrat and every Republican—to authorize this program.

I offered an amendment before the committee and which the committee approved that cut $25 million from the present Apollo funds, making money on the present Apollo program $2½ billion or exactly $2,521,500,000.

I believe that is an adequate amount. I believe it may be cut further—but only after we know the impact of the tragic loss by fire of the three astronauts. We call it the Apollo 204 accident at Cape Kennedy.

We on the committee, and the subcommittees have taken great care and have gone to various NASA installations, such as Houston, Cape Kennedy, and to other facilities. We have been carefully looking to see how we can improve the safety factors.

I would approve every penny of the $2.5 billion for the Apollo program requested this year. In fact, the chairman, Mr. GEORGE MILLER, and I, before the Rules Committee yesterday, each strongly advocated it. No member there disagreed. Is that not so, Mr. MILLER?

Mr. MILLER of California. That is correct.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Our committee has been very careful. We have really provided less authorization than the other body in many cases. In fact, on the program itself we have been within something like part of 1 percent of the right figure, year after year.

I must say that within the Manned Space Flight Subcommittee, under the leadership of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], we have likewise been very careful in monitoring these programs. They are technical programs. With a total authorization and appropriation of more than $4.9 billion, it is extremely hard to go into the many scientific programs involved, determine their significance, their value, and the possible results of each program. We must understand that in scientific research and development we are continuously assessing programs. We are not always successful.

You might ask, for example, how did we do on the Gemini flights?

There were 12 Gemini flights, of which 10 were manned, during the period April 8, 1964, through November 11, 1966.

There were two mishaps—not failures—consisting of an instance when an Agena target vehicle failed to orbit and an Atlas booster engine failed shortly after takeoff. In both instances, the mishaps were corrected by back-up missions which were successful.

The total program cost was $1,290,000,000 contrasted to a fiscal year 1964 runout cost estimate of $1,350,000,000.

No one was lost in those flights.

The Gemini two-man program is over, and I am very glad to say, successfully. No one was lost.

Russia has lost one man in space flight. The United States has lost none in space.

I support the manned space flight program as amended by the committee to reflect my original reduction of $25 million in the Apollo program and the proposed reduction I intend to offer of $150 million in the Apollo applications program. With these reductions, I believe that we have a viable, economical, and efficient manned space flight program.

In addition, I believe the committee acted judiciously in approving funds for construction of facilities in the amount of $66,980,000, including $5.5 million for facility planning and design. These funds reflect a reduction made by the committee of $9,720,000, including the elimination of funds for the Electronic Research Center which has large amounts of prior year funds which have yet to be obligated.

Also included was a modest reduction in funds for the Nuclear Rocket Development Station in Nevada and a $500,000 reduction in facility planning and design funds. With these funds, I believe that NASA will be able to carry on with an aggressive and justifiable construction program.

NASA had originally requested over $670 million for administrative expenses and the committee reduced this request by slightly more than $23 million. I agree with this reduction in the interests of economy and austerity, even though I recognize the fact that salaries and administrative costs are continuing to increase.

There is included in this bill $662,131,000 for further research and development in the area of space science and applications. I supported this part of the program in committee, and I support it now.

The amount now included in the bill is $32,469,000 less than was requested by NASA. Actually a cut of $42,469,000 was made by the committee in certain projects, however, $10,000,000 was added to the NASA request for the sustaining university program.

The space sciences and applications effort is basically the unmanned space flight programs directed toward scientific investigations of the earth, moon, sun, planets, stars, and interplanetary space; and the development of technology and spacecraft systems for operational type missions such as meteorology and communications.

In the physics and astronomy part of this program we are basically concerned with increasing our knowledge of the fundamental nature of the universe. Such projects as orbiting Solar Observatories, Orbiting Astronomical Observatories, Geophysical Observatories, Pioneers, Explorers, Sounding Rockets, and the Sunblazer. The committee cut $15.9 million from this program for the fourth astronomical observatory and the sixth geophysical observatory.

The Lunar and Planetary projects in the bill total $142,000,000. This is essentially a series of projects to conduct scientific exploration of our solar system using automated spacecraft and earth-leased research. The immediate objectives include the unmanned exploration of the moon, the planets Venus and Mars and the intervening interplanetary space. Such projects as the Surveyor, the Lunar Orbiter, and the Mariner are now included. The latest Mariner is now on its way to Venus and should pass the planet on October 19, 1967. These have all been highly successful programs.

The Voyager is a new major program for which full-scale design and develop-

ment will start in fiscal year 1968. A total of $71,500,000 has been included as the first increment of a program which will ultimately cost between $2 and $3 billion. Its first missions in 1973 and 1975 is designed to determine the existence and nature of extraterrestrial life on Mars. Also it will provide information on the atmosphere as well as surface and body characteristics of the planet.

A total of $41,800,000 is included for the bioscience program, one which furthers the search for extraterrestrial life and the attainment of a thorough knowledge of the effects of the space environment on terrestrial organisms. Some of the work in this program was not considered urgent and the committee deferred $2,500,000.

Space Applications projects total $94,500,000 in the bill before you. This is an extremely beneficial program to all mankind. The democratic nations throughout the world look to the United States for economic, scientific, and technological leadership. Through this program this country can demonstrate this leadership in terms readily understandable by all.

I included in such projects as Tiros to provide assistance in weather analysis and prediction; Nimbus, a second generation weather satellite; sounding rockets to gather data in the atmosphere where satellites cannot operate; applications technology satellites designed to develop advanced spacecraft technology; geodetic satellites to conduct geodetic measurements on a worldwide basis.

Not all of the projects requested survived committee scrutiny. Almost $10,000,000 was deferred from the space applications request.

Also included is the launch vehicle procurement program for which the committee approved $150,700,000, which is $14,400,000 less than NASA requested. You should not confuse this line item with the Saturn program, nor the nuclear rocket development program. This program provides for the purchase of small and medium size launch vehicles for various flight projects of the space science and applications as well as the advanced research and technology programs.

The last project in the space science and applications program is the sustaining university program. The committee voted to increase this program from $20,000,000 to $30,000,000 over the objections of certain of my colleagues. The gentleman from Indiana has indicated that he will introduce an amendment to restore this program to the level requested by NASA. I intend to support his amendment.

I also strongly support the programs of the Office of Advanced Research and Technology, Technology Utilization, and the Tracking and Data Acquisition. The work being done in advanced research is very important to the future progress of NASA's programs, especially in assisting the managers to make the right planning decisions. This activity produces the knowledge necessary to determine the technologies that will be available and possible of achievement to carry on the manned and unmanned spaceflight programs. The most important research now underway, in my opinion, is being done in propulsion and in materials. Both provide the keys to capabilities that will continue to extend our mission objectives in the years ahead.

The work being done by NASA in its technology utilization effort is of great significance to the Nation. It is here that the payoffs from space exploration that were anticipated and promised back in 1958 when the Space Act was enacted are being realized. Already a large amount of new technical knowledge from space research has been translated into tangible goods, tools, processes, and techniques now benefiting industry, the economy, and the American people. This is only part of what the Nation is getting for its money. There are also the many intangible benefits, of which there is concrete evidence, to the academic and scientific communities from which will come important additions to our national strength and resources.

The tracking and data acquisition activities are, of course, completely essential to all of the space flight programs. This is the network which provides the means by which the objectives of each flight into space are achieved and the information acquired made meaningful.

The next point I would like to make is on the question whether this program should be cut. There is a difference of opinion. The post-Apollo activity is called Apollo Applications. That means that after we land a man on the moon, then what do we then do? In that program I believe there should be a cut of $250 million. I started out with a higher figure. You can read it in my "Dissenting Views" of the committee report. I made a study and thought it could be cut $350 million. I reduced that from $350 million to $250 million. I have given careful study to the question.

You say, "Why did you reduce that program? Would not it delay the major Apollo program?"

It will not. My reduction applies to a figure of $444,700,000 for the programs that will come in the calendar year 1971, 1972, and probably into 1973.

In the Apollo program itself we have the Saturn V booster. It is expected that out of 15 Saturn V's on order, there will be four to six left over. We really do not know actually how many will be left over. If we have more left over, the Saturn V will be considered successful. That is all to the good. If we do not have any, the Apollo Saturn V then is obsolete. We should not use it.

My amendment of $250 million removes one Apollo Saturn V launch vehicle, not from the moon program, but for the follow-on program. If we have four to six left over of the Saturn V's why are we funding the fifth or the seventh one now? We can put it on the shelf. So I say, Let us spend $194 million of the $444 million for research and development and develop a better vehicle.

Only 4 weeks ago, NASA crews had to disassemble the second stage of a Saturn V. Why? Because of hairline cracks in the welds of the hydrogen tank which permitted the hydrogen to leak out of the tank. The design is not good enough.

Another thing, if we achieve a solid-fuel booster, we can keep it on the pad. We do not have the plumbing problems of liquid-fueled boosters.

Next, if we get high-energy upper stages, we can benefit from 25 to 42 percent increase in the specific impulse, that is, the increased push per pound.

The Saturn can only take 32,000 pounds on a direct flight to the moon, but the Nerva, if we put it on, can take about double that amount and also have energy to maneuver. It can probably be re-used again. Our problem is that we do not have space-storable fuels. We do not now have the extra safety, the higher power Nerva would give us. We could increase the safety factor.

My position is: Emphasize research and development and do not lay up the hardware that we will not use until 1973.

I strongly oppose the administration's placing the manned orbiting laboratory program under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Air Force.

MOL should be placed under the jurisdiction of NASA, the research and development agency of the Federal Government for space and aeronautics. Or, MOL should be placed under the joint jurisdiction of NASA and the U.S. Air Force for development.

I believe the action is a serious mistake, both in organization and philosophy, as well as for public relations purposes.

Latest information shows that the cost of the MOL program has risen to $2.2 billion, which is a $700 million increase in the predicted total costs of the research and development program since August 1965 for a seven-flight program. It was further expected that MOL flights would begin in mid-1968 but now will very likely slip by 2 years or possibly more. Surely, prudent management and good judgment dictate a common earth orbital program where NASA launch facilities, knowledge, existing hardware, and capability are used to avoid the cost increases and launch schedule slippages.

I strongly oppose the action of Secretary of Defense McNamara when, in his December 10, 1963, news conference, Mr. McNamara announced without prior notice of any kind that the manned orbiting laboratory program would be assigned to the Air Force. Neither Congress nor the scientific community of the country had any prior notice or inkling that this was to be the case until Mr. McNamara made his bland announcement.

I also oppose the announcement by the President on August 25, 1964, at a news conference that the MOL program would be worked upon by certain major contractors. This is certainly not the way to do business, nor is it appropriate to ignore the existing science and research facilities of the Federal Government without any consultation or authorization by Congress whatever. It is complete fiction to state, as Secretary of Defense McNamara has assumed, that MOL is completely a military task and therefore can be handled by him as Secretary of Defense, as if he and the Department are the only people concerned in this tremendous development.

The announcement by Secretary Mc-

Namara makes a fiction and is in direct violation of the expressed intent of the Congress in section 102(a) of the original Space Act, Public Law 85–568, dated July 28, 1958, wherein it was expressed that—

> The Congress hereby declares that it is the policy of the United States that activities in space should be devoted to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind.

The action of Secretary of Defense McNamara is also in direct violation of the provisions of resolution 1472. "International Cooperation in the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space," adopted by the United Nations at the 856th Plenary Meeting of the 14th General Assembly on December 12, 1959. Under this resolution, the United States, along with other countries including the U.S.S.R., agreed to foster international cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space. It was a privilege and a real responsibility for me to be able to work as one of the delegates on the U.S. mission to the United Nations for this purpose, under the leadership of Henry Cabot Lodge, chief U.S. delegate.

On January 27, 1967, the United States, U.S.S.R., Great Britain, and many other nations signed the treaty on principles governing the exploration and use of outer space. On April 25, 1967, the U.S. Senate ratified the treaty, and the U.S.S.R. similarly ratified the treaty on May 18, 1967. The treaty specifically provides for peaceful exploration of space and bans the orbiting of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction in space. It also prevents the use of the moon and other celestial bodies for military purposes. It is provided in the space treaty that space shall be used exclusively for peaceful purposes. Thus, is the U.S. policy on the use of space facing two directions? Has the United States already been violating this treaty at the time of signing?

The Congress of the United States should decide the basic national policy on space according to the will of the American people, after thorough study and due deliberation.

Being first in space, for scientific and prestige purposes is one thing. Being first in space to better deliver weapons of destruction or nuclear and atomic weapons is quite another field entirely.

Do the American people want the administration to have the first manned orbiting laboratory solely dedicated for military purposes? This would have the fatal result of excluding all peaceful purpose research and development or, at best, make a poor second the research and development that could be done by NASA for the benefit and progress of the American people and all mankind.

EFFICIENT USE OF MANPOWER RESOURCES BY NASA

I believe that the continuing increase in NASA scientific and engineering personnel has reached the point where a detailed review by the Congress is required. Over 40 percent of the total NASA civil service strength of 34,000 are scientists and engineers and the ratio of scientists and engineers continues to rise each year.

I point out the situation at the new NASA Electronic Research Center at Boston. Personnel strengths at this Center have increased from 250 in fiscal year 1965 to 510 in fiscal year 1966 to 741 in fiscal year 1967. The personnel strength requested by NASA for fiscal year 1968 is 1,041. Most of these will be scientific and engineering personnel. Amazingly, all this increase happens while the Center itself has yet to build one building for its activities.

The great bulk of NASA personnel are scientists, engineers, and technicians, all of whom are in critical shortage in the U.S. economy, at a time when the Nation is producing for the war in Vietnam. As the large amounts of personnel used by NASA are not blue-collar workers, there is need for great caution.

There is the major question of NASA management of personnel. Is NASA using these critically scarce personnel in the best possible fashion? Is NASA responding to the sudden changes in the U.S. space program as projects phase out and others expand or reach their peak effort? NASA reports that the total personnel used in the space program, which of course includes contractor and subcontractor personnel, is being reduced at the rate of 5,000 per month.

The impact of reserving to our space activities, both in Government and in contractor plants, a large percentage of U.S. scientific and technical personnel can only be judged serious and critical for these reasons:

The war in Vietnam.

The current inflation in the economy.

The requirements for defense industries.

The requirements for U.S. business and the U.S. economy.

The requirements for maintaining a healthy scientific pool of talent in U.S. scientific and academic communities, universities and colleges, foundations, and research institutions.

I strongly recommend that a competent survey be conducted by an experienced, nongovernmental management organization of the management techniques and the utilization of scientific and technical personnel in NASA. I also recommend that the preliminary report of this survey be provided to the President, the National Aeronautics and Space Council, and the Congress before final action on the fiscal year 1968 NASA authorization bill takes place.

I further strongly recommend a study in depth of NASA manpower utilization by the appropriate committee of the Congress—either the Manpower and Civil Service Subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee—or by the House Government Operations Committee.

I am seriously concerned over the lack of field monitoring of NASA activities by the Bureau of the Budget, by the General Accounting Office, and by the Science and Astronautics Committee.

For example, the Bureau of the Budget has far too few people with far too much control over the NASA budget. On my latest information, there are only three staff members in the Bureau of the Budget who have the responsibility to make all types of major decisions concerning the $5 billion NASA budget. These people spend altogether, on the annual NASA budget, only 5 to 6 weeks continuous time. From time to time on current matters, there is additional time given but this time is not substantial. This type of budget control can be labeled with one word, "superficial."

The General Accounting Office has failed to this date to provide Congress with any competent management surveys or audits of one of the largest agencies in the Government. They have made specific audits, but not agencywide. These audits have been cashbox and not management audits and evaluations. Nor have these audits balanced the need for and value of various and gigantic scientific programs in relation to each other. I feel that the General Accounting Office is far too bound with its past history in emphasizing accounting and bookkeeping practices at the expense of scientific management surveys. This new function must promptly be added to the General Accounting Office as I have urged for some years.

On a $5 billion annual budget, it is necessary to move far beyond the limitations of accountancy and bookkeeping. It is vitally necessary for congressional purposes that personnel be available with adequate judgment and experience in research and development activities. This personnel is required in three places: the Bureau of the Budget; the General Accounting Office; and the Science and Astronautics Committee. Congress can then make decisions of choice among the various programs presented by NASA in the light of the potential research and development gains, all based on an adequate base of reference.

The American people must realize that the days of monitoring and supervising large technical programs on the limited basis of mere accountancy and bookkeeping are gone forever. It is a simple axiom both in Government and in business—"Technically qualified people must oversee technical programs." My conclusion, therefore, is: Current and continuing program evaluation of Government scientific programs is badly needed, and sorely lacking at the present time.

For several years I have been urging the Science and Astronautics Committee to increase its technical staff by at least five scientists, engineers, and accountants, for continuous field investigatory duties. I repeat my recommendation, particularly in view of the fact that the committee has not used all of its presently allocated funds.

To safeguard the interests of the U.S. taxpayers and for efficiency in management of research and development, involving so many highly technical programs, the Government must have sufficient research and development, construction and technical management personnel assigned exclusively for field evaluation and monitoring duties separate and apart from program responsibilities or contractor personnel.

I have strongly recommended that an inspector general, with necessary staff and facilities, be established in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. I wish to emphasize the criti-

cal importance of such an office to the efficiency and safety of NASA operations and programs.

The current NASA program contains a myriad of complex scientific and technical projects designed to meet a wide variety of objectives of importance to the Nation. The current NASA request contains 20 separate and distinct research and development programs, of which the multibillion-dollar Apollo lunar landing program is only one.

It is inconceivable to me that many serious management problems will not arise as a result of the various programs and objectives. These involve not only an annual Federal expenditure of over $5 billion but also the future of the national space program. I believe it is necessary that the Administrator of NASA be provided with the capability of obtaining independent evaluations and examinations of management actions by personnel other than those involved in formulating or implementing management policies. To maintain their complete objectivity and for greater effectiveness, such personnel should not be within the ranks of current NASA or aerospace contractor personnel. Their orientation should be independent.

The chairman of the committee has assured me for the past few years that my proposal for the establishment of an inspector general in NASA would be the subject of hearings. These hearings have never been held. I have already introduced during this session of the Congress, H.R. 4473 for the creation of an inspector general organization in NASA.

It is significant to note that numerous other agencies of the Federal Government have recognized the importance of utilizing inspector general offices to effectuate internal and periodic examinations, evaluations, and corrective measures. These offices have been singularly effective. Among these agencies are the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of State, and the Department of Agriculture.

The existence of an adequate inspector general organization might have been able to uncover the inadequate safeguards which led to the recent Apollo 204 disaster. It is significant that the Apollo 204 Review Board included a representative of the U.S. Air Force inspector general. If such participation was considered desirable on an after-the-fact basis, why was not such participation equally desirable in the period before the accident? Similarly, if the Air Force inspector general proved of use during the Apollo accident investigation, would not a NASA inspector general office have fulfilled the same purpose? If the inspector general concept is not worth while, as may be implied from the continued NASA resistance to my proposal, should all such offices in other Government agencies be abolished and the money now spent used for other purposes?

I believe it of urgent and vital importance that NASA establish and maintain an inspector general to insure that the space program and objectives of this Nation are carried out and met with both economy and efficiency.

I have consistently emphasized research and development in high-energy liquid fuels, solid fuels, and advanced propulsion technology and engines. This policy will result in larger payloads, longer missions, space-storable fuels, weight decreases of boosters and increased payloads, and the elimination of heavy and bulky insulation materials now required.

Likewise I have insisted that adequate research emphasis should be placed on nuclear propulsion and power. I strongly favor the President's action in adding to the NASA budget additional money for the Nerva nuclear rocket development.

I have pointed out that the exploration of the eight other planets of our solar system as well as their 31 moons will be too expensive using the present generation of boosters, capsules, components, and hardware.

In fiscal year 1967, $4 million was added to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration authorization to accelerate NASA chemical propulsion research and development. In the 1968 budget the NASA total chemical propulsion program was increased by $11 million. This is really a decrease rather than an increase. The reason this is a decrease is that significant projects in chemical propulsion have been carried on in past years by the Office of Manned Space Flight and the Office of Space Science and Applications of NASA. These offices are highly mission and program completion oriented. Under this policy, if research does not have an obvious and immediate program application, the funds cannot long be justified.

I have been urging the development of boron-fluorine-hydrogen combinations that will give much greater specific impulse. Specific impulse, of course, means "push per pound." Experiments have already shown that with the use of boron and fluorine additives or mixtures there can be additional power and energy output varying from 30 to 45 percent increase with the fuel used. Such a surprisingly productive avenue should not be overlooked by NASA.

My criticism has been and continues to be that NASA tends to be a large engineering, plumbing, and manufacturing concern with the emphasis on science becoming less and less. The emphasis on programs has increased geometrically through the successful Mercury program, through the successful Gemini programs, to the staggering size of the Apollo moon flight program. It must be kept in mind that these programs are really production, engineering, and development, with very little scientific knowledge or invention being added in the process. It certainly takes research of a high level to have the equipment and personnel adequately perform under these programs and to be able to take advantage of the tremendous new fields in which they will be operating.

But this research and development is in the nature of refinements of processes and present components and parts. This is using much present knowledge in new conjunctions, rather than the basic and applied research necessary for the new generation of boosters, fuels, capsules, components, and hardware that are so necessary. My estimate is that 95 percent of the NASA budget is not research and development in the ordinary scientific meaning of the term.

Development of the spike nozzle concept for liquid engines also has lagged. Taking advantage of this concept would improve the liquid stages by improving the operating efficiency. This development would obtain higher performance in flight and would reduce the length of the stages required with improved structural strength.

For several years, I have strongly supported what to me is an obvious and urgent need for a minority committee staff. I have argued for that requirement at every opportunity during sessions of the Science and Astronautics Committee, the House Administration Committee, and in debate on the floor of the House of Representatives as well.

In the February 18, 1965, session of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics I strongly urged the appointment of a minority staff, along with other staff specialists, to the existing staff to broaden committee capabilities to meet steadily increasing responsibilities. I repeated my request and arguments in committee meetings on April 8, 1965, April 6, 1966, and February 21, 1967.

The exploration of space, research and development in science and aeronautics, has had vigorous bipartisan support over the years. There are certainly significant divisions of opinion in the scientific community, the business community, among research and development personnel and among members of the Science and Astronautics Committee that are important, and transcend partisanship. These differences of opinion are to be found in any research and development activity, whether in Government or in business, in universities, or in research foundations. This means progress.

In order that the administration proposals, as well as the many proposals from every avenue shall be tested and adequate staff work accomplished, in order best to prepare the statement of these points of view, I firmly believe that minority staff development on the House Science and Astronautics Committee is essential.

I therefore recommend that a minority staff be developed on the House Science and Astronautics Committee to serve the adherents of minority viewpoints, regardless of party affiliation. Such technical, scientific, research, engineering, and management know-how for the minority members, regardless of party, on particular issues, is a vital necessity if balanced judgments leading to sound committee and congressional decisions are to be achieved.

Of course, at present committee professional staff assistance is provided to all members of the committee to help on individual problems. But this does not solve the really big problems, nor does it call the urgency and need for evaluation to the members' attention. This means the individual member has little chance to initiate action that is necessary and which requires definite professional staff assistance and guidance.

ADEQUATE COMMITTEE STAFFING

Minority members of this committee have repeatedly expressed concern over the limited number of committee staff personnel available to the members of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics. In my opinion it is impossible for the 12 professional and technical staff members adequately to handle the workload associated with the committee's broad responsibilities in the field of science and space. The Committee on Science and Astronautics is responsible for authorizing and overseeing one of the largest budgets in the Federal Government. The committee has one of the smallest committee staffs in Congress to assist in this process.

I have consistently and constantly made known to the committee and the Congress my view that additional technical, scientific, and engineering staff is vitally necessary. In the committee meeting of April 5, 1967, I made the following observation:

> I do believe we need extra staffing for people to go and see * * * we have brought it up time after time * * * we should have three, four, or five people in the field. On February 21, 1967, I also commented in the organization meeting of the committee, "On staff, I have suggested previously that we have an outside permanent liaison staff (at appropriate locations) * * * reporting back * * * so there is a closer liaison with the contracts, contractors as well as the facilities.

On February 18, 1967, in full committee I again raised the question:

> I have made a suggestion previously that we ought to have * * * staff members who are really field representatives.

In previous years I have made this point again and again in the reports accompanying NASA authorization bills in 1963, 1965, and 1966.

It is the responsibility of the House Science and Astronautics Committee to study thoroughly the many space projects and programs. The committee staff must contain enough individuals trained in technical management, engineering, electronics, science, and other space-related disciplines to assist in this important work. With the present staff, despite their individual competence, I believe the committee cannot fully perform its prime functions—to review the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's budget and to assist in evaluating, on a continuing basis, these programs. This situation constitutes a weakness in the system of checks and balances. Here is an instance where the legislative branch of Government, because of inadequate staff, is unable to keep watch on a huge executive agency. This leads to waste and makes inefficient our system of government.

In addition to the responsibility for the conduct of scientific research at all levels, departments, and agencies of Government, the committee has authorization and oversight responsibility over one of the largest Government agencies—the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, with an annual budget totaling over $5 billion. Without additional staffing the committee cannot carry out these oversight responsibilities throughout the year and in addition involve itself in the many other responsibilities in the fields of science. Aeronautics supervision is simply a "lost cause." The behemoth National Bureau of Standards, which is under the legislative jurisdiction of the committee, recently decided to spend $64,000 on a flagpole, but who was watching the store?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All of the time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

The gentleman from Florida is recognized.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the able gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT].

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to express my opinion in support of three different subject matters before us now.

Naturally, on the rule, which I heartily endorse, the distinguished gentleman from Florida has outlined the committee's position very well, and the distinguished gentleman from Ohio has addressed himself to the bill. I shall direct my remarks to the bill on the next two occasions of support.

I agree very much with the gentleman from Ohio in his quotation that the space program "should be thoughtfully considered by thoughtful Americans." I submit, Mr. Speaker, that I know of no more thoughtful Americans than the dedicated members of the Space Committee of the House in which we serve. Their dedication is a hallmark of their efforts in bringing this legislation of authorization before us today. It is the result of the thoughtful approach by thoughtful Americans.

I am a strong believer in going to the experts when I want advice. Serving on a committee in this body that authorizes more money than any other committee, the Committee on Armed Services, which is sitting at the moment on the justification for some 1,800 line items in a military construction bill, and having just passed and reported out in this body a procurement bill in the amount of billions, I can well understand and can well conceive the apprehension which some have who are not immediately involved in the studies of these types of legislation, and I appreciate their viewpoint.

But I must indicate again that, beginning with the statement of the distinguished gentleman from Florida, in which he itemized how many millions of dollars had been cut from the original proposal, and the fact that over $100 million was cut by the committee, $46 million of that cut by the committee of the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], after these broad and definite cuts, I wonder how anybody who has not been given the opportunity of hearing the testimony and visiting these installations throughout this Nation and listening to the people talk, can challenge what has been done by this thoughtful committee of thoughtful Americans.

I believe my record in this body will show—and I take second place to no one—that I have voted against the appropriations for certain programs with which I disagree, and I am unalterably opposed to the so-called giveaway programs, the so-called poverty programs, the so-called do-good-here and do-good-there programs—so I suggest that we examine the differences between those and these of which we are speaking.

Not one of those programs produces a single item of income in this country. Not one. That is really a giveaway. For good purposes, yes; I respect the motives behind these programs.

This is a program in which every dollar put into the program comes out in a productive manner, by a productive individual who supports the economy of this country, who works for his living, who earns his keep, and who pays his taxes.

I shudder to think of what would happen if we came in here with another suggestion, if the gentlemen in the majority had followed the suggestions already made and had cut the program. I am sure there would have been another suggestion for more cuts.

I am not being political in any sense of the word, but the suggestion is made that some went back home and told their folks how they were going to save them money, and how they want to do this. If we want to continue in that vein, my friends, I wonder how many of us could go back into our own individual communities and our own individual States and explain it to those people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the able gentleman an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. HÉBERT. How could Members explain this to those people who will be out of jobs, or to the owners of those plants which will be closed down?

Are we going to put them under the poverty program? Are we going to explain to them the economy of taking the bread and butter out of their mouths? Are we going to tell them we cut their income?

I am not talking about pump priming. I am talking about a definite and constructive program.

I have had an opportunity to visit these places. I have visited with my old and distinguished friend, the gentleman from California, and more recently with my distinguished friend the gentleman from Texas. I have walked through these plants.

I have been through the Kennedy Space Center.

I have been through Huntsville.

I have been through the Missile Test Flight Center.

I have been through the Michoud Assembly Facility.

I have been through the Slidell Facility.

I have been through the George C. Marshall Space Flight Center.

I have heard Dr. Wernher von Braun, for whom I have the greatest of respect.

I have heard these people explain, in the most minute detail possible, for a layman to understand, what their program is.

I am convinced that this is no time to practice false economy. This is no time to stop the pipelines of the future, upon

which the economy of this Nation is built, together with the Department of Defense.

Whether we like it or not, we cannot deny that this economy now is geared, hand in hand and arm in arm, with the Defense and the space programs. These are the two biggest spenders in the country. One is in the defense and security of this Nation, and the other is projected into the future, pouring billions of dollars into the economy for productive means, for productive efforts, from which results taxes and jobs and support of this economy.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. The gentleman is one of the key Members of the Congress who serves on some of our defense committees.

I, like many other Members of Congress, am concerned about the space program and its relationship to our military efforts. I realize there are certain security provisions which will restrict any major response by the gentleman, but I wonder if he could at least allude to some of the problems with which we might be faced in the way of technological fallout if we do not have an adequate program.

This is what I am principally concerned about, because I know that our major adversary, Russia, certainly plans for progress in this field. I am particularly concerned about the space program, for I know there is a substantial fallout which comes from this program which will accrue to our benefit, so far as our military activities are concerned.

Mr. HÉBERT. I say to the gentleman, within the bounds of classification, that one cannot, under any circumstances, separate the value of the space program in any area, in any field, in any realm, from our defense program and the protection of the security of this country. They simply cannot be separated. We must consider them together.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from California

Mr. MILLER of California. It may be interesting to the gentleman to know, without describing too much, because it is common knowledge, that there are in excess of 200 Air Force officers on duty as engineers and technicians assisting in the space program.

There are astronauts and others. These men work together. You must remember, because you are an old flyer, that NASA inherited the work of the National Advisory Committee on Aviation and it does all of the research and development work on all of our planes such as the X–15 and the RS–70. These are not Air Force projects but NASA projects. In all these things where research and development are concerned, NASA does this work for civil aviation and everything connected with air. In order to get close cooperation you have these people from Defense interwoven with the NASA crew.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for that statement. He stated the case very clearly and within the confines of classification. I again repeat that not even the wisdom of Solomon or the cutter of the Gordian knot could separate the security of this program as between defense and space. They are inexorably intertwined forever.

May I say again to these gentlemen, yes, thoughtful Americans can do a thoughtful job in cutting fat, but for your own sake, the sake of our Nation and our future, do not cut the muscle from this program.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 150]

Adair	Edmondson	Leggett
Addabbo	Fallon	Long, La.
Annunzio	Findley	Lukens
Ashbrook	Fino	Mahon
Ashley	Fisher	Mailliard
Baring	Ford, William D.	Meskill
Bates	Fraser	Moore
Berry	Friedel	Morgan
Bolling	Fuqua	Nichols
Bow	Gallagher	O'Hara, Mich.
Brasco	Garmatz	Pool
Brock	Giaimo	Rodino
Broomfield	Gibbons	Rooney, N.Y.
Brown, Calif.	Goodling	Roush
Buchanan	Hamilton	St. Onge
Burton, Utah	Harsha	Schneebeli
Carey	Hawkins	Selden
Celler	Hays	Springer
Conable	Herlong	Steiger, Ariz.
Conte	Ichord	Thompson, N.J.
Daniels	Irwin	Vigorito
Dawson	Kee	Williams, Miss.
Dent	Kelly	Wyman
Derwinski	Kluczynski	Zablocki
Diggs		

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall, 362 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS TO THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10340) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 10340, with Mr. FLYNT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] will be recognized for 1½ hours and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the Science and Astronautics Committee is here today on behalf of H.R. 10340, which authorizes appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1968. This bill is a clean bill and reflects the actions of the Science and Astronautics Committee.

At the outset let me tell you that our committee gave this budget the most thorough study. To consider it, we held nine full committee meetings and 45 subcommittee meetings. In doing this we took 4,273 pages of testimony resulting in four volumes of hearings. The report is 158 pages long with 36 pages of additional or dissenting views. In this latter respect, I want the Members to know that, although there are a considerable number of additional views, the vote on the bill was 24 in favor with only 1 opposed.

NASA's original request was for $5,100,000,000 and the committee is recommending a total reduction of $107,818,000. Therefore, the total recommended budget is $4,900,000,000-plus.

The three main categories of this bill are divided into research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations. The largest single program in the research and development category—and I am sure the one of most interest—is the Apollo lunar program. For this the committee authorized $2,521,500,000. This represents a reduction of $25 million from the original NASA request, and I might also add that it is approximately $446 million less than was authorized for this program last year.

When considering the funds for Apollo, we must keep in mind that NASA is not asking for additional funds for this program because of the Apollo 204 accident. NASA is absorbing $75 million which it is estimated must be spent because of the accident. This $75 million which NASA must make up out of its budget will be spent as follows:

Five million dollars will be required to make material changes and flammability testing for the new spacecraft configuration;

An estimated $40.0 million for required design and incorporation of equipment changes and modifications;

An estimated $8.0 million for development of new spacesuits;

An estimated $17.0 million for re-

scheduling of deliveries of command and service modules; and

An estimated $5 million will be required for modifications of launch facilities.

Now, the increased cost of $75 million, it is believed, can be offset by a reduction of $25 million stemming from a lower than originally planned level of mission operations, because of rescheduling of the first manned flight, and an expected reduction of $50 million in cost of existing contracts through effective management.

Continuing in the manned space flight category. I turn next to the Apollo applications program. In 1961 the United States undertook the first step toward a major manned space flight capability by selecting the goal of a manned lunar landing within the decade. The Apollo and Saturn systems have been developed to meet that goal, and the successful Gemini program has provided the necessary early experience in maneuver, rendezvous, docking, extravehicular activity and 14-day flight.

The Apollo applications program is the second significant step toward that capability and represents an effort even more important and far reaching in its implications than the Apollo effort upon which it is based. The program will carry out a full investigation of man's role in the effective exploration of the environment of space to meet man's needs on the earth and in the long-term exploration of the universe. The program of investigations and development carried forward in the Apollo applications program will meet two basic objectives: to make unique contributions to practical applications, operational capabilities, science and technology, and at the same time to place the Nation in a position to assess, on the basis of valid scientific experimentation and actual experience, the value and feasibility of future space flight and the interrelated roles of manned and unmanned systems.

The committee recommends an authorization of $444,700,000 for this program, which is a reduction of $10 million from the NASA request. In this connection you should know that the Apollo applications program was reduced over $170 million by the Bureau of the Budget before the request came to the Congress. During its deliberations, the committee considered a more severe cut in this program, but came to the conclusion that a greater reduction would severely affect the better development of manned space flight capabilities.

The last item in the manned space flight portion of the bill is an item for $6.2 million for advanced mission studies. The committee reduced this program by $1.8 million from the original NASA request of $8 million. The committee recognizes the importance of advanced mission studies because they are the basis upon which informed and intelligent decisions are made concerning the future of manned space flight. Nevertheless, the committee reduced the program by $1.8 million because it does not believe that NASA can advantageously spend all the funds requested for this program in fiscal year 1968.

I turn next to those programs which come within the general category of space science and applications. These are the programs listed in the summary on page 3 of the report, starting with item No. 4 and ending with item No. 9. In the physics and astronomy program, the committee reduced the NASA request of $147,500,000 by $15,869,000. NASA had planned to develop a fourth and last orbiting astronomical observatory satellite during fiscal year 1968. However, the committee has had this program under investigation for some time and the deficiencies in the OAO system and in the management of the project caused the committee to recommend disapproval of $8.9 million requested for the last OAO. The committee believes that Congress should be convinced of the soundness of the basic design of the OAO as well as the effectiveness of the management practices in this project before approving funds for the construction of a new spacecraft in this series.

Likewise, the committee recommends against authorization for the sixth and last geophysical observatory satellite. NASA had requested $6,923,000 for this project and the committee denied this request.

The committee recommended a $2.5 million reduction in the $44.3 million requested by NASA for the bioscience program because there appears to be no urgency in carrying out certain experiments included in this project.

The committee also deferred NASA's $5 million request for meteorological satellites Nimbus E and F, believing that these could be deferred until a later date. Two and four-tenths million dollars was also denied NASA for support development of three additional geodetic satellites, as well as $2.5 million requested for the voice broadcast satellite program.

NASA requested $165.1 million for procurement of small- and medium-sized launch vehicles for various flight projects. The committee denied $14.4 million of the request.

I would like to say a few words about Voyager which is a major new program. The full scale design and development of this new program will start in fiscal year 1968. The Voyager will provide the first opportunity for man to obtain sufficiently detailed data concerning the planets of our solar system to permit a significant step in the understanding of planets and to apply this information to the earth itself. The objective of the Voyager program beginning with the missions planned for the 1973 and 1975 Mars opportunities is to obtain information relevant to the existence and nature of extraterrestrial life, the atmosphere, surface, and body characteristics of the planet Mars, and the nearby space environment. Three primary objectives will shape the Voyager missions: to gain knowledge about the origin of the solar system, to gain knowledge about the origin of life, and to apply both to a better understanding of terrestrial life. Not only do these objectives directly bear on man's place in the universe, but they are closely related to the origin of the universe itself. NASA requested $71,500,000 for this program in fiscal year 1968, and the committee recommends authorizing that amount.

There is one program in the space science and applications category which the committee increased. I have reference to the sustaining university program for which NASA requested $20 million. The committee increased this request by $10 million. The sustaining university program is designed to help replenish the highly trained manpower pool drawn upon by NASA programs. The committee believes that a demonstrable need for a more highly trained manpower exists today. There is undeniable evidence that companies in the aerospace industry are aggressively competing for scientific and engineering personnel. Moreover, there is little reason for believing that the situation will improve during the next few years. NASA appears to hope that programs of the National Science Foundation and the U.S. Office of Education and others will fill the gap and satisfy the Nation's vital need for highly trained manpower, but the committee does not agree. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $10 million for the predoctoral training grants program and specifies in the report that the intent of Congress is that the educational funds so authorized may not be reprogramed or diverted to other purposes.

The third and last general research and development category is advanced research and technology, with other programs such as aeronautics, tracking and data acquisition, and technology utilization. These programs are items 10 through 20 in the summary on page 3 of the report—with the exception of the sustaining university program which I have just explained.

The committee made small reductions in several of these programs. I will not take the time to go through each since they are all adequately explained in the committee report, but I do wish to call your attention to one program in this category. That is the nuclear rockets program for which the committee recommends an authorization of $70 million. The objectives of this program are to develop the technology of the nuclear engine systems utilizing graphite solid-core reactors to develop the Nerva engine. Due to its high efficiency compared to that achievable with chemical rockets, the nuclear rocket provides a vastly increased performance capability for use in future space exploration activities. The size of the Nerva engine is such that it can be used as an upper stage on the Saturn V launch vehicle. Among its advantages it would increase substantially the payload that could be carried to the moon for extended lunar missions or for the support of future lunar-based activities.

The nuclear rockets program is a joint AEC–NASA effort managed by a single office, the Space Nuclear Propulsion Office, which was established by interagency agreement between AEC and NASA. We believe this is an extremely important program for future space exploration.

I turn next to the chemical propulsion program and particularly to the large solid motor project. The committee increased the NASA request for this project by $12 million and this is not the first

year that it has done so. The reason for this increase again this year is for continued work on the large solid motor project in an effort to further develop this technology or to embark on the full length test firing of the motor which would require subsequent year funding. This action is taken on the continuing conviction of the committee that the large solid fuel motor as a first stage booster will be cheaper, more versatile, simple, and more reliable than other boosters. Additionally this rocket could fill a wide gap in our capability for placing large payloads in earth orbit. The committee was also careful to write language in the bill which restricts the use of this money to only the large solid motor project.

I think Mr. FULTON spent some time in his remarks on this phase of this work.

I will turn next to the construction of facilities program for which NASA requested $76,700,000. This is a small construction program by comparison with past years, and I will not take the Members' time to run through each project. It is thoroughly explained beginning on page 121 of the report. I will say, however, that the committee reduced the request $9,720,000.

The last general category of the bill is administrative operations, and NASA requested $671,300,000 for this category. This represented an increase of $15.4 million over that authorized for the preceding fiscal year budget. The committee reduced the NASA request by $23,094,000. This was done, generally speaking, on the basis that the committee believes that greater austerity can be practiced by better management control and by better attention to areas concerning nonpermanent positions, reimbursable details, overtime pay, travel, and matters of this nature.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would like to again remind the House of the amount of care and attention which the Science and Astronautics Committee has given to this year's NASA budget request. We have attempted to hold the NASA budget to a bare minimum and yet authorize sufficient funds for NASA to go forward with the Nation's space program.

I believe we have in this bill recommended a sound but austere budget for NASA, and it is the committee's conviction that with good management NASA can do its job with the funds the committee recommends.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that you cannot turn on and off the development of an agency such as NASA. One of the most important assets that NASA has are the teams of scientists and engineers who are working with them. It has taken years to develop them, and the theory that you can turn this on and off is fallacious.

Mr. Chairman, the next thing I would like to tell the Members of the House is that this committee has worked ir.telligently and industriously. I would challenge anyone to controvert that statement. As chairman of this committee, I have invited its members and authorized them to go into the field to visit NASA's installations, and the installations of contractors.

Many of them have taken advantage of this, but some of them who criticize NASA have never found it convenient to do this.

I believe this is one of the things I am sorry to have to report to you.

But we have made a thorough study and the study has been one in which no partisanship whatsoever has ever raised its head.

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WIGGINS. I wish to state first that I have absolutely no prejudice at all against this program. I find it very exciting as a matter of fact.

But I would like the chairman to answer briefly, if he would, for my own education, some matters that are not touched upon in the committee report.

I would like the chairman to give us his view as to why it is necessary for man to set foot on the moon at all.

Mr. MILLER of California. I have been through this so much now, I am rather surprised but, of course, I understand this is the gentleman's first term in the Congress. But I will tell you the reason we go to the moon—it is to develop the techniques for the exploration of space and to learn how to live in the hostile environment of space—and it is a hostile environment.

I foresee the time and I hope it is a not too distant time in the future when we will have recoverable space ships and not have to spend money on large boosters—money that disappears into the blue every time we fire one. Because with the development of communication satellites and weather satellites and navigational satellites, all of which cost a lot of money, we must sometime, someplace have the facilities to go out and repair these things in space.

Maybe it only requires one little black box that has gone dead and maybe you can bring it back to life. But today we cannot do this.

If you are going to live in space, you have to know a lot more than we know today and, I presume, we have selected the moon as an exercise—a plateau if you will, in the exploration of space.

There is another facet of it that frankly I do not so much subscribe to. But there is a great deal of prestige in this field.

I am sure if the gentleman will let his mind go back to 1957 when Sputnik was first launched, there was a great deal of humiliation in this country—and I happened to have been on the high seas and landed in England just 3 days after that and the British papers, editorially and otherwise, were filled with the statement—"Oh, well, the big shot got his comeuppance—the greatest industrial nation on earth could not make the grade."

Of course, we felt this impact.

We have not set this up necessarily as a race to the moon. I shall place in the RECORD an interview on one of the stations in which three of the astronauts were interrogated. They disavowed this so-called moon race and I disavow this so-called moon race. But I do say it is a prestigious thing because the new nations of the world are watching all of this.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I think if the gentleman will go back and check the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of some 50 or 60 years ago, he will find that the question was asked on the floor of this House—"Why fly?" The statement was made that the airplane would never be anything but a toy for millionaires.

Our country made the first airplane, but when World War I came along there was not an American plane flying while there were hundreds of planes of many other countries.

You can ask this kind of question about almost anything. But the results that have been obtained—and I think it is unfortunate that we have used the word "moon" to describe this project and program—I think we should call it a "space program"—but as I was saying, our results that we have obtained from communications and from weather observations and navigation and reconnaissance have paid for this space program.

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Chairman, I think these comments are helpful so that all of us can better understand this program.

I can say frankly that I have spent a lot of time studying the committee report and I am sure other Members have too—and if they are honest with themselves they have to admit that they could not understand it.

A discussion of space goals is illuminating, however, and I think the chairman will agree, this is a political question and not a technical question. This is something that I feel this House should debate from time to time.

I would like the chairman to answer this one more question and then I will be happy to yield back to the gentleman. I would like to know if these objectives which we have talked about must be achieved in at least the Apollo program by 1970. Is it not possible to stretch out the program a bit and save some money in that connection?

Mr. MILLER of California. This was adopted many years ago as a goal, and I am afraid in some of these programs if you do not have a goal they string on forever. That is true in business and anything else you want to get into. You establish a goal. This goal was established. We have worked toward this goal. We are still working toward it.

I again want to impress upon you that if you say, "We can retard it, we can hold this back," that it costs more money to get up your momentum and go on again. As the gentleman knows, it is getting a plane off the ground that is the expensive part of flying a plane. If you are going to make little hops across the country in this program, it will be more costly than if we get the plane up there and keep it there.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BELL. I just wanted to point out something to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. WIGGINS]. It was estimated by Dr. Mueller, associate administrator for manned space flight, that if we were to put off the space program for any period of time, or lengthen it out, it would cost us $1 billion a year merely to maintain the operations and investments that NASA now has in Cape Canaveral and elsewhere.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. Yes, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. With reference to the Nerva project, some $70 million. I am wondering if NASA has laid out any requirement or specified any mission for a nuclear rocket in space.

Mr. MILLER of California. This, as I understand it, right now is an experimental project, as the gentleman knows. We are trying to develop the Nerva engine. I presume after we get the Nerva engine designed, we will be able to apply it where we now apply chemical rockets for second and third stages. As you know, it will not be practical to use it as a first stage, because of the fallout that emanates from it. But as to the second and third stages, those of us who have great confidence in the ability of this country, through the cooperation of the AEC and NASA to develop an engine, just as the AEC has made great progress in its field, look forward to the time when, with such an engine, we can have a bigger apparatus and perhaps a cheaper apparatus.

Mr. HOSMER. The reason I have asked the question is that the ANP aircraft nuclear propulsion project had better than $1 billion spent on it without a requirement from the Defense Department. It was developed on the assumption that the device would generate a mission, but that was so slow in coming that the whole program had to be disbanded. I would hope that the Space Committee would, if they could, press NASA for some delineation of a mission of something more than an ambiguous nature, with some finite time-scale specification so that this program might not lose itself in some limbo after the $70 million that we have in this bill has been spent.

Would it be possible to press them? We tried over in the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy without too much luck.

Mr. MILLER of California. I think that we will be able to do this. I think the Space Council will keep very close tab on this.

Let me say that perhaps in the beginning, when we spoke of applying atomic energy to planes, I happened to have been on the Armed Service Committee during that time. Unfortunately, the people in this country had an idea that you could use atomic energy. They did not know how the heat generated nuclear energy could be transferred into work or into motion or a force.

So the only thing they had to go on was the same principle that is used in atomic submarines or other vessels. We replace the heat element in generating steam and then use steam to propel the vessel. They thought this might be done in some other way. It proved a little impractical to do this. But I think this is part of the loss. As we know, the Nerva system engine uses an entirely different theory, than does the engine in the nuclear submarine or powerplant.

Mr. HOSMER. Then some people say, just cluster a few solid fuel rockets and you have it. Other questions come up. The reason for my suggestion is that I would hesitate to vote for this project if I thought it was going to get launched and then get lost in the shuffle 12 or 24 or 36 months from now.

Mr. MILLER of California. I will say to the gentleman, who is a ranking minority member on the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, that the Science and Astronautics Committee will work closely with his committee to make sure this is not lost, because we do not like things to be started and then get lost in limbo. If they are good, let us go on with them. If they are not good, let us cut them out.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] asked a question about why now the Nerva engine. I believe we can look back to the aircraft industry and the development of the airplane itself and come up with the answer to his question. The engine is the pacing item. We build the powerplant of the aircraft, and then we build the plane to utilize that powerplant. We cannot build a plane, and then hope that somebody will come up with an engine that will fly that plane. This is necessary if we are going to have ongoing programs for the future which require extended trips into space.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman. I say to my friends, a great deal has been said here today about defining things we want to do. If we could define and if we knew the answers that the layman can ask about these things, we would not have to go into experimental programs.

We heard a great deal about what we could do with cancer and stroke and these other things. I do not know that we could spend any more money in research in these fields than is being spent today. I do not know that we can get any more competent people working in these fields than we have in NIH and many foundations today in cancer research. We have not even discovered the cure for the common cold, which costs in loss of time as much as does cancer. But we are working at them. And this is no reason we should not work at them. I have never hesitated to vote for money for NIH and moneys for medical research or money for research in the field of agriculture. If it were not that 100 years ago—or a little more than that—some people had the courage in Congress to establish the land-grant colleges, we would not today be a Nation producing surplus food.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 151]

Adair	Farbstein	Mathias, Md.
Adams	Feighan	Meskill
Addabbo	Findley	Minish
Annunzio	Fino	Monagan
Arends	Flood	Moore
Ashbrook	Ford,	Morgan
Ashley	William D.	Morse, Mass.
Bates	Fraser	Murphy, Ill.
Berry	Frelinghuysen	Nichols
Blatnik	Fuqua	O'Hara, Mich.
Boggs	Gallagher	Patman
Bolling	Giaimo	Philbin
Bolton	Gibbons	Pool
Bow	Gray	Reid, N.Y.
Brasco	Grover	Reifel
Brock	Halpern	Resnick
Brooks	Hamilton	Roberts
Broomfield	Hanna	Rodino
Brown, Calif.	Hansen, Wash.	Rooney, N.Y.
Buchanan	Harsha	Rosenthal
Burton, Utah	Hawkins	Roush
Button	Hays	St. Onge
Carey	Hébert	Selden
Clark	Herlong	Slack
Clausen,	Ichord	Smith, Iowa
Don H.	Jones, N.C.	Thompson, N.J.
Conable	Kee	Thomson, Wis.
Conte	Kelly	Tunney
Corman	King, Calif.	Ullman
Cowger	Kirwan	Vigorito
Daniels	Kluczynski	Watson
Dawson	Landrum	Whalley
Dent	McCarthy	Williams, Miss.
Derwinski	McCulloch	Willis
Diggs	McEwen	Wilson,
Dingell	Macdonald,	Charles H.
Dow	Mass.	Zablocki
Edmondson	Mahon	
Evins, Tenn.	Mailliard	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Moss) having assuming the chair, Mr. FLYNT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 10340, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 317 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose, the gentleman from California had consumed 34 minutes. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOSHER].

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman, I see no need for other than very brief remarks here today.

I do support H.R. 10340, the NASA authorization. And I especially emphasize that the bill, in the form we are considering it has very strong, bipartisan support in the Science and Astronautics Committee. I believe the committee record will show that all members on this side of the aisle voted in favor of recommending the bill for passage by the House.

I emphasize also that the full committee and all three of our subcommittees gave NASA's budget requests exceedingly thorough and detailed consideration over a period of many weeks. I salute the chairmen for their insistence

on the very careful combing and consideration of the NASA requests.

Especially, also, I salute the staff members for their strong and conscientious support of the committee.

It is my personal belief that we have an excellent staff, but that it should be larger in members and somewhat more specialized in technical competence in order to help the committee members fulfill more adequately our oversight responsibilities in a very complex, difficult, adventurous realm of new technology.

Mr. Chairman, I also repeat here what we minority members have said so often. We believe we could use effectively—and not at all for politically partisan purposes—a couple of very capable staff members specifically assigned to the minority members of the committee.

In our two-party system of government, the minority always has a special role of challenge and inquiry, if it is to be responsible and effective. We believe it is impossible to fulfill that responsibility without the assistance of at least a small staff whose first and constant responsibility should be to support minority inquiry, and the development of minority alternatives. The entire committee would be helped and strengthened by that arrangement.

Now, I address my remarks principally to that portion of the NASA authorization which supports the Office of Space Science and Applications. By that, I mean our unmanned scientific efforts in space.

Frankly, it is my personal belief that we taxpayers receive a lot more return in scientific payoff for every dollar invested in the unmanned, instrumented satellites and probes, than we do from the manned programs.

I recognize that we are obliged to complete the present Apollo manned-flight program, and that undoubtedly there will be a continuing manned program. Especially, I recognize the probable value of earth-orbiting manned flights, as distinguished from manned deep-space efforts. I recognize the probable value of men in orbit as technicians, to oversee, inspect, repair, and replenish the instruments and other equipment on unmanned satellites.

Thus, as I look ahead, I support an appropriate, efficient mix of manned and unmanned programs. This will require careful and wise study by the Congress, and difficult policy decisions as to goals and priorities.

But, personally, I look forward to the day when we will not be forced to support the space program as we have thus far known it, distorted in its overemphasis on manned flight.

Mr. Chairman, the budget proposals for the Office of Space Science and Applications, the unmanned programs, were considered with extreme care by the Karth subcommittee, of which I have the privilege of being the ranking minority member.

Again, I compliment the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KARTH] for his excellent, conscientious, and fair leadership. We on the Republican side enjoy working with him.

We on the committee recognize that NASA's Office of Space Science and Applications has mounted an attack on many of the most fundamental scientific questions of the day.

If our Nation's preeminence in science and technology is to survive, it is imperative that NASA's attack on those fundamental questions must continue. It must be vigorous and strongly supported; and I suppose so long as man survives in this universe these scientific explorations will evolve, will become more sophisticated.

I suggest we have very good reason to be most proud of our beginning achievements in the space sciences.

For example, the physics and astronomy program has already increased dramatically man's understanding of the environment in which we live, and of that special relationship which exists between the Earth and the Sun.

The extensive and valuable data produced by sounding rockets, explorer satellites, solar and geophysical observations has expanded our knowledge of near space, and especially the processes which shape our weather.

These tools of the space age have given our scientists a clearer understanding of solar phenomena, particularly the prodigious production of energy, and the Sun's influence upon the Earth.

The reason for such striking advances in our knowledge and understanding of the physics of our environment is that, for the first time in history, man can make his observations by instruments at a new vantage point above the earth's atmosphere.

Until recently, man was restricted to observations from the surface of the earth. Our earth atmosphere, unfortunately, screened out all but a few narrow portions of the electromagnetic spectrum, and many of the wavelengths that were able to penetrate the atmosphere were distorted by the time they reached the ground. Thus, the images received were comparable to those of a nearly blind person.

Scientific satellites now carry their instruments above the earth's atmosphere, and observations made from that vantage point have given our scientists new insights into the dynamic nature of the earth's environment.

This Nation's investigations of the nearby planets have also been singularly successful. Our leadership in this field is undisputed at this point, though the Soviets continue to challenge.

The high quality pictures of the moon's surface produced by Ranger, Surveyor, and Lunar Orbiter are familiar to people all around the world. Our Mariner missions to Venus and Mars have also produced startling new knowledge about our neighboring planets. It is no exaggeration to say that in the past 5 years this aspect of the science of astronomy has been advanced more than in the previous century.

But, this work is far from completed, I suppose it is hardly started, and the bill before the House today provides for a continuing, orderly program designed to keep the United States in the forefront in the exploration of our solar system.

While all the members of our committee are enthusiastic about the progress that has been made in our space program, we have not lost touch with reality. Not all NASA projects have been models of good management and unerring technical capability.

Our subcommittee recommended, and the full committee endorsed, substantial reductions in the astronomical observatory program and the geophysical observatory program, both of which have encountered difficulties resulting in mission failures, greatly increased costs, and schedule delays. In both cases the committee has recommended deletion of the last spacecraft in the series, with instructions to NASA to improve performance.

In addition, the committee recommends delay of the third block of spacecraft in the biosatellite program, providing additional time for the solution of existing technical problems, and thereby increasing the expectation of ultimate success.

These three actions reduced the NASA authorization by more than $18 million for fiscal year 1968 and should save even more in future years.

Mr. Chairman, our subcommittee has always strongly supported the unmanned applications satellite program—research and development of space meteorological and communications systems. Again, however, close scrutiny of NASA's proposed new projects led the subcommittee to disapprove the so-called voice broadcast satellite proposal on the basis that private enterprise should undertake, or at least help underwrite, some of the research and development costs of such a commercial system.

In addition, we recommend against both the follow-on geodetic satellite project, and the follow-on Nimbus project; the former on the basis that other Government agencies have the primary interest in the acquisition of geodetic data and should therefore assist in funding additional Geos satellites, the latter because NASA now has several meteorological research projects underway, and a new start can be deferred without impeding progress.

Before closing, Mr. Chairman, I would like to state my strong conviction that the committee's recommendation to increase the training grants program in universities by $10 million is appropriate and desirable. NASA is almost unique in its large requirements for Ph. D. level scientists and engineers to carry out its programs in industry, the universities, and in Government laboratories.

For this reason, NASA recognized its responsibility to assist in replenishing the pool of highly trained scientific and technical manpower as early as 1961. The training grants program was designed to meet this responsibility.

Each year since 1962, NASA witnesses have provided the most persuasive testimony in support of the training grants program. Suddenly, this year NASA has decided to phase out this vital program.

The need for highly trained scientists and engineers has not diminished. On the contrary, there is strong evidence to indicate that it is increasing rapidly.

NASA's decision to phase out this ef-

fort was not based upon sound information, but rather under budget pressures, the mere hope that other organizations such as the National Science Foundation and the Office of Education would expand their programs, and thereby pick up the slack left by elimination of the NASA training grants program.

Until such time as our committee can be assured that future needs for such manpower will be filled through the efforts of other organizations, it is our belief that NASA should not relinquish its responsibility for the training of a portion of tomorrow's space scientists and engineers. For this reason the committee recommends an increase of $10 million to the NASA budget with instructions that the training grants program not be further reduced during the forthcoming fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I again recommend strong support for this NASA authorization for fiscal year 1968.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight has held detailed hearings on the fiscal year 1968 NASA authorization during January, February, March, and April. A complete review of the manned space flight program was undertaken. Hearings were held at the three NASA manned space flight centers, with the management personnel here in Washington, and at the facilities of the key industrial contractors.

I want to congratulate the members of the subcommittee for their thorough work in examining the NASA program. The subcommittee traveled to Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp., Bethpage, Long Island; North American Aviation, Downey, Calif.; the Boeing Co., Michoud assembly facility, New Orleans, La.; the Chrysler Corp., Michaud assembly facility, New Orleans, La.; Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, Calif.; Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala.; Kennedy Space Center, Cape Kennedy, Fla.; and the Manned Spacecraft Center, Houston, Tex.

The subcommittee has gone into detail on every item in the manned space flight authorization and has searchingly examined the program.

The committee has approved the fiscal year 1968 budget request with several changes. NASA has proposed to initiate in fiscal year 1968 a new program—Apollo applications—utilizing the hardware developed in the Apollo program to expand man's capability in space. In addition to this, budget realinements have been necessary since original submission based on actions necessary to recover from the Apollo 204 accident at Cape Kennedy in January of this year.

It is important to note that the Gemini program has been successfully completed. The Apollo program is continuing at a decreasing annual cost with the peak effort having been reached in fiscal year 1967.

The NASA request for continuation of the Apollo program for fiscal year 1968 is $2,546,500,000. This total request for the Apollo program remains unchanged when costs of the Apollo 204 accident are taken into account because of the following actions being taken by NASA:

First. An estimated $5 million will be required to make material changes and flammability testing for the new spacecraft configuration.

Second. An estimated $40 million will be required for design and incorporation of equipment changes and modifications in the Block II spacecraft.

Third. An estimated $8 million will be required for development of new spacesuits.

Fourth. An estimated $17 million will be required because of rescheduling of deliveries of command and service modules and lunar modules.

Fifth. An estimated $5 million will be required for modifications to launch facilities. Offsetting the increased costs of $75 million is a reduction of $25 million stemming from a lower than originally planned level of mission operations and an expected reduction of $50 million in cost of existing contracts through effective management.

The committee has carefully reviewed each element of the Apollo program noting that NASA is planning to absorb the fiscal year 1968 costs within the total budget originally submitted. Based on the schedule changes and anticipated improvements in costs through incentive contracts, it is the view of the committee that a reduction of $25 million in the Apollo program can be made. Therefore, the committee recommends an authorization of $2,521,500,000 for continuation of the Apollo program.

Further, the committee notes that NASA has established a most disciplined set of cost goals for the Apollo program for fiscal year 1968, requiring highly effective management to meet these cost goals.

Prior to coming before the committee, the Apollo applications program was reduced over $170 million by the Bureau of the Budget, and in addition the Bureau specifically deleted NASA's request of $100 million to go forward with an orbiting space station.

The committee believes the Apollo aplications program is important because it provides the United States with the opportunity to take advantage of space for practical applications and scientific benefit, while at the same time providing the needed information on how man can best perform in space for extended durations. Importantly, the Apollo applications program capitalizes upon the investment already made in the Saturn/Apollo hardware, and does not require the development of major new systems.

The program as originally planned by NASA would have called for two dual launches to take place in mid-1968 and early 1969. However, as a result of the Apollo accident, certain changes have been made. NASA's current plans for Apollo earth orbital missions call for concentration solely on qualification of the Apollo/Saturn space vehicle systems and flight operations to provide the earliest possible availability of the lunar mission configuration. As a result of this decision, a number of science and technology experiments have been removed from the Apollo program, and will be flown on the first Apollo application mission expected in late 1968. This will be followed by the first of the dual launch missions in early 1969, with the second dual launch mission expected in mid-1969. One result of this delay, however, is that it enables scientists to better refine their experiments for the Apollo telescope mount in keeping with the recent report of the President's Science Advisory Committee.

Another decision made as a result of the Apollo accident and the subsequent delay in the program concerns the availability of spacecraft, which now appears to be the pacing item in the Apollo applications program. To overcome this difficulty, NASA plans to refurbish and reuse command modules previously flown on Apollo missions, and to procure and modify additional service modules to mate with the refurbished command modules.

For fiscal year 1968, these two decisions will require an increase in funds used for spacecraft modifications, but there will be a corresponding decrease in command module procurement and experiment costs. The total NASA request for the Apollo applications program in fiscal year 1968 remains the same at $454.7 million.

The committee believed that NASA can accomplish this program with a small reduction, particularly in its mission support and experiment requirements, and consequently reduced the Apollo applications program by $10 million, to $444.7 million. During its deliberations, the subcommittee had considered a more severe cut in the program, but decided against a greater reduction in the belief that it would severely limit the program and the future development of manned space flight capabilities.

NASA has requested $8 million for advance mission studies to examine advanced manned space flight mission concepts for fiscal year 1968. The committee has reduced this program $1.8 million to $6.2 million.

The committee recognizes the importance of advance mission studies because they are the basis upon which informed and intelligent decisions are made concerning the future of manned space flight. Nevertheless, the committee reduced the program because it does not believe NASA can advantageously spend all the funds requested for this program in fiscal year 1968. Based upon NASA's previous pattern of advance mission obligations and considering the funds available from fiscal 1967, the committee does not believe that NASA could obligate in fiscal 1968 all of the funds it has requested. Consequently, the committee has reduced the program $1.8 million to the fiscal year 1967 level of funding of $6.2 million.

NASA has requested a total of $27,900,000 to cover the cost of nine construction porjects in four of the manned space flight areas.

The largest single project is for the completion of the Saturn V complex at the Kennedy Space Center. The other projects involve alterations, modifications, upgrading of water pollution facilities, and minor access road work.

The committee approved the entire NASA request in the light of the extremely low level of contemplated construction and modification work. The

manned space flight area will utilize over $43 million for fiscal year 1967, compared with the $27.9 million for fiscal year 1968. In addition, the manned space flight field centers had initially requested over $82 million of construction funds for fiscal year 1968 and were reduced by NASA headquarters and Bureau of the Budget action to about one-third of this amount.

The committee believes that the projects in the current request are justified and essential to continued orderly progress in the program.

In the area of administrative operations for manned space flight, NASA has requested $323,500,000 for fiscal year 1968, which is $15 million less than was requested in fiscal year 1967. Administrative cost increases are anticipated in previous pay increases voted for Federal employees, automatic step increases based on longevity of satisfactory service, the higher costs of services and communications and utilities required to support the completion of additional facilities constructed with prior year funds, and the higher costs associated with increased costs of labor and materials for support services.

Nevertheless, the committee has reduced the manned space flight portion of administrative operations by $10 million, or about 3 percent, to promote an austere, cost-conscious philosophy in the NASA efforts.

I detail these actions so that the Members may see that the committee actions have been positive. It has been important to understand the effect of the accident in January of this year on the safety, performance, schedule, and costs in the Apollo program. The committee has confidence that NASA management is proceeding in an orderly and efficient manner to assure to the maximum extent the safety of the astronauts while maintaining a progressive and forward-looking program.

Major procedural, schedule, and management adjustments have been made in the Apollo program as a result of the tragic accident of January 27, 1967. It is a credit to NASA management that a critical, substantive revision was made and necessary corrective actions were aggressively undertaken to correct unsatisfactory conditions. With all the emphasis that was necessary to examine this accident and surrounding attendant conditions, we may lose sight of what is right with the program. A measure of this is the fact that NASA has been able to take positive, decisive action in its corrections, while proceeding with the many necessary actions in the bulk of the research and development effort for Apollo which was unaffected.

The assessment which the committee has received is that a lunar landing in this decade is still possible, although with a somewhat reduced probability. As significant as this is, the use of the Apollo hardware beyond the initial lunar landing portends the greatest return to our Nation for the investment being made. It is regrettable that funds for an orbiting space station were struck from this budget by the Bureau of the Budget. However, the Apollo applications program offers the opportunity to proceed with a scientific and practical benefits development program from the strong base of hardware and personnel experience derived in the Apollo, Gemini, and Mercury programs.

Of equal importance is the continuance of advanced planning for future space effort. The advanced missions program, although requiring a relatively modest level of funding, is the program which provides NASA with information to make decisions on future activities in space. NASA for fiscal year 1968 requested $8 million for advanced missions studies. The committee, after reviewing the program, decided to hold the authorization to $6.2 million, which is equivalent to the 1967 funding level. The advanced missions studies are composed of a series of contracts which analyze the potential worth, both in technical and in dollar terms, of future manned space flight activity. The budget cycle for funding these programs is such that late in each fiscal year new contracts are let for the following year. Consequently, obligation of funds in this program is not made until late in each fiscal year. However, if funds were deleted from this program, as has been proposed by some, it would mean the deletion of NASA's advance planning effort for manned space flight. It is inconceivable to think that NASA management should make decisions without the availability of the information derived from such a program. Therefore, it was the committee's determination that a funding level of $6.2 million would, in fact, allow NASA to continue their advanced missions studies at a level that will permit them to make the decisions among the varying alternatives in our future national space program.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Science and Astronautics has brought to the floor a bill that will allow a vigorous and forward-looking national space program. Support of this bill will provide to the United States the capability of competing in space while maintaining a balanced effort that we can reasonably expect the American public to support. I recommend the passage of this bill as presented to the House.

Having looked at the NASA program for this coming fiscal year I will now turn to place the total program in perspective.

Since its inception, the space program has proceeded through two major phases. The first phase, from 1958 to 1961, was one of establishing the framework and doing those things that could be done with existing capability.

The second phase, which began in 1961, has been one of establishing a broad national capability in space. This capability comprises skilled people, facilities, basic space technology, and the ability to carry out a series of manned and unmanned programs. To provide a focus for this effort, the Apollo program is being conducted with the mission of landing man on the moon and returning him safely to earth within this decade.

But it should be kept in mind that the principal objective of Apollo has been the creation of capability, rather than the performance of any one mission in space. What remains is the demonstration of that capability through the manned Apollo missions scheduled for 1968, 1969, and 1970.

For some time, the Congress has been concerned about how the capabilities developed in the space program will be employed for the benefit of the American people. Because of this concern, the Committee on Science and Astronautics has conducted a number of studies with a bearing on the selection of future programs. An outstanding example is the staff study, "Further National Space Objectives," conducted for the Subcommittee on NASA Oversight and published in August 1966. The principal conclusions of that study were that the technology base existed to define objectives for the exploration and exploitation of space in the 1970's and that five major policy factors should be evaluated in the development of the program. These factors were and are:

First, national security; second, economic advantage; third, scientific discovery; fourth, international cooperation and competitive position; and fifth, technological progress.

Despite the burden of the war in Southeast Asia and the Nation's domestic needs, President Johnson has placed before the Congress a proposal to begin a third phase of space activity. In this phase, the emphasis will be on realizing benefits by utilizing the capability that has been established. The NASA authorization for fiscal year 1968 provides for getting this third phase underway. It is a limited program with limited objectives at the present time. But it does represent a major decision to continue beyond the Apollo program the utilization of the Apollo people, the Apollo industrial team, the Apollo physical plant, and the Apollo flight hardware. This post-Apollo program is in accordance with the eight major objectives of the Space Act. It reflects consideration of major policy factors such as those which emerged from the study conducted by the Subcommittee on NASA Oversight.

Now what is this post-Apollo program? It is a balanced effort in the areas of practical applications, manned space flight, technology, and unmanned exploration of the planets. The effort is designed to provide the maximum in benefits to the people of the United States at a reasonable cost.

The Apollo applications program is the manned space flight part of the post-Apollo program which will be beginning under the fiscal year 1968 authorization bill. The two other major new proposals—the Voyager program for unmanned exploration of the planets, and the Nerva II nuclear rocket development will also use the Saturn V launch vehicle development in the Apollo program.

The Apollo applications program includes the following features:

Manned flights carrying sensing equipment that will permit experimentation directed at long-range weather prediction and control, and at other earth-sensing applications such as determination of the status of crops and forests, detection of pestilence, forest-fire warnings,

location of schools of fish at sea, prospecting for ores and oil deposits, keeping world maps current, early warnings of tsunamis and tidal waves, measurements of air and water pollution, and the assessment of earth resources as a whole.

Observation of the sun and stars with large man-operated telescopes and other instruments which will provide important new scientific information and experience with the possibility of manned scientific work in space.

Continued exploration of the moon after the initial landing, at the rate of two to four flights a year.

Extension of man's experience in space through flights lasting 1 month, 2 months, and eventually a year or more in orbit.

Improvements of the Apollo spacecraft to convert it, with the Saturn I launch vehicle, to a six-man ferry between earth and earth orbit with the capability for landing on land.

The Apollo applications program will contribute directly to many important national objectives:

First, it provides for expansion of human knowledge of phenomena in the atmosphere and space. Scientific investigations performed in this program include studies of earth, examination of the space environment, exploration of the moon, and astronomical observations of the sun and stars and study of the effects of space on men and other living organisms.

Second, the program provides an experimental means for studies of the potential benefits to be gained from, the opportunities for, and the problems involved in the utilization of manned space activities for scientific and practical applications.

Third, the program provides for the improvement of the usefulness, performance, safety, and efficiency of space vehicles. It enables the Apollo spacecraft to be used repeatedly to carry six astronauts, to land on land, and to extend the duration of flights to a year. It calls for converting the upper stage of a Saturn rocket into an embryonic space station and for the development and operation of specialized vehicles capable of carrying instruments, equipment, supplies, and living organisms through space and for stays on the moon of up to 2 weeks.

Fourth, the program provides new opportunities for cooperation by the United States with other nations and groups of nations in the work done pursuant to the Space Act and in the peaceful application of the results thereof. This is especially true of the weather, communications, and other practical applications, which can supply benefits to the people of every nation on earth and in which scientists in every part of the earth can take part.

Fifth, and most importantly, the program contributes to our long-term national security and posture in the world preserving the role of the United States as a leader in space science and technology and in the application thereof to the conduct of peaceful activities within and outside the atmosphere. A continuing and developing manned space flight program is an essential ingredient of space and technological leadership. No one can predict what other nations will do. This program, however, will keep the United States moving forward in the post-Apollo period at a healthy pace for a relatively modest investment in post-Apollo activity. If we do not continue beyond the Apollo program we are leaving the field of manned space exploration to be exploited by other nations. This is the year of decision.

An aspect of this program worth particular attention is that it includes a major effort to reduce the cost of manned space flight in the future. This is especially significant in view of present budgetary pressures. In the early stages of the space program, the cost of the investment was substantial. Research and development constitute a learning process. In this learning process, it is not always possible to do something the most economical and efficient way the first time. Experience has revealed a number of ways of achieving more in results from each space flight, thus reducing unit costs and speeding the arrival of the day when a wider range of space applications can be realized economically.

To make this point clear, let me review some of the cost-saving aspects of the Apollo applications program.

One is the reuse of the Apollo command module. After command modules are flown and returned to earth it is planned to refurbish them for Apollo applications flights, avoiding substantial costs of producing new units.

Further savings will result from the addition of land-landing capability, which facilitates reuse by minimizing the work of refurbishment. If this should lead to the ability to dispense or substantially reduce the requirement for naval recovery forces, there would be even greater impact on costs.

Still another major cost-saving benefit results from the increase in crew capability from three to six in land-landing Apollo. More men can be flown on each mission, thereby enhancing its effectiveness.

A fourth item is the double use of the second stage of the Saturn I launch vehicle. After this stage has finished its work of launching the spacecraft into orbit, the stage is converted into an orbital workshop. The empty liquid hydrogen tank becomes a space station 26 feet long and 22 feet in diameter—about the size of a small two-story house.

Fifth is the use of this space station repeatedly. The astronauts will return to Earth at the end of a mission, but the space station will remain stored in orbit until astronauts return for the next mission.

Sixth is the increasing duration of flights in this workshop. The greater part of the cost of space flight is for takeoffs and landings. Thus greater value per dollar is obtained from longer flights. On the advice of space medical experts, it is planned to proceed by steps that roughly double the length of each previous flight—from 2 weeks to a month, 2 months and eventually a year or more in orbit. Long-duration flights will make it possible to do what otherwise would require additional flights.

Finally, a most important economy feature of Apollo applications is its basic concept—that of using the Apollo people, industrial organizations, physical plant, and flight hardware, rather than developing new hardware.

Altogether, this series of innovations will greatly improve the economics of space flight.

In summary, the Apollo applications program will make a major contribution to the achievement of the objectives of the Space Act of 1958. It is not directed at a single dramatic objective, but at a broad range of important objectives. It provides a way of working toward these objectives through a single flexible program which can build on experience as it moves ahead.

From the foregoing review, I think it is also evident that this post-Apollo program reflects consideration of major policy factors such as those set forth in the committee's study of future national space objectives. It contributes to national strength and security, economic advantage, scientific discovery, international cooperation and competitive position, and technological progress.

Now I would like to turn to some of the specific results that will be provided by the Apollo applications program. It is important to keep in mind that an underlying question is man's capability to operate in space. Therefore it is necessary to make advances in the ability to live and work in space, at the same time that devices and techniques are perfected and tested for realizing the benefits of manned space flight.

The first phase of the program calls for initial experiments with space applications, flight of the orbital workshop in low earth orbit, and a mission to observe the sun during its maximum activity, about 2 years from now.

The initial experiments with space applications include conventional earth photography like that in Gemini, and the beginning of multiband photography—that is, photography in the infrared, ultraviolet, and other portions of the spectrum. A plan under consideration is to launch this spacecraft into an orbit that would cover most of the United States. Previous U.S. manned flights have covered only Florida and the southern parts of Texas and California.

In the orbital workshop mission would be the investigations of living and working conditions. Some of the questions to be asked are:

How much cubic footage is needed for routine functions of life, conduct of experiments, and maintenance of equipment?

What is the best floor plan, for crew quarters and work stations?

What forms of exercise are best for keeping the astronauts physically fit?

What are the best foods and methods of preparing them, caring for personal hygiene, managing wastes, and attending to other household matters?

What about motion within a large space station and the effect of this on experiments and work performance?

Flights of a month or more in the orbital workshop—a space station as large as a small two-story house—will help to provide these answers.

The solar astronomy mission will carry into space the most comprehensive and sophisticated array of instruments ever assembled for observation of the sun. This flight, at the height of the 11-year sunspot cycle, will provide for a considerable increase in understanding of the sun and its effect on earth—particularly on the weather and world communications.

Later phases of the Apollo applications programs call for flights of the applications A and applications B space modules. These are very advanced assemblages of earth-sensing equipment that will permit considerable advances toward weather prediction and control, as well as the survey and utilization of earth resources. In addition, those latter phases of the program include work in the areas of communications and astronomy at an orbit synchronized with the earth's rotation, as well as exploration of the moon to follow the first Apollo flights.

Next, let me turn to the relationship between the Apollo applications and manned orbiting laboratory programs. A great deal of confusion has resulted from the fact that both of these programs involve manned flights in earth orbit. There is a misconception in some quarters that the two programs duplicate or overlap one another. This is not so.

The manned orbiting laboratory program, begun in December 1963, is designed to meet the specific needs of the Department of Defense. For this reason, some aspects are classified. It uses a modified Gemini spacecraft and the Titan III launch vehicle.

The Apollo applications program builds on the much broader capability of the Apollo spacecraft and the Saturn I and Saturn V launch vehicles. Thus it has much more inherent capability than the manned orbiting laboratory. Some earth-orbital experiments in the Apollo applications program might be conducted on the manned orbiting laboratory, and vice versa. But there is no duplication. Proposed experiments are reviewed by a Manned Space Flight Experiments Board consisting of senior officials of NASA and the Department of Defense. Experiments are assigned to flight missions in either program on the basis of economy, timeliness, or other considerations of national interest.

Finally, let me discuss one other misconception. Some people believe that a schedule of specific flights should be laid out over a period of several years prior to approval by the Congress. This would be the very antithesis of research and development. By freezing in advance the plans several years ahead, it would inhibit the flexibility in the program to capitalize on success or to repeat a flight if necessary.

The initial phase of Apollo applications has been defined. Objectives for the later phases have been established. The scheduling of all phases depends on Apollo progress as well as progress in Apollo applications. In such a program, flexibility is most essential.

The cost of the program also depends on Apollo. Should Apollo progress successfully, flight hardware may be available for Apollo applications and the costs will be relatively low. Should follow-on hardware be required, the costs would increase accordingly. But the Apollo applications program is planned in a way that will reduce unit costs as much as possible.

In summary, the President has asked the Congress to make a major decision regarding a third phase of this Nation's space activity. This phase will place emphasis on the benefits to be gained from utilizing the capability developed in the Apollo program. It places emphasis also on reducing unit costs, thus attaining the maximum in benefits from the minimum in costs.

This program opens the way for efforts toward using space for benefits to man on earth in meteorology, agriculture and forestry, oceanography, prospecting, mapping, disaster, warnings, pollution control, and resources management.

Even if only a few of these are realized, their value would far exceed the cost of the investment.

There is one final thought I would like to leave with you. All of the arguments I have made apply with equal force to the Soviet space program. The Soviets also have developed a capability that can be employed at less cost than the development of new systems. They also have the ability to provide these benefits to their friends throughout the world.

For the first time since the beginning of the space age, the Soviets are launching satellites at a greater rate than the United States. They have flown 32 this year as against our 26—as of June 17. The secret nature of Soviet space activities permits them to make the preparations and announce a project only when the equipment is flown. Do we want to leave open the possibility that they will do so while we are still debating whether to have such a program? Should we let history repeat itself?

The better course would be to proceed with a program that meets United States needs—regardless of what others may do.

The manned space flight program in fiscal year 1968 does two things. The flight-test phase will begin in the Apollo program to land Americans on the moon and return them safely to earth. Work will begin to use this capability for the benefit of man on earth.

Despite substantial progress in most phases of the broad Apollo effort, this program suffered its most severe setback on January 27, 1967, in the fire that took the lives of Astronauts Virgil Grissom, Edward White, and Roger Chaffee.

The accident and the searching inquiries by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and committees of the House and Senate focused attention on problems of spacecraft design, quality assurance, procedures, safety, and program management. These problems are being dealt with. Every possible deficiency is being corrected. The scope of the actions being taken is well beyond the requirements highlighted by the accident. As a result, the Apollo program is stronger today than it was before the accident.

In reviewing the manned space flight program, it is well to keep in mind the record of accomplishment prior to this accident. In Mercury and Gemini, American astronauts were launched into space 16 times and returned to earth 16 times. The Saturn launch vehicle has been flown 13 times and has been successful 13 times. An industry-science-Government team of 300,000 persons has been assembled and trained. More than 90 percent of these people are outside the Government civil service structure. When we think of the scope of this challenge, it is perhaps easier to understand why problems still remain. Solving problems is basic to the research and development process. The authorization for fiscal year 1968 will support the efforts to solve them.

The total of $2,521.5 million authorized by the bill reported by the Committee on Science and Astronautics is $25 million less than President Johnson's budget request, received by the Congress prior to the Apollo accident. Since then, NASA has estimated that an additional $50 million will be required for the actions resulting from the accident. Thus a total of $75 million must be absorbed if the objective of a manned lunar landing is to be retained. The fact that the recovery plan does not call for greater expenditures is evidence of the inherent strength of the program.

The manned space flight program also provides for the beginning of substantial efforts to make use of the Apollo capability for the benefit of man on earth. This new program, Apollo applications, is the focus of these efforts. Apollo applications is a long-term effort to learn by doing and to do while learning abilities and limitations of man in space.

The Apollo applications program will also add assurance of success to the Apollo lunar landing program by holding together the teams of engineers and specialists to solve problems should they occur in the final stages of the program. Otherwise, additional costs would be required for keeping these experts available.

The Apollo applications program is the least costly means that can be employed to hold open the bridge to the future. It introduces a series of innovations that reduce the costs of doing business in space, and it avoids the waste resulting from stops and starts.

The Apollo applications program calls for beginning a new contractor effort in spacecraft modification, to provide these benefits without interfering with Apollo.

The scope of this program has already been twice reduced. The NASA request to the Bureau of the Budget was $626.7 million for fiscal year 1968. The budget request by the President reduced this by $172 million, to $454.7 million. The Committee on Science and Astronautics reduced the sum by a further $10 million, to $444.7 million. This amount, plus $6.2 million for studies of advanced manned missions, constitutes a minimum requirement for proceeding in orderly fashion.

The manned space flight program—Apollo, Apollo applications, and advanced manned missions—drives the Apollo effort into its final phases and begins the work of realizing benefits for man on

earth. It supports national security, fosters national growth, expands knowledge, and retains options for the future at a cost the country can well afford. To delay this program is, in effect, to cancel it. Such a decision would put the space plum in the hands of the Soviet Union. By continuing, we tell the world we are not abandoning the benefits to others and we are not leaving open any temptation to undertake dangerous adventures in space.

I feel that I must also speak to another major area of effort proposed in this budget—Apollo applications.

President Johnson has asked the Congress to authorize the beginning of a third phase of U.S. space activity. The first phase, one of initial development, began with the enactment of the National Aeronautics and Space Act in 1958. The second phase began in 1961 with a focus on the Apollo program to land man on the moon and return him safely to earth in this decade; this phase has been one of establishing broad national capability.

In the third-phase program proposed by the President, the emphasis will be on realizing benefits for the people of the United States from their investment since 1958. Its focus will be the Apollo applications program, employing the people, industrial team, physical plant and flight hardware created in Apollo. And it is this Apollo applications program I should like to briefly discuss.

First. The Apollo applications program supports the broad-based advance of technology vital to our national security and guards against the hazard of technological "surprise" by other nations. It provides for improving the Apollo spacecraft to convert it into a six-man ferry vehicle with capability for landing on land, extending man's experience in space through flights lasting up to a year in orbit, and developing additional space modules.

Second. The Apollo applications program maintains the forward momentum that space technology has given our competitive position in the world marketplace through research and development for our industrial technology. The most important benefit thus far has been the surging national growth of the last 6 years. I believe that it is no coincidence that this has occurred at a time when this Nation was investing at an unprecedented rate in research and development, with the focus of this investment in the Apollo program. Despite the long leadtime between discovery and commercial utilization, new products, new processes, new materials, and new techniques have been entering our industrial system at a rapid rate. This rate is accelerating. The Apollo applications program will accelerate it further.

Third. The Apollo applications program will take advantage of tremendous opportunities for expansion of knowledge at a time when space-based astronomy and exploration embracing the whole field of space science show promise of breaking through into an era of real discovery. The program calls for observations of the sun during the sunspot maximum, with the most comprehensive and sophisticated array of instruments ever assembled for this purpose anywhere. It contemplates the use of similar equipment to observe the stars and galaxies from high altitude. It includes the study of the space environment. And it provides for the continued exploration of the moon after the Apollo landing.

Fourth. The Apollo applications program continues the advance of space technology vital to meeting the challenges of the future. It leads to understanding of man's ability to live and work in space for long periods of time. It permits experiments with advanced components and systems. It provides for continued production of the launch vehicles which will be used for the unmanned Voyager flights to Mars and Venus, and for the flight tests of the Nerva II nuclear rocket.

Fifth. Finally, the Apollo applications program utilizes the launch vehicles, spacecraft, ground facilities, and human resources that have been developed. By maintaining an orderly pace of effort, the Apollo applications program avoids the waste resulting from stops and starts, dispersal and reassembly of teams, mothballing and reactivation of facilities. In addition, it includes the introduction of innovations that will reduce the costs of space exploration and bring closer the day when wider utilization of space will be practical and economic.

Furthermore, this program allows the United States to meet the challenges of the future without demanding a major increase in cost as related to the Nation's resources. In the peak year of fiscal year 1966, NASA expenditures amounted to 0.83 of 1 percent of the gross national product. In the fiscal year that ends this month they have decreased to 0.73 of 1 percent. Under the NASA authorization for fiscal year 1968, as reported by the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, this total would decline further, to 0.65 of 1 percent.

In summary, therefore, the Apollo applications program supports our national security and our international posture, sustains our competitive position in the world market, expands knowledge tremendously, permits us to meet the challenge of the future, and does this at a cost that we can afford.

Our investment in space is just beginning to pay off. This is a time to continue the work to assure that all of the dividends are returned.

One specific aspect of Apollo applications is of major significance. The Apollo applications program is the focus for a new phase of space activity that places emphasis on realizing benefits for the people of the United States from their investment over the last 9 years. Some of these benefits are directly related to world peace and national security.

The events of recent weeks remind us again that our world is small and growing smaller. The headlong pace of science, technology, and their applications makes every man and woman on earth our next-door neighbor. The communications satellite transmits by television the scenes of battle in the Holy Land and Vietnam. The jet airliner carries us to Europe in 6 hours and Asia in 12. The intercontinental missile reaches its target in a half hour. Events in Vietnam and the Middle East have as much impact on the deliberations in Congress as anything occurring within the United States. Perhaps more.

As this trend increases we ask ourselves whether these crises can be predicted, whether science can help predict them, and whether science can help solve them. How can we cope with this kind of a world? What can we do to improve the outlook for world peace? How can we plan in an orderly way for the security and well-being of the United States?

The House Committee on Science and Astronautics has sought to obtain help from scientists in answering such questions. The committee has employed its Panel on Science and Technology, as well as direct contact with scientific leaders, to obtain advice on the problems just over the horizon, that may threaten world peace and national security in the years to come. For example, the eighth meeting of the Panel, January 24–26, 1967, concentrated attention on government, science, and international policy.

One overriding concern has emerged from these consultations. In the minds of the scientists who have shared their wisdom with the committee, one problem appears most likely to threaten peace and security. That problem is the population explosion.

Let me mention a few figures on the size of this problem and how it is growing. The population of mankind doubled, from a quarter to a half billion in the 1,650 years after the birth of Christ. It doubled again in 200 years, by 1850. The next time, it doubled in 80 years, by 1930.

Now there are 3.35 billion mouths to feed on earth. The total is increasing by 180,000 each day. At the present rate the total will double again—to almost 7 billion—by the year 2000. That is only 33 years from now. By the year 2000, India alone will have a billion people, and the population of Asia will exceed the entire population of the world today.

Dr. Roger Revelle, of Harvard University, described matters this way at the seventh meeting of the Panel of Science and Technology in January 1966:

> In many of the underdeveloped countries, 45 to 50 percent of the people are under 15 years of age, and this is simply an inevitable mathematical consequence of rapid rates of population growth. What this does is produce a very heavy dependency burden on a relatively small number of people who have to do the work, the adults. It also puts a very heavy burden of services on the society in terms of education, in terms of health, and other welfare services.
>
> A second thing that a high population growth does is to keep per capita incomes down, because the economic growth has to be divided up all the time among ever-larger numbers of people, and the result is that the income per person doesn't grow very fast, and economic growth depends very largely upon not only savings but upon a continuously increasing amount of savings, preferably an increase in the proportion of income that goes into savings.

Lord Snow, the distinguished scientist and novelist, who served as the Joint Parliamentary Secretary of the British

Ministry of Technology, had this to say, also at the seventh meeting of the Panel:

To echo with reverence the greatest of democratic leaders, the world cannot survive in peace half-rich and half-poor. It remains to be proved whether it can for long survive at all.

That is the greatest challenge to the next two or three generations. That is the greatest challenge to our science and technology and all our thinking about people and the actions we take. That is the greatest challenge to our humanity; and maybe its final test.

Is starvation inevitable? Is it necessary to feed half the world on concentration camp diets? Does our planet have the resources to support all of its people?

The committee received testimony from Dr. Lloyd Berkner, of the Southwest Center for Advanced Studies, whose death we mourned on June 4, 1967. Dr. Berkner said:

As populations increase and as there is a rising concern with the problems of living in a crowded world, we have greater need to make effective use of the earth's resources. To do this, we need to measure their totals, and the depletion and contamination that man's activities produce.

A satellite is a vantage point at which comprehensive mapping and accurate measurements over really broad areas are possible for the first time. . . .

Space offers the opportunity to do many things that just cannot be done in any other way.

Additional commentary on the world population problem is found in the testimony of Dr. Wernher von Braun. He said:

We believe that one effective antidote is a worldwide earth resources management system. . . .

We have all seen the pictures taken with a Hasselblad camera from the Gemini spacecraft. The Hasselblad is a simple hand-held camera, not very sophisticated, but its pictures showed a tremendous amount of detail. Now if we can combine more sophisticated cameras, with better resolution, with some new types of film material that have recently been developed, we shall be able to use the space medium to conduct continuous, never-ending surveys of our earth resources. We shall be able to tell rye from barley, and rice from soybeans. We shall be able to tell how those soybeans or that rice is coming along. And this includes seasonal variations. We shall be able to mark the progress of these crops through their growing seasons, and the impact of weather-droughts, storms, hurricane damage—on that progress. And at harvest time, we can predict the harvest yield in various parts of the world. Now this business of being able to identify "what" and "where" and "how much" is going to be harvested in various locations of the earth is half the problem of earth resources management; namely, the supply of food available.

The other half is the demand, and this is measured in numbers of people. The very same system that enables us to distinguish between types and qualities of crops can also give us the pattern of population growth. If we continuously overfly the same areas we can learn by city and town where man is multiplying most rapidly. We can know how many eaters there are and where they live.

These supply-and-demand data gleaned from earth-orbiting spacecraft would give us the information needed for resource management.

We would feed this information into a computer, and the computer would tell us many weeks ahead of time of famine in Calcutta or somewhere unless we do something soon. Food shipments could be initiated before disaster hits.

Dr. von Braun testified that there are other benefits from such a system. He said:

Suppose we learn that the yields in certain parts of the world are consistently poor. As part of our worldwide system we could employ multispectral sensors to find out what the problem is—too much salinity in the soil, poor fertilization, not enough water, maybe soil erosion. We could convert this information not only into food shipments, but into words of advice to solve a chronic agricultural problem. Instead of food, we could ship fertilizer, or even consultants to give some advice on the spot.

The scientists have made it clear that major research and development activity and studies by a number of Government agencies would have to precede the inauguration of such a system. Indeed, I would judge that international discussions would also be necessary. But let me share with you the assessment of Dr. George Mueller, the NASA Associate Administrator for Manned Space Flight. He says:

The earth resources survey does seem to be a technically feasible way to help solve some of the most pressing problems of our growing world population.

What can be done about this potential? NASA, in close cooperation with the Departments of Agriculture and Interior, and other agencies, has underway a program of experiments from aircraft carrying a variety of sensors. The NASA authorization for fiscal year 1968 provides for the necessary research and development in space. In the Apollo applications program, experiments will be conducted, the sensing equipment will be developed, and the methods of operation will be tested. The first such experiment will be on the first Apollo applications flight—the initial experiments mission tentatively scheduled for 1968 or 1969. Later in the program it is planned to fly the applications A and applications B space modules containing much more advanced equipment.

The Apollo applications program also provides for an assessment of the role of man in activities such as the resource survey. In the experimental phase it is believed that man is required in the spacecraft. However, the experiments may result in a finding that the equipment can run automatically in unmanned spacecraft after the system goes into operation.

In summary, therefore, science may be able to help us to deal with the problems that can threaten U.S. security and world peace in the years to come. Scientists consulted by the Committee on Science and Astronautics believe that the population explosion is potentially the greatest of these problems.

One thing that can be done now to deal with that problem is the research and development of equipment and operational methods for managing earth resources from space. After all, it is only from space that the earth can be seen as a whole. Before we decide what to do about any problem it is a good idea to back off a little and look at it in perspective. Space flight makes it possible to back off from our planet and see it as a whole.

The Apollo applications activities projected for fiscal year 1968 are the first step in this process. By seizing the present opportunity to use the Apollo people, the Apollo contractors, the Apollo facilities, and the Apollo flight hardware, we are making it possible to take this first step at a relatively low cost.

In examining the relationship of the NASA Apollo applications program and its possible relationships to the Department of Defense planned orbiting laboratory the question of the new treaty on outer space and the MOL program was voice. At my request Mrs. Eilene Gallaway of the Library of Congress prepared a report entitled "The Treaty on Outer Space and the Manned Orbiting Laboratory."

Because of the significance of the study, I am including this with my remarks for the benefit of the Members:

THE TREATY ON OUTER SPACE AND THE MANNED ORBITING LABORATORY

Questions have been raised concerning the relationship between the Treaty on Outer Space and the Manned Orbiting Laboratory (MOL) project of the U.S. Air Force. Some have wondered whether the MOL is kindred in spirit to the Treaty while others have questioned whether the Treaty has provisions which would hinder the development of the MOL. This situation requires an analysis of our basic national policy on space activities set forth by Congress in the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, the nature of the MOL project and the Treaty's provisions on the peaceful and military uses of outer space. It should be stated at the outset, however, that these questions were thoroughly investigated when the Treaty was being formulated and prior to the time the Senate gave its advice and consent to ratification on April 25, 1967. Officials of the Department of State and the Department of Defense testified in favor of the Treaty, stating emphatically that its provisions would not interfere with the peaceful mission of the MOL, which is not a weapons system, nor would the MOL violate in any way the terms of the Treaty. Such official testimony will be quoted in the analysis given below.

BASIC U.S. SPACE POLICY SET BY CONGRESS

In the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, Congress declared that "it is the policy of the United States that activities in space should be devoted to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind." NASA was established as the civilian agency to exercise control over aeronautical and space activities sponsored by the United States, "except that activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems, military operations, or the defense of the United States (including the research and development necessary to make effective provision for the defense of the United States) shall be the responsibility of, and shall be directed by, the Department of Defense; and that determination as to which such agency has responsibility for and direction of any such activity shall be made by the President in conformity with section 201(e)" of the NASA Act. The National Aeronautics and Space Council, an advisory body to the President, was given a role in the coordination of the entire national space program. Whether a project is administered by NASA, the Department of Defense, or in accordance with a memorandum of understanding in cooperation with

some other agency of the government, the objective of U.S. space activities is the maintenance and promotion of the peaceful uses of outer space.

RELATION BETWEEN PEACEFUL AND MILITARY USES OF SPACE

The peaceful uses of outer space and the military role were delineated five years ago when the House was considering the authorization for NASA's funds for fiscal 1963.

"Civilian and military requirements for the use of the space environment are similar for the most important developments which have been made thus far: improved communications, weather prediction, navigation, and mapping of the Earth.

"The fact that civilian and military departments have a common interest in space communications, weather, and navigation, is not unique to outer space. The same situation exists in all other environments in which man carries on activities—the land, the sea, and the air. Nor is this mutual civilian-military interest unique to periods of warfare; in fact, the need for better weather prediction and efficient communications exists at all times—in peace, cold war, or war. Space vehicles are a new technological tool in improving services which are an inextricable part of all phases of modern industrial society, and as such may be regarded in the same light as the telephone, telegraph, radio, and television." [1]

THE MOL IS NOT A WEAPONS SYSTEM

The fact that the MOL is not a weapons system or a space vehicle for any type of aggression has been brought to the attention of Congress repeatedly since the program was first assigned to the Air Force in December 1963. When the President reported to Congress on U.S. aeronautical and space activities in 1963, he stated that—

"The MOL program is not aimed at a military operational system, or even to an orbiting manned space station capability in the context usually attributed to that term. Rather, it will be designed to provide a minimal but substantive assessment of the feasibility and effectiveness of manned operations in orbit which may later be used to specify operational design characteristics and performance parameters." [2]

In the President's report for 1964, he explained that in order to achieve the best R&D plan, in-house investigations would be conducted in addition to those carried on by companies with contracts from the Air Force and the Navy. At that time, the objectives of the MOL were given as follows:

(a) provide a multi-purpose space laboratory for conduct of significant scientific, technological and bioastronautic experiments.

(b) utilize the GEMINI spacecraft for ascent and descent, the TITAN IIIC booster for propulsion and a laboratory module making maximum use of APOLLO subsystems to provide an early, minimum cost capability of at least 30 days manned flight.

(c) accomplish a series of progressively more sophisticated experiments which will contribute to the understanding of man's ability to operate military equipments in space, of his ability to work outside the spacecraft to assemble and service large objects such as telescopes or radio antennae.

(d) provide a vehicle with flexibility for a wide range of activities of national importance and follow-on potential for military operational utilization of required or additional experimentation, perhaps to include rendezvous and coupling.[3]

It should be recalled that from the very beginning of the space age, and even before, there was recognition that "military equipments in space" were concerned with communications, reconnaissance, and meteorology, all of which are peacekeeping and not aggressive activities.[4]

The President's report to Congress for 1965 states that—

"The first test of the Air Force's TITAN 3–C, the world's most powerful known space booster to date, came early in the year, and the decision to develop the MANNED ORBITING LABORATORY (MOL), which the TITAN will put into space, came later. World audiences were told that the TITAN 3–C is the first military booster designed from the outset for space missions, and that by strengthening the free world it will help to keep the peace. MOL is to be neither a weapon nor a weapon's carrier and in no way contradicts America's peaceful purposes in space. Rather, it aims to increase knowledge of man's usefulness in space and to relate this ability to free world defense." [5]

The 1966 report of the President on United States aeronautical and space activities indicates the integration of official thought and action concerning the relationship of the MOL and the Treaty on Outer Space:

"The United States continued to implement its policies of peaceful space objectives and of international cooperation toward the attainment of such objectives. Of major importance was the successful leadership shown by the United States and the cooperation of the Soviet Union in the development of a United Nations Space Treaty banning nuclear weapons in space and specifying the moon and other celestial bodies as being available only for peaceful activities.

"Important progress was made during the year in the development of the MANNED ORBITING LABORATORY, a project designed to evaluate the extent to which man in space can contribute to our national security. It is not a weapons system, it is not a means by which aggressive actions can be perpetuated, and it is in no way in conflict with the established peaceful policies of this nation. Rather, it is expected to improve the prospects for world peace." [6]

On April 27, 1967, during the hearings of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences on NASA's authorization for fiscal year 1968, Senator Clinton P. Anderson, Chairman, inquired—

"Is the MOL in any way part of a weapons program?"

Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Department of Defense, replied, "No, Mr. Chairman, it is not."

When the Chairman asked, "Although MOL is a military system, can its mission be characterized as peaceful and passive?", Dr. Foster said, "Yes, it can, Mr. Chairman." [7]

Concerning the question of whether the MOL would have to be modified in order to comply with any of the space treaty's provisions, the following testimony was given at the hearing:

"Senator CANNON. With relation to the MOL, will the MOL program be affected in any way by the space treaty?

"Dr. FOSTER. No, sir; it will not." [8]

At the same hearing, there was this exchange betwene Senator Jordan (Idaho) and Dr. Foster:

"Senator JORDAN. I understood you to reply to Senator Cannon that in your opinion, the objectives of the MOL program do not violate the terms of the space treaty. Yet in your statement you say, among other things, that priority will be given to those tests which support the investigation of the utility of military manned space flight, and so on, and performing meaningful military experiments would not contravene the terms of the space treaty.

"Dr. FOSTER. Yes, Senator Jordan; I tried to cover that in the answer to Senator Cannon and to Senator Anderson.

"The MOL is not a weapons system. It does not involve explosives in any way, or means of destruction." [9]

In fact, the United States has continuously had a policy of not placing any weapons of mass destruction into orbit, the first statement of this principle having been made on September 5, 1962, by Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell L. Gilpatric. Consequently, the same policies which apply to the MOL are also applicable to any defense space program developed by the Department of Defense.

SPACE TREATY FAVORED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The position of the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff was explained to Congress during the hearings before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations when consideration was being given to the Treaty on Outer Space. The statement of the Secretary of Defense, presented by the Deputy Secretary, Cyrus R. Vance, on April 12, 1967, concluded that the treaty would enhance U.S. national security and called attention to the fact that in 1963 the United States voted for a UN General Assembly resolution calling on nations to refrain from orbiting weapons. Pointing out that the treaty does not exclude military personnel and equipment from outer space, the Secretary stated:

"Military space programs concerned with communications, navigation, or observation are permitted. These programs, too, are peaceful uses of space. Our Vela satellite program, to take but one example of a military space program, is designed to observe—to watch for nuclear tests in space or in the upper atmosphere, and thereby to safeguard the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. We plan two additional Vela satellite launches in April to maintain and to enhance this peaceful military capability. Other specific programs which are not prohibited include our Manned Orbital Laboratory, our extensive and successful communications satellite programs, mapping and other observation satellite systems, and the already operational navigation satellite system.

"The Department of Defense plans to continue its activities in space and to complement the work of NASA in those space endeavors in which the Defense Department

[1] NASA Authorization for Fiscal 1963. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, U.S. House of Representatives, 87th Congress, 1st session. March–April 1962, Part 2. Appendix V, pp. 1051–1065.

[2] President's Report to Congress on United States Aeronautics and Space Activities, 1963. House Document No. 207, 88th Congress, 2nd session, January 27, 1964, p. 41.

[3] President's Report to Congress on United States Aeronautics and Space Activities, 1964. House Document No. 65, 89th Congress, 1st session, January 27, 1965, p. 42.

[4] Introduction to Outer Space. A statement by the President and an explanatory statement prepared by the President's Science Advisory Committee. The White House, March 26, 1958, 15 p.

[5] President's Report to Congress on Aeronautics and Space Activities, 1965. House Document No. 371, 89th Congress, 2d session, January 31, 1966, p. 123.

[6] President's Report to Congress on United States Aeronautics and Space Activities, 1966. House Document No. 49, 90th Congress, 1st session, January 31, 1967, p. 2.

[7] NASA Authorization for Fiscal Year 1968 Hearings, Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, 90th Congress, 1st session, April 27, 1967, p. 981.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 993.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 996.

has achieved a high degree of technical competence.

"The United States is dedicated to the search for peace and to avoidance of nuclear war. Its policy is to control, to reduce, and finally to eliminate modern weapons of mass destruction.

"This treaty is an important step toward that goal. It is the most important arms control agreement since the Limited Test Ban Treaty." [10]

General Earle G. Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, testified that rational arms controls measures have been supported by the Joint Chiefs, and in the treaty—[11]

"Principles are set forth which can potentially keep the vast new frontier of space free of obstacles to international peace and order.

"The Joint Chiefs of Staff recognize that national security can be improved by balanced, phased, and safeguarded arms control agreements limiting the military capabilities of nations in a manner conducive to the achievement of a secure, free, and peaceful world. We are equally aware of the historical record in this regard and conscious of the need to proceed with hope but without illusion.

"Having pledged ourselves to the international community, there have been and there are now no U. S. plans to deploy weapons of mass destruction in outer space. The treaty provision on "no bombs in orbit" accords, therefore, with our decision not to deploy these weapons.

"Confident that our Government is strongly resolved toward this end, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have no military objection to the United States becoming a party to this treaty, and the articulated goals of this treaty are fully acceptable to them."

Whether or not the treaty was ratified, however, the Joint Chiefs of Staff would be concerned about the possibility of an enemy having weapons on orbital platforms and would plan to protect the United States against such a hazard. General Wheeler said that—

"With a treaty agreed to and ratified, there are psychological and world opinion factors would, I believe, exert a restraining influence upon a state contemplating violation of the treaty."

"In either case, whether or not the treaty is signed, it is the judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that we must have a strong research and development program pointed toward improving our detection and verification capabilities."

DEPARTMENT OF STATE TESTIMONY ON THE SPACE TREATY

Hearings were held during March and April of this year by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to consider the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies. Prior to that time, on January 27, 1967, the treaty was opened for signature in Washington, London, and Moscow. The representatives of 60 nations signed the treaty in Washington, including those of the United States, the Soviet Union, and the United Kingdom. In subsequent weeks some 20 additional countries signed this treaty which had been negotiated within the structure of the United Nations. On February 7, President Johnson transmitted the treaty to the Senate, stating that [12]—

"The provisions of this treaty reflect the will and desire of the signatory states, already numbering more than half the nations of the world, that the realms of space should foreover remain realms of peace."

Calling attention to the fact that the treaty is a significant interim achievement and not a final step, the President said:

"It carries forward the thrust of the past decade to enlarge the perimeters of peace by shrinking the arenas of potential conflict. This is a thrust to which the Senate has given its support by ratifying the four Geneva Conventions on the Law of the Sea in 1958, the Antarctic Treaty of 1959 and the Limited Test Ban Treaty of 1963.

"As we have dealt with the sea, the atmosphere and the vast unpopulated continent of Antarctica, now in this treaty we extend reason to the activities of nations in the endless realm of outer space."

In testifying before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on March 7, 1967, the Secretary of State pointed out the importance of the treaty in developing international law for outer space, and stated that—

"The treaty's arms-control provisions are of immediate and particular importance to our national security. Parties to the treaty undertake not to place in orbit around the earth any objects carrying nuclear weapons or any other kinds of weapons of mass destruction, install such weapons on celestial bodies, or station such weapons in outer space in any other manner. Parties to the treaty undertake as well to use the moon and other celestial bodies exclusively for peaceful purposes. They undertake not to establish military bases, installations or fortifications and to abstain from testing any types of weapons or conducting military maneuvers on celestial bodies. There is, of course, no prohibition on the use of military personnel and equipment for peaceful purposes.

"Concomitant with these arms control measures, the treaty contains provisions which, together with our own developing national capabilities, will permit adequate verification that the treaty is being observed. . . .

"The conclusion of the executive branch, including those with special responsibility for military and defense matters, is that the treaty will contribute to this Nation's security." [13]

Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg's statement before the Committee considered that the arms control features of the treaty are an advantage to the United States:

"President Johnson has called this Treaty 'the most important arms control development since the Limited Test Ban Treaty of 1963.' Unlike the nuclear tests which were outlawed by the 1963 Treaty, the military measures in outer space which this Treaty will outlaw are measures that have never been taken.

"But nobody can say with confidence that they might not be taken, and this Treaty forbids such measures. Surely it is much better and infinitely easier to close the door to the arms race before it enters a new dimension, than to attempt to root it out once it has become established." [14]

NASA'S SUPPORT OF THE SPACE TREATY

NASA's Administrator, James E. Webb, urged that the Senate give its advice and consent to the Treaty as a foundation stone in building a regime of law in outer space. Pointing out that NASA worked closely with the Department of State in negotiating the treaty's provisions, Mr. Webb said that—

"We are already meeting these high standards by the open character of our activities, our emphasis on international cooperation, and our high-priority efforts to develop practical benefits from the exploration and use of outer space which can be shared with all people. Millions of people in other nations have, through TV satellite and other communications links, been party to our launchings and space activities. The scientists of over 70 nations have cooperated actively with us in space projects, and the practical benefits of our progress in satellite communications and meteorology are in operational use by dozens of nations today. All nations can benefit from the general application of these principles and patterns of performance.

"All have interests in narrowing the field for military competition.

"The security of this country rests both on a strong defense posture to make aggression unattractive to any who may consider such a course and on a vigorous, dynamic aeronautical and space program. . . . Do this, and we can face the future with confidence. Fail, and no treaty can guarantee our security." [15]

MAJOR PROVISIONS OF THE TREATY ON OUTER SPACE

The Treaty establishes principles to govern states in exploring and using outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies. The major provisions may be summarized as follows:

1. Outer space and celestial bodies are to be explored and used for the benefit of all mankind, in accordance with international law and with free access to all areas of celestial bodies.

2. "Outer space, including the Moon and other celestial bodies, is not subject to national appropriation by claims of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation, or by any other means." (Article II).

3. International law, including the United Nations Charter, shall govern space activities to attain international peace and security, international cooperation and understanding.

4. No objects carrying nuclear weapons or any other kinds of weapons of mass destruction shall be placed in earth orbit, installed on celestial bodies or stationed in outer space. The moon and celestial bodies shall be used "exclusively for peaceful purposes." The establishment of military bases, installations, and fortifications and the conduct of military maneuvers on celestial bodies are forbidden, but the use of military personnel and equipment on celestial bodies for peaceful purposes is not prohibited.

5. Astronauts shall be regarded as "envoys of mankind" and in case of accident shall receive every possible assistance and be returned to the state which registered the space vehicle. Astronauts shall also assist each other, and dangerous health conditions in outer space or on celestial bodies shall be reported to States parties to the treaty or the U.N. Secretary General.

6. States which are parties to the treaty shall bear international responsibility for national activities in outer space, on the moon and on other celestial bodies.

7. States are internationally liable for damage involved when they launch or procure the launching of objects into outer space and use their territory or facility to launch such objects.

8. States retain jurisdiction and control over their registered objects launched into outer space, including personnel while in outer space or on a celestial body.

9. States agree to conduct space activities with due regard for the interests of others, avoiding harmful contamination and adverse environmental changes of the earth. International consultation is provided for in cases involving potentially harmful interference.

10. Requests to observe the flight of space objects shall be considered on a basis of equality by states which are parties to the

[10] Treaty on Outer Space. Hearings before the Committee on Foreign Rleations, United States Senate. 90th Congress, 1st session. April 12, 1967, p. 81.

[11] *Ibid.*, pp. 82, 83, 85, 90.

[12] Congressional Record, February 7, 1967, p. 2781.

[13] Treaty on Outer Space. Hearings before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, 90th Congress, 1st session. March 7, 1967, pp. 3–4.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 148.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 158.

treaty, but such opportunities shall be determined by separate agreements between the states involved.

11. States agree to inform the UN Secretary General, the public, and the international scientific community, of their space activities "to the greatest extent feasible and practicable". The Secretary General should effectively disseminate such information immediately.

12. Stations, installations, equipment and space vehicles on the moon and other celestial bodies shall be open on a basis of reciprocity to the representatives of other states, with reasonable advance notice being given for a projected visit.

13. The treaty provisions apply to space activities of single states, those acting jointly, and those carried on by international inter-governmental organizations. Practical questions arising from the activities of the latter type shall be resolved by states which are parties to the treaty.

The remaining provisions of the treaty deal with such matters as ratification, deposit, entry into force, amendments, and withdrawal.

Neither the MOL nor any other defense space project of the Department of Defense violates the provisions of the treaty as quoted below:

"ARTICLE IV

"States Parties to the Treaty undertake not to place in orbit around the Earth any objects carrying nuclear weapons or any other kinds of weapons of mass destruction, install such weapons on celestial bodies, or station such weapons in outer space in any other manner.

"The Moon and other celestial bodies shall be used by all States Parties to the Treaty exclusively for peaceful purposes. The establishment of military bases, installations and fortifications, the testing of any type of weapons and the conduct of military maneuvers on celestial bodies shall be forbidden. The use of military personnel for scientific research or for any other peaceful purposes shall not be prohibited. The use of any equipment or facility necessary for peaceful exploration of the Moon and other celestial bodies shall also not be prohibited."

NASA, THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, AND THE MOL

There has been some discussion of the jurisdiction of the Air Force over the MOL and the degree of coordination between NASA and the Department of Defense in developing this space project. The latest information furnished to Congress on this subject was that given by the Secretary of the Air Force, Harold Brown, when he testified on March 14, 1967 before the House Committee on Appropriations (the Subcommittee on the Department of Defense and the Subcommittee on Military Construction). The following memorandum explains the steps taken to meet the requirements of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, that space activities shall be conducted to contribute materially to "the most effective utilization of the scientific and engineering resources of the United States, with close cooperation among all interested agencies of the United States in order to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort, facilities, and equipment."

INTERRELATIONSHIP BETWEEN NASA AND DOD MANNED SPACE PROGRAM (MOL)[16]

In August 1965, the President approved DOD proceeding with the development of the Manned Orbiting Laboratory (MOL). The objectives of MOL Program are to improve our knowledge of man's ability in space and to determine what application may be made of man in space to perform military tasks.

During all of 1964, MOL activity included studies, simulations and tests to better define experiments and subsystems in real terms rather than in broad theoretical aspects. As a result of these efforts, in January 1965 the Secretary of Defense reoriented the project, and defined detailed tasks to reassess the configuration, to choose an optimum program, and coordinate with NASA in conducting analyses of the applicability of Apollo equipment.

Within these guidelines, the following steps were taken by means of analyses in depth. First, essential vehicle characteristics to meet the program objectives were determined. Second, detailed studies were made to assess the capabilities of the Gemini/Titan/Laboratory and Apollo/Saturn to fill these vehicle specifications, and to meet MOL objectives. NASA provided information and data on the use of Apollo to perform the MOL functions and participated in performing specific tasks and analyses. Third, detailed comparisons were made of the various options, the results were evaluated. The Apollo/Saturn system was ruled out on the basis of cost, additional re-engineering that would be required, the broad capabilities of the Apollo spacecraft not needed for MOL (such as re-entry at super-orbital speeds), and the potential impact on the lunar landing program. Completion of these tasks led to the August 1965 decision.

The MOL Program, as currently configured, consists of a Titan IIIM launch vehicle, a modified NASA Gemini capsule to transport the crew members to and from orbit, and a Laboratory on the order of ten feet in diameter. The Gemini/Laboratory will be integrally launched into earth orbit. The two pilots, in the Gemini during launch, will transfer to the Laboratory upon achieving orbit, and will live and work in a shirtsleeve environment for the 30-day duration. At the completion of the mission, the crew will return to the Gemini for re-entry and landing.

The culmination of the comparative analysis and information exchange between NASA and DOD recognized that major NASA systems such as Apollo could not effectively accomplish the MOL mission for the basic reason that the respective missions are too dissimilar. Whereas the Apollo vehicle has a principal function of transportation of men in reasonable comfort and safety over great distances, the MOL has a principal function of providing men a workshop or laboratory wherein they may conduct experiments of a military nature in a shirtsleeve environment for a relatively long duration. Although the overall vehicle designs to satisfy these two different missions are of necessity vastly different, many of the supporting subsystems are common in performance and can be adapted with some redesign. Therefore, since major NASA systems are not directly adaptable to MOL requirements, the next most effective course of action has been adopted, namely to apply to MOL the philosophy of maximum use of existing subsystems and hardware components from such space programs as Apollo and Gemini. In addition, maximum utilization of contractors having such subsystem experience has been observed.

Many Apollo subsystem contractors have won competitions for MOL subsystems, assuring that developed hardware, reliability, and contractor know-how are applied directly to MOL. As specific examples, the fuel cell for electrical power for MOL is being produced by Pratt and Whitney who is also the fuel cell subcontractor for the Apollo program. The MOL environmental control system (ECS) is being produced by Hamilton-Standard who also produces a similar system for the Apollo Lunar Module (LM). Other Apollo contractors also providing MOL subsystems include Collins Radio for the communications system, IBM for the data computation subsystem, Marquardt for the attitude control system thrusters, Honeywell Corporation for the MOL Attitude Control System and other component contractors.

In addition to the MOL Program benefits derived from use of NASA Apollo contractors for major MOL subsystems and components, many other benefits are being exploited. The vast experience gained by the McDonnell Aircraft Company in producing the Gemini spacecraft for NASA is, of course, being directly applied to the MOL Program. Only those changes in the Gemini essential to fulfill MOL mission requirements are being made by McConnell in producing the MOL Gemini B vehicle.

Many millions of dollars worth of ground support equipment has been transferred at no cost from NASA to the Air Force. Gemini flight simulators will be used to train MOL astronauts. Apollo instrumented range ships and aircraft are anticipated for use during the MOL mission. NASA manned space flight network stations will be used in support of MOL during special events or emergencies for back-up voice communications.

To assure that the NASA/DOD exchange of technology, hardware and experience continues to be effective throughout the life of both the Apollo and MOL Programs, there are several formal and many informal organizational interfaces.

Formal coordination between NASA and DOD on manned space flight programs is the subject of several joint organizations. The joint Aeronautics and Astronautics Coordination Board (AACB) has provided a mechanism for a great deal of policy interplay and coordination. The Manned Space Flight Policy Committee (chaired jointly by Dr. Foster, DDR&E and Dr. Seamans, NASA) provides policy level coordination between the two agencies relative to manned space flight. The joint Manned Space Flight Experiments Board provides for discussion, evaluation and decisions regarding experiments to be flown in manned space vehicles. Within this overall framework, the working level day-by-day cooperation between DOD and NASA is extensive—in research, exploratory development, aerospace medicine, test programs, and use of operational support capabilities such as that provided to support Gemini tracking and recovery.

As follow-on assessment of optimum joint use of NASA and DOD hardware, a 1966 study was conducted by NASA for the Bureau of the Budget (BOB) to ascertain whether MOL hardware and the MOL Titan booster might be used to accomplish the follow-on Apollo mission, namely the Apollo Applications Program (AAP). The DOD-supplied data in answer to NASA questions was used by NASA in preparing their study for the BOB. The study served to continue exercising inter-agency critical analyses of optimum modes of mission accomplishment. This is another example of how the NASA and DOD have continually cooperated in cross evaluation of available hardware, technology and objectives.

Any review of NASA/DOD cooperation should recognize that the flow of experience hardware and support has been a two-way street. During the early build-up of NASA, the flow was primarily toward NASA from the wealth of Air Force capabilities in high performance aircraft research, development and operations. Launch vehicles for the NASA Mercury and Gemini were adaptations of military ballistic missiles, Atlas and Titan. In many cases, DOD technology has gone to NASA, has been further improved by NASA experience and developments, and has subsequently been re-adapted to DOD programs. Within the context of the overall national space effort, cooperation between NASA and DOD has been of value to both agencies.

[16] Department of Defense Appropriations for 1968. Hearings before the House Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Department of Defense and Subcommittee on Military Construction. 90th Congress, 1st session. March 1967, pp. 755–756.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I shall make my remarks very brief. As the record will show ever since I have been on the House Science and Astronautics Committee, and in fact since the National Aeronautics and Space Administration was created, I have had misgivings as to the amount of money involved in comparison with other national needs. Today, again—especially after the action of the House yesterday in raising the debt ceiling by $29 billion—I must express serious doubts as to whether the Congress should authorize approximately $5 billion for the space program. Let me hasten to say I support the objectives of exploring space and scientific research. I want to see our Nation first of all nations of the world in space, but I think a system of priorities should be established by the administration to enable the Congress to substantially reduce overall spending.

Mr. Chairman, a number of years ago, and again this year, I introduced legislation which in effect would allow a stretchout in our Apollo lunar landing program in which we will end up spending something like $30 to $40 billion. I have believed that the United States could land scientific instruments and obtain scientific knowledge and know-how without a race to land men on the moon. Whether or not the Kennedy goal of landing and returning men to the earth before 1970 resulted in the recent tragic disastrous flash fire I do not know, but I strongly suspect that the recent scandal and investigation showing so-called sloppy work and other revelations would never have come about had it not been for pressure to meet this goal.

Be that as it may, Mr. Chairman, I regret that the Committee on Science and Astronautics has never held hearings on this legislation of mine. I know a number of scientists and others who have supported a stretchout of the lunar landing program. They would have so testified, but they have never had an opportunity.

However strongly Congress supports the space program and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, as I say, we must weigh the needs of curtailing spending in light of priorities. For example, I might mention that the Council of State Chambers of Commerce in analyzing the President's budget requests suggested cuts of $1 billion as being feasible as far as the Space Agency was concerned. The council said this might be too drastic on the overall program because of the loss of scientific talent and accordingly recommended a 10-percent reduction, or a reduction of $500 million from the budget request. The National Chamber of Commerce of the United States likewise called for a similar reduction and also the National Manufacturing Association. But Mr. Chairman, I do not have the technical knowledge, or time, or talent, to suggest where such cuts could be made. One member of my subcommittee, indeed, in offering an amendment to reduce one amount frankly stated the basis of his amendment was intuition. In other words, unless one uses a meat-ax approach or risks great harm to a necessary program one has to know what he is doing.

Mr. Chairman, if the minority members of the committee could have been furnished, as they requested, with a special staff to work for them I would have hoped that we could have effectively suggested where any reduction might be made. But it would take a full-time expert to analyze this vast program. The minority was denied that staff and accordingly I feel helpless to contribute toward economy and carry out what I think is in the national interest. So all I can do today is say I believe further substantial reductions can be made and I hope the House in its wisdom will reduce the amount recommended by the committee by at least 5 percent so that it will force the President to review this authorization and in cooperation with officials of NASA find where reductions can be made.

Mr. Chairman, I voted to report the bill out of committee and as I say I support the objectives of the program, but I have serious and substantial reservations regarding the advisability of spending all this money at this time when we have a war and other higher priority national needs.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUDEBUSH].

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the passage of H.R. 10340 authorizing appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

As a member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics I am certainly aware of the importance of this appropriation.

I am fortunate to be a member of two important subcommittees. I am a member of the Manned Space Flight Subcommittee and the Ranking Republican member of the NASA Oversight Subcommittee. This committee, as most of you know, had the responsibility of investigating the terrible Apollo disaster.

The Honorable OLIN TEAGUE of Texas is chairman of both of these subcommittees. Mr. TEAGUE is an outstanding chairman and one who works hard and expects other members of the committee to work equally as hard.

Just for a minute I want to briefly outline some of the successes and some failures of this NASA program during the last year.

We have finished the Gemini program in which we sent into space and brought back safely 20 men in 20 months.

Three successful unmanned flights in the Apollo program demonstrated the performance of the uprated Saturn launch vehicle, the Apollo heat shield and the Apollo propulsion and navigation systems.

Surveyor I and III made successful soft landings on the moon and sent back data of great importance.

We have obtained Apollo landing still pictures from each of our first three lunar orbiters.

We have taken the first pictures of the earth from the moon.

We have successfully tested the Nerva I, nuclear rocket engine, at full power and had successful firings of the half-length 260-inch large solid rocket motor.

We have played a major role in advancing aeronautical research and development.

But not everything has been successful. In a new program such as space there are bound to be some setbacks and some, I am sorry to say, are tragic ones.

What about the future? The future looks bright for the U.S. space program.

There are some exciting things in store for this country. Of course the Apollo program will move ahead in leaps and bounds and in 1968 we hope to begin the Voyager program.

This will be a series of unmanned exploration flights to Mars. Mars will be studied and some of the great mysteries of this red planet will be solved.

There remains the possibility that this Voyager program will be expanded and Venus will also be studied.

Today you are being asked to approve our committee report which includes spending $4,992,182,000.

This is a lot of money. Most of you in the House know that I have always been one who has voted for economy down the line.

And I will continue to vote for economy.

And I am going to vote for economy today.

But I am not going to vote for false economy.

We have spent nearly $28 billion since 1959. I want to protect this investment.

I certainly do not want to be a party to a program which is technically capable of getting to the moon but does not have the money to get there. As one of the astronauts once said to me: "I hope they do not cut off our appropriations when we are en route to the moon."

I want to be very candid here. I do have some reservations on the final bill. I am not going to elaborate on them as you all have your report in front of you I will call your attention to pages 176 through 188 and 191 and 192 of the committee report. These pages pretty well state my reservations on this bill.

Shortly I will offer an amendment which is outlined on page 182 of the committee report.

But I want to caution you, we must not do anything which will harm this program. Let us take a quick look at the amount of the appropriation.

NASA asked for $5,100,000,000. The committee has cut $107 million from this. This is the most that the Congress has sliced from NASA's request since 1964.

We hear a lot about progress. I have heard many on this floor plead with all of us to vote for progress.

Nothing can be as progressive as this space program.

I am certainly going to vote for progress and I hope that the entire membership in the House will join me in my vote.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield

10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 10340 authorizing appropriations to NASA for fiscal year 1968.

I do this only after careful study to reassure myself as I now would reassure you. That the proposed budget is for the most part merely a continuation of a space program which virtually all of us have approved in the past.

Having invested so heavily, I believe we cannot wisely reduce our commitment just at the moment when the greatest rewards are about to be realized.

But I would not be candid if I did not stipulate that in my mind, as in the minds of other members, grave concern is felt that the budget we discuss today is not subtly designed to produce new commitments in new areas of space which will, in effect, obligate this body for years to come.

I am convinced that this is not so.

I believe the committee budget is intended to do, and in fact does, just three things:

First. It provides for the continued, orderly development of the Apollo program for a manned lunar landing.

Second. It provides for the development of a limited series of applications of the technical knowledge which constitute what might be called spin-off benefits on our sizable investment in Apollo.

Third. It allows for research and development spending sufficient to keep pace in space technology so that in the future we will be able to exercise options to proceed or not to proceed without incurring the kind of extraordinary initial expense we were forced to accept in the late 1950's.

It might be argued that public mood today would suggest abandonment of substantially all research and development spending.

I submit that such action would be perilous.

Ours is the clear obligation to manage Federal spending.

Stop-start programing is not management; it is anarchy.

No one among us is sufficiently farsighted to say with certainty that the circumstances in the future, perhaps as dramatic as the sputnik launch of 1957, might not demand significant new undertakings in space.

And in such an eventuality no Member would wish to have on his record the fact that excessive emergency spending to redress some new and unforeseen balance of power and accomplishment in space was even partially caused by his unwillingness to support the most modest research and development activities necessary to keep us up to date and to keep our options open.

The years 1958, 1959, and 1960 produced lessons too expensive to be repeated.

This is the seventh year that I have appeared before you to advocate the passage of the annual authorization request of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

This year, as in the past, I have served as a member of the Manned Space Subcommittee which has made detailed review of NASA's manned space flight activities.

I should like to stop at this time to pay tribute to the excellent foresight and the courage of the chairman of the full committee in continuing and keeping the space program on the level it has been going for the past few years.

I also want to pay tribute to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], who through his insight and knowledge and following of NASA operations has kept us in steady contact with all of the problems and all of the knowledge we need to have to go ahead with this program.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BELL. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. MILLER of California. While you are paying compliments I would like to return one to you. The gentleman is one of the hardest working members of this committee. He has a fine knowledge of the subject and travels far to get his information. I want to congratulate him on the excellent statement he has made.

Mr. BELL. I thank the chairman.

Over 1,400 pages of testimony and supplementary material have been reviewed in this connection.

The subcommittee visited every manned space flight center and all of the major contractor facilities.

Based on the testimony and the material presented during the hearings, the committee has recommended substantial reductions in spending.

I believe the amounts now recommended for these programs constitute the minimum amounts necessary to support our manned space flight program.

I believe that further reduction would severely affect the future of the national space program.

Early this year, on January 27, we all were shocked by the tragic deaths of astronauts Virgil I. Grissom, Edward H. White, and Roger B. Chaffee which occurred during the test of the Apollo 204 spacecraft.

These men were the first American astronauts to lose their lives in a space-related accident.

The tragedy moved us to a thorough reexamination of the program by the Congress and by NASA.

Changes are now being made in the spacecraft, in the materials carried on board, and in the test procedures to insure that a similar accident will not again occur.

I believe that the true cause of this accident can be summed up by the remarks of Astronaut Frank Borman.

During the committee's investigation of the Apollo accident, he commented:

I don't believe that any of us recognized that the test conditions for this test were hazardous.

I, myself, in Gemini 7, flew for 2 weeks in a 100 percent oxygen environment.

We tested on the ground with 14.7 pounds per square inch absolute oxygen. We purged with 20.7 pounds per square inch absolute oxygen.

In no way did I consider the test condition hazardous.

Before his death Virgil Grissom had this to say:

If we die we want people to accept it.

The conquest of space is worth the risk of life.

Our investment in Apollo is great and it is no longer just a financial one.

Our obligation is to get the program back on a success schedule.

The first manned Apollo flight has been delayed about 1 year in order that new safety procedures can be incorporated into the program.

During this time NASA is continuing with its unmanned tests of spacecraft and launch vehicles.

I am confident that with the budget proposed the United States can still meet its goal of achieving a manned lunar landing and return in this decade.

Russia, like the United States, suffered a space tragedy this year.

The Soviets show every intention of persevering.

I believe we can do no less.

Nor do I believe a slowdown can be justified.

Argument that postponement of the lunar landing would save money is inaccurate.

The opposite is true.

Each year Apollo is delayed would add $1 billion to the cost of the program.

Our haste to catch up with Russia may have resulted in disproportionate expense during the early period of space development.

That time has passed.

Apollo's hardware needs have now been virtually filled, the technology has been developed, the personnel have been trained.

Remaining before us are essentially the launchings which have relatively fixed costs.

But postponements would require the expensive maintenance of launch facilities for a longer period than is now necessary. Just as they would require revision of phaseout plans for launch complexes and assembly plants and alteration of schedules to reduce the number of personnel to 100,000 by the end of 1968.

How do we justify this outpouring of the Nation's wealth?

Implication of military necessity, or at least military usefulness, has always been present in space dialog.

President Kennedy, in a letter to Congress on January 31, 1962, wrote:

It is the policy of the United States that activities in space be devoted to peaceful purposes and during 1961 we made significant progress in that regard.

Such progress included space projects to help keep the peace and space projects to increase man's well-being in peace.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I think we must recognize that the majority members of this Committee—Committee of the Whole—voted for this bill and is committed to this bill overwhelmingly and has been so committed for the past few years.

It is the same basic space program to which we were committed some time ago. There are no major new commitments.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we hear mutter-

ings in our respective districts about the problems, the costs involved, and so forth, as well as the fear that we are spending too much.

After meeting with and talking to some of the contractors involved in this project who are located in the congressional district which it is my honor to represent, one of the main things about which they were concerned, one of the things that cost them the most money, was the "stop and start procedure."

At one time we appropriate so much money and then the next year we cut it a way back and in the long run it costs the country more money than anything else involved in this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from California 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlemen for yielding this additional time to me.

Mr. Chairman, if we through fear stick our head in the sand, we must remember that the Soviet Union is continuing to produce and to pursue this program; it is continuing to proceed, and we may find out at some time in the future that a new sputnik or perhaps highly advanced new space vehicle, has been developed by the Soviet Union. Then we again will find it necessary that we as a nation begin spending fantastically great sums to speed up and to catch up with the Soviets.

Then we will be the victims of the same costly delays, of stop and start speedups that we were involved in immediately after sputnik was sent into orbit, and will find that we have not kept up to date in the development of our technological know-how in outer space. We will be again faced with the same problem of catching up.

Mr. Chairman, because this is what I believe is true, it is my opinion that we should spend the minimum requirements now in order to face up to this problem and to continue to advance our state of the art in the future.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I am pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, during the arguments which were made earlier in the day, a remark was made to the effect that our goal to attain the placing of a man on the moon and returning him with safety during this decade was thrust into the background and that its achievement was no longer a possibility.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California has indicated that he does not agree with that statement, and since the gentleman from California has heard the testimony presented before our committee, he believes we can achieve this goal, provided we follow it systematically and in accordance with those programs included in the authorization bill which is before us today.

I ask the gentleman from California if he has any question at all but that we can achieve our stated objectives.

Mr. BELL. I believe that is correct. I believe we can do this with an orderly procedure and program. However, I do not feel that we can accomplish this objective with a stop and go program. This has represented the most expensive feature of the program and has also represented the most time lost therein.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman feels we can accomplish this objective through following and carrying out our program such as that which we have been carrying on heretofore?

Mr. BELL. Yes; such as that program that we have been carrying on heretofore.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] 10 minutes.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I have a rather lengthy prepared statement here which I had intended to give, but I will put it in the RECORD and summarize it instead, since the hour is getting late, and we are going to have amendments here which will be the most important part of this bill anyway, but I would like to say that I support this program of the United States in space, wholeheartedly. I support this bill as it comes before the House floor wholeheartedly. I know the committee has worked on it at great length, and supervised it carefully, and I believe it is a sound budget and a frugal budget, which is more than can be said about a lot of budgets that have been brought before this House this year. There is one thing I would like to emphasize, however, and that is what I will proceed to do in my allotted time.

There will be a concerted effort in the amending period to cut down on the Apollo applications part of this space program, and I hope it does not succeed. I further hope the Members of my own party do not go along with the proposed cut in the Apollo applications. Apollo applications is the ongoing manned space flight program of this Nation. We have had Mercury, and we have had Gemini, which were completed very successfully. We are now in the Apollo program, and will complete that in 2 years—that is, the trip to the moon—but if we do not go ahead with the Apollo applications in this bill this afternoon and provide the money that is in this bill, 2 years from now the manned space flight program in the United States is going to come to a screeching halt, and we will have done it here in this Chamber this afternoon if we go along with the proposed cuts in this program.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has made a most important statement, and one I wish to associate myself with. I agree with the gentleman when he says when we cut out the Apollo applications we are cutting the heart out of the program.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the support of my subcommittee chairman in this matter.

Let me say this also: This committee last year tried its hardest to get the NASA people and the administration—because NASA was willing to do it—to go ahead with the Apollo applications 1 year before. We were not able to do it because we had spending problems and budget problems which emanated from the White House, so this program was postponed a full year.

Mr. Chairman, if we had gone ahead with it when we should have it would be well along the road now, and it would not be in jeopardy as it is in jeopardy on the floor of this House this afternoon, or it will be during the amending period.

I hope the Members who have been in this House a lot longer than I have, and who were here in 1957 and in 1961, have not forgotten when Sputnik I went up in 1957, and when the first man went around this earth in space in 1961. Believe me, Mr. Chairman, his name was not Smith or Jones, or Riley, or anything like that. It was Yuri Gagarin, and Yuri Gagarin will be remembered in the history books from now on, just as Lindbergh is remembered as the man who first flew the Atlantic Ocean.

I suspect there were people back in 1928 who said to themselves, "What is that darned young fool flying the Atlantic for?" Because it was just as unwise and as impractical then for Lindbergh to go to Paris as I suppose Members later here in this well will say today: "What is this Nation going on this crazy journey to the moon for?"

But what Lindbergh did by going first was to unveil unlimited horizons so that today—which was the tomorrow of 1928—anybody of any economic means at all can fly anywhere in the world that he wants to.

I would expect that with the fast pace of our space flight, we will go a lot farther in space than we have in heavier-than-air craft flight.

I said I was not going to take my full time, but I am afraid I am running out of time. Let me make one more point here because I think it is very important.

Program after program has come to the floor of the House of Representatives this year and I would venture to say I am accurate when I state that every major program that has been voted upon by this House of Representatives this year has been increased.

I know that every appropriation bill was increased because I looked up the figures last night and they will be listed in my formal statement.

The appropriations for independent offices under which NASA lies, came to this House a few weeks ago. This bill was not in it because the authorization had not come before you yet. Yet, that appropriation was increased $474 million. Yet, this program comes to the floor of the House of Representatives showing a decrease in the last 5 years—showing a decrease in dollars but even more than

that, a very significant decrease in the percentage of the national budget.

Let me read these figures to you because they are interesting.

In 1964, the NASA authorization was 5 percent of the budget.

It has dropped to 4.9 percent in 1965 and to 4.1 percent in 1966.

Based on the figures, as best we can develop them from the Bureau of the Budget, it would be down to 3.7 percent of the national budget for this year.

If it is true, as the Secretary of the Treasury has said, that we are going to run a $25 billion deficit this year, then next fiscal year, NASA's authorization, as included in this bill, will sink to 3.1 percent of the national budget.

Now what agency or bureau of the National Government has come before this Congress and this House of Representatives with as good a record as that? Not asking for anything more, so help me, but asking for less and less and less over the years. Yet, it is proposed here by some in this House, and it will occur later today, that for their good record of managing their money and doing their job with the low money appropriations that they have had in comparison with other agencies and bureaus of Government that we are going to kick them in the budget.

I think that is a pretty poor way to handle it. If we are going to do anything about trimming down the national budget—which probably ought to be done—let us do it with those agencies and bureaus that deserve it. Let us do it with these new programs that are asking for more and more money and which have been given more and more money by this House each year and this year.

Let us not kick the biggest and the best scientific and industrial program that the United States of America has.

Mr. MORTON. Did I understand the gentleman correctly when he said that in this year with a budget of $4 billion and 900-and-some-odd-million dollars that this would represent about 4.7 percent of the national budget?

Mr. GURNEY. No, I said it would represent 3.1 percent of the national budget.

Mr. MORTON. That is for this year?

Mr. GURNEY. For this fiscal year, 1968.

Mr. MORTON. The cost of our military posture, plus the hot war, plus the cost of past wars, totals 89 percent, leaving 11 percent for all other programs and expenditures made by the Federal Government not funded through special trust funds. Does this mean then that one-fourth of the money available for all other programs, including our environmental and public works development is going to be spent by NASA?

Mr. GURNEY. I cannot answer the gentleman's question there because I have not followed your figures. All I know is I took the moneys in this bill and I used the projected national budget for the coming year, the one proposed by the President in January, and I added the $25 billion figure that the Secretary of the Treasury used before the Committee on Ways and Means here a few weeks ago, and that is where I got my figures, which I think are accurate.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DADDARIO. I want to compliment the gentleman from Florida on his remarks because they so well illustrate the effort that the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight has taken to bring together the facts especially in regard to the Apollo applications program.

I am sure that the gentleman from Florida will recall that last year, as he rightfully said, when we postponed this program for a year, we took into consideration the fact that the Gemini program was phasing out, and that it would come to the end of its financing. We could then take advantage of the fact that there would be a cutoff of that part of the budget so that we could then afford even in such critical times as these, to support the Apollo applications program as it ought to be.

I recall that this was part of the reason, part of the logic behind our taking that position at that time.

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct. That is a point well made. I am glad that the gentleman brought it to the attention of the committee.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. The Apollo applications program is not only what the gentleman has said it is, the important keystone upon which we will build our program in the future, but within it there is the accumulation of all of that planning, all of that expert knowledge which we have developed in the space program to this point, and as we focus it in Apollo applications, for a relatively small amount of money we can then make the necessary choices. So we can come before the House and state why we want to go further in the program. Without this, the Apollo applications program, our space effort will end with the lunar program, and if that is to be the case, we should not have started it in the first place.

Mr. GURNEY. That is exactly so. The point made by the gentleman from Connecticut is eminently correct. What we are doing here is simply buying the necessary hardware to keep the options open, as the gentleman said.

Mr. Chairman, I support the space program of the United States with great enthusiasm and this bill H.R. 10340, which sets out the authorization for fiscal 1968 of NASA, the space agency.

I will first direct my remarks to that part of the bill called Apollo applications, for in my thinking this is probably the most important part of the bill. It is also the part which will undoubtedly be under attack later on today.

Here the bill provides for moneys of $444,700,000. That is a large sum and it will be argued that this is a new program so let us cut it out. Here is a good place for economy. But let us take a look at what Apollo applications is all about.

Apollo applications is the ongoing program of manned space flight.

Although this Nation was second in space, after the Russians, we built an enviable second in our Mercury and Gemini programs.

We are on the threshold of new and much greater advances in manned space flight in the Apollo program.

Apollo applications will build on this sound foundation.

It will give our Nation a chance to determine the future role of man in space.

The principle objectives of the program will be:

First. Flights of long duration—up to a year.

Second. The conduct of manned astronomical and earth observations from space.

Third. Continued exploration of the moon.

Let us turn to the first objective. The manned space programs of the United States, so far, have capability of flights of only two weeks in duration. This is true even of Apollo, the flight to the moon.

If man is to have a significant role in space flight of the future, our efforts so far are the first faltering steps only; they could be compared to the Wright brothers' achievements in aircraft.

The Apollo trip to the moon, in space flight, may well be compared to Lindbergh's flight to Paris, in heavier than air craft.

Lindbergh proved it could be done.

But great hero that he was, I do not doubt that there were many back there in 1928, who shook their heads and said, "Why does that darn young fool want to risk his life to fly to Paris?"

There are skeptics who will say in the well of this House today, why do we spend all this money to fly to the moon? To bring back some green cheese?

Sure Lindbergh's flight was hare brained and impractical, if you look at it by itself, and with 1928 aircraft technology.

But what a curtain it raised, unveiling the unlimited horizons of air flight for tomorrow, when today—the tomorrow—anyone even of limited financial means can fly anywhere in the world.

Can anyone here doubt that if man has the capability of long duration space flight that future space flight probably has similar broad horizons?

As crude as our present spacecraft are, compared with those of 50 years from now, we have made far greater and swifter progress in space flight than we ever did with aircraft.

The horizons in space flight are surely more unlimited than those of aircraft, for they are not earthbound, they include the whole universe for explorations.

However, whether this Nation continues on with manned space flight depends on what the House does today with Apollo applications.

The present Apollo program will terminate in 2 more years.

Manned space flight for the United States will then come to a grinding halt if the Apollo applications program is not funded this year.

The money here provided goes, first, to buy hardware, that is, the already developed Saturn I and Saturn V boosters; second, to modify already developed Apollo spacecraft; and, third, to develop a new orbital workshop and a telescope mount for the planned space observatory experiments.

It is important to note that Apollo applications builds on hardware in existence in which this Nation already has multibillion-dollar investment.

Even the new orbital workshop and telescope mount will make use of a converted, spent, Saturn upper stage.

NASA is planning well and frugally on the lessons already learned. It is putting to effective use the very considerable investment this Nation has made in space.

The argument may be made: but this is a year of great money demands upon our Nation because of Vietnam. Let us await a year or more until the war is over and we are less pinched for money.

Now everyone in this House who has any slight knowledge of science and engineering, knows that you cannot go out and buy at Sears Roebuck or Macy's Department Store, off the shelf, a sophisticated rocket booster or spacecraft.

It takes leadtime and long leadtime—5 to 10 years if you start from scratch. It takes years even when you have already developed the hardware.

Sometimes a decision to go ahead can be made best, by seeing what happens if one does not go ahead.

In this case the production lines of the boosters, the engines, the spacecraft will shut down.

Teams of scientists, engineers, technicians, skilled workmen, carefully and painfully put together over a period of years, will scatter all over the United States.

In short an investment of billions of dollars moneywise, and of incalculable value knowledgewise, will go down the drain.

Now then, let us say in a year or two, the Russians put up an orbital workshop. And any bet on that goal of our competition can be made safely, even giving long odds.

Then suppose the workshop goes spinning around the earth week after week, month after month, a living, ever present testimonial to the great scientific and engineering achievements of Russian communism.

What a propaganda triumph.

What an advertisement for the superior ability of the Communist world.

I hope the memories of the Members of this House go back just a scant 10 years to October 1957, when Sputnik I was launched by the Russians.

Surely you remember the dismay of the whole Nation. The United States, the greatest scientific and industrial nation, second in space.

As one Member said then in this very well:

> People were not simply shocked and awed, they were literally stunned.

And then just 6 years ago in April 1961, surely we remember the name of the first man in space, Yuri Gagarin and of his nation, Communist Russia.

As another Member then said in this well:

> The full impact or reaction of this propaganda victory of the Reds cannot be appraised or measured.

I remind this House that the Russians followed with the first walk in space, the first soft landing on the moon, the first photos of the moon.

Now do not think I am here to sell the Russian space program over ours. In most areas we have probably, I say probably because theirs is veiled in secrecy, caught up and exceeded them.

But there can only be one Lief Ericson or Columbus, or Lindbergh. The Russians were first, and as a Member of this House said at the time: Lindbergh was first to fly nonstop to Paris, who remembers who was second?

The Russians were first in space and that is the way the history books are going to be written. But of more importance, what are they doing now?

For the first time since the beginning of the space age, the Soviets are launching satellites and space probes at a greater rate than the United States. As of June 21, the Soviets led us by 33 to 27 in the total of successful launches this year.

These 33 launches included the Soyuz flight of April 23, in which Cosmonaut Vladimir M. Komarov lost his life. In addition, the study of information available from open sources seems to indicate that three others were unmanned flights in their manned space flight program. One of the three, Cosmos 140 on February 7, was probably a flight in preparation for Soyuz. But two others, Cosmos 146 on March 10 and Cosmos 154 on April 8, may have been part of another and more advanced series. In fact, there was a report in the British press that Cosmos 146 was the heaviest space payload ever put in orbit.

Drawing conclusions from the limited information available about the Soviet space program is very difficult. But there are a few criteria that the experts believe help identify their preparations for manned flights. One is the low perigee, which leads to very short lifetimes. A second characteristic is the resulting irregular decay as these large spacecraft graze against the upper atmosphere. In addition, sometimes the spacecraft is returned suddenly—presumably with the aid of retrorockets. Finally, they all are in orbits inclined about 52° to the plane of the earth's equator.

Now what about the thrust of the Soviet rockets? They announced in 1965 the introduction of the Proton booster, with a capability of putting in earth orbit payloads weighing about 27,000 pounds. In 1966, the United States began the flights of the uprated Saturn I, which demonstrated at the start the ability to orbit 29,000 pounds. The Saturn I payload capacity is being increased by increments to about 40,000 pounds by next year.

But the Soviet statements about the horsepower—60 million horsepower—of the Proton booster indicate that its thrust is at least 2½ million pounds. Some writers for our trade press think it is even more. The speculation on its actual capacity is generally in the range of 50,000 to 60,000 pounds.

The Soviets have stated that the Proton booster will be used for manned flight. If this is true it would be surprising if it had not been used in the last 2 years for preparations for manned flights. According to this line of reasoning, the Cosmos 146 and Cosmos 154 flights this year might have been launched by the Proton.

Since 1957, the Soviets have successfully launched 207 rockets into space. The total nominal payload capacity of these launches is believed to be more than 2 million pounds. I emphasize "nominal capacity," for their booster capacity is obviously subject to uncertainties. In the same priod, the United States has successfully launched 370 rockets into space. The total nominal payload capacity of these 370 rockets was 1.4 million pounds. Thus, even though we have launched more of our smaller rockets, the total weight placed in orbit by the Soviet Union is believed half again as great as that of the United States.

Since the ill-fated Soyuz flight of April 23, there has been no indication of further flights in their manned flight program. One possibility might be a suspension of flight operations pending a review of the accident. However, the Soviets have stated several times since then that manned flights will proceed as soon as they have corrected the causes of the accident.

The secret nature of the Soviet program permits them to make their preparations quietly, announcing a project only after a flight takes place. It is hardly surprising that they have continued that policy at this time.

The Soviet manned space flight program is a significant challenge to U.S. technology. On the long term basis, the Apollo applications program is the free world's effective response to this challenge.

To delay this program is in effect to cancel it; deferral would allow the teams to be disbanded, the facilities to be mothballed, and the flight equipment to become obsolete. Thus, the Soviets would reap the benefits of the unchallenged initiative. By continuing, we let it be known that we are not abandoning this initiative and we are not leaving open the temptation to undertake dangerous adventures in space.

Furthermore, all the benefits of employing existing capability apply with equal force to the Soviets. They have such capability and the opportunity to provide its benefits to their friends. Do we want to give them the freedom to proceed with their program while we are still debating ours? Should we let history repeat itself?

The better course would be to proceed with a program that meets our needs—regardless of what others may do.

I have dwelt heavily here on the propaganda value of the space program. I hope no Member underestimates this.

I doubt if there is a living world leader or crowned head of state in the world today that has not visited the Kennedy Space Center, especially those of the emerging, uncommitted nations. The first thing they want to do after a White House reception is to go to the cape.

Now I know this bill provides for a great variety of programs.

I know the argument will be made, let us cut on manned space flight because we do not know what man's future role in space will be. But this is all the more reason why we should find out.

The United States does not have a 100-percent record of looking ahead wisely.

The Wright brothers made the first successful heavier-than-air craft flight.

But it was European nations that leaped far out in front of us in the use of aircraft both for military and commercial purposes.

Even in our modern day who flew the first jet fighters—Germany; and the first commercial jets—England.

In the field of rocketry, the very subject we are discussing, the first man to develop a modern rocket was Goddard, an American, way back in the 1920's. He tried long and valiantly but in vain, to interest U.S. Government in rocketry. Had we given him even meager financing, we would be flying spacecraft today, that would make Apollo a horse-and-buggy museum relic.

Let us not forget that there was a small group of scientists that did recognize the importance of Goddard's work. A quarter century ago they were hard at work at a place called Penemunde in a nation called the Third Reich, under the leadership of a madman named Adolf Hitler, who was exhorting his political cohorts, today Germany, tomorrow the world.

As often happens in government Hitler and his scientific advisers did not fund their rocket program with enough money. The V–2 rocket was a year or 2 late. Thank heaven for the free world. For an operational V–2 in numbers would undoubtedly have changed the course of world history.

Or let us look at a more recent example of foresight—this time in our favor. Nuclear power applied to submarines and the development of the Polaris missile to use with it, may well have had a profound effect on world history also.

But its development was touch and go. Only the brilliance and courage of Admiral Rickover and the foresight of Members of Congress, especially this House, overcame the lethargy of bureaucratic brass.

Lessons indeed can be learned from history.

Those of us who work with the space effort of our Nation are convinced that the Nation which leads in space will lead in this very competitive world of ours.

Such leadership demands being first and foremost in all parts of the space program, but especially in manned space flight.

Without a substantial commitment to manned space flight this Nation will slip back to the also ran position in the space competition. It will also contribute in great degree to a second position in world leadership.

In my opinion shooting down Apollo applications will be a direct, telling, and highly damaging blow at the world leadership position of this Nation.

I sincerely hope that my colleagues do not fall for an appeal for economy and a short-sighted goal of taking it all out of the space program.

Heaven knows we need economy in Government and also that there has been little evidence around this House this year for economy. Lots of talk about it, but no action.

Space does not have the appeal economically or politically in some States as in others. But I hope this House will rise above a demogogic one shot blow for economy against space. If we do this, all of us will live to regret it.

To those on my side of the aisle, I might observe that we have suffered enough from fake issues. In 1964, during the presidential campaign we got shot down with the nuclear daisy bomb and the social security boogyman. In 1960 we got shot down with the so-called missile gap. That was so blatantly false that Secretary McNamara labeled it so after he became Secretary of Defense.

But here, in this bill in this Apollo applications programs, if we vote to gut this one, be assured as surely as night follows days, that we shall regret it and it will come back to haunt us, as a manned-space-flight gap.

A big cut out of Apollo applications today will kill our manned-space-flight program 2 to 3 years from now.

One last argument, which I think is all convincing.

This is one of the few Government programs that has not been given more money. So far this year every appropriation bill has exceeded the year before.

Appropriations so far

Independent offices up 5 percent	+$474,000,000
Department of State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary	+61,000,000
District of Columbia	+58,700,000
Department of Defense	+65,500,000
Legislative branch	+587,000
Department of Interior	+22,300,000
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and Department of Labor	+143,500,000
Treasury, Post Office, and executive offices	+798,000,000
Supplemental Defense appropriations	+12,200,000,000
2d supplemental appropriations	+2,040,000,000

I point out specially the independent offices appropriation because the NASA budget falls in this category. This appropriation has already passed the House without the NASA moneys. The increase over last year was $474 million. Up 5 percent. Yet NASA spending has fallen in dollar amounts over the last 5 years.

It has fallen considerably more percentwise of the Federal budget.

List:

[Dollar amounts in billions]

Year	NASA	National budget	Percent
1964	$5.100	$101.1	5.0
1965	5.250	106.6	4.9
1966	5.175	126.4	4.1
1967	4.968	[1] 135.0	3.7
1968	4.992	[1] 160.0	3.1

[1] Probable.

If NASA was before us this year with requests for increased moneys, then the people who argue to cut would have a case.

But I cannot see how those who have supported all manner of new programs and increases of these new programs, can fail to support in full, a vitally necessary space program when the people who run it come to this House, asking not for more money than before, but less money.

I hope we do not reward them with a kick in their budget. If other agencies or bureaus of the Federal Government had been as responsible, we would not be in the budget fix we are in today.

I urge my colleagues to vote down cuts in this authorization in Apollo applications.

Let me say further, Mr. Chairman, that the United States is engaged in no more important undertaking than the space program. It is of tremendous value to our Nation and to the rest of the nations of the free world. The nation that demonstrates clear superiority in space will be the acknowledged leader of the nations of the world. We have long since determined that this position belongs to the United States.

No one knows completely what is in store for those who are first to conquer space. There are certain to be many benefits that we cannot fully comprehend at the present time. Little did Christopher Columbus appreciate the true import of his adventures when he set out on his courageous voyage. What he discovered, although not what he set out to find, has changed the course of world history. Today we are on the brink of even greater discoveries, ones that seem certain to again alter the entire future of mankind. The United States must lead the way in this exciting challenge. It is imperative that we be first in space, just as we have undertaken to be first in the defense of the freedom of man. Let us not underestimate at our peril the meaning of the events of our time.

There are many reasons why it is important for the United States to be first in space. One of the most important is the security of our Nation. It is evident that just as space holds the key to the greatest scientific achievements of the future, it also holds the key to the most significant military advances. No nation desires peace more fervently than the United States, yet this desire for peace must be evaluated realistically. The political forces contending in the world today make it clear that the surest way to protect this peace is through strength. By maintaining our strength, through conquering the great expanses of space, we are assuring ourselves a forceful bargaining position, and generating confidence in those countries which look to us as the leader of the free world.

Of equal importance is the acquisition of scientific knowledge that results from the space program. The achievements of the United States in space during 1966 were impressive. We completed the last five Gemini missions, proving the concepts of extravehicular astronaut activity, first-orbit rendezvous and docking, and tethered stabilized flight and docked vehicle maneuvers. We qualified the uprated Saturn launch vehicle for manned space flight with the Apollo spacecraft. We successfully placed into orbit 100 spacecraft, more than ever before.

What are the returns from this unprecedented activity? Those who feel that the goal of our space program is only to place a man on the moon are

greatly underestimating the benefits to be derived from it.

Our weather satellites are giving us a greater understanding of the natural forces around us than we could have possibly hoped for just a few decades ago. Observations from space are being used on a routine basis by the world's weather services. We can now look forward to a day when it will be virtually impossible for the world to be caught by hurricanes, and other great storms that have caused untold damage, suffering, and loss of life.

In the field of communications we are also making great strides forward because of our space program. Our progress in communication holds the promise of increased effectiveness in business, education, government, and the home. In the field of education, for example, David Sarnoff, chairman of RCA, has said that with a direct-broadcast television network which can be developed through our satellites, we could eradicate illiteracy from the face of the globe within 10 years.

Photographs taken from space have increased man's knowledge of earth and the rest of the universe. The mapping and surveying potential that is present through space photography is amazing. Possibly one of the most exciting applications of space photography is in determining the most effective use of resources through resource surveying. The Interior Department has estimated that the worldwide data that could be gathered from space in 17 days would take 20 years to assemble by aircraft. By that time, the information would obviously be out of date.

Medicine has improved its understanding of the workings of the human body. The tiny biosensors used to monitor the astronauts' physical condition during flight are now being used in hospitals. They permit a single nurse at a central console to monitor the condition of a number of patients. This may be one answer to the shortage of hospital help and the rapid current increases in hospital costs.

Navigation service is now provided to ships at sea in all types of weather by our satellites.

Our space program has also provided a new surge in technology. Many people, notably including many European industrialists, are convinced that the industrial sophistication generated by our space program has given the United States an important competitive advantage in all technological fields. We are making things better than ever before. Microminiaturization has revolutionized electronics. Computers are prevalent in industry and government, freeing people from routine work to use more fully their ability to think and create. We are reaching a standard of excellence in materials, structures, fuel cells, that is unprecedented, and heralds a new prosperity for America as the technological leader of the world.

Our space effort has led to the creation of an extremely competent science-industry-government team. Only by a full utilization of this team, which has been assembled at great cost, can we get a maximum return on our investment. By utilizing this team we will be able to reduce unit costs of space flight, sustain the forward momentum of progress, and continue the flow of new products, processes, and ideas that have contributed to our prosperity.

In a number of areas of space activity it is safe to say that the United States is now in a position of leadership. But there is a keen rivalry in the area of space flight between the United States and the Soviet Union, accompanied by an acute awareness that many nations of the world are making judgments on the competence and leadership of these two great powers based on their performance in space.

Let us learn a lesson from history. The Roman mastery of land and sea communications, the English mastery of the seas, the American mastery of air and nuclear power were each followed by a greatly enhanced prestige and a vast increase of power and position. New knowledge also accrued from these achievements, along with a more effective use of resources, a more advantageous economic standing in the world, and a great surge in military capability. These in turn led to a great increase in national pride and motivation, and generated a confidence that the Nation could achieve whatever it set out with full purpose to accomplish. These are the benefits that the Russians hope to gain from their space program. These are the advantages we cannot allow them to acquire and use against the free world.

We should learn from experience that the Russians are serious in their space endeavors. They beat the United States in the race to acquire effective missiles, then we rushed to catch up. The same has been true in space, where they have established an impressive list of firsts, and again we rushed to catch up.

The whole world was astounded when the Russians ushered in the space age by announcing the launching of Sputnik I on October 3, 1957. And then, on April 12, 1961, Yuri Gagarin became the first man in space. At that time one of the Members of this House said:

> The full impact or reaction of this propaganda victory of the Reds cannot at the moment be appraised or measured. I shall never forget the reaction in the fall of 1957 following Sputnik I, when the Russians won the first race into space. People were not simply shocked and awed, they were literally stunned and I suspect these same feelings are going through the land today, but this time in addition we are just downright hurt that we must again take second place.

Another Member said:

> Who ever heard of the name of the second man to fly nonstop from New York to Paris? It is Lindbergh whose name is inscribed on history's tablets of immortality. Fate, it would seem, has been rather niggardly in awarding first-class prizes to second-class winners.

The Soviet Union has followed these achievements with the first walk in space, the first soft landing on the moon, the first orbit around the moon on a photographic mission, and more.

Where are they now? The Russians have an ambitious program today, and their actions indicate that it maintains a high priority in their scheme of essential activities. They have great faith in their space program, and the benefits to be derived from it. This is evidenced by the fact that they spend a significantly greater portion of their gross national product on space activities than does the United States, although their standard of living is much lower and their other needs much greater.

The Russians can also repeat an attempt rapidly when a mistake is made, and this significant ability to bounce back enables them to determine what their mistakes are and take steps to correct them. The recent death of one of the Russian cosmonauts has not slowed the progress of their space program to a significant degree. Even now a Russian spacecraft is on the way to Venus, 2 days ahead of our own.

The great surge in Soviet prestige that their space program has generated has given them a new weight and assurance in the international political arena, and a new pride and confidence in the Soviet national purpose. We are reacting quickly and with ever-increasing success, but the greatest challenges are yet to come.

Can we afford to allow the Soviet Union to forge ahead of the United States in the manned space flight program, with the many benefits to be derived from the mastery of space? The answer must surely be no. The United States is doing a great job with its space program, but there is no room for complacency. In a world which is looking for a leader, the space program offers the United States a way to show that freedom and democracy is a superior system, and can produce superior results.

This bill, H.R. 10340, enables us to maintain an orderly pace in our space program, thus reducing the possibility of surprise and the necessity to frantically undertake a crash program to catch up. In my opinion the bill is a sound one, and I urge its support by my colleagues, to the end that the United States may gain and maintain preeminence and world leadership in all of the space frontiers of today and tomorrow, especially tomorrow.

While I support this bill without reservation, there are matters in connection with the work of the House Science and Astronautics Committee with which I am troubled.

I am deeply concerned by the inadequacy of the committee staff, which makes it impossible for the committee to carry out its assignments as effectively as it should. This is not a qualitative deficiency, as the members of the present staff are excellent. But there simply are not enough of them to handle the immense tasks of a committee which is charged with overseeing yearly budget requests of about $5 billion, for NASA, and the entire science budget of the Nation totaling over $20 billion, plus legislative oversight of the Bureau of Standards and the National Science Foundation. There are faults in the NASA operation that are not being identified and corrected, to the detriment of the U.S. space program, because of this committee deficiency. Until this deficiency is recognized and corrected, the committee will not be able to properly discharge its

obligations, and thereby the Congress will continue to fail in meeting its obligations to the people of the United States.

There is another problem that exists in regard to staffing: namely, that there is no minority staff for the House Committee on Science and Astronautics. Regardless of the competence of a staff, how can a staff member serve both sides at the same time with equal fidelity? It is impossible to do so. As a result the committee, the Congress, and the people of the United States are denied the balance, the probing, the questioning, and the testing of ideas which leads to a more effective committee operation and to the quality of legislation that they are paying for and deserve. In "We Propose: A Modern Congress," by the House Republican Task Force on Congressional Reform and Minority Staffing, my distinguished colleague from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] says:

> The need for establishing new rules in Congress to insure the minority party an adequate supply of professional staff on committees is of overriding importance. It must be met properly if Congress is to fulfill its constitutionally assigned functions as a co-equal branch of government.

I hasten to point out again that these matters do not reflect at all upon the merits of this bill, but are considerations which I feel are important to make our committee work more effective. I am unequivocally in favor of H.R. 10340 as it stands, and urge each Member of Congress to support it.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON], such time as he may require.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, my purpose here is not to challenge NASA, the great committee that brings this legislation to the House, or even the adventure of our generation into space. The challenge of this adventure is of our times. We must accept it and we must pursue it.

Having read the report, it is obvious that the Committee on Science and Astronautics has done a thorough job in the development of this proposed legislation.

Mr. Chairman, in spite of this, I cannot accept a $4.990 billion authorization for our space program without laying before my colleagues a very basic question. The question is, What are the priorities which we are using to give appropriate and comparative emphasis to the demands on our Government in meeting the crying needs found everywhere we look throughout the land?

In the budget that was released on January 24, 1967, from the Bureau of the Budget and the Executive Office of the President, we find that 89 percent of all Federal expenditures within that budget were absorbed by our military requirements for defense and in Vietnam, interest on our debt, veterans' benefits, and other fixed charges. This leaves only 11 cents out of each dollar for all other Federal programs not funded through special trust funds, user fees, and the like. A nearly $5 billion authorization for our space program means that one-fourth of all the money available for other budgetary requirements of the Federal Government is being absorbed by our efforts in space exploration.

Mr. Chairman, where in this scheme of priorities lie the interests of our cities, our desperate need for new ships—a new maritime posture? Where do we place in comparison to space exploration our efforts to develop an adequate mass transportation system, our efforts to overcome the sins of the past in cleaning up our lakes, streams, bays, and even our oceans? How do we rank our effort in space in comparison to the needs of adequate housing, of broader educational opportunity, of paying for parks and recreation areas which have been authorized, as well as establishing new places where people can escape, though momentarily, from the pressure of their work, and even the pressure of their existence?

Mr. Chairman, the very fact that we, as a responsible legislative body, are willing to commit to a single program one-fourth of all the funds available after appropriations to the military and the costs of past wars, leads me to conclude that we face an overriding requirement to develop a system of priorities to be the guidelines for fiscal planning. The sacredness of our military budget and the almost unchallengeable size of our space effort could well be the beginning of the deterioration of the physical environment on the crust of this earth which is absolutely essential for the support of a higher order of civilization.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD].

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, I supported this legislation in committee, and support it today. I want to associate myself wth the remarks of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY], who just spoke, when he discussed the need for this country to develop and maintain a broad space capability. I will not reiterate many of the things that have been said previously in the debate this afternoon. I would like to comment on three or four aspects of the bill and of the report which are pertinent.

During the debate on the rule there was a speech made in which it was suggested that the speaker supported the space program because it provided jobs, because he was against many of the domestic programs, and because the money was spent here in the United States.

I do not support the space program for any one of those reasons. I support the space program because I am convinced that capability—not merely manned space flight—but the capability in weather satellites, communications satellites, and the broad technology that is being developed, will be of great value to the people of our country and the people of the world in the coming years.

As other speakers have said, I cannot pinpoint every advantage that will accrue to this country. But I can say that if history has taught us anything, we have to be willing in our time to undertake projects that have the prospect of bringing dividends in the future even though we may lack such specifics.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I am glad to yield to the chairman.

Mr. MILLER of California. Is not one of the greatest and biggest fallouts that will come to this country our ability to set up and manage large operations such as the space effort that will be important to us in solving the vexatious problems of the future such as sewage control and other management fields in which we have never had any experience, and we are training the men who can do these jobs in the future?

Mr. RUMSFELD. It seems to me there certainly is reason to hope that the processes and techniques can be transferable to other areas.

The report on page 148 has a paragraph titled "Information." In this bill, on page 9, there is a section which the committee inserted in this legislation for the first time this year, which specifies that "the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall keep the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate fully and currently informed with respect to all of the activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration."

Separate views in the report on page 191, authored by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER] and joined in by other minority members of the committee, highlight the background of this amendment to the legislation. It is a sound improvement and hopefully will benefit the Congress as we deliberate and consider the space program, hopefully with fuller information, in the coming years.

The reason it is there, the reason I offered the amendment in committee, and the reason it was supported unanimously in the committee is because of a deep concern that developed as a result of several specific instances. The Members believe that we should have access to fuller reporting, a greater amount of information, and that we should increase our efforts as members of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics to try to do a better job in this important area. This amendment to the bill and the comments in the report are an improvement over prior years' authorization bills.

The minority views, the separate views, also discuss the problems of committee staffing and minority staffing. This is an old story. Since 1963 some Members on our side of the aisle have been expressing the hope that the House Committee on Science and Astronautics could add to the individuals now serving on our staff, who are individually competent—and let there be no question about that—that we might add to them some additional individuals with technical backgrounds, so that we in the House of Representatives can fulfill our constitutional responsibilities in seeing that we have analyzed to the extent that is humanly possible these vast programs and oversee the expenditures of these vast sums of money.

It is not a simple business. It does require a competent and sufficiently large staff.

Also the question of minority staffing is discussed. This was raised when the resolution of the House Administration Committee was before us earlier this year. I am still of the belief that our committee and the House will be better served if we follow the recommendations of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress and provide minority staffing for this committee, this committee being the only committee to my knowledge in the House of Representatives where the minority has requested minority staffing and has not to this point had an opportunity to appoint a staff member.

The reason is obvious. For this Congress and for this country to come to balanced judgments, we have to have broad investigation, and probing, and questioning, and testing of ideas as we try to hammer out a legislative solution in a complicated area. I am hopeful that when next this authorization bill comes before us, I can stand in this well and say to the House that we have had the benefit of review and assistance for the members of a larger committee staff, and, further, that we will have had the benefit of the work of a minority staff, so that the minority members can be better served in their duties.

Finally, there is the problem that has touched this whole country as a result of the Apollo fire, the tragic accident which resulted in the death of three astronauts. I intend to offer an amendment during the reading of the bill which will establish an independent safety board of review for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The reason for this is quite simple. In the hearings by the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, the Subcommittee on NASA Oversight, repeatedly the committee was told that there was a hazard that existed over a prolonged period of time—undetected, unidentified, and uncorrected.

It was a hazard which was repeatedly described as not a complicated one. It was oxygen, in a confined space, under pressure, with the opportunity for ignition from arcing or a spark.

The fact that this was not discovered—I can only say it was not—I believe points up the need for improvements in the Space Administration's safety procedures.

A safety man has been appointed for the first time to serve in the NASA headquarters, and I applaud this.

NASA has no inspector general, as does the Air Force, the Army, and the Navy.

NASA has no independent safety review board, as does the Atomic Energy Commission, asking the hard questions about safety apart from programing, apart from scheduling, apart from cost considerations, apart from political fears of rocking the boat and possible retaliation from an individual high up in the chain of command.

I believe NASA needs this.

The people of this country, through the Members of this body, have invested vast sums in our space program. I believe we owe it to the people of this country to assure them that we have done everything humanly possible to see that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration corrects the now apparent structural management weakness with respect to safety, and that we do something here today to adopt an amendment which will provide an independent safety review board to work on these problems.

We will never eliminate all accidents; I know that. But at least we must reduce the number and increase the Space Administration's capabilities and the contractors' capabilities in closing this hazard evaluation gap.

I will offer an amendment to that effect during the amending process.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman for his excellent statement.

I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER].

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, essentially I am here in support of H.R. 10340, the authorization bill for the Space Administration, presently before us, but, of course, I have reservations concerning this bill and parts of it.

The main general problem facing the House and the Congress at this time is the fact that we have to marshal the assets we have to spend, and we have to make cuts in our national spending in places where it may hurt but where it will hurt less than it will hurt our national economy if we do not do it.

We have to protect the space program, because we have an enormous investment in it. We have to protect its essentials. We certainly have to protect our Apollo program, the man on the moon program, because of the billions of dollars we have already invested in that program.

But I do not believe we can approach any part of this program, any more than we can approach any part of any other program before the Congress, as a sacred cow or as being sacrosanct and beyond the ability of the Congress to make a change, a deletion, or to defer some program that can be deferred.

I do not believe it would be wise for us to make these cuts, if indeed we are going to make cuts, in the Apollo program, but we should be able to look at all of the other parts of the space program with a different eye and look into the program to find those things which are new starts, which will take a long time to accomplish, and which can be deferred, so as not to cast on the backs of the American taxpayers, new taxes and a new inflationary force in these very troubled times.

I believe we have to go through this program and come up with the programs which can be considered in this light.

In the programs which came before the Advanced Research Subcommittee, of which I am a member, the one program that stands out the clearest as the one that we could defer—certainly could defer—is the Nerva program.

This is a new program, a new development program, of something called a nuclear rocket. Now, get it clear in your minds. This is not a nuclear rocket in the sense that it is the direct use of nuclear power. It is just another chemical rocket, similar to the types of chemical rockets we already use, but it utilizes in addition nuclear heat to give it additional generating thrust. To undertake this program at this time is going to commit us to a program over a 10-year period, it is estimated, involving $2 billion, and it is going to commit us not only this year to the expenditure of about $100 million in our national budget but probably twice that amount next year as between the budgets of NASA and AEC. If we start the program this year, we will certainly have to continue it next year. So just remember that when you vote on this issue.

This Nerva rocket has no known use or need except if it is going to be used for some type of manned planetary mission such as a Mars flyby or Mars landing mission. Of all of the programs I know of from my own personal knowledge that we should defer this year, it seems to me the Nerva rocket program ranks No. 1. I will discuss this further when we get into the reading of the bill and amendments are in order.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to this, it seems to me we have to face a quite serious problem which we have in this program regarding Apollo applications. Certainly everything that has been said about carrying out the American effort of keeping a man in earth orbit is true. The question we face, though, as a nation today is whether we need a man in earth orbit in the civilian NASA program and a man in earth orbit in the military MOL program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. WYDLER. You can call the military program MOL and the civilian program Apollo applications but they are essentially the same thing. You take a man and put him in earth orbit on a platform. You can put a military marking on one capsule and you can put a civilian marking on the other capsule, but the plain fact of the matter is once that man is in earth orbit and on that platform he can perform either function just as well. I feel that the American people are going to wake up to the fact that we are going steadily toward having these duplicating programs separated only by our delusion that there is a distinction between them. They will rebel against it unless we take some steps now to get these two programs into one coordinated effort. This affects the Apollo applications program which we have before us today.

It is difficult in voting on this to handle this problem on the floor of the Congress. It is a question that the President should be resolving and resolving right now, but we can only vote on the matters before us. For that reason I am going to support the motions that are going to be made to cut the Apollo applications and to dramatize the serious problem not only of today but for the future when billions of dollars of national funds will be wasted and we will have duplication because of our failure to bring these programs together.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYDLER. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. WOLFF. The gentleman makes this statement on the cutting of these Apollo applications programs knowing that there are men in his own district working on this program?

Mr. WYDLER. I presume that there are men working in my district on every program that is funded by the Federal Government, but I have to take into account when I vote on the floor of the House of Representatives the general good of our Nation and not the specific good of any particular person or company in my district or out of it. Of course I realize that, but I am still going to vote the way I think the American taxpayers and the American public want me to vote, which is for the general good of our country. That is the way I will make my decision. In my opinion, the effect of the amendment would not affect ongoing programs at all on Long Island.

In fact, if we were to properly utilize Apollo hardware, including LEM, in a coordinated program we might find a great increase in space work on Long Island. We are competitive and can win on the merits.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYDLER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. With reference to the proposed cut of the Apollo applications program, let us point out the fact that this will involve the use of a vehicle in 1972 or 1973, and the last Saturn V will be four to six to seven times more expensive than we are manufacturing now. It is simply saving the taxpayers' money because by then your own automobile and this Saturn V will be obsolete.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 addition minute.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYDLER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Would it be true to say or correct to say that the gentleman in the well now has some taxpayers in his district?

Mr. WYDLER. Yes, we have quite a few taxpayers in our congressional district. Their interests are paramount to me. We are talking about duplicating and wasting hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, during the NASA authorization hearing I urged that the Congress adopt a new approach to the NASA budget. I pointed out that we should be presented with explicit choices between well-defined alternative long-range programs and that NASA's technical intelligence should operate within the framework of decisions and goals as defined by Congress.

I have done a great deal of thinking this year about the role of Congress in relation to the space program. I have tried to communicate what I believe to be Congress opportunity to influence the broad goals of the space program and to become a significant force for improving the quality of their practical execution.

I presented my views to the committee; they are summarized in my additional views in the committee report—Report No. 338.

I suggested that there are two possible views of Congress role. I said:

> The first approach is simply to attend annual authorization hearings, receive highly technical testimony from NASA experts in specific areas of technology on what technical progress they have made in the past year, and judge each area and its authorization merely on the basis of some vague notion of what constitutes satisfactory progress.

I said further:

> I believe that inefficiency, misallocation, and diffusion of scarce skills and resources, and unnecessarily long leadtimes result from the present method of basing research and development choices on vaguely defined technical needs and preferences, as determined solely by a small group of NASA's top managers.

In considering the alternative approach, I stated:

> Were we to be presented with explicit choices between well-defined alternative long-range programs, we could subject NASA's most important decisions to public scrutiny and bring to bear our judgment as representatives of the people. Rather than being involved in long and all-too-often fruitless hours of detailed technical discussions, we could weigh the benefits and the impact of the various major post-Apollo space exploration programs from the solar probe to the manned mission to Mars. I feel very strongly that such public consideration of both comparative results and costs would far better serve the interests of our constituents than discussions of the merits of high voltage ion propulsion. Our consideration and determination of major goals could then form a framework within which NASA's technical intelligence would operate . . . . NASA, subject to our review, would determine those specific technological advances requiring research and development effort which would most efficiently accomplish the national aerospace goals which we would have participated in defining.

It is ironic that it took a national tragedy involving the loss of three brave astronauts to focus national attention on some of the serious deficiencies in the space program. I hope today the House will look more critically than ever before at NASA's budget request, and the recommendations which have been submitted by the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

Mr. Chairman, the Apollo program to land a man on the moon by the end of this decade, or the beginning of the next decade, is a set, established national goal.

But, Mr. Chairman, there are other items proposed for funding under this authorization bill which are not national goals. Some of them have been referred to previously.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER] spoke of the Nerva program, and I shall deal with that program when we are under the 5-minute rule. I believe that, by authorizing the Nerva program, we will set in motion a chain of events which will find us at a later stage being told that we have an ongoing program that must continue lest we lose all of the costly effort invested in it.

Mr. Chairman, the development of Nerva nuclear rocket engine is a new departure. The Apollo applications program is a new departure. I think we should look at these programs from the point of view of our national goals and priorities and determine whether or not in the scale of priorities we should be committing vast public funds and energies to these particular programs. Unfortunately, in the past we have embarked upon vast and expensive programs without sufficient critical inquiry or national debate.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I would prefer to complete my statement before yielding to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. Chairman, 6 years ago, on May 25, 1961, in proposing the lunar landing goal President Kennedy said to the Congress:

> This is a judgment which the Members of Congress must finally make . . . This is a choice which this country must make . . . I believe we should go to the moon. But I think every citizen of this country as well as the Members of Congress should consider the matter carefully in making their judgment . . . as it is a heavy burden.

Needless to say the recommended national evaluation and debate never took place. The moon goal was assigned the highest priority. Without waiting to determine the dimensions, difficulties, and potential benefits of this task, we committed ourselves to a lunar landing within this decade, and there ensued the so-called space race and the rapid growth of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

In 1963 two events brought the original question back into focus. During October of that year Soviet Premier Khrushchev announced at a press conference that the Russians were "not at present planning flights by cosmonauts to the moon." At the same time Congress was faced with an extraordinary budget request for fiscal year 1964 by NASA for $5.7 billion. This was an increase of more than $2 billion over the $3.674 billion appropriation just 1 year before, and nearly $4 billion greater than the $1.825 billion appropriation for fiscal year 1962 a mere 2 years before. Finally, $5.1 billion was appropriated. This is the largest reduction that NASA's budget request has ever sustained. In fiscal year 1965 NASA's budget request was funded at 96.5 percent; in fiscal year 1966 at 98.4 percent; and in fiscal year 1967 at 99.3 percent. In other words, once the $5 billion ice was broken, Congress continued to grant practically all of NASA's requests. The exercise of critical judgment in connection with NASA's plans, management procedures, and allocation of resources has been insufficient. Congress has served too often as an admiring public for the space agency—too seldom as a watchdog over policies and costs on behalf of the American people who pay for this program.

One can hardly expect a program of this magnitude to double and triple in so brief a period without encountering severe problems of inadequate planning

and costly error. Precipitous expansion laid the basis for fiscal irresponsibility and permissive policies leading to waste, inefficiency, and poor workmanship in the space program. Management problems have proliferated and infused all phases of the agency while the public was allowed to revel in the idea that their space program had an unblemished record of success. The threat of severe public disenchantment is one of the very forces that now encourages us to avoid the hard questions and unpleasant disclosure, which would enable Congress to oversee adequately this program and make rational decisions concerning its future.

NASA's budget requests have temporarily leveled off at around $5 billion—many believe restrained largely by the cost of the Vietnam war. But let us make no mistake. They will increase again enormously as NASA's ambitions continue to grow in size and complexity.

The most significant omission of Congress has been the failure to give serious consideration to the question of national priorities. Many people are sensitive to the psychological and human implications of a Federal budget that allocates mor ethan $70 billion in 1 year for the military and only $11.3 billion on programs of direct welfare to its people. But few have stopped to evaluate the implications of NASA's ambitions in space. The American people have been mesmerized into accepting the idea of a $23 billion program to attempt to put astronauts on the lunar surface within this decade. At the same time only $1.5 million is spent by the Federal Government for rehabilitation of narcotics addicts, only $175 million on cancer research. It is difficult to find funds to mount a serious attack on the growing menace of air pollution which poisons the earth while we seek glories in the void of space.

Mr. Chairman, during the course of the hearings on the tragic fire which occurred at Cape Kennedy on January 27 we came to realize there are serious deficiencies in NASA's programs; that there are serious management deficiencies. It has not properly supervised its contractors. The way in which the Apollo program increased in costs and was out of control is a classic example. There is no need at this date to reiterate in full the many recent disclosures that have revealed the extent of serious managerial difficulties and quality deficiencies in the space program. But I believe it is important to mention the Phillips report which detailed the tripling of costs and the unacceptable performance of low-quality hardware produced by North American Aviation. I believe it is important to remember the Apollo Review Board report which made a very severe indictment, pointing to inadequate design and safety features, lack of inspection procedures, and poor workmanship in the Apollo program.

Then there was the General Electric report, which specified hardware deficiencies in the Apollo program which were uncorrected by January 1, 1967, some of which were deemed serious enough to have catastrophic implications on reentry.

Then there was NASA's incredible failure to review its own literature on space cabin fire hazards or to properly supervise North American Aviation and discover that the company did not meet already extant criteria for selection and placement of materials in the space cabin in order to reduce fire hazard.

These and other reports show that there has been insufficient supervision by NASA of its contractors.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

(On request of Mr. MILLER of California, and by unanimous consent, Mr. RYAN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. RYAN. I thank the chairman for yielding.

(On request of Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, and by unanimous consent, Mr. RYAN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me 2 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the list, then, of evidence of negligence and mismanagement is long. NASA management is out of control of this program.

Mr. Chairman, while I believe it is proper to place blame on NASA and the contractors, Congress also has to bear a part of the blame for not having exercised sufficient critical judgment or supervision of the programs. The space agency has been allowed to grow at a rate which is too rapid to permit or encourage the development of adequate coordination and control.

In many ways the program has run away from its administrators in size and scope before the agency itself had a chance to develop the requisite experience, maturity, and mastery of its own resources. Part of this is, of course, because we have been involved in a crash program, a competitive race for the moon. The history of the space program has been a continuing quadrille of design changes, specifications, readjustments of quality standards, testing procedures, and cost estimates between NASA and its contractors.

We see this in a letter of January 31, 1966, in a reply to General Phillips about his report of December 19, 1965, in which J. L. Atwood, president of North American Aviation, Inc., said:

> The first of these basic problems has been the tremendous impact of the evolutionary nature of the technical concepts and program philosophy and the corresponding difficulty in visualizing the full scope of the tasks to be accomplished and the methods of accomplishing them in order to obtain the lunar landing objective. . . . This condition has led to a continual traffic between NASA and NAA in changes both large and small and affecting both technical and management aspects, with great impact on both the Apollo CSM and Saturn S–II Programs. To illustrate the impact on cost alone, the dollar value of contract changes (over $400 million) in the Saturn S–II Stage Program exceeds the original basic contract value of $320 million.

Whether the truth lies more in General Phillips' devastating indictment of NAA's operation or in NAA's explanation of NASA's lack of clarity in planning and program specification we do not know. And this is precisely where Congress is to blame. Congress has not held NASA responsible to account in detail for its operations or for the many management failures and the deterioration of schedules and standards. There has been an overrapid, uncontrolled growth leading to conditions of waste, inefficiency, lack of control, and excess hazards. It is entirely possible that out of this chaos further disasters will occur. There is no reason to believe that anything short of a deliberate brake on this program and severe demand for decisive realinement of management procedures will prevent the situation from continuing.

Mr. Chairman, We may be on the verge of perpetuating mistakes which have been made in the past. The Nerva program is one place where we can exercise judgment and begin to bring this program under control. The Apollo applications program is another place where we can exercise more strict control.

A major decision facing us concerns the funds intended for a new phase of the Nerva nuclear rocket program. This new phase is the change from technology development to the actual building of the Nerva nuclear engine—flight hardware for testing and eventual use. The committee has recommended for this authorization $70,000,000 for the nuclear rocket program and $16,500,000 for construction at the Nuclear Rocket Development Station in Nevada to carry out the testing. NASA does not mention other associated costs such as administrative operations support of this program nor the approximate $100 million to be expended also in fiscal year 1968 for AEC's portion of this coordinated AEC–NASA program. It is estimated that within 8 years at least $2 billion will be spent in this effort in addition to the $1.6 billion already expended for technology development. Thereafter, it will require a conservatively estimated $150 to $200 billion for the probable effort to land a man on Mars in approximately 1985. NASA does not yet specifiy the manned Mars landing as a goal. Therefore, neither Congress nor the public has yet assented to this incredibly costly venture. But it is freely discussed in the press and in every technical aerospace journal. The spring 1967 issue of the TRW Space Log contains a lengthy discussion of the nuclear rocket engine—its alleged efficiency and its proposed use in a manned Mars mission. The article is written by representatives of the SNPO, the joint office of AEC and NASA which is in charge of the nuclear rocket program. It says:

> In a multi-stage mission such as a manned Mars landing, the advantage (of a nuclear rocket engine) would be compounded.

NASA has already clearly spent a great deal of money on press and information releases about this unspecified mission. NASA's own graphs and charts of future space efforts always include such a Mars or Venus manned landing.

I believe that the reason NASA will not admit to a manned Mars mission at this time—which it is carefully implanting in the national consciousness—is that NASA fears serious questions would be raised concerning the astronomical

costs and unspecified benefits of this program. It is—and should be—a serious possibility that the Nation would reject, at this time, a pricetag of $200 billion and perhaps a great deal more to land a man on the planet Mars. NASA probably hopes that in time sufficient funds will have been sunk into this program so that the only way the Nation will be able to reject the project will be to throw away incredible sums already spent.

I believe we should eliminate the additional funds for building the Nerva nuclear engine for which there is no explicit mission requirement.

Another major decision facing Congress today concerns the projected Apollo applications program. NASA's comment on this program reads as follows:

> Contracts for the Apollo Applications Program will be negotiated after the Congress has approved the program. Current contracting has involved definition studies and procurement of long lead-time items.

In other words despite a budget request for $454.7 million, this program does not yet clearly exist. Costly, long lead-time items are being purchased in order to justify a program whose main purpose will be to justify those purchases. In regard to this proposal, the "DMS-Market Intelligence Reports" stated in its July 1966 report:

> The Apollo Applications Programs has evolved from the Agency's urgent need to identify for itself—and substantiate—a continuing role in manned space exploration. NASA must have a manned space mission if it is to continue to command a sizable budget, with the prestige and power that it brings . . . (NASA) officials were hard put to define a manned mission for which it could provide justification, specific objectives and scientific (and Administration) support . . . NASA has been placing with industry an increasing volume of short and medium term study contracts relating to the AA. Partly to help it identify specific missions, partly to keep a momentum going in manned space orientation. NASA has now something over 300 such contracts in progress . . . It (NASA) is even proceeding to buy long-time items for 24 Saturn boosters and Apollo spacecraft it proposes to use in the AA program, whatever and whenever it is defined . . . in early June, it (NASA) selected Lockheed and Martin to conduct parallel year-long studies of the experimental integration for AA, indicating that one of the two would then be selected to manage the program. In effect, these are the AA mission definition studies, on which NASA must justify its case before Congress . . . (NASA) on the one hand is bringing up the "Space Gap" threat and, on the other, predicting that some of its facilities 'will have to be put in mothballs' within a year unless it gets full funding of the AA.

DMS' commentary rings true when one views NASA's justification for its $454,700,000 budget request for Apollo applications. NASA's budget presentation cites the program as being a "full investigation of man's role in the effective exploration of the environment of space." The committee has recommended for this program $444,700,000, a reduction of a mere $10 million.

Although NASA has mentioned various possible experiments to be conducted at some unspecified time in the future by the Apollo applications program, once again we are asked to invest in a program where no mission is explicitly outlined, plans are not clear, not a single launch is yet scheduled, not a single cost estimate is projected—in fact, the program conception does not yet fully exist.

I believe we should reduce the funds for this program by 50 percent of the committee's recommendation and defer any further funding until we have a clear projection of plans, costs and benefits as a basis for serious congressional review and decision about this projected program.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to refer to a statement made by Mr. Webb several years ago in which he said that the program authorized by the Congress for 1964 "constitutes the minimum appropriation which will enable NASA to maintain its momentum, to sustain our on-going programs at an optimum pace, and to achieve our stated national objectives in space."

Mr. Chairman, it is noteworthy that devotion to the national objectives is third in the list of three. First is NASA's momentum, and second is NASA's sense of what constitutes its own "optimum pace."

It is time Congress demanded a reorientation of NASA's concerns—that the public interest be first on the list—that NASA be accountable to Congress in detail—not for continued overtechnical explanations of various esoteric fuels and advanced propulsion systems, but for proving the importance and adequacy of all its requests and plans. It is time that NASA find that pace of achievement which allows the highest standards of quality to be maintained in the Nation's space program.

As for Congress' task, the Congress must call a halt to the accumulation of difficulties and inadequate management procedures within the space program, and to determine a level of funds that is truly consistent with the national interest. Congress must examine and determine the goals that are most worthy of this Nation's support and ask NASA's technical intelligence to serve these goals.

The moon landing has been accepted as a national goal. However, I believe that Congress must, today, begin to use its fiscal power in other areas in order to take control of the space program and shape it into an effort that is first in the quality of its efforts and first in the benefits that it provides for the people of the United States. This would be a worthy goal.

At the same time, let us also look at our national priorities. Let us remember, as we are about to authorize for appropriation almost $5 billion, that Congress eliminated this spring on the floor of this House a mere $10 million for rent supplements.

We have not provided a mere $10 million that is needed for the adult literacy education program.

Somewhere and somehow we must reassess our values.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendments which will be offered to give Congress greater control over the Nation's space program.

Mr. Chairman, I include at this point in the RECORD my additional views which appear at page 159 of the committee report No. 338:

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

The Committee on Science and Astronautics has a critical opportunity to influence both the broad goals and the practical execution of our quest into space. Whether or not we take advantage of this opportunity depends on how we view the role of Congress with respect to NASA.

There are two possible views of this role.

The first approach is simply to attend annual authorization hearings, receive highly technical testimony from NASA experts in specific areas of technology on what technical progress they have made in the past year and judge each area and its authorization merely on the basis of some vague notion of what constitutes satisfactory progress. We may even occasionally apply our technical judgment and try to influence NASA's course in one specific development item or another. This is our present modus operandi, which has not been noted for its impact on either NASA management procedures or NASA programs, and raises doubt as to the effectiveness of congressional review.

I believe that inefficiency, misallocation, and diffusion of scarce skills and resources, and unnecessarily long leadtimes result from the present method of basing research and development choices on vaguely defined technical needs and preferences, as determined solely by a small group of NASA's top managers. In the area of advanced research and technology this is apparent in the proliferation of sizes and types of space power generating systems and small thrustor motors—or, for example, in the inexplicable confusion that greets us when we attempt to get a clear picture of the procedures and funds that are being requested for the Electronics Research Center.

Considering the alternative approach, I believe that it is possible for Congress to play a truly influential and appropriate role in the management of the Nation's space program. Were we to be presented with explicit choices between well-defined alternative long-range programs, we could subject NASA's most important decisions to public scrutiny and bring to bear our judgment as representatives of the people. Rather than being involved in long and all-too-often fruitless hours of detailed technical discussions, we could weigh the benefits and the impact of the various major post-Apollo space exploration programs from the solar probe to the manned mission to Mars. I feel very strongly that such public consideration of both comparative results and costs would far better serve the interests of our constituents than discussions of the merits of high voltage ion propulsion. Our consideration and determination of major goals could then form a framework within which NASA's technical intelligence would operate. Under this revised view of the congressional role NASA, subject to our review, would determine those specific technological advances requiring research and development effort which would most efficiently accomplish the national aerospace goals which we would have participated in defining.

I find strong and eloquent support for these views in the report of February 1967, by the President's Science Advisory Committee, "The Space Program in the Post-Apollo Period." The President states, in the introduction—

> "Because the opportunities in space are great but the costs are high, our space planning deserves the thoughtful consideration of all thoughtful Americans."

The committee's subsequent statements amplify this sentiment:

> "The Nation can choose any one of several different levels of space effort. The program

can be extremely ambitious and press rapidly forward with manned exploration of the planets, or can be less expensive and emphasize a larger proportion of unmanned missions in near earth space; the choice must depend on evaluation of the direct and indirect benefits * * *

"Going ahead with forethought to future needs can lower mission costs and make success more rapid, particularly in such very difficult undertakings as manned planetary exploration.

"Recommendation.—We recommend that NASA study the advantages of adopting a planning and decisionmaking structure which emphasizes program objectives rather than the means used to attain them.

"In the Panel's judgment, however, the overall NASA organization, while logical now, is potentially awkward and illogical for the planning of major new space programs. This problem will arise because NASA's organization is divided according to capabilities and techniques rather than broad space objectives. While the present organizational form was perhaps ideal for developing new space capabilities, it is now likely to complicate rational application of such capabilities in meeting future program objectives. For example, we believe that man should be used in space flight only when his presence contributes in an important way to the exploratory and scientific objectives. To insure that he is used in this way implies much greater integration of manned and unmanned mission planning than is reasonable to expect from NASA's present arrangements."

Our Committee on Science and Astronautics is in a key position to advance these aims since the manned space flight, the space applications, and the advanced research and technology budgets all contain major requests which will implicitly shape the Nation's space objectives and capabilities for many years to come.

As an example, in advanced research and technology, NASA requested, and the committee approved, $47 million for a major flight hardware program, the NERVA engine. In fact, just the engine program alone will cost the Nation $1.5 to $2.0 billion in 10 years; moreover, it is justified on the basis of an unspecified deep space mission which will probably cost 100 times the cost of the engine.

Another new request this year, with much larger immediate budget impact and equally questionable justification, is the Apollo applications program. This project, which according to conservative estimates will cost the Nation at least $5 billion in the next 5 years, is justified on the basis of being simply a full investigation of man's role in the effective exploitation of the environment of space (NASA fiscal year 1968 budget estimate, vol. V, p. RD–2). In other words, the committee is recommending an experiment to determine not whether, but how we should thereafter proceed to spend, say $200 billion for space missions which have not yet been determined to be in the national interest. In reviewing the basic information to be derived from Apollo applications, we may ask if much of the data collection could be less expensively performed by unmanned satellites, and if it otherwise duplicates information to be gathered by the Department of Defense's manned orbiting laboratories.

The manned orbiting laboratory raises another issue to which Congress has given no serious thought or investigation. We have no clear idea of the extent to which the Defense Department and NASA may be duplicating each other's efforts and "reinventing the wheel" at vast, unnecessary public expense. Furthermore, we have not seriously considered the implications of military efforts in space and their relation both to our treaty commitments about peaceful use of space and to our diplomatic relations with other countries. This entire issue is too broad and too important not to be dealt with through an extensive and searching congressional inquiry.

Claims that the Department of Defense space program has fared better in terms of less cost escalation and fewer quality difficulties should be investigated to determine whether there are substantial lessons to be learned by the civilian agency.

NASA argues that the manned space Government-industrial team must be preserved to avoid some disastrous technological deficiency as compared to some unspecified future requirement. This is not particularly persuasive when it is implied that anything less than $5 billion per year will fail to hold this team together. To accept this argument would be to admit gross negligence in our failure to preserve the Government-industrial zeppelin team at the level to which it was accustomed in 1937—the year of the Hindenburg disaster. In its requests for post-Apollo hardware, NASA emphasizes two major themes—first, the great urgency of getting on with all the postlunar missions and secondly, the great savings to be achieved by maintaining the present levels of effort and production. Congress should closely examine and question these two allegations.

We must squarely face the question of whether NASA's inner councils should be permitted to determine, without the benefit of explicit public review, the allocation of resources that will ultimately determine what space objectives we can and cannot achieve in the period 1975–85. It seems clear that by committing funds now to flight hardware items for as yet unspecified missions, NASA will be able to control and even dictate in the future our interplanetary space goals by simply pointing to the large sums already invested in specific equipments.[1]

A simple projection of the costs of a 1986 manned Mars mission will indicate the enormous commitments that will be made by default if we do not take an active hand in shaping our future space program. The manned Mars mission, according to present predictions, will involve a gross weight of seven to 14 times the 6,400,000 pounds of Apollo and mission durations of 35 to 70 times as long (requiring major advances in reliability and life support). Certainly a minimum cost estimate for a mission of this magnitude would be five to 10 times the $20 billion cost of Apollo. In other words, the decisions that are implicit in present hardware choices involve sums of at least $100 to $200 billion, without taking into account the usual pattern of NASA cost escalation.

NASA has consistently refused all requests to make explicit their future alternatives, their recommended choices and the implied costs. The President, in his letter of January 30, 1964, to the Honorable James E. Webb, specifically requested:

"A statement of possible space objectives beyond those already approved * * *. The projection should include an analysis of the advances in space technology likely to be needed as well as estimates of the time and funds required to implement the major missions of the overall program."

This letter requested a preliminary report of May 1 and a final report on September 1, 1964. NASA's response to this letter on May 20, 1964, in promising a report by September 1 of that year, said:

"An extensive analysis of each mission listed above is being made to determine its requirements in manpower, facilities, and other resources and to balance these against the value of potential returns in the form of new national space capabilities, new knowledge, new civilian and military applications, and new industrial capabilities."

The promised report, transmitted some 5 months late on February 16, 1965, has been published as the "Summary Report—Future Programs Task Group" and, in 100 pages, neither specifically recommends nor costs a single mission. Administrator James E. Webb's covering letter recommends only a Mars soft landing in 1971 at a program cost of "in excess of $1 billion." In this report, there are repeated implicit objections to the President's request for a clear exposition of program structure, of which the following is typical (p. 29):

"Where there is reasonable promise of success in the development of such things as new materials, propulsion systems, or techniques, it is NASA policy to pursue those directions even though a specific use is not clearly defined."

Since NASA's definition of the "pursuit of a direction" seems to include the production of flight hardware (e.g., NERVA at $1.5 to $2 billion cost in 10 years), it is clear that NASA intends to continue making implicit mission decisions by developing whatever hardware it finds attractive without any external guidance or review of the Nation's space objectives. This attitude has been reaffirmed recently in NASA's failure to comply with Senator Cannon's request for recommended post-Apollo missions and schedules, a request with a formal deadline last December 1.

The standard NASA objection to the organization and presentation of a cost-benefit program structure is typical of the objections of any R. & D. management that wishes to escape review of internal decisionmaking. That is, the claim is always made that fruitful research is such an unpredictable and fragile bloom that any attempt to introduce directed or planned growth will cause it to wither. In other words, those supporting research must not interfere with the sacrosanct process, must not reduce "flexibility," and must not question the objectives of technically fascinating projects.

The answer to these NASA objections is very simple:

Even if research were as unpredictable as claimed, NASA is not primarily in the business of pure research. NASA is in the business of managing the engineering, production, and exploitation of space hardware in order to accomplish the Nation's goals in space—presumably at the least cost to the Nation. In doing this, it faces much the same problems as any major corporation; it does not have unlimited funds at its disposal; and it must allocate these funds between production using present technology and investment in improved technology.

NASA does in fact make such decisions although they are rarely explicitly stated and even more rarely substantiated. It is clear that we will not and cannot afford to develop and improve all possible approaches to space problems. This means that choices and decisions are being made, although NASA management refuses to make explicit the criteria by which they are made.

Congress should insist that all important decisions made within NASA be openly presented to the Congress in terms of specific space mission objectives together with their benefits and their costs to the Nation. The Congress should decide how much and toward what ends public funding is spent. To do this, we should be provided with a sounder and more understandable basis for decision than technical incantations about improved specific impulse, higher structural efficiency, and reduced weight in orbit.

In view of the failure of attempts to obtain from NASA the materials necessary for congressional review of national space objectives on any basis other than NASA's chosen ground of technical detail, I am firmly convinced that Congress must make

[1] NASA almost explicitly admits this in the "Summary Report—Future Programs Task Group" statement (p. 77): "Decision on missions should be made on the basis of technology that is in hand or close to being available."

good use of its fiscal powers. This view is reinforced by recently developing doubts as to NASA's managerial competence.

The congressional hearings on the Apollo disaster have revealed that NASA's control over its own programs is inadequate to the point where proposed schedules have lost their meaning and cost estimates are unrelated to reality. Lack of clear mission specifications were introduced as a factor in poor quality of hardware, schedule slippages, and escalating costs when the president of North American Aviation, Inc., testified on May 4 that "mission criteria had been evolving toward their final form."

He explained the existence of technical and managerial problems by stating that "Until these criteria become stabilized it was extremely difficult to achieve full control and visibility of North American's basic design and development effort." NASA has shown, then, not only an inability to supervise properly a $23 billion program that was underway, but an inability to carry out an adequate planning process to serve as a foundation for its operations. These deficiencies were perhaps the largest contributing factor to the tragedy of January 27.

Since the lunar landing is an agreed national goal, we must apply our fiscal power to those remaining areas where explicit program objectives and costs have not been stated.

Specifically, I would recommend that all post-Apollo hardware programs that are not fully justified on a specific mission objective or economic benefit basis receive only part-year funding until such time as NASA has seen fit to present Congress with mission and cost projections adequate to the importance of the decisions involved.

In the areas of Apollo Applications and advanced research and technology, I do not believe that Congress should authorize expenditures which commit us to hardware programs and objectives whose implications have not been adequately defined for sound public review. I recommend the elimination of the NERVA flight hardware engine project, the largest single hardware project yet requested in the advanced research and technology budget. It will commit us not only to a $2 billion investment, but also to a far more expensive though unspecified mission commitment.

The committee has recommended $444.7 million for the Apollo Applications program as opposed to NASA's request for $454.7 million. I propose a contingent authorization of $222.35 million pending submission by NASA of a clear description of the Apollo Applications program, to include:

(*a*) A 5-year cost, launch schedule and mission projection for the NASA-proposed program based on several assumptions concerning Apollo success.

(*b*) An assessment of costs and data deficiencies for an alternative program based on MOL and unmanned flights with, first, no postlunar Apollo vehicle procurement and, second, a minimal post-Apollo vehicle-only procurement for storage against future contingencies (no payload development).

These reductions will not in any way impede the continuation of non-hardware-oriented technological progress until such time as the public has had a chance to participate in the charting of a clear, rational and efficient course for space exploration.

The committee has recommended $861.56 million for advanced research and technology. In analyzing NASA's budget request of $687 million, I proposed a reduction of $147.6 million.

I pointed out that the following requirements, which are in accord with the sense of the letter of January 30, 1964, from the President of the United States to the Administrator of NASA have not been met:

(1) A statement of specific mission objectives and estimated launch schedules for space missions after the manned lunar landing, together with an assessment of the benefits to the Nation derived from these objectives.

(2) An estimate of the costs of achieving each of these objectives.

(3) A justification of fiscal year 1968 hardware and mission-oriented program budget requests in light of the stated post-Apollo objectives to include costs and benefits of each program and the reasons for its selection over other alternatives.

(4) For nonspace hardware programs with claimed or inferred benefits to the Nation, an estimate of the full program costs and eventual benefits to be derived.

Until these requirements are met and subjected to congressional review, the fiscal year 1968 authorization for advanced research and technology should be limited to the following amounts:

(A) For research and development for the following programs:

1. Basic research—$21,465,000.
2. Space vehicle systems—$32,885,000.
3. Electronic systems—$32,797,000.
4. Human factors systems—$14,675,000.
5. Space power and electric propulsion systems—$34,070,000.
6. Nuclear rockets—$44,220,000.
7. Chemical propulsion—$32,441,000.
8. Aeronautics—$49,205,000.
9. Tracking and data acquisition—$266,300,000.
10. Technology utilization—$3,300,000.

(B) For construction of facilities, including land acquisition as follows:

1. Electronics research center—no funds authorized.
2. Lewis Research Center—no funds authorized.
3. Nuclear rocket development station—no funds authorized.
4. Ames Research Center—$3,170,000.
5. Goldstone (TDA)—$2,880,000.
6. Jet propulsion lab (TDA)—$1,930,000.

(C) For administrative operations—no funds authorized pending a complete assignment of AO to advanced research and technology budget activities.

Under the offices of manned space flight and space science and applications, funds for AO should be similarly deferred, pending the same submission of a breakdown relevant to other budget categories.

AO budget requests are presented according to location at the various NASA centers. For each location an overhead analysis is provided in terms of salaries, travel, equipment, and so forth. It is not possible from these presentations to discern that portion of AO funds intended to support a particular NASA effort. One cannot determine the actual cost of a given item such as, say, aeronautics during any fiscal year.

Confusing and incomplete testimony should not be relied upon to clarify deficiencies in NASA's original budget submission. Recent testimony leaves the impression that AO support of aeronautics is approximately 75 percent of the direct aeronautics budget and AO support of technology utilization may amount to over 200 percent of the technology utilization direct budget. We are not in the habit of multiplying by a factor of 3 when we consider the cost of technology utilization and evaluate its related benefits. Congress will not have a sound basis for judgment of NASA's requests until NASA reorders its presentation of AO funding to reflect its direct relation to programs.

In sum, the purpose in limiting various authorizations is to defer without prejudice those expenditures which have not been explicitly stated or justified in terms of specific national space and aeronautics objectives.

Unless Congress issues a clear statement of its intent to review NASA goals, decisions and costs presented in explicit and comprehensible terms, and unless this statement is coupled with a significant authorization reduction, the public will not be able to play any part in the great decisions facing the Nation's space program.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. I regret that the gentleman from New York is giving the indication here that this Congress and the House Committee on Science and Astronautics in particular has not made any choice over the years as to what goes in the space program and what does not go in the space program.

There is a list of numerous changes and recommendations and adjustments that have taken place over the course of time. One outstanding and major judgment which I can call to the gentleman's attention is when we decide that we would have a manned lunar program within this decade. There was offered to us not only an Apollo program but a Nova program which would have cost hundreds of millions of dollars.

As I say, we were offered a corollary program which was called the Nova program which would have, as I have said, cost this country hundreds of millions of dollars. Even though it was supported by NASA and even though their experts came before us saying that this was a necessary program, the House Committee on Science and Atronautics struck it down. The House Committee on Science and Astronautics, in its judgment, based on experience it has developed over a course of time, also had come to the conclusion that it was an unnecessary program.

Judgments of this kind have been made and they will continue to be made over the years that lie ahead. I am sure as a result of the opportunity we will have through the development of experience that in this authorization bill and in the years ahead we will have more judgments of this kind.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINN].

Mr. WINN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 10340.

I want to go on record as supporting the committee recommendation concerning the sustaining university program. Although I am usually one of the first to vote for cuts in our Government spending programs, I do think that we ought to take a good look at our space efforts for the future.

The sustaining university program augments and complements NASA's "in-house" research and extramural sponsored work in universities and industry. The program has three main elements—training, research, and research facilities—concerned respectively with maintenance of a supply of manpower highly trained in space-related areas, the fostering of multidisciplinary research which crosses conventional departmental boundaries, and the acquisition of graduate laboratories on a highly selective basis as necessary to attain special research and training objectives.

This is an important long-range program, which is badly needed to protect the billions of dollars we are pouring into

the space efforts. We must maintain the equilibrium of NASA by urging them to further promote research and the training of space educated young men and young women from the outstanding universities of our Nation.

Where else, but in our universities, do we have any type of training and education along these lines? You may say private industry can provide the trained talent we need, but private industry needs every specialist they can procure to further their own research and objectives.

At the present time, 152 universities, representing every State in the Union, have received training grants.

Three thousand six hundred and eighty-one NASA predoctoral trainees under the university program will increase the supply of trained scientists and engineers in space-related science and technology in order to help insure meeting NASA's responsibilities.

Although NASA has a tendency to want to phase out the university program, many of us are just as interested in urging NASA to step up its promotion of the long-range training program.

As of December 1, 1966, a total of 431 doctorates had been conferred on trainees under this program. About 55 percent were in the physical sciences, 32 percent in engineering, 8 percent in the life sciences, 4 percent in behavioral sciences, and 1 percent in other fields.

When this program was initiated, the objective was to graduate a thousand Ph. D.'s a year. The Office of Education should not be expected to provide this specialized training for our space efforts, but NASA—the organization charged with the overall operation of our science and astronautics program should keep the university program under its guidance and jurisdiction.

When questioned at the subcommittee hearings, April 17, Dr. Homer E. Newell, associate administrator for space science and applications, of NASA, said:

> The doctoral research performed by these students has been very good. We have a listing of the theses put out by the graduates.

The following is the list:

NASA TRAINEES' PH. D. THESES AND DISSERTATIONS

"Reactions of Tertiary Aliphatic Amines with Copper Halides."

"The Local Time Dependence of the Non-Stormer Cut-Off for 1.5 MeV Protons in the Quiet Geomagnetic Field."

"Alpha Particle Resonance."

"A Study of the Evaporation Behavior of the Zirconium Beryllides."

"Comparative Studies of Sterols in Chlorella."

"A New Method for the Determination of Electron Drift Velocity Based Upon a Study of Electrical Conduction in Gas Filled Cylindrical, Thermionic Diodes."

"Pre-Nucleation Reactions in the Precipitation of Nickel Dimethylglyoximate from Homogeneous Solution."

"Stability of Thin Cylindrical Shells Subjected to a Class of Axisymmetric Moving Loads."

"The Formolysis of Allylcarbinyl Tosylates; Studies of Fluoroalkadienes by Nuclear Magnetic Resonannce Spectroscopy; Dissociation Constants of Methyl Alkyl Ketone Cyanohydrins."

"The Production of Tritium and Helium 3 by Proton Bombardment of Metals: Solar Origin of Terrestrial Tritium."

"Integration and Optimization of Sustained-Thrust Rocket Orbits."

"The Physiological Effects of Multiple Aversive Stimuli."

"A General Approach to the Bound States of Several Nucleons."

"Galaxy Formation in a Steady State Universe."

"Recombination Spectra of Hydrogen and Helium in Gaseous Nebulae."

"The International Law-Making Process: A Case Study on the International Regulation of Space Telecommunication."

"Non-Equilibrium Statistical Mechanics of Simple Dense Fluids."

"Energy Propagation in a Stratified Gas."

"Depth Cues in the Ames Trapezoid Demonstration and Other Motion Illusions."

"Cyclotron Resonance Investigation of the Fermi Surfaces for Cadmium, Zinc, and Magnesium."

"Magnetic Properties of $CeFe_2$, $LuNi_5$, and Some 1:2 Intermetallic Compounds of Lanthanide Metals with Nickel and Cobalt."

"On the Optimum Design of Conventional and Complex Distillation Columns."

"The Crystal and Molecular Structure of Ruthenium-Sulfur Dioxide Coordination Compounds."

"Temperature and Viscosity Effects on the Decay of Triplet States and the Singlet Excited States of Acridine."

"Control of Small Two-Phase Servomotors."

"Two-Phase Radio Frequency Heating of a Plasma Confined in a Magnetic Mirror System."

"Thermal Bending of Sandwich Panels Under Uniaxial Loading."

"Continuous Separation of Argon-Helium Mixtures by Means of a Glow Discharge."

"An Investigation of the Temperature Dependence of the Nuclear Spin-Lattice Relaxation Time of Fluorine Nuclei in Single Crystals of Calcium Fluoride Doped with Rare-Earth and Actinide Elements."

"Asymptotic Values of Meromorphic Functions."

"Some studies of *bis*-Arenechromium Compounds."

"Electronic Structure of $CH+$."

"Potential Surfaces of H_3 and H_3+."

"A Survey of Electrons Beyond 5 R_E with Explorer XIV."

"Ion Cyclotron Whistlers."

"A Radiative Heat Transfer Analysis of Diathermanous Sheets and Coatings."

"Some Renewal Theorems for Positive Independent Random Variables."

"Semi-Markov Processes."

"An Analytical Study of the Steady State and Transient Behavior of One- and Two-Phase Polymerization Reactors."

"Bound State Techniques for the Investigation of Resonances in Electron Scattering from Atomic Hydrogen."

"Relaxation Phenomena in Viscoelastic Fluids."

"The Structure of Some Cyano Compounds of Group IV and Group V Elements."

"A Practical Implementation of Feedforward Control."

"A Thermodynamic Interpretation of the Solvent Effect in the Reaction of Metafluorobenzoyl Chloride with Isopropanol in Isopropanol-Benzene Mixtures."

"The Boranocarbonates."

"The Adsorption of Potassium on Tungsten and the Co-Adsorption of Potassium and Hydrogen on Tungsten."

"Cross Sections and Isomeric Yield Ratios for (d,p) and (d,n) Reactions."

"The Ionization of Lithium Ions by Electron Impact."

"Displacive Isothermal Transformations in Copper-Zinc and Copper-Gold Alloys."

"The Tertiary Geology and Ignimbrite Petrology of the Grant Range, East Central Nevada."

"Fluid-to-Particle Heat Transfer in a Vertical Moving Bed of Solids with Interstitial Fluid Flow."

"On Closest-Point Maps in Banach Spaces."

"Synthesis of Three-Terminal $\pm R,C$ Two-Ports with One Controlled Source."

"Interfacial Tension in Liquid-Liquid Systems."

"Measurement of the Stark Widths and Shifts of Nitrogen Ion Lines."

"Spontaneously Radiating Atom in Cavity Fields."

"A Theoretical Model for the Emission of the Decametric Radiation from Jupiter."

"Late Pleistocene Glacial Chronology, Northeastern St. Elias Mountains, Canada."

"Norms and Noncummatative Jordan Algebras."

"Subdirect Products of Finnite Lattices."

"The Dissociation Energies of the Gaseous Rare-Earth Monoxides."

"The Two-Dimensional Jet Under Gravity from an Aperture in the Lower of Two Horizontal Planes Which Bound a Liquid."

"Asymptotic Behavior of Functions Holomorphic in the Unit Disc."

"A Matrix Method for Investigating the Vibrations of Elastic Beans Having a Horizontal Plane of Symmetry."

"Magnetic Properties of Lattice Imperfections in Alkali Halide Single Crystals."

"Nuclear Resonance Fluorescence Using Recoil Broadened Gamma Rays from the Radiative Capture of Thermal Neutrons."

"Dynamic Snap-Through Buckling of Low Arches and Shallow Spherical Caps."

"The Cross Correlation of the Neutron Density Fluctuations at Two Points in a Nuclear Reactor."

"Controllability and Time Optimality of Systems with Linear Control and Bounded State Space."

"Experimental Hybridization, Geographical Variation and Distribution of the Closely Related Topminnows, *Fundulus Notatus* and *Fundulus Olivaceus*."

"On a Class of Right Alternative Rings Without Nilpotent Ideals."

"The Elastic Scattering of Fast Neutrons by Deutrons."

"The Three-Npcleon System."

"An Investigation of the Charged Bose Gas Model of Superconductivity as Applied to Persistent Currents and Josephson Tunneling."

"Paramagnetic Relaxation in Very Dilute $CR^{3+}:Al_2O_3$."

"The $Ca^{40}(p,\gamma)Sc^{41}$ Reaction."

"The Polarization of Protons Elastically Scattered from C^{12}."

"The Crystal Structure of Porphine."

"Two-Dimensional Elastic and Elasto-Plastic Analysis of Infinite Plates Containing a Hole."

"Photoperiodic Testicular Responses of the House Finch *Carpodacus Mexicana*."

"The Chemistry of Ionizing Ultraviolet Radiation."

"Diffractive Limitations on Visual Acuity, and Some Properties of a Visual Pathway in the Ventral Nerve Cord of Locusts."

"Theory of Multiple-Photon Ionization."

"The Effects of Epithermal Neutron Flux Anisotrophy on Cadmium Correction Factors."

"Significance of Pigments in Radiation Resistance of Micrococcus Radiodurans."

"Some Transition Metal Complexes of 8-Aminoquinoline."

"The Application of the Ritz Method to the Problems of Steady-State Longitudinal, Flexural and Torsional Wave Propaganda in Bars of Rectangular Cross-Section."

"Dynamical Theory of Hyperelastic Rods."

"On the Boundary Behavior of Functions Bounded and Analytic in the Unit Disk."

"Turbulent Pipe Flow of an Internally Heat Generating Fluid."

"Fakeability and Validity of Two Types of Forced-Choice Formats."

"Gravitational Effects on Plant Disease."

"Magnetic Attitude Control of Rigid Axially Symmetric Spinning Satellites in Circular Earth Orbits."

"Vortex Formation and Resistance in Unsteady Flow."

"Luminescence and Triplex Energy Transfer in Carbonyl Containing Compounds."

"Synthesis and Directed Polymerization of Certain Vinyl Monomers Containing an Acetylenic Moiety."

"Hypophysectomy and Hormonal Replacement in Young Cockerels."

"The Effects of Lithospermum Ruderale Extracts and Resorcinol on the Thyroidal ^{131}I-Labeled Iodoamino Acids and the Circulating ^{131}I of the Fowl."

"The Effects of X-Irradiation on the Rat, Mouse, and Hamster Testes and the Survival of Autografts and Homografts of Unirradiated Testicular Tissue Into the Irradiated Testes of the Mouse and Hamster."

"The Absolute Stability of a Nonlinear Control System."

"Some 2-Aryl-6-Phenylindenes, 2-Aryl-3-Methyl-6-Phenylindenes, 2-Aryl-3, 4-Dihydro-6-Phenylnaphthalenes, and 2-Aryl-3, 4-Dihydro-1-Methyl-6-Phenylnaphthalines as Liquid Scintillators. The Steric Effects of a Methyl Group."

"Hydromagnetic and Radio Wave Propagation in the Magnetosphere Along a Field-Aligned Plasma Stratum."

"Optimal Control of Unknown Systems."

"Optically Active Polyamides; Poly Alpha, Beta, Gamma and Epsilon-Methyl-Epsilon-Caprolactam."

"The Theory and Application of Adaptive Logic."

"The Sleep Need: Sleep Deprivation in the Rat."

"Nonlinear Response of a Thin Conical Shell to Dynamically Applied Axial Force."

"Investigation of Some Tetragonally Distorted Cobalt (II) Complexes."

"Studies of Isotopically Labeled Boron Hydrides."

"Elastic Waves at Solid-Solid and Liquid-Solid Interfaces for Solid Media with Cubic Symmetry."

"A Kinetic Study of the Periodate Oxidation of Aromatic Systems."

"A Numerical Method for the Conformal Mapping of Finite Doubly Connected Regions with Application to the Torsion Problem for Hollow Bars."

"The Effects of Ultrasonic Cleaning on Aerospace Materials and Coatings."

"Sums of Solid Horned Spheres."

"Tame Subsets of Spheres in E^3."

"Almost Periodic Functions on Groups and Their Mean Values."

"The Effect of Ultrasonic Waves on the Mass Transfer Rates of Selected Fluids."

"Some Factors Affecting Solution of Transfer in Concept Identification Problems."

"The Radioactive Decay of Lanthanum-140."

"Crustal Structures in the Pacific Northwest States from Phase-Velocity Dispersion of Seismic Surface Waves."

"Plasma, Urinary, and Myocardial Catecholamines of the Dog During Hemorrhagic Shock."

"An Analysis of Stochastic Eigenvalue Problems."

"Hyperthermal Processes in the Solar Atmosphere."

"Catalytic Ethylene Oxidation Pore Diffusion and Reactor Size Effects With Copper Oxide-Alumina Catalysts."

"The Eclipsing Systems RX Arietis and UV Leonis and a Discusion of the Mass-Luminosity Law."

"Part I: A Study on the Coordination Catalyzed Copolymerizations of Phenyl Glycidyl Ether. Part II: Thermally Stable Polymers."

"A Theoretical Study of Optical Resonator Modes and a New Class of Special Functions 'The Hyperspheroidal Functions.'"

"Boundary Value Problems for Ordinary Second Order Systems."

"Precursor Studies in an Electromagnetic Shock Tube."

"Stresses Near a Semi-Circular Edge Crack."

"Finite-Element Analysis of Structural Frames."

"The Heat Capacity of Adsorbed Helium."

"Adsorption of Water on Alumina."

"Stratigraphy and Associated Tectonics of the Upper Permian Castile-Salado-Rustler Evaporite Comples, Delaware Basin, West Texas and Southeast New Mexico."

"A Hypersonic Theory for Blunted Slender Bodies."

"Homology of Local Rings."

"Measurements of the Velocity of Sound in Gaseous Helium Three and Helium Four at Low Temperatures."

"Shock Structures in a Gas of Rigid Non-Central Particles."

"A Nonlinear Theory of Thermo-Viscoelasticity for Materials With Memory."

"The Reaction of Certain Sulfones With the Grignard Reagent."

"Phenanthridinones From Pyrolysis of Maleythrilindoles: A Novel Intramolecular Diels-Alder Reaction."

"Coherent Reception of Pulsed Signals With Linear Arrays in Traveling Noise Fields."

"Dynamic Loads on the Edge of an Elastic Plate."

"Iron (III)-8-Hydroxyquinoline Equilibria."

"Multi-Level Digital Signaling in Impulsive Noise Channels."

"The Internal Friction and Steady State Creep Properties of Pure Ag and Internally Oxidized Ag–Mg Alloys."

"Surface Temperature with Temperature Dependent Thermal Properties."

"Some Solutions of the Ring for Elastic Materials Exhibiting Couple-Stresses."

"Thermionic Properties of Polycrystalline Zirconium, Beryllium and Selected Zirconium Berylilides."

"Use of Complementary Equations for the Experimental Determination of Thermal Diffusivity of Solids."

"The Non-Linear Response of a Two-Layer, Baroclinic Ocean to a Stationary, Axially-Symmetric Hurricane."

"The Diagonal Tension Resistance of Structural Lightweight Concrete Slabs."

"A Thulium Compound with a Lower Oxidation State. Part I: Preparation of a Thulium Compound with a Lower Oxidation State. Part II: Some Preliminary Studies with Samarium, Thulium, and Ytterbium."

"Electron Spin Resonance Investigation of the Hydrides of Gadolinium and Gadolinium-Yttrium Alloys."

"The Adiabatic Motion of Charged Particles in a Model of the Geoelectric and Geomagnetic Field."

"High Pressure Adsorption of Light Hydrocarbons on Charcoal and the Two-Dimensional Equation of State."

"Application of the Perturbation Method to the Finite Deformation of a Thin Cylindrical Shell."

"The Stokes Settling of One or More Particles Along the Axis of Finite and Infinitely Long Circular Cylinders."

"Physical Processes in H II Regions."

"A probabilistic Sequencing-Delivery Model."

"Crystal-field Splitting in Rare-earth Chelates."

"Intramolecular Spin-orbit Coupling in Naphthalene Analogs."

"Nuclear Research Rates in Extremely Dense Matters."

"On Probabilistic Graphs and Some Applications."

"Transient Response of a Rapidly Pressurized Nonlinear Viscoelastic Cylinder Bonded to a Thin Elastic Shell."

"Conditions for the Existence of Closed Solutions by the Normal Ordering Method."

"Polarization of Protons Scattered Elastically from He^4."

"Nucleate Pool Boiling in Saturated and Subcooled Water Under Normal and Low Gravity Fields."

"An Investigation of the Effects of Job Design on Output and Physiological Costs for a Strenuous Task."

"On Compact Uniquely Divisible Semigroups."

"Preparation of some BH_3 Analogs of Ox-acids."

"Scattering of Light from Atoms, Molecules, and Free Electrons in Gases and Plasmas."

"The Effects of Familiarity on Perceptual Recognition and Categorization of Verbal Information."

"The Multiple Bragg Reflection of Neutrons in Mosaic Crystals."

"Geology of the Lookout Mountain Area, Freemont County, Colorado."

"An Analysis of CH in the Solar Atmosphere."

"Electrometric Measurements in Fused Ammonium Nitrate."

"The Existence of Optimal Controls."

"Radiation-Induced Reactions in Alkyl Bromides."

"Determination and Optimization of System Response."

"Cyclooctatetraene Chemistry: PI Complexes and Carbonium Ions."

"Scattering Processes."

"An Approximation to the Electron Gas Slater Sum in the Form of a Boltzmann Factor Involving Pair-Potentials."

"Propagation of Electrostatic Disturbances in Finite-Temperature Plasmas."

"A Multivariate Extension of the Exponential Distribution."

"Infrared Absortion Bands of Acetylene."

"Computer Study of the Effect of the Amortisseur Windings on the Control of an Alternator When Driven by Diesel Engines."

"Approximate Solutions of the Compressible Laminar Boundary-Layer Flow Over Slender Pointed Bodies of Revolution."

"A Solution of the Boltzmann's Equation for the Electrical Conductivity of a Slightly Ionized Gas (In the Presence of a Weak Magnetic Field)."

"Theory of the Motion of Small Particles in Temperature Fields."

"Supersonic Turbulent Boundary Layer Separation Ahead of a Wedge."

"Matrices Over Commutative Noetherian Rings."

"A Study of the Process $\pi^+ + d \rightarrow p + p$ at Low Energies."

"Response of the DBA/2J Mouse Strain to Acute Ionizing Radiation."

"Controlled Potential Oxidation of Aliphatic Amides."

"On the Enhancement of the Random Velocities of Stars in Disk-Like Galaxies."

"On the Calculation of Spiral Structure in a Disk Galaxy."

"High Energy Elastic Scattering of Molecular Beams: I. H—H (Theory); II. HE—H_2HE—D_2 (Experiment)."

"Specific Heat of a Germanium Wisker in the Temperature Range 350° C–650° C."

"A Study of the Valance Bands in Sodium Iodide."

"Atmospheric Densities Determined from the Spin Decay of Explorer VI."

"Quotient Spaces of Absolute Neighborhood Retracts."

"The Experimental Determination of the Local and Average Heat Transfer Characteristics and Average Friction Coefficients for Turbulant Flow of Air and Argon with Variable Properties in Smooth Tubes with the Boundary Conditions of Constant Wall Temperature Heating and Increasing Heat Flux Heating."

"Transient Radiation Effect on Semiconductor Controlled Rectifiers."

"Degeneration of the Solutions of Certain Well Posed Systems of Partial Differential Equations Depending on a Small Parameter."
"Linear Topologies Induced by Bilinear Forms."
"The Non-Destructive Determination of Silicon and Oxygen in Meteorites by Fast Neutron Activation Analysis."
"The Galactic Center: Reddening, Structure, and Mass Loss."
"An Impact Theory Approach to the Pressure Broadening of Microwave Absorption Lines."
"A State-Variable Approach to Control System Design."
"UBV Photometry of DQ Cephei."
"Identification of Dynamic Systems by Digital Computer Modeling in State Space and Component Parameter Identification of Static and Dynamic Systems."
"The Effect of Certain Additives on Transition in Pipe Flow."
"Generalized Ilstow and Complex Wiener Integrals and a Related Integral Equation."
"Collisionless Damping of Hydromagnetic Waves."
"The Paleozoic Crater at Flynn Creek, Tennessee."
"Reaction of 12-Keto Steroids."
"Consequences of the Jordan Curve Theorem."
"Brillouin Scattering in Viscoelastic Liquids."
"Rapid Identification of Time-Varying Linear Dynamic Systems."
"Two-Port Network Parameters of the Piezoelectric Semiconductor Electroacoustic Amplifier."
"The Design of a Shock Absorber to Improve Ride Comfort by Reducing Jerk."
"A Computational Technique for Identification of Linear Systems."
"Study of a Beta-Gamma Correlation in the Decay of Sb^{122}."
"Buckling of a Spherical Sandwich Under Uniform External Pressure."
"Solution Reactions of Fluoro-complexes of Antimony and Tin."
"The Time Domain Inversion of Convolution."
"Rarefied Gas Flow Between Two Parallel Plates for Three Molecular Models."
"Low Temperature Volumetric Properties and the Development of an Equation of State for Methane."
"Partial Ring Currents and Some of the Geophysical Effects."
"The Magnetic Field of a Rotating Superconductor."
"Mixed Estimates for a Class of Singular Integrals."
"Magnetization Measurements in Superconductive Molybdenum."
"A Mechanical Study of the Forces on Moving Intermediate State Regions in a Type I Superconductor."
"The Effects of Impurities on the Plastic Deformation of Molybdenum Single Crystals."
"Dynamic Response of Elastic and Inelastic Systems of the Shear Beam Type."
"The Rearrangement of Isotopically Labeled Diazonium Salts."
"Mississippian Rocks of the Southwestern Great Basin, Nevada, and California."
"Comparison of Deuterium and Tritium Isotope Effects."
"I. The Preparation and Optical Resolution of dl-2β-Acetoxy-8-α-methylpodocarpane-7,9-dione. II. Exploratory Studies in the Total Synthesis of Ajmaline."
"Radium Transport in the Cesium Thermionic Converter: A Plasma Model and an Emitter Heat Balance."
"On the Regular Perturbation of the Subdominant Solution to Second Order Linear Ordinary Differential Equations with Polynomial Coefficients."
"A Determination of the Neutral Composition, Density, and Temperature of the Upper Atmosphere from 120 to 200 Kilometers with Rocket-Borne Spectrometers."
"Origin of the Jeptha Structure, Kentucky."
"Transient Potentials."
"Effects of Manganese Oxide on the Sintering of Alumina."
"Conjugative Interaction of Benzene Rings and Double Bonds."
"A Study of Lactic Acid Dehydrogenase Activity of Rat Hemopoietic Tissues."
"Mass Transportation Mechanisms in Open Channel Flow."
"An Experimental Study of the Buckling of Reticular Cylinders Under Axial Compression."
"Response Strength as a Function of Brightness."
"High Temperature Initiation of Natural Amino Acid Synthesis."
"Reaction Energetics of Perfluoromethyl Radical Addition to Monoolefins."
"Adsorption of Gases on Polymers."
"Reaction of Bromine Activated by (n,γ) and (I.T.) Processes in Carbon Tetra chloride and the C_6-Alkanes."
"Boundary Value Problems for Second Order Ordinary Differential Equations on Infinite Intervals."
"Dynamic Systems with Inverse Quadratic Restoring Forces."
"Electric Field Induce Infrared Absorption Spectra of Hydrogen."
"Thermal Degradation of Styrene and Methylmethacrylate Copolymers with Pure *m*- and *p*- Divinyl-Benzene Isomers."
"Longitudinal Elastic Wave Propagation in Finite Cylindrical Bars."
"Proximities and Uniform Structures Induced by Families and Real Functions."
"On the Approximation of Functions in the Tchebycheff Norm: A Characterization Theorem and a Computational Procedure for Approximation Under Convex Constraints. Part II: A Computational Procedure for Approximation Under Convex Constraints."
"The Theory of Signal Detectability Extended to the Case of Amplitude Known Statistically."
"Laser Phasography of Jets, Shocks, and Plasmas."
"The Development of 2-Dimensional Growth in the Fern Gametophyte."
"Aldehyde and Ketone N, N-Dimethylhydrazone Reactions; Conversion to Hydrazones by Exchange and to Pyridines by Quaternary Derivative Pyrolsis."
"A Study of Thermoelectric Power in Cerium Oxide."
"Substituent Effects. V. Further Evidence Concerning the Nature of the Inductive Effect."
"Components of the Stimulus in Serial Learning and Their Relation to Meaningfulness."
"Heat and Mass Transfer Coefficients in Microwave Freeze-Drying."
"Numerical Studies on the Non-Linear Vlasov Equation."
"Delay of Reward Effects in Differential Conditioning."
"An Accelerometer for Pure Fluid Control Systems."
"Synthesis and Reactions of β-Substituted Perfluoroolefins."
"Vlf Ray Tracing in a Model Ionosphere."
"The Stereochemistry of the Addition of Reagents to Norbornene Compounds."
"A Survey of Electrons Beyond 5 Re with Explorer XIV."
"An Interplanetary Diffusion Model for the Time Behavior of Intensity in a Solar Cosmic Ray Event."
"Analysis of Crystal Growth of High Temperature Materials in a Plasma Furnace."
"Oxygen-18 Tracer and Low Temperature Chemisorption Studies of the Carbon-Oxygen Reaction."
"Cyclopentadienone Ketals."
"Pool Boiling Heat Transfer to Liquefied Hydrocarbon Gases."
"On Laser Induced Damage in Transparent Solids."
"Analysis of Some of the Near Infrared Absorption Bands of the Molecule Ethane-1, 1, 1-d_3."
"Substitution Reactions of Trans-Hydridochloro-Bis (Triethylphosphine) Platium (II)."
"Thermal Shock in Thermoelastic and Thermoviscoelastic Cylinders and Spheres."
"Hydromagnetic Model for the Solar General Circulation."
"Thermal Convection in a Rotating Annulus of Liquid: Numerical Studies of the Axisymmetric Regime of Flow."
"21-CM Line Observations of Small Diameter Galactic H II Regions."
"The Origin and Evolution of the Comet Cloud."
"An Analysis of Total Losses in Ferromagnetic Materials and a Model of Ferromagnetic Domain Interactions."

Dr. Newell continued, and I quote:

One of the advantages of this type of program that we have pointed to in the past has been that you have students who are not only working toward their own doctorate but are working on problems of interest in the space effort.

I want to commend the Congressman from Texas [Mr. ECKHARDT] for his interest in the university program. He wrote each participating university asking them their feelings on the subject. I have in my hands the answers from two of those universities, the University of Kansas and Kansas State University. These letters speak for themselves, Mr. Chairman, as to the tremendous success of the university program sponsored by NASA.

THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS,
Lawrence, Kans., June 16, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ECKHARDT: In response to your letter of June 14, 1967, to Chancellor Wescoe, I am happy to send you herewith one copy of our most recent proposal for renewal of the University of Kansas NASA sustaining grant. Although I believe you would find the entire proposal interesting and helpful, I am sure that the summary on pages 2 and 3 will provide in concise form the information you have requested concerning the effective operation of the NASA sustaining university program.

The University of Kansas has been far more than satisfied with the success of these NASA grants. They have assisted in a major way in the development of new lines of research in important interdisciplinary areas, and they have contributed most substantially to the development of an expanding advanced training capability as well as research effort in the broad field of space science.

If you should wish additional information, please call on me directly.

Very truly yours,
WILLIAM J. ARGERSINGER, JR.,
Associate Dean of Faculties.

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY,
Manhattan, Kans., June 19, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ECKHARDT: The National Aeronautics and Space Administration Sustaining University Program has provided valuable support for research in various scientific fields at Kansas State University. Research has covered the gamut from nozzle design for rocket vehicles within our Department of Mechanical Engineering,

through complex biochemical studies related to metabolism performed in our Department of Biochemistry, to investigations of human performance as this may be related to the duties of the crew on a space mission.

The valuable of this support is manifold. It has been possible to support younger scientists with funds provided by NASA so that they might obtain sufficient recognition to seek continuing support from such agencies as the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, and the Department of Defense. Support by NASA has stimulated their interest in the space program and, accordingly, their work has not only provided valuable results but has increased their competence as scientists in fields of importance for our space program. Faculty members have been assisted in this research by graduate students, the interests of whom in turn have been influenced in a valuable way by the nature of this program. I heartily endorse the farsighted efforts of the Congress in its attempts to maintain this program at its present level.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. MCCAIN,
President.

Let me urge you to increase the amount of funds requested by the Bureau of the Budget from $7 to $17 million. We must continue our university research, and faculty fellowship programs if we are to see our space program through.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to request unanimous consent to be allowed to insert extraneous material in the RECORD.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ECKHARDT. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Kansas. I would like to ask one further question. Do you not believe that there is a tendency to decrease the number of programs in all agencies of the Government with respect to the Ph. D. degree?

I bring to the attention of the gentleman a letter I have received from Notre Dame University in connection with these letters, in which the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, the president, states:

The real problem is not that just one federal program supporting predoctoral studies is being curtailed, but that all of them are being curtailed, while each agency hopes that the loss will be picked up by one of the other agencies. In his letter of January 9, 1967, informing us of the six new NASA Traineeships to begin in September, 1967, at Notre Dame, Dr. Smull, Director of NASA's Office of Grants and Research Contracts, implied as much: "It may also be pointed out that other federal agencies charged primarily with the general support of higher education have in recent years substantially increased their predoctoral support programs in the areas of science and technology." However, you are already aware of the fact that the House recently cut the appropriation for graduate fellowships for 1968 under Title IV of the National Defense Education Act by $10 million.

He comments further on that and says:

The National Science Foundation's Traineeship and Fellowship Programs in support of graduate students were curtailed for September, 1967. To begin in September, 1966, Notre Dame was awarded sixteen new NSF Traineeships, whereas we were awarded twelve in September, 1967—a 25% reduction.

It would appear there is actually a tendency of general decrease in supporting traineeship programs throughout the country.

Mr. WINN. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Texas to be correct in general. I have no facts or figures to back up his thinking, but he has done a great deal more research on the subject than I have.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, I would love to read some of the numerous letters from the universities throughout the Nation which they have probably been inspired to send the Members of Congress. I have received several of these myself. They say that this is a general curtailment of education in this Nation.

This is tomfoolery. Eleven billion dollars is being offered by agencies of Government this year. This appropriation is $10 million more than the agency wants. I just regret that my colleague feels as he does.

Mr. WINN. The gentleman from Indiana is correct. It is $10 million more than the agency wants, but the agency has been cutting back on this program. Many of us feel it ought to be accelerated and that an additional $10 million ought to be put in to bring the total to $17 million.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman from Kansas and the gentleman from Texas for their studious work, long-range planning, and their effort to get to the bottom of these most important educational programs. The House is the place for this difference of opinion to be stated. If we all agreed, there would be no reason for any of us to be here.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman for the remarks he has made. I believe what the gentleman has said simply points out the fact that we are all for this program. We just have varying ideas about how much we should spend on different facets of the program. We are entitled to that. The gentleman has proved the point that we all approve of this program.

Mr. WINN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KARTH].

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 10340, the NASA authorization bill for fiscal year 1968.

Mr. Chairman, I understand there are a series of amendments to be offered, and I shall not belabor the time of the committee at this point, because I do intend to take some time under the 5-minute rule to debate those amendments.

One of NASA's major program offices, the Office of Space Science and Applications, submitted a request of $694.6 million for research and development for the forthcoming fiscal year. The subcommittee which I have the honor to chair carefully reviewed this budget request and reduced it by almost $32.5 million, to approximately $662 million.

The amount recommended in the bill is about the same level of funding authorized by Congress for these activities last year, and I submit that the authorization recommended to the House today for these important programs is entirely justified.

Mr. Chairman, the tools of the Office of Space Science and Applications are unmanned satellites and probes. The many successful missions of this Office have been responsible for an explosive increase in our knowledge about the earth on which we live, its environment in space, earth's relationship with the sun, and about the nearby planets in our solar system.

Let me give an illustration as to why such information is so significant. Just a few years ago, the region between the earth and the sun was thought to be a nearly perfect vacuum. But because of the many scientific satellites and probes which our scientists have launched in the last few years, we have come to understand that there are important physical processes which occur continuously between the sun and the earth.

We had known for years before we were able to send instruments into space that the sun is the ultimate source of all energy on earth and our scientists suspected that solar phenomena were the cause of dynamic processes in the earth's atmosphere directly affecting our weather. During the past few years, discoveries have been made which provide clear evidence of this close and constant relationship of the earth to the sun.

Space-age tools—rockets, satellites, and probes—have given our scientists an opportunity to study firsthand the controlling influences which the sun's activity has on our weather, and these have already led to a much improved knowledge of the environment in which we live. We now have sophisticated instruments observing the sun, sampling the interplanetary medium, and sensing the changing patterns in the earth's near environment and atmosphere.

While it is true that we have only begun to scratch the surface, I am convinced that as our knowledge and understanding is further refined, such practical goals as weather prediction, and, ultimately, some measure of weather control will be achieved. What I am suggesting is this: Knowledge and understanding will place man in a position to play a part in determining his destiny. Ignorance makes him a victim of the fates.

Our planetary program, a modest effort compared with that of the Soviet Union, has been remarkably successful to date. Although the Soviets have seized virtually every opportunity since 1960 to launch spacecraft to Mars and Venus, they have yet to achieve a real success. As early as 1962, on the other hand, our Mariner II spacecraft returned significant information about the planet

Venus. Two years later our Mariner IV sent back pictures of the surface of Mars, and other significant information about its atmosphere.

As all of you know, both the United States and the Soviet Union recently launched spacecraft to Venus, destined to arrive in its vicinity next October; and our explorations of Mars will continue in 1969 and 1971 with additional Mariner spacecraft of improved capability.

This year, the committee recommends that NASA be authorized to undertake a much more ambitious program to investigate the nearby planets of Mars and Venus. The Voyager project is expected to provide the answers to some of the most challenging and basic scientific questions. The origin and evolution of the solar system, and the possible existence of extraterrestrial life are the primary goals of Voyager.

Mr. Chairman, 40 outstanding American scientists, most of whom are associated with the great universities of America, recently produced a report on the Nation's space program for the President's Advisory Science Committee. That report gives unequivocal endorsement, and highest priority, to the exploration of the solar system; and it strongly recommends an expanded commitment to the Voyager program.

Unless we undertake the Voyager program in fiscal year 1968, the aggressive Soviet program to explore the nearby planets seems certain to take over leadership in this important scientific endeavor.

Mr. Chairman, the last thing I want to see happen is a crash program by the United States after the Soviets have startled the world with a successful soft landing of instruments on the surface of Mars or Venus. An orderly, adequately funded Voyager program will cost less in the long run, and will keep the United States first in the exploration of our solar system.

In addition to the space sciences effort, this bill authorizes continuation of the so-called applications satellite projects. These projects have short-term economic benefits for our country, and are immediately useful for practical purposes. I hardly need to remind the Members of this body of the successes NASA has achieved in communications and weather satellites. NASA's research and development work in these areas has already led to operational systems. It is no exaggeration to say that these programs have opened up a new era in worldwide communications and improved weather prediction.

Yet, much remains to be done. New and better meteorological sensors must be developed, and more effective communications equipment must be produced. The Office of Space Science and Applications is advancing the state of the art in both these fields, and is examining the feasibility of additional systems for earth resource observatory systems, as well as air and sea navigation systems.

Before closing, Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a few remarks about the only program for which our subcommittee voted to increase the amount requested by NASA, and to explain why the full committee endorsed this recommendation.

We learned during our hearings this year that NASA had decided to reduce the training grants program during the current fiscal year to slightly above one-half the level of effort of last year. NASA's goal was to introduce 1,335 new predoctoral students into the program each year, beginning in September 1966; at this rate, the program was expected to produce 1,000 Ph. D.'s per year.

Without notifying the committee of its plans to phase out this important program, NASA now informs us that they intend to bring only about 760 new students into the program in September 1967.

Moreover, the request for funds for fiscal year 1968 will permit only 350 new predoctoral candidates to enter the program in September 1968, a further deep cutback in the size of this program.

Mr. Chairman, the members of our subcommittee consider the training grants program a vital activity. The talented youth of our country constitute our most important resource. If we fail to develop this resource, future generations will suffer. These young graduate students are the "seed corn" of future American society.

NASA programs utilize Ph. D. level scientists and engineers in great numbers. It was on this basis that it was determined that NASA had a responsibility to help replenish the highly trained manpower pool so heavily drawn upon by NASA and its contractors.

That responsibility continues to exist. And until it can be demonstrated that it has been taken over by other organizations, our committee vigorously opposes any further reduction in the training grants program.

That is why, Mr. Chairman, the committee recommends an increase of $10 million in the training grants program. This additional authorization will maintain the program at the current level of effort—that is, about one-half the level recommended by NASA only 1 year ago.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I should like to compliment the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINN] for the excellent statement he made in support of the sustaining university program. I believe the letters which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ECKHARDT] sent out have been very effective in producing concrete evidence of the meaning and value of this sustaining university program which NASA is funding. As a former university professor, I deeply appreciate its value in enriching the well springs of our Nation's scientific strength.

I might add, it was at the Bureau of the Budget level rather than at the NASA level the reduction in amount was requested. I fully support the effort by the committee to vote additional funds to this valuable program.

WEST VIRGINIA HAS FEW SPACE CONTRACTS

There was considerable discussion earlier this afternoon about contractors or employees in the districts of various Members of Congress. I should like to say, since I come from the Fourth Congressional District of West Virginia, that I am asked the question in every campaign why it is that though I am fourth-ranking member on the Space Committee I have never been able to obtain a single space contract in my district in West Virginia. Of course, there are some small subcontracts, but it can properly be said that West Virginia gets shortchanged in the NASA program.

Well, I support the space program not because there are contractors or employees in my district or State. My support for the space effort is because this is a necessary program which has strengthened the Nation and will continue to strengthen the Nation in the future. It is a bold venture which we must afford; in fact, the question should properly be asked: "Can we afford not to continue to sail the new oceans of space?"

The Subcommittee on Advanced Research and Technology, which I have had the honor to chair for the past 5 years, took over 1,000 pages of testimony in its extensive deliberations during March and April of this year. I commend all the members of the subcommittee and the staff which so ably assisted us in our analysis of this complex and challenging program.

THE NERVA NUCLEAR ROCKET ENGINE

Reference has been made to the Nerva project and the statement was made that this is only a program to provide a manned mission to Mars. This is entirely incorrect. The purpose of the Nerva program is to develop our nuclear rocket capability for a third stage, to develop versatility in the space program, for a wide number of possible missions which NASA and the Nation and the Congress can then select from, in order to meet a particular goal 10 years hence, when this engine development is completed. It is true that no specific mission has been pinpointed, and that is further proof that this third stage nuclear rocket is not designed exclusively for a manned Mars mission. When the engine development is completed 10 years hence, it will then take 5 additional years to apply and tailor this 200,000–250,000-pound thrust upper stage to whatever mission the Nation finds most feasible at that time. The important point is that we are developing a high-thrust, high-performance item which can deliver a heavier payload at a lower cost per launch. It is a necessary development unless we choose to stand still in our space effort in the 1980's and 1990's.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I am glad to yield to the able gentleman from California.

Mr. BELL. Would it not be possible to consider that perhaps, in this Nerva program, we are on the verge of developing a new system of transportation in space? Up to this time we have been pushing out in our area in space in an artillery type of development, where we throw away so many different segments. With the nuclear developed rocket we will not be discarding so many segments. In addition,

the power engendered through a nuclear rocket will put us in the area of transportation and not in the area of artillery; is that not correct?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I would concur with the gentleman's observations on that. Furthermore, I believe the gentleman from California was very correct when he stated earlier:

Stop-start spending is not management; it is anarchy.

We have invested $1 billion in nuclear rocket research and testing by the Atomic Energy Commission and NASA. This is no time to stop.

If the only goal of the space program were to get to the moon we would not have to even think of developing the Nerva program. As Chairman MILLER has so well stated on many occasions, our moon program is to get to a plateau from which we will develop the necessary versatility for further exploration and understanding of space for the benefit of all mankind.

Mr. BELL. Is it not quite possible that another nation, perhaps the Soviet Union, could continue to develop this nuclear program? I understand they have started on it. If that should be done, we could be again caught behind the eight-ball, so to speak, in an entirely new method of transportation. We would be again startlingly behind the Soviets, if we do not continue the minimal support toward a nuclear developed type of propelled vehicle.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. The gentleman from California is absolutely correct. If we are idle while the Soviet Union continued its nuclear rocket development, the space Pearl Harbor which this Nation suffered in October 1957. with the launching of the Russian sputnik, would look small in comparison.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from New York, a very able member of the Subcommittee on Advanced Research and Technology.

Mr. WYDLER. If this rocket, as the gentleman agreed, is to be for space transportation, could the gentleman tell me where we are going to transport ourselves to?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. There are a number of possible missions for which Nerva can be utilized. For example, this could be used for a heavy payload unmanned or manned flight directly to the moon without the necessity for a lunar excursion module and the complexities which rendezvous entails. There are many other missions which I will discuss if my time allows.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has again expired.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from West Virginia 1 additional minute.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. In further answer to the gentleman from New York, Nerva could be used to maneuver in earth orbit with large payloads, for unmanned planetary missions such as the sun, and for manned planetary flybys.

I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he desires.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I was going to say on the Nerva II nuclear engine, that is for an upper stage and probably a fourth stage.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Probably the third stage, but we might best term it an "upper stage" engine.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Either third or fourth. NASA has just given me a memorandum that it could be a fourth stage. Nerva delivers approximately double to the moon what a Saturn V does alone. For example, Saturn V delivers 25,000 pounds. The Nerva will deliver 47,000 pounds. In addition, where the Saturn V is going to cost for two of them $320 million, for the Nerva third and fourth stage it will cost only $210 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has again expired.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I yield the gentleman from West Virginia an additional minute.

So we have a saving there in money as well as getting an increase in weight. Likewise the gentleman from California should be complimented because the matter of reusability and maneuverability of the Nerva is very high compared to the Saturn V complex.

Another point is with the Nerva we can probably pick out very carefully the particular target landing spot and make sure of it so we get better results from it.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from West Virginia yield?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BELL. I want to point out in this regard that there is a reusability to the nuclear propelled vehicle, which is very important. Up to this time there has not been reusability of any consequence. Secondly, I think anybody who at this stage of the game, today, would say that space travel is not a matter of the immediate future, should reexamine the facts.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I thank the gentleman from California. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to add some general comments about the work of the Subcommittee on Advanced Research and Technology.

Mr. Chairman, I have expressed concern in the past few years at the declining support for advanced research and technology.

INCREASED SUPPORT FOR ADVANCED RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

In 1965, the Office of Advanced Research and Technology had $331 million available for research and development. For the fiscal year 1966, $289 million was available, and NASA requested even less—$278 million in its fiscal 1967 budget.

During our budget hearings in 1965, I asked Dr. Raymond Bisplinghoff, who was at that time head of the Office of Advanced Research and Technology:

How can you possibly continue to cut down on research and technology and hope to maintain strength in the field of aeronautics and astronautics in the future?

He answered my query quite candidly:

I think the answer, Congressman Hechler, is we cannot maintain that strength if we continue to cut down. I am hopeful that in future years we can return to a higher budget level in advanced research and technology.

Now I am very pleased to note that for the research and development phase of OART, NASA has in this year's budget requested a substantial increase—$345.5 million. This strongly reverses the repeated declines of the past few years. I believe this is a very healthy trend if we are to have a strong space program, in the 1980's and the 1990's.

In February of this year, there was released a landmark report of the President's Science Advisory Committee, entitled "The Space Program in the Post-Apollo Period." This report, called the PSAC Report, contained these two significant sentences. It was recommended "that both the NASA efforts in advanced research and technology be maintained at a high level with particular attention to providing the demanding technologies needed to meet requirements for long-duration space travel." It further stated:

Relative to the total effort envisioned for post-Apollo programs, and particularly as preparation for design of systems for early manned planetary exploration, the current available financial support for advanced research and technology is not adequate.

Our subcommittee recommended, and the full committee approved, an increase of $1,965,000 in the total amount requested for the research and development phase of the Office of Advanced Research and Technology, thus bringing the request up to $347,465,000. Reductions in administrative operations and construction of facilities were recommended so that the overall total NASA request for OART was reduced by our committee to the $579.7 million requested.

TECHNOLOGY UTILIZATION AND TRACKING

Our subcommittee also had under its jurisdiction technology utilization and tracking and data acquisition which, plus OART, amounted to a grand total of $887,215,000 in the NASA budget request. Our action was to reduce this amount by a little over $25 million down to $861,560,000 which is the amount requested for authorization in the bill you have before you.

Fiscal year 1968 will be extremely important for the Office of Advanced Research and Technology. This office is concerned almost exclusively with developing techniques and devices which will serve the space program in the years ahead. If we were to suppose that NASA's mission was to be complete with the Apollo lunar landing, then the budget for advanced research and technology should be virtually nothing in fiscal year 1968. If we believe that the U.S. program for the peaceful uses of space and space technology will continue, then the OART budget must be fully supported at a healthy and vigorous level.

I asked the Associate Administrator for OART, Dr. Mac C. Adams, how the efforts of his program were divided between the present and the future. He replied with the following distribution: 5 percent for current mission support and

95 percent for mission extension, new starts such as Voyager, and future missions. Therefore, in considering this authorization it is necessary for the Congress to take a stand on the long term position of the space program in the context of Federal activities.

MORE AERONAUTICS RESEARCH

The Congress has made considerable efforts over the past several years to stimulate more research in aeronautics. We have authorized additional moneys and we have prodded NASA with our report language. They have responded this year by increasing their request by almost $31 million which the committee feels is not only justifiable, but is more in keeping with the vital needs of this industry. Of specific interest to the Congress will be the amount of money allocated to improving or reducing aircraft noise. NASA is planning a research program totaling $6.8 million. This program included research on the aircraft engine, research on aircraft flight patterns to reduce noise around our airports, and the development of a new, quieter engine which will come to fruition in about 7 to 8 years. I assure you that this program is a coordinated one and has resulted from the actions of the President's Director of Science and Technology, the Department of Transportation, and the Federal Aviation Agency. Testimony was taken from the heads of all of these agencies to be sure that the program was coordinated and to be sure that the program was adequate to meet the needs of the country. We have these assurances in testimony and we believe that NASA is responding in every way that it can in order to make the greatest contribution to relieving our citizens of this noxious problem.

MORE ON THE NERVA PROGRAM

I have already mentioned the development of a nuclear rocket engine. As you know, NASA has been engaged in nuclear rocket research for a number of years. As a matter of fact, NASA, together with the AEC, has invested over $1 billion in this research. The results to date have been extremely gratifying and NASA has conducted successfully eight test firings of a nuclear rocket reactor. The program now being initiated will result in the development of an upper stage rocket producing 200,000 to 250,000 pounds of thrust over a period of time in excess of 30 minutes. The cost of this development is estimated to be about $1 billion with an additional one-half billion being required to make it applicable to a space mission. It is estimated that it will take approximately 10 years to perform this work.

There is no question that this is a major undertaking. The committee gave it serious consideration and we concluded that it should be initiated. Testimony before the committee pointed out the unprecedented versatility that a device of this type can add to our capability. For example, it can be used for major earth orbital missions, for unmanned probes to the planets and is almost mandatory for manned missions to the planets.

AMORTIZING THE COSTS OF NERVA

We are concerned about the cost of such a device. However, testimony revealed that because of the enormous weight required in space to perform a mission to the moon or the planets, this device, because of its superior capability, will pay for itself even though very few missions are planned. It is estimated that a manned Mars mission using existing chemical boosters would require 5 million pounds in earth orbit. This weight would have to be put in earth orbit using four Saturn V rockets. The amount of weight required in earth orbit using the nuclear stage would be one-half of this amount. Therefore, at a cost of about $500 per pound of weight in earth orbit, the difference in costs using the nuclear stage would be $1.25 billion. You can readily see that the cost of this development is almost amortized by one mission in the case listed above.

There are, of course, many other advantages such as a reduction in overall mission launch requirements, simplicity of operation, reliability and simpler mission planning. At this time, there is no specific mission for this device. However, it is the function of the advanced research program to embark upon such technology developments. We feel that to initiate the development at this time would result in a lower overall cost, first of all, but not having a crash program development, and, second, we would continue the work already underway at this time. For this work the committee recommends an authorization of $70 million which includes the development of the nuclear rocket. Also $16.5 million is in the construction of facilities item for necessary test facilities.

DEVELOPMENT OF LARGE SOLID ROCKET MOTOR

The third item of major concern is a recommendation by the committee to include $12 million for the continued development of the large solid rocket motor. NASA requested no funds for the continuation of this very vital and successful program. There have already been two successful firings of the 260-inch solid rocket, and a third partially successful firing was conducted on June 17. This third firing has proved to us that there are still some gaps in this technology. The committee feels that the booster has not been fully developed and that the technology is not available to be placed on the shelf or for use.

RESULTS OF JUNE 17 SOLID ROCKET TEST

We have just been given the preliminary results of the firing of this last large solid on June 17. The results of this test fully confirm the committee's view as expressed this year and last year that the technology is not on the shelf and available to us. NASA has had considerable success in the three firings that have been performed. However, even though the full test data are not available to us, the contention that insufficient experience in handling large propellant mixtures, not being able to forecast their action in the large mass, and to repeat the performance of prior firings have been confirmed. The perturbations that are obvious in the test results are of such magnitude that they would cause a manned flight to be aborted for safety reasons and they are convincing to the expert that more tests are required before this technology is fully proven.

This does not mean that the development is too aggressive or that NASA has overly extended itself in seeking to utilize solid propellants, for up to this time where the program has been carried to complete conclusion, the solids have been extremely reliable. This does not mean, however, that you can make a firm decision based on three firings. I do not wish to belabor the point. However, it is obvious to us on the committee, and it should be obvious to all that this is another instance where the committee has been correct in its assessment of the program and that the continued development of this reliable and economical booster is necessary.

The committee has repeatedly called for action on this development to be sure that our propulsion capability is not seriously limited and that we have all the needed booster capability for a well-rounded space program at the most economical cost. The continued development of the large solid rocket will result in a very versatile, extremely simple, extremely reliable, and less costly vehicle than our current major boosters. The committee is determined that this country will not be caught short without the needed booster vehicles for a vital space program. We are even now spending money in our space program to upgrade the Saturn V rocket because we were not farsighted enough to have additional capability in our current stable of booster vehicles. For these reasons we are recommending the addition of $12 million to the chemical propulsion program for the continued development of the booster.

ECONOMIES ACHIEVED

These items are program areas where major actions were taken by the committee. The committee recommends a reduction in every other disciplinary research area except one and that is the human factor or medical research area. The tracking and data acquisition program was reduced $1.7 million, and Technology Utilization remained $5 million as requested. The resulting research and development moneys requested by NASA were reduced by $5.735 million.

Additional items within the Office of Advanced Research and Technology considered by my subcommittee were Administrative Operations and Construction of Facilities. These were reduced by $10.2 million and $12.22 million respectively. The committee feels that NASA can effect economies in their administrative operations to absorb $10.2 million, although we agree that the reduction is a strenuous one in view of generally rising costs.

ELECTRONICS RESEARCH CENTER

In the Construction of Facilities request, I am sure that it will be pleasing to some Members of this body to know that the committee has denied NASA any construction moneys for the Electronics Research Center in fiscal year 1968.

The reason for denying the $6.2 million that was requested for construction is that NASA has $20.8 million not yet on contract from prior years. I should

remind my colleagues that the Electronics Research Center is contributing greatly to our space capability and currently there are 698 permanent personnel at the center. NASA has requested funds totaling $41.63 million to be utilized at ERC for administrative operations—$19.26 million—and for research and development—$22.37 million.

The total amount recommended for authorization by my subcommittee is $861.6 million or a total reduction of $25.655 million from the amount requested by NASA. We feel that this is a minimum figure that should be authorized for this program.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he might require to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LUKENS].

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Chairman, I support the passage of H.R. 10340, the NASA authorization bill because of the obvious need for this country to compete in the general space science field.

The Nerva development program, in my opinion, should be continued. I rise in opposition to any amendment to delete Nerva from this bill.

As a member of the subcommittee considering this item, I believe that we made every effort to insure the programing for NASA is consistent with its fund request and with our national demands.

We determined a need to pursue this development, and there are many essential reasons for embarking on a program of this magnitude. It is not easy to talk about a billion-dollar investment when our country faces almost daily economic crises. But we are not just discussing the immediate future and the short-term future. This is an investment in power—for this Nation and for this world for perhaps a hundred years.

At the present time, the Nerva program possesses the greatest potential for a pollution-free, economic, and consistent power source which will add greatly to this country's technological stockpile. If we conquer nuclear energy and its peaceful applications, we could guarantee this country's preeminence in the next generation of science and space activities. The soundness of this development and this program has already been proven by prior technology and research. The long leadtime required to meet any reasonable space mission in the next 10 years or more necessitates our initiating Nerva now. Testimony was presented to the effect that orbiting weight of the booster can be reduced approximately 50 percent for all missions if this nuclear rocket is used as a second stage. It is just another real advantage now available to us and on which we can build to gain even greater benefits from the basic Nerva program.

I do not pretend to be a judge of exactly how much this will cost. I do not think anyone can really effectively give either the ultimate cost or the ultimate impact and advantage from the research and development of a nuclear energy propulsion system.

In my mind, although the cost is staggering, the advantages to this country now, in terms of increased capability and advantages to the world in terms of peaceful applications, have convinced me that there is a need for us to take this responsible step forward.

A country which stands still not only deserves to be passed, but it will be passed.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUNT].

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 10340 in the main. I also rise in suport of my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER] with respect to some of his views.

Mr. Chairman, I occupy a rather unique position on this committee. Not only am I the junior member and the freshman Congressman occupying the last slot of the minority group, but I am also in the last slot on the full committee. I want to state publicly that I am most grateful to the distinguished Member of this House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] for the wonderful opportunity he has afforded me in these first few months to understand this program more fully. I am most grateful to you, sir, for this and to the chairman of the committee and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] for their assistance to me.

I am a very firm supporter of the space program. However, there are some inequities, in my estimation, that need correcting. First, I believe we should have an inspector general as an overall watchdog. Having spent some time in the services, I found they were quite helpful. The safety factor has been overlooked, and unquestionably it is something that the American public today is mulling over. I think this committee should go on record as supporting a measure of this nature so that the American public would believe that we intend to make this program safe for the astronauts in their future flights.

Mr. Chairman, the matter of minority staffing is something which we can no longer overlook. The staff that currently occupies the positions with the committee is doing a fine job. But, we do, on the minority side, need someone to advise us upon particular aspects of this very highly varied and complex program. So I am wholeheartedly for both proposals.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to briefly touch upon the Nerva II program to which I am opposed at this time, because it will be 10 years in the building. It is going to cost over $1.5 billion, to say the least. It will then take 10 years to tailor a rocket that will carry it.

So, Mr. Chairman, we have today an opportunity confronting us and upon which a decision must be made.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday in this very House we heard the cries and pleas with reference to the question of raising the national debt ceiling and someone said that if we did not increase the national debt ceiling, the veterans of prior service to this country would suffer and that we needed money for the fulfillment of our commitment to these veterans under this program. However, Mr. Chairman, everyone knew that that was "eyewash." But by the same token we have been talking about our needs in carrying on the war in Vietnam. I am not opposed, in general, to the Nerva II. But I say at this time we can very easily put it aside while the Vietnam war is in operation and hopefully brought to a successful conclusion, because the Nerva II program is not important. It is a projection, and based upon the very word of the gentleman who spoke only a few moments ago, it is only to be constructed for a "possible" mission.

Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen, we are not dealing in the realm of "possibilities." We are dealing in the realm of "actualities." We are dealing in an age where we must know where the American taxpayer's dollar is going to be expended and for what.

Mr. Chairman, we can no longer go on sheer imagination.

Nerva I has been successfully completed, but to go into the completion of Nerva II project would entail the additional expenditure of about $200 million this year.

Mr. Chairman, I would think that all of us should support the proposal which has been suggested by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINN] to add $10 million to the university program which to us is much more important now.

Mr. Chairman, we should delete the Nerva I program for at least this 1 year—until we find a possible mission for something on which we can expend billions of dollars in the future—but at the present time it has no particular objective.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I favor this program and join in the comments which have been made by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], the chairman of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I believe the House should immediately correct a serious inadequacy and provide a professional minority staff for the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

NASA spends more money than any other agency of Government with the exception of the Defense Department. It is therefore the No. 1 target for nondefense spending cuts.

In a time of severest financial pressure and unprecedented defense expenditures, it is vital that the most critical eye be kept on all other expenditures to fund only projects that are essential to our national interest. Provision of minority counsel would certainly aid in the quest.

Beyond these important economy considerations, however, I think it is in the majority's interest to have the minority as well informed and as well prepared as possible. This is particularly so in an area as highly technical and complex as our space endeavors. The majority can only lose if it inhibits the minority's ability to take only the most responsible positions of opposition. We all know the devastating results of uninformed attacks on legislation that may pass be-

cause of their emotional appeal and inadequacy of information available to the House.

Also, in considering this question, we Democrats must remember that, while it is unlikely and unwelcomed, someday we may find ourselves in the minority. Consideration of this issue should not be on a partisan basis.

I am sure the committee staff exercises every effort to be impartial and to render good service to all members. No matter how able and earnest its members may be, however—and no matter how stern may be the instructions of the committee's fine chairman and the staff be impartial—yet we all know that committee staffs are badly overworked. The practical result is that they spend most of their limited time on the business of the chairman and the majority.

The tradition of committee staffing for both the majority and the minority in the House of Representatives has long been established. It fits into the pattern of intelligent and informed opposition which makes the two party system work both in Congress and in the entirety of American political life. For several years now, members of the minority on the Science and Astronautics Committee of this House have pointed out the absence of any minority staff on that committee. Today's authorization from the Science and Astronautics Committee amounts to nearly $5 billion—a tremendous sum. It seems obvious even to the layman Congressman, unfamiliar with the technical issues involved in the NASA authorization and the space program, that the most effective and in the long run, the most efficient management of this budget can only be accomplished by encouraging the divergent viewpoints within the committee itself. As in the other committees of this House, I feel that this can best be accomplished by the addition of a committee staff group responsible strictly to the minority.

Serious discussions have been held with regard to the problem of minority staffing for the Committee on Science and Astronautics in both the House Administration Committee and on the floor itself. With this precedent of concern extending beyond the individual committee, I too am speaking out. A committee spending this much money, and facing such technical decisions as booster capacities, liquid and solid fuels, aerospace technology, and interplanetary travel complications really needs effective staff work for all points of view. In my opinion, and concurring with others beyond the minority of that committee alone, such decisions require a minority professional staff.

I agree with the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967, developed and unanimously approved by the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, which clearly substantiates the need for minority staffing and makes provisions for it. The situation existing in the Committee on Science and Astronautics is fast becoming an anachronism in the light of many efforts to update the Congress to serve most effectively the American people.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight and the Subcommittee on NASA Oversight, I have for several years been intimately involved with NASA's manned space flight programs, and with the Apollo and Apollo applications programs in particular. In my work with these subcommittees, I have participated in briefings at the manned space flight field centers and at the contractor plants, and during these past 5 months I have participated in the investigations into the Apollo 204 accident.

From this experience, my overriding concern at this time is to get the Apollo program going again. It is a prudent program. It is an orderly program. It is a safe program—as safe as the hard work and talents of dedicated men can make it. And it is a worthwhile program. It is time to move this program forward again.

The accident has been thoroughly, even exhaustively, investigated and reviewed. I believe that the actions taken as a result have strengthened the program and supply the basis for proceeding with greater assurance of success.

In talking with the workers at the contractor plants and at the NASA installations, I get a feeling of great enthusiasm and confidence on the part of everyone—from top-level administrator to the men in the shops—in response to the challenge of getting this program back to the launch pad.

I have never seen more highly motivated people. As a businessman myself, I can assure every Member of this body that the United States is getting a dollar's worth of value for every dollar spent in this program—in fact, we are getting a dollar and a half's worth of value for every dollar spent.

I have been concerned about the cost of the Apollo program, and I have devoted considerable effort to investigate this matter during the past months. While there is no question that NASA and the contractors have many tough problems ahead of them, I am satisfied that they are making progress, and I am confident that both NASA and the contractors are doing their best to protect the public interest in every way.

For our $20 billion investment in Apollo, we are realizing returns far greater in import and scope than the manned lunar landing alone. We are building a space flight capability with which we can carry out whatever missions of the future the national interest may dictate. We are insuring ourselves that the advance of technology will not leave us behind in this era of rapid change. We are building our sense of national pride by doing "impossible" things. We are strengthening our position in this "show-me" world—a world of uncertainty and transition—by conveying a picture of a strong, "can-do" nation.

The space program helps to demonstrate our leadership before all the nations of the world. It does for our free enterprise system what advertising does for individual businesses. It improves our bargaining position at the conference table and it improves our competitive position in the world marketplace. And it provides opportunities to return real benefits to the man in the street. Consider the advantages of worldwide weather forecasting and reporting and worldwide satellite communications.

The space program is making direct contributions to the economy of the Nation by accelerating one of the most basic aspects of economic growth—the development of new technology. The space program leads to new applications, new knowledge, new technology, and the continued flow of new products, new processes, and new ideas—the basic elements that have contributed to our present national prosperity and strength. By bringing about these advancements, the space program is giving people the chance to help themselves by learning how to do new things, and how to do old things in new ways.

The space program is contributing to the overall excellence of the United States. To accept the challenge of going where no one has gone before requires the same qualities that made us great in generations past.

Because of the space program we are better—better as persons, better as a nation, and better as a world in which the peoples may one day live in peace and dignity and security.

Today in space we stand on a plateau of technology provided by the Apollo program. This technology will enable us to continue the exploration of space—an exploration that holds untold promise for all mankind. Through the imaginative application of this Apollo capability, we can capitalize on our investment in space to accomplish many things of real benefit to the Nation and the world.

We must not stop now. We must continue to grow if we are to realize the full promise of man in space. Believe me when I say the space program is as vital to us today as development of the airplane was in that day.

This great and wealthy Nation can afford to do what is necessary, in space as well as on earth. Which is more, we cannot afford not to do it.

Let us now get on with the job. I urge passage of H.R. 10340.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, about a decade has passed since the Congress first considered the establishment of an organization to fill the important role of coordinating and carrying out our Nation's program of space exploration. During this decade, most Americans have watched, first with impatience at our lagging efforts; later with excitement and exaltation with our initial success; and, more recently, with interests waning and attention wandering as NASA, the space industry, and our astronauts recorded success after success with deft precision.

Today, as we act on the question of NASA's future authorization, we are all haunted by the disastrous Apollo fire. As we consider this authorization, I think it appropriate that we reflect on the record of the past. Hopefully, by considering the successes and the failure that NASA has experienced, we can bring to this vitally important question the comprehensive and balanced attention that it deserves and requires.

The NASA program's 10-year history can be divided into two rounds. In the first round of the program, including all those projects started before January 1, 1961, dozens of Explorer satellites did fundamental work in the study of atmosphere, magnetosphere, geodesy, and space environment; orbiting solar observatories and orbiting geophysical observatories made possible multidisciplinary studies covering atmosphere, magnetosphere, sun, and space environment; and satellites were launched for other countries in cooperative programs dealing with the ionosphere as well as areas covered by previous projects. The Ranger and Surveyor lunar missions were successfully completed, pioneering deep space probes brought a new understanding of outer space environment, and the Mariner spaceships were sent to Venus and Mars.

The second round of missions, those projects started after January 1, 1967, included the tremendously successful Gemini program through which significant scientific experiments in photographing earth and its weather patterns; space environment, astronomy, and bioscience were subjected to more advanced study; and Explorer satellites including the interplanetary monitoring platform, international cooperation satellites, made significant contributions to our understanding. New and improved Pioneer satellites are now orbiting the sun sending back important data. The crowning success was, of course, our lunar orbiters which have provided photographs of and from the moon which have amazed the world.

PROFOUND IMPORTANCE

The missiles and the launchings have frequently overshadowed all else. Too often the lasting and important NASA successes have been obscured by plaudits paid the astronauts and the actual missile firings.

In appraising the value of the NASA program, one must take into account all of the direct and indirect ways in which the space program contributes to our Nation. Aside from the obvious contribution in the field of space research, the NASA program gives to the American society a reward well worth the budget allotment we are required to make. The most oftmentioned NASA byproduct is national security. The role of the NASA program with regard to national security has three facets. First, it maintains our freedom of choice in space matters. We are not the only nation involved in space building programs. Just as we are careful to protect our rights to open waterways and airways for defense purposes, we must do the same things in space. If we were to allow a foreign power to probe space alone, that power would eventually control space absolutely, and be able to use space to affect its authority around the world—no nation having any defense mechanism. Second, space development has quickly grown to be one of the major indicators of a nation's resources and technical advancement. In order to maintain our mantle of leadership and thus maintain the confidence of our allies and the possibility of gaining more friends, we must uphold "national prestige." Third, there are a great many specific inventions and breakthroughs that contribute a great deal to the military efforts that have been made through the NASA program.

A second field which benefits from the NASA program is health and medicine. Dr. George E. Mueller, Associate Administrator for Manned Space Flight, NASA, stated that—

> For the first time in the history of medical learning, because of the need to understand haw men work in space, we are beginning to make some measurements about well people as sick people . . . we are developing the devices . . . for actually monitoring the activities in a meaningful way of the subsystems of the human body.

There have been a great many specific practical breakthroughs in this field, also; many of the special needs of the astronaut or the spacecraft are being adapted to aid for invalids and the treatment of disease on earth as well. Consultation with the medical community is extensive in the NASA program, providing mutually profitable results.

Certainly the stimulation and development of industry accruing from the NASA program must be considered. Space vehicles are the most intricate structures ever built. No single company can make them. Space operations have, therefore, required the creation of larger industrial complexes than ever worked together before. Their success calls for new machinery and devices stronger, lighter, more powerful, more accurate, and more reliable than anything men have built in the past.

Thus, the work of the space program spreads across a wide industrial spectrum; electronics, cryogenics, plastics, ceramics, textiles, thermals, metals, fuels, machinery, instruments, and many others. NASA deals directly or indirectly with nearly 21,000 contracting companies and employs approximately 400,000 people. Below the major contractors are other tiers of subcontractors, suppliers, and vendors reaching into almost every community in the Nation.

When we authorize $5 billion for the space program, we are not merely shooting it into space. That money is spent here in our own country and this serves to stimulate our economy and give jobs to our own people. During the past 5 years, more than $803 million in NASA subcontracting work has gone to companies officially designated as small businesses, and more than $390 million has been spent in surplus labor areas. According to NASA, if we consider only the first- and second-tier contractors and subcontractors, the work is being performed in 47 States and the District of Columbia. Ninety percent of the money goes directly to private companies. NASA performs a great economic service.

The NASA program contributes to industry in another manner. It has caused some profound changes in industrial patterns. It is beginning to revolutionize communication, energy conversion, power generation, transportation, geodetic surveying, and weather prediction here on earth. Nearly 1,300 inventions and improvements of previous technology have been identified as resulting from space requirements. Moreover, the NASA program calls for a capability-oriented rather than a product-oriented industry. This difference calls for changes in administrative policy and organizational plans and this provides a new insight for industrial management.

In these fields as well as science in general, food and agriculture, education and welfare, and certainly others, the NASA program can be seen to be making a significant contribution to the United States. We are getting a tremendous return on our money. The NASA authorization represents an investment in a tremendously multifaceted program.

THE TRAGIC ACCIDENT

It is doubtful that the tragic accident of the Apollo 204 on January 27, 1967, was indicative of any fundamental flaw in the NASA program. As Wernher von Braun stated on May 4 of this year:

> The early flights in Mercury like the checkout flight, the distance flight, and John Glenn's orbital flight . . . actually were exposed . . . to greater substantial hazards than Apollo was, and we were just on the lucky side of the curve.

All indications seem to suggest that the unfortunate combination of individual factors, rather than a pervasive breakdown in the program, caused this most regrettable incident.

To cut NASA's authorization on the strength of this reverse would be to lose sight of the great progress and value of our space endeavors over the past 10 years. We would be thereby saying that, because of one tragic accident, the program no longer merits our full support. Some have said that rather than castigating the program, we should marvel at the fact that for almost a decade we succeeded in plunging into the absolute wilderness of outer space without a single astronaut being injured. The emotional shock of those first deaths must not lead us to make such a regrettable decision as to handicap the NASA program.

I know Mr. Webb and many members of his able staff. I know they are redoubling their efforts to avoid the recurrence of the Apollo tragedy. Mr. Chairman, in view of the great accomplishments and contributions to the American society that the NASA program has made, I must stand firmly behind it. I believe that the Apollo 204 was an unfortunate accident and that the space program must go on, with full support.

MOMENTUM IS CRITICAL

The proposed NASA authorization is at the lowest level feasible for the effective continuation of the program. Any authorization short of this would jeopardize the momentum that the program has picked up over the past few years, and as Mr. Webb testified to the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences earlier this year, "Momentum is a very important word in such an endeavor." NASA has developed an efficient, and massive, yet highly integrated program. If we take away or ration more strictly its source of support, thus endangering the momentum, we may well depreciate its effectiveness and waste much of the time, effort, and expense we have poured into developing this strong motive power.

The space program operates as an evolutionary process. The progress of one mission often depends on the success of the project preceding it. Yet the nature of the space program is such that individual missions must be planned long in advance. A cutback in funds would slow down to a dangerously retarded pace the future planning of the program.

A second and inseparable problem would be one of personnel. Our leadership and innovative success is attributable to the fact that this program has captured the imagination and talents of many of our Nation's finest minds. NASA has gathered together within its staff and the staff of contracting companies, some of America's greatest men in many interrelated fields. A decrease in the appropriations for 1968 would certainly mean a cutback in personnel, and more importantly an indication of a lessening national commitment.

Such a reduction in commitment would deprive the participants of the sense that they were representing a united people who were making a full scale effort to conquer space. Each man has gained from his experience in the space program. Thus, as he leaves the program he takes with him one of the most important elements of our space progress, experience. When we again have the chance to go ahead at full appropriation, new people will be brought into the program and a very inefficient "generation gap" will exist. The new people will not have the benefit of previous project experience and the evolutionary process will be impaired. To quote the first appendix of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences hearings of this spring:

A space capability is a dynamic thing. It exists only so long as it is nourished and used.

We must continue to "nourish and use" our NASA program. We must do that by approving the full appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, the history of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has been one of progress. NASA has made tremendous strides in a great number of fields of space research. At the same time it has boosted our economy and done a great number of services for our society. We are now asked to authorize $5 billion to continue this program. When we consider the record of NASA and the great problems it would face if given a smaller budget, we have only one choice and that is to support the space program and approve the appropriation.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to stress the importance of one section of the bill currently before the House authorizing nearly $5 billion for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. That is section 5 of the bill, dealing with the geographical distribution of Federal research funds.

For several years Congress has written this language into the authorization bill. I see little evidence that this congressional recommendation is being followed by the executive branch.

The section clearly states that whenever feasible, the Administration give consideration to the geographical distribution of research funds. A close examination of the first tier of contracts still reveals that a bulk of the research funds go to the Pacific coast, northeast and southern crescent.

Excellent facilities for many related phases of research activities exist throughout all other sections of the country, as well. Congress realizes this fact and has reflected its position in section 5 of the bill.

Hopefully, the Administration will make a more significant effort to abide with the language in the bill. Without concerted adherence to this section, Congress should enact special legislation to force compliance from the Administration so the entire Nation can share and contribute to our research efforts in this field.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote against this bill. My vote does not mean that I consider our space program to be undesirable. On the contrary I share the pride of millions of Americans in our accomplishments in the space program. Were these normal times, I would gladly support this measure. However, these are not normal times.

At this juncture in our history where so tremendous a portion of the taxpayers' money is spent for our military needs, I think it essential that we recognize a system of priorities concerning our many domestic programs. The simple fact is that in my judgment it is more important to use the available money to combat such things as despair and crime resulting from our troubled social and economic problems than it is to race the Soviet Union to the moon. There is no doubt that the country which first lands a man on the moon will achieve a significant propaganda advantage. However, I believe that we can achieve an even greater propaganda advantage by proving to the people of the world that we care enough about human misery and degradation to do something about combating their root causes.

We will be honored more by making this Nation and its people healthy, productive, and useful than by launching screaming missiles to other planets. When we have done something more significant to eliminate our slums, feed our hungry, build colleges for our young people, and sufficient hospitals for the sick, it will be time enough to spend for space. Let us come to grips with our problems on earth before adventuring into the beyond.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration carries out one of the most widely publicized and universally acclaimed programs of our Federal Government. With all Americans, I have rejoiced in the achievements of our able and courageous astronauts and the significant contribution of the many fine people in our space program. I have marveled at the incredible advances in science and technology which have made possible the space programs undertaken by NASA scientists, engineers, doctors, and thousands of other specialists. And I have without exception supported NASA appropriations year after year, firmly convinced that these programs are in the interest of the American people by advancing scientific knowledge, enhancing American reputation throughout the world, and providing impetus to many areas of our economy.

But today, I am compelled to conclude that an authorization of almost $5 billion for space activities in the fiscal year that begins in less than 10 days cannot be justified in light of the magnitude and number of other obligations our country faces today.

The $5 billion request comes at a time when there are responsible congressional, governmental, and private expressions that we may face a deficit as high as $29 billion during this upcoming fiscal year. There is growing evidence that the full range of our Federal responsibilities and the funds needed to meet them are becoming dangerously high, so high as to endanger sound economic growth and stability.

There must be a compromise between the very fruitful and necessary space program requirements and the needs of our Nation in other areas and this requires the development of priorities as to where we will spend our Federal funds.

I am not suggesting total and complete abandonment of our space program, but I am calling for a substantial slash in space expenditures which I feel can largely be accomplished by abandoning arbitrary deadlines and allowing the program to proceed at a more rational pace.

Valuable though our space program has been and may be in years to come, the $5 billion which we are being asked to authorize today is excessive in view of our other national needs and commitments and this is one of the few places in the entire national budget where a substantial cut can be made without endangering national security or the most urgent needs of our people.

Let me touch on the defense picture first. At the beginning of 1966, defense spending for fiscal year 1967 was estimated at $60.5 billion. Now as the fiscal year is coming to a close, the estimate is $70.7 billion; $10 billion or 18 percent more than the original estimate. In January of this year, we were given an estimate of $75.5 billion for defense spending in fiscal year 1968; this has already been raised to $76.2 billion; and there are unofficial reports that it may well go above $80 billion.

Of necessity, we have been less generous in many of our domestic programs. We in the House of Representatives, thanks to our capable and vigilant Committee on Appropriations, have made a concerted effort to reduce the total level of Federal spending as much as possible. For fiscal year 1968, we have approved to date appropriations totaling $109.6 billion, a cut of almost $3 billion from administration requests totaling $112.5 billion. This covers about 85 percent of the requests for appropriations which the House expects to get this year. Others, including the space program we are considering today, await authorizations.

In brief, Mr. Chairman, it seems clear to me that we must take the approach which will be most consistent with our responsibilities to the American people. This involves in the first instance cutting back on those programs which do not directly and seriously involve national security or the welfare of our people. It is for this reason that I shall oppose the current NASA authorization request and urge my fellow Members of the House to do likewise.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Subcommittee on Space and Science and Applications of the Committee on Science and Astronautics I did some work on the training portion of the sustaining university program. In this connection, in order to see how it was working in the various universities that have participated in the program, I wrote each of them and received the attached reply from them.

Because of their bearing on the NASA authorization bill, H.R. 10340, and particularly on any amendment which might be offered which would have the effect of curtailing the programs at the universities from present levels, I wish my colleagues to see these excellent recommendations of the sustaining university program from the academic community in each State.

A very few of the recipients of the letters are not participating, and only one university authority did not give support to the program. But I have attached all letters received, and you may judge if they are not a glowing tribute to this program.

The following are from institutions in the State of Alabama:

AUBURN UNIVERSITY,
Auburn, Ala., June 19, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Committee on Science and Astronautics,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ECKHARDT: This letter is in response to your letter to us dated June 14, 1967, and is written in behalf of the President of Auburn University, Dr. Harry M. Philpott.

We are vitally concerned relative to the fate of your amendment to the NASA 1968 congressional authorization and appropriation of $10 million in support of sustaining university programs.

This institution, partly because of interests and staff competence, and partly because of location relative to the Huntsville Redstone Arsenal and NASA facilities in this State, has been involved for a number of years in a relatively large contract research and development program with NASA. Essentially all of this work is developed and executed on a contract-by-contract basis. We have not been able to incorporate these activities into our overall sustaining university program. This has created some serious problems for us. In the future, this situation can lead to very acute problems.

Because of professional manpower shortages in these types of areas, and because of an increasing demand for this limited manpower, competition for well-trained, experienced, and competent professional manpower has been very keen in recent years. In the absence of research support for a sustaining university program, university recruitment of professional research personnel is very difficult. Retaining the better qualified and more productive research personnel is even more difficult.

For a university to develop a sound, stable, productive, dynamic research program of excellence requires support of a continuing or sustaining nature. Our research and development work with NASA (and other agencies) would be far more efficient and effective than at present if more of our support were of a type that we could include in our overall sustaining university program.

We, therefore, are very pleased to see your amendment to NASA's 1968 authorization for support of sustaining university programs. We enthusiastically endorse this amendment and hope that it not only passes the Congress as a 1968 authorization, but this session of the Congress will also approve an appropriation in support of the authorization.

Sincerely,

BEN T. LANHAM, Jr.,
Vice President for Research.

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA,
University, Ala., June 19, 1967.

Congressman BOB ECKHARDT,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ECKHARDT: I am very happy to provide you with information concerning the effective operation of NASA's Sustaining University Program at the University of Alabama.

We are now in the fifth year in which we have received support under this program. Without question, it has been the most effective form of support which the University has received from any government agency. The general-purpose research support has enabled us to put into operation the University of Alabama Research Institute in Huntsville. This Research Institute, which concentrates its efforts in the aerospace and missile-related physical sciences and engineering, has strengthened greatly our ability to carry out quality research for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the U.S. Army, supporting industrial contractors of these agencies, and industry in general. Equally important, it has been a major factor in establishing and sustaining one of the largest graduate programs in the physical sciences and engineering in the South. Located in a research park, it also has been a strong force in attracting new industry to the Huntsville area.

On our Main Campus in Tuscaloosa, the research support and the doctoral traineeship support provided under the Sustaining University Program have made possible strengthening several departments in the physical sciences and engineering. The traineeship support alone will permit us to provide, at the rate of 10 per year, a total of approximately 50 new mathematicians, physical scientists, and engineers. A striking testimony to the worth of these traineeships is that they are the most sought after by graduate students among all graduate traineeships and fellowships.

As you know, the University receives support from many Federal agencies. That which we receive from NASA through its Sustaining University Program, in my judgment, is the most useful to us, and I strongly urge that the level of support be maintained.

Most cordially,

FRANK A. ROSE,
President.

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA,
University, Ala., June 16, 1967.

Congressman BOB ECKHARDT,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ECKHARDT: We shall be most pleased to provide information concerning the effective operation of the sustaining NASA grant at our institution. We have just completed a report of our progress under this grant, and it should be simple for us to get something to you before June 20. This we shall attempt to do.

With best wishes and with appreciation for your making this opportunity available, I am

Cordially yours,

ALEX S. POW,
Vice President.

The following is from an institution in the State of Alaska:

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA,
College, Alaska, June 19, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ECKHARDT: President Wood has asked me to reply to your good letter of June 14 about House action on the NASA sustaining university program.

Unfortunately, we cannot help you by providing evidence of the practical success of this very excellent program as the University of Alaska does not at present enjoy such support.

However, the University does receive a number of project grants from NASA, particularly in the fields of geophysics and zoophysiology. Consequently we have often considered requesting sustaining funds and have, indeed, discussed this several times with the staff at NASA. For this reason we wish you every success in your salutary efforts to amend the authorization to the extent of adding $10 million to the program. We are, of course, extremely grateful for your good efforts.

Yours sincerely,

K. M. RAE,
Vice President for Research and Advanced Study.

The following is from an institution in the State of Arizona:

TUCSON, ARIZ.,
June 20, 1967.

Hon. ROBERT ECKHARDT,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

The NASA sustaining university program has been and remains an important investment in research and training. On this campus, we have found it possible to develop a number of unique and highly worthwhile approaches to space-related research as a result of funds made available under the sustaining university program. In the national interest, this program should be encouraged and strengthened through additional appropriations. It would be a disservice to the Nation as well as to science if this highly worthwhile and relatively low-cost activity were to be cut back.

RICHARD A. HARVILL,
President, University of Arizona.

The following are from institutions in the State of California:

CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,
Pasadena, Calif., June 16, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. ECKHARDT: I was delighted to receive your letter of June 14 and to know of your interest in retaining the $10 million budget item for the NASA university-support program. I congratulate you on this move, and I believe it is of great importance that this budget item be retained.

A large component of the NASA space program depends upon the active collaboration of university scientists and engineers throughout the country. While many of these individuals are directly involved in NASA flight projects, a considerable number are at work on their own campuses on teaching and research activities which are of great future value to NASA and which are of enormous aid in maintaining close relations between university scientists and

NASA personnel. Much of the good will and collaboration between NASA and the universities would be impaired, and the space program would suffer, if these university-support projects were deleted or reduced; rather, they should be substantially expanded.

Two important enterprises at Caltech are threatened by budgetary restrictions. One is the NASA Fellowship Program which has been extremely valuable in training graduate students in space-related science and engineering subjects. Many of our graduate students go into NASA activities on the completion of their studies, and it is important to maintain this flow of high-quality professional people into NASA and NASA-related activities. The possible great reduction in the NASA Fellowship Program would be a serious blow to our Caltech graduate education.

A second project which was given a serious blow by NASA budget restrictions was the building of a new laboratory for geophysics and planetary science on our campus. We have an urgent need to expand our geophysics and planetary science work, and we have an excellent staff and fine facilities for work in this field—especially work in collaboration with the Caltech Jet Propulsion Laboratory (a separate NASA activity, not included in the university-support program). Although we were encouraged to hope that NASA could finance such a building—and we therefore proceeded with plans for it—we later learned that budgetary restrictions had forced the elimination of this project. It is now in abeyance, and we have no immediate prospects for financing this very important structure.

There are a number NASA-supported projects on our campus in fields of fluid mechanics, planetary science, astronomy, and other areas. It would be a serious blow to our work, and a serious interference with our support of the NASA program, were these activities to be curtailed.

I know from personal contacts that similar situations are present in many universities throughout the country, in which a reduction of the NASA university-support program would cause a serious deterioration in the good relations between university scientists and NASA. I strongly urge that the Congress support the retention of the budgetary item, as you have proposed.

Very truly yours,

LEE A. DUBRIDGE,
President.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
June 19, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Graduate training in space sciences depends on adequate support from NASA chief beneficiary of that training. Stanford from NASA chief urges House provide fully adequate appropriation for NASA sustaining university program. Thirty nine Stanford students now on NASA traineeships. Very important to keep pipeline full.

J. E. WALLACE STERLING,
President, Stanford University.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
Committee on Science and Astronautics,
House of Representatives, Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C.:

The University of Southern California is very appreciative of the support it has received through the NASA sustaining university program. The funds have been extremely important and useful not only in assisting the university in achieving its goals but in helping NASA achieve its objectives. We look upon this program as very important for NASA to be able to continue at a high level because the three aspects of the program broaden the base of university participation in space activities and increase the overall national capability. We have participated in the traineeship part of the program for several years. Eighteen NASA trainees have completed their third year of tenure and are completing or have completed their Ph. D. requirements. A group of eight graduate students will begin new traineeships in the fall of 1967; in addition, 24 current trainees at intermediate graduate levels will continue their studies on a NASA traineeship renewal. This program has contributed significantly to increasing the supply of scientists and engineers in the space-related sciences and technology.

The university received a grant for enlarging the centrifuge building under the facilities part of the NASA program. Several large, space-related research projects under other NASA programs have been, or are being, conducted in the facility. This is the only human centrifuge in this geographical area, and the only one in the U.S. on a university campus.

We also have received a multidisciplinary research grant from the program which has been used during this past year (the first year of our grant) to support creative, multidisciplinary, space-related research by 15 different faculty members and to support approximately 20 graduate students as research assistants on these projects.

NORMAN TOPPING,
President, University of Sourthern California.

The following are from institutions in the State of Colorado:

FORT COLLINS, COLO.,
June 19, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge full support for restoration of 10 million dollar appropriation for NASA sustaining university program. Without supporting program Colorado State University would not be able to train 22 students now enrolled in space program or do important space research underway. Increase rather than reduction in support needed for educational and research programs which assure competence in space program next decade.

WILLIAM E. MORGAN,
President, Colorado State University.

UNIVERSITY OF DENVER,
Denver, Colo., June 19, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ECKHARDT: I am responding to your letter of June 14, 1967 concerning the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's sustaining University program. The University of Denver has had excellent relationships with NASA under this program and we have felt for some time that it is one of the most attractive programs available for colleges and universities. We have benefited greatly both from research funds and from the opportunities afforded graduate students to study under this program.

I know I speak for all members of the faculty in hoping that you and your colleagues will be able to keep this fine program operating at a significant level.

Sincerely yours,

WILBUR C. MILLER,
Acting Chancellor

The following is from an institution in the District of Columbia:

GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY,
June 19, 1967.

Hon. ROBERT ECKHARDT,
House of Representatives, Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ECKHARDT: In response to your letter of June 14, 1967, addressed to President Lloyd H. Elliott, I am pleased to submit the following comments on the operation of the NASA supported sustaining program at the George Washington University.

The University was enabled, through an institutional grant from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, to establish a Program of Policy Studies in Science and Technology commencing September 1, 1966. While this Program has been in operation for a relatively brief period, we can already identify several positive and significant gains for the University.

The establishment of this cross-disciplinary program, which focuses upon the ways in which advancing science and technology can be effectively applied to the analysis and solution of major social problems, has promoted the following important University objectives:

1. Provided a policy analysis function appropriate to a major university in the Nation's capital

2. Provided the means by which policy-oriented faculty members in the various Schools and Departments of the University can pursue their research interests in an effective manner

3. Encouraged the introduction of new courses and seminars into University curricula relating to science, technology and public policy

4. Provided a University-Community Forum assuring a continuing interaction of University faculty members with representatives of government, industry, and various community groups.

Through these activities, the Program of Policy Studies in Science and Technology has been able to generate a most useful exchange within the University on pressing matters of public policy. The research capability of the University in the policy analysis field has been substantially enhanced. The Program's activities assure a continuing review and revision of the content of University courses involving science and public policy. Further, the research staff and faculty engaged with the Program are in position to apply their talents to the extremely important problem of utilizing scientific and technological advance for the benefit of the whole society.

I wish to emphasize that the institutional grant arrangement has a value to the University in terms of increased research capability, quality of instruction, and improved University-Community relationship which is far superior to the project-by-project grant and contract relationship. Through the sustaining grant we are able to plan for a reasonable period in advance. This enables us to attract better people, to do research studies in greater depth, and to add both stability and flexibility to our research efforts.

We are pleased to have this opportunity to explain briefly the operation of our sustaining grant program.

Sincerely,

LOUIS H. MAYO,
Vice President, Advanced Policy Studies.

The following is from an institution in the State of Florida:

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA,
Gainesville, Fla., June 16, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ECKHARDT: In reply to your letter to President Reitz of June 14 I should like to make the following comments since I am chairman of our local steering committee for the NASA institutional grant. This grant is for 335,000 dollars per year and it represents more than fifty per cent of our support for research in the broad area of the space sciences. There are at present 27 research projects in engineering, physical and biological sciences operating under this grant. I would also estimate that there are

upwards of fifty PhD students involved in these research activities. Hence it has an important relationship to our graduate program.

Next fall we will put into operation the new NASA Space Sciences Research Building. This is a multi-disciplinary research effort which will be heavily dependent upon continuation of the NASA Institutional Grant. In my personal opinion the NASA Institutional Grant has been excellently administered both from Washington and locally. It has been highly productive of published research and has been an effective supplement to the traineeship and fellowship programs in completing the last stage of dissertation research for numerous PhDs. We greatly appreciate your efforts to continue such support.

Sincerely,

L. E. GRINTER, *Dean.*

The following are from institutions in the State of Georgia:

EMORY UNIVERSITY,
Atlanta, Ga., June 19, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of June 14 addressed to President Atwood has been referred to me for reply. Emory has had a program of NASA Traineeships for three years. We begin our fourth year in September 1967. This program has been of great assistance to our graduate program in the biological and physical sciences. NASA Traineeships have been awarded in the departments of biochemistry (1), biology (2), Chemistry (4), mathematics (2), psychology (1), and statistics and biometry (1).

The two 1964 awardees are completing their traineeships in Summer 1967. Both were outstanding graduate students. Mr. Benjamin C. Clark, Chemistry, earned his Master of Science degree in Spring Quarter 1967; it is possible he may receive the Ph. D. in Summer 1967. Mr. Samuel C. Mozley, Biology, received the Master of Science degree in Summer 1966. He has passed his doctoral examinations and expects to earn the Ph. D. soon. Mr. Mozley in 1967–68 has been awarded a research fellowship by the Federal Water Pollution Control Agency, Department of the Interior.

The three trainees under the 1965 grant have either been awarded the Master of Science degree, or have finished the master's work. All of them are now working actively toward the Ph. D. and are expected to continue doing so during 1967–68, the final year of the grant. These trainees are Miss Reba Kay Wright, Biochemistry; Mr. Edward H. Leiter, Biology; and Glenn Francis Webb, Mathematics. Mr. Leiter presently is conducting research at the Marine Biological Laboratory, Woods Hole, Massachusetts.

One of the four trainees under the 1966 grant resigned his traineeship. The other three are still working toward the Master of Science degree and are expected to be enrolled at Emory during 1967–68, when a replacement also will fill the vacated traineeship. The two new awards granted in 1967 have been accepted by graduate students in chemistry and psychology, and will begin tenure in September, 1967.

The NASA grants have provided stipends and (where appropriate) dependency allowances for all trainees, and travel funds in the grants have enabled trainees to attend professional meetings in the fields of their interest. Emory University has provided full tuition for all NASA trainees.

Thus far in the program, $21,400 has been applied to faculty salaries in the participating departments. These supplementary funds have made it possible to add new faculty members in mathematics (Dr. William S. Mahavier), in biology (Dr. P. Edward Bostwick), and in physiological psychology (Dr. Barbara S. Uehling). Each grant provided a small budget for library purchases, and these funds have been used to augment library holdings in certain interdisciplinary areas such as geophysics, geochemistry, space physics and biophysics.

The supporting funds provided by NASA have brought a group of distinguished scientists to Emory for lectures and conferences. The first of these was Dr. Charles C. Wunder, Department of Physiology, State University of Iowa, who lectured on "Life in a Non-Terrestrial Gravity." In May 1966, Dr. Donald B. Lindsley, University of California at Los Angeles, one of the nation's leading psychologists, spoke on "Brain Organization and Behavior" and "The Role of Thalamo-Cortical Systems in Attention and Perception." In May 1967, Professor Svetozar Kurepa, Department of Mathematics, Georgetown University, a noted Yugoslav mathematician from the University of Zagreb, discussed 'Entire Functions" at the mathematics colloquium. Dr. John Theios, University of Texas, and Dr. B. J. Underwood, Northwestern University, under the auspices of the Emory Psychology Graduate Club, lectured on the subjects of "An Evaluation of Incremental and Discrete Theories of Classical Iyelid Conditioning" and "Some Implications of Implicit Associative Responses" respectively. The following visitors came at the invitation of the Chemistry Department and lectured on the subjects indicated: Dr. William Parker, University of Wisconsin, "Diterpene Chemistry"; Dr. A. J. Poe, Imperial College, University of London, "The Trans-Effect in Octahedral Rhodium Complexes"; Dr. Charles Tanford, Biochemistry Department, Duke University, "Chemical Basis for Antibody specificity, Protein Structure, and Denaturation"; and Dr. Thomas Spencer, Dartmouth College, "Diterpene Chemistry." Guest lecturer in the Biochemistry area was Dr. Salih J. Wakil, Professor of Biochemistry at the Duke University Medical Center, who discussed "Fatty Acids Synthesis." Other visiting lecturers in the Mathematics Department were Professor B. H. Neumann, University of Wisconsin ("Mononomic Varieties") and Professor Karl Menger, Illinois Institute of Technology ("A Characterization of Analytic Functions"). The support by the NASA grants in this area has been of great benefit, and further visitors are scheduled.

As a direct result of the general stimulus in the scientific area produced by the NASA training grants, Emory has begun a program to increase and upgrade its faculty in physics. We expect to continue this development and begin Ph. D. work in physics by the fall of 1968.

Yours truly,

CHAS. T. LESTER,
Dean.

GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,
Atlanta, Ga., June 17, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ECKHARDT: I am happy to respond to your letter of June 14 regarding the NASA sustaining university program. We deem this to be of utmost importance.

This program has been of great value to Georgia Tech and, I believe, to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's total effort. We have participated in a continuing grant program since June, 1964. Because of the continuing nature of this grant over a three year period, now extended through 1970, we have been able to make concentrated approaches to problems impossible to solve in a short length of time.

The grant has been used to support research in the physical and engineering sciences which has a clear relevance to the nation's space effort. The major areas of activity which have been supported are (1) materials and materials processing, (2) transport phenomena, (3) energy conversion, (4) systems research, and (5) nuclear processes. In a typical year, forty projects involving fifty faculty members and fifty graduate students received support from the grant. Some insight into the varied character of the research may be gained from consideration of the following project titles selected from the forty which appear in the last Annual Report of the President of the Georgia Institute of Technology:

1. Preparation of new and unusual complex metal hydrides
2. Development of a drift-tube mass spectrometer for studies in atomic collisions
3. Electrical conductivities and thermodynamics of seeded plasmas
4. Computer-aided control system synthesis
5. Fast neutron cross section studies of astrophysical interest.

We have now begun to concentrate on fewer, larger, even more complex problems than before and our future efforts will reflect this philosophy as another step in making positive contributions to our nation's overall space and scientific efforts.

I am most enthusiastic about the concept of the sustaining university program because it allows smaller, yet excellent, institutions to develop the capability of the highest type of research which will not only benefit the space program directly by the research results, but indirectly in the future because of the continued research that will have been 'seeded' by these efforts. The importance of this program cannot be over-emphasized in my estimation.

I hope that you are successful in your efforts in the House of Representatives to have this program retained and funded.

Sincerely,

EDWIN D. HARRISON,
President.

The following is from an institution in the State of Idaho:

UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO,
Moscow, Idaho, June 20, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ECKHARDT: Your request for information concerning the effective operation of a sustaining university program at the University of Idaho has been received.

I am sorry to say, even though we did make application for these funds, our proposals were not accepted. We, therefore, do not have any of the money appropriated for the sustaining university program. Even though we were not successful in gaining a grant, we do feel that the program is worthwhile. Perhaps better geographical distribution of the funds would make them more useful. I do not believe the State of Idaho has any funds appropriated for that purpose. We certainly are, however, in favor of the program.

Sincerely,

H. WALTER STEFFENS,
Academic Vice President.

The following are from institutions in the State of Illinois:

ILLINOIS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,
Chicago, June 19, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. ECKHARDT: The NASA Sustaining University Program has been very important to the development of graduate programs in engineering and science at the Illinois Institute of Technology. We have received support under this program for the training of graduate students in space-related science and technology for a period of four

years. During these four years, our graduate enrollment has more than doubled from 379 to 836; the number of Master's degrees awarded has increased from 141 to 292; the number of Ph. D. degrees awarded has increased from 41 to 71.

This growth, which meets an important national need, has been made possible in large measure by the support, received from NASA through its Sustaining University Program. Owing to curtailment of that program, support for NASA Trainees at IIT for the coming year has been cut in half. If such a reduction remains in effect in succeeding years, our ability to train graduate students in science and engineering will be substantially impaired.

The NASA Sustaining University Program is an imaginative program which has been administered with great understanding. It has been a strong favorable impact upon American universities, adding substantially to their strength in science and technology. I give this program my strongest endorsement.

Sincerely yours,

J. T. RETTALIATA,
President.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY,
Evanston, Ill., June 19, 1967.

Subject: Effects of sustaining university program at Northwestern.

Re your letter to President Miller, dated June 14, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
Committee on Science and Astronautics,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. ECKHARDT: Northwestern's participation to date has been largely through traineeships, with a pending involvement with the multidisciplinary research program during FY 1968.

The traineeship program has facilitated the build-up of graduate training and the critical areas of study in sciences and engineering.

The phenomenal growth of doctoral study in the U.S. has come largely through the efforts of the Federal Government. The recruitment of young people to these activities has been supported by the government's furnishing approximately 20,000 fellowships and traineeships for new students each year. This is a potential of perhaps 15,000 additional Ph. D.'s per year, four or five years later. With the assistance of these kinds of support, Northwestern has been able to increase its full-time graduate enrollment in the sciences and engineering from 258 students in 1957 to 668 in 1965–66. This has resulted in proportionate increases in science-engineering doctoral degrees awarded—from 35 in 1957 to 94 in 1966. This increase in degrees conferred, coupled with the increased costs of dissertation expenses, has been made with the recent assistance of federal fellowships and traineeships in these areas of specialty.

Reduction in these activities, with no foreseeable substitutes at a time when the pool of available students has just hit the graduate school level, would be a serious deterrent to the nation's science and technological goals at the very time when its dependence upon scientific and technological studies will be even greater than they have been in the past.

Serious reductions already made threaten the recruitment of science and engineering graduate students into critical areas of study in private universities, where other forms of subsidy are at a minimum. This support for doctoral work through traineeships and fellowships in the science-engineering areas has been rising, but for the next year has already been cut to the extent of 50% from NSF, 50% from NASA, and is threatened to be cut 50% by NDEA Title IV sources. Private universities, particularly, have no other recourse but to reduce their commitments. At Northwestern, increased fellowship contributions from university funds have already been made—$40,000 increase last year; $150,000 for next year, etc. But this is insufficient to meet the pressing needs.

The great onslaught of students at the college level just now begins to appear at the graduate level, when the sons of World War II veterans begin to make their appearance. If this generation of students is denied the financial assistance that their predecessors had, they and the nation will suffer the consequences.

In addition to the fellowship program, the support of research under the Sustaining University Program in NASA is of equal importance. Northwestern now has a proposal pending in NASA. The Sustaining Program will permit strengthening of research related to space exploration. Flexible funds are urgently needed by universities to maintain balance in research and research training and to preserve the unique aspects of institutions of higher education. The Sustaining Program provides an opportunity to get young investigators launched more expeditiously and effectively and to provide for the scientific strength that we will require in the future.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. D. COOPER.

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY,
Carbondale, Ill., June 19, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Replying your letter dated June 14 re amendment to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's 1968 authorizations adding 10 million dollars for the sustaining university program. Southern Ill university does not share in the current sustaining program. It does participate in NASA fellowship research. The university would favor the increase of 10 million dollars recommended. In the hope that additional universities might share in the sustaining university programs.

DELYTE W. MORRIS,
President, Southern Illinois University.

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY,
Carbondale, Ill., June 19, 1967.

Hon. ROBERT ECKHARDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Disregard previous correction quote wire. Southern Illinois University's participation in the NASA sustaining university program is concerned with training scientists. Presently this program supports two Phd candidates in chemistry and one in mathematics. This support will be increased to three chemists and two mathematicians starting 1 September 1967. This training support has done much to stimulate interest in space science on this campus as evidenced by the increasing competition for these traineeships and the candidates selected are of the highest quality. Southern Illinois University is proud to be a part of the NASA sustaining program for we feel that it is of national significance in training scientists in the space sciences.

We feel that a reduction in support for the sustaining university program might seriously effect our Nation's future space science capabilities and we urge Congress to consider increased support for this program unquote.

DELYTE W. MORRIS,
President, Southern Illinois University.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS,
Champaign, Ill., June 19, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Though the University of Illinois has had no grant under the sustaining university program in October it will dedicate a three million dollar coordinated sciences laboratory built with the aid of a 1,125,000 dollar grant from NASA. The maximum utilization of this laboratory in the research training of graduate students in space-related sciences and in the performance of research valuable to the space effort will depend heavily upon research funds from NASA, preferably under the sustaining university program.

DANIEL ALPERT,
Dean, Graduate College, University of Illinois.

The following are from institutions in the State of Indiana:

INDIANA UNIVERSITY,
Bloomington, Ind., June 19, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ECKHARDT: I appreciate the opportunity to respond to your request for information concerning the impact of the NASA Sustaining University Program upon Indiana University. My response has been delayed only long enough to secure all of the desired information. I hope that it will be useful.

Indiana University has participated in this Program only through a relatively small traineeship project. During the academic year ending June 30, 1967, we have had a total of 24 NASA trainees in residence, of whom 12 were newly appointed first year trainees. These trainees are among our most able graduate students, yet many are in fields for which there is little fellowship support available. For this coming academic year the number of new traineeships approved for funding has been reduced from 12 to 6, and we will have a total of only 16 trainees in residence. The subvention to the University, including the traineeship stipends, amounted to approximately $140,000 in 1966–67.

Indiana University, unlike many large state universities, does not have a program in engineering. Nevertheless, our basic science program is extensive, and the scientific research and training carried on here has both direct and indirect significance for the space agency program. We have important research projects, for example, in such fields as information retrieval (ARAC), astrophysics, and stress physiology which are of primary interest to NASA, and we are engaged in the training of new scientists, a function of vital consequence to the continuing development of scientific research beyond the immediate future. Indiana University has actively sought to expand its program in the applied sciences, but thus far, funds have not been available in sufficient quantity for us to begin realizing this objective to any appreciable extent.

As the trainee figures indicate, our support from the NASA Sustaining University Progam has been decreased considerably for next year. This decrease has occurred concurrently with decreases in new grants from most fellowship sources. The number of new NSF traineeships decreased this year as did the number of new NDEA Title IV fellowships and the number of new NDFL fellowships (Title VI). Clearly, the decrease in NASA support cannot be argued on the grounds that other sources of support are increasing. The opposite is the case.

At the same time it should be noted that costs of education are rising and many more graduate students are seeking admission. The number of graduate applicants to Indiana University is expected to increase significantly next year, but many of these students will be denied the opportunity to attend the University for lack of financial aid.

As we see it, the increasing needs, demands, and costs all indicate that the Sustaining University Program of NASA should be expanded rather than contracted or even

leveled off. The proposed decreases in funding, if allowed to remain, would surely have a deleterious effect on the nation's scientific capability in the next decade and conceivably even longer.

Thank you for soliciting our evaluation.

Sincerely,

ELVIS J. STAHR,
President.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY,
Lafayette, Ind., June 19, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN ECKHARDT: It has come to our attention that the level of Fiscal Year 1968 funding authorization for the sustaining university program of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is soon to be taken up by the House of Representatives. Since this particular NASA program has had a salient impact upon the graduate education and research efforts of Purdue University, I feel compelled to let you know about the ways in which the sustaining university program has been effective. Each of the three branches of the program—predoctoral training grants, basic research grants, and facilities grants—has contributed to Purdue's development in space-related disciplines.

As emphasized repeatedly in the scientific and technical manpower studies of the National Science Foundation, the need for doctoral and postdoctoral training is not being met. Whereas, prior to World War II, colleges and universities were the principal employers of doctoral recipients, we now find ourselves in an age so technically complex that industry, government, and the colleges and universities are in competition for our available manpower resources. I see no evidence at the moment that the situation is likely to change.

The training of scientists and engineers has become truly interdisciplinary. No agency of the government has been more understanding of this need than NASA. The award of NASA traineeships to predoctoral candidates at Purdue in sixteen different departments within five different schools of the University is evidence of the breadth and depth of the educational and research problems of the space age. Seven of our nine schools and departments of engineering have NASA trainee fellowships, as does each of our basic science departments (biology, chemistry, mathematics, and physics). In addition, students in pharmacy, plant and animal sciences, psychology, and sociology are being supported.

A recent development in the predoctoral training program is the initiation at five universities (including Purdue) of projects to provide predoctoral training oriented toward engineering systems design. This new approach seems likely to answer a need expressed by industrial firms and governmental agencies and reported in the preliminary publication of the "Report of the Goals Study of the American Society for Engineering Education." The need is for engineers trained in depth to the Ph. D. degree and motivated toward creative design as well as for engineers trained in the classical research-oriented programs. With the large undergraduate enrollments in the Purdue Schools of Engineering, the "fallout" from the NASA-supported training program in engineering systems design is expected to have a strong influence not only on our graduate students in engineering, but also on our undergraduate students.

An ever-increasing number of scientists now require training beyond the Ph. D. level. This trend, which is now well established, will continue because of the complexity of the problems confronting us. The chemist and the physicist are now entering biology at the postdoctoral level. The engineer and the biologist have created the new discipline of bioengineering, and the physicist, the mathematician, and the engineer must combine their talents as we move ahead in the computer sciences, nuclear engineering, high energy physics, systems engineering, and a host of space-related programs.

Support of research efforts by postdoctoral personnel, regular faculty members, and predoctoral graduate students has been forthcoming at a modest level from the research funds available in the NASA sustaining university program. A continuing grant to the University for multidisciplinary research in space-related sciences and engineering has partially supported the research of about seventy staff members and graduate students and has influenced the work of others. The grant is helping the University move toward achievement of a number of objectives, four of which may be of particular interest:

1) Increasing the scope of interdisciplinary activities in the University

2) Establishing a closer, more productive working relationship with industry for the transfer of results of such activities and of all university research

3) Increasing the production of graduates needed by industry and government

4) Establishing new standards for professional education, particularly in engineering, so that the engineer can play an increasingly productive role in society

Other individual research grants to Purdue University on behalf of specified principal investigators (researchers) and their teams of graduate students provide project support to several of our engineering, science, and life science departments.

Thus, such topics as automatic control systems and theory; propulsion systems; remote infrared sensing systems for surveying and recording agricultural crop conditions from aircraft, or more likely in the future from orbiting laboratories; communication theory and systems; water-clay systems and their effect upon biological activity; high precision spectroscopy; measurement of lunar and planetary surface characteristics by means of random signal radar; and basic studies in fluid dynamics—all of which have great potential for applications in industries in general as well as in the space industries—are being pursued in depth at Purdue University through sponsorship by NASA. Through the involvement of the teaching faculty and graduate students on these and other such subjects, our graduate educational programs are enriched by these research activities.

A modest facilities grant from NASA's sustaining university program has made it possible for us to add a high pressure propulsion test laboratory to our Jet Propulsion Center on the campus. This will provide our propulsion researchers with the continued capability to be in the front ranks among the few universities which have programs in propulsion. In addition to the facilities grant, considerable NASA research support has been afforded the Jet Propulsion Center which, through its research activities and through later career activities of its graduates, has made and continues to make contributions to the space effort—as well as to the solution of problems for non-space industries.

Purdue's Jet Propulsion Center students have earned thirty-three Ph. D. degrees and one hundred seventy-one Master of Science degrees to date. A graduate of the Purdue Jet Propulsion Center is President of Aerojet's Operating Nuclear Company; another, Chief of the Liquid Rocket Division of Aerojet. Others include the Chief Scientist of the Army Mobility Command; Acting Chief of the Long-Range Planning Division of Aerospace Corporation; the Vice President at Ling-Temco-Vought in charge of V/STOL production; Pratt & Whitney's director for the application of aircraft gas turbine technology to stationary plants and inter-city transportation; two founders and heads of companies based in aerospace technology.

I am sure that you can see that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, through its sustaining university program, has been an effective sponsor of research and graduate education at Purdue University. All three parts of the NASA sustaining university program—predoctoral training, research, and facilities—have contributed appropriately to the growth and sophistication of our space-related departments and have accordingly upgraded the graduates of those departments. I feel sure that the future accomplishments of the graduates of those departments will bear this out.

Yours sincerely,

FREDERICK L. HOVDE,
President.

UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME,
Notre Dame, Ind., June 20, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ECKHARDT: Thank you for the opportunity to respond in support of your amendment to NASA's Fiscal Year 1968 authorization adding $10 million for the sustaining university program.

The University of Notre Dame was awarded a NASA Training Grant (Supplement No. 4) to support six new graduate students in space-related science and technology entering the program in September, 1967. The earlier quotas were as follows: eight new traineeships began in September, 1963; eight in September, 1964; ten in September, 1965; and ten in September, 1966. Thus the six to begin in September, 1967, is the smallest number since the program began.

The real problem is not that just one federal program supporting predoctoral studies is being curtailed, but that all of them are being curtailed, while each agency hopes that the loss will be picked up by one of the other agencies. In his letter of January 9, 1967, informing us of the six new NASA Traineeships to begin in September, 1967, at Notre Dame, Dr. Smull, Director of NASA's Office of Grants and Research Contracts, implied as much: "It may also be pointed out that other federal agencies charged primarily with the general support of higher education have in recent years substantially increased their predoctoral support programs in the areas of science and technology". However, you are already aware of the fact that the House recently cut the appropriation for graduate fellowships for 1968 under Title IV of the National Defense Education Act by $10 million. Unless the cut is restored by the Senate, as all university presidents and graduate deans sincerely hope, the net effect will be a reduction of NDEA Title IV Graduate Fellowships to begin in September, 1968, from 6000 to 3400.

The National Science Foundation's Traineeship and Fellowship Programs in support of graduate students were curtailed for September, 1967. To begin in September, 1966, Notre Dame was awarded sixteen new NSF Traineeships, whereas we were awarded twelve in September, 1967—a 25% reduction. Other universities experienced similar cuts.

Regarding research grants in science and technology for faculty members through which graduate students are supported as research assistants, the trend in the agencies seems to be to continue support for old projects or well-established professors and to curtail support for young faculty members. This has its impact on the universities across the land.

One could add as a postscript that the large Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Program after 1967–68 will no longer be supported by the Ford Foundation to offer 1000 first-year graduate fellowships per year. Thus,

a ten-year program which has made a quarter of its awards in Science over the years will cease.

The number of students seeking admission to graduate schools, and the needs of the country for personnel trained to the doctoral level, will continue to rise each year while at the same time the means of supporting graduate students will be drying up. Unless the trend to curtail federal support can be reversed, the graduate schools will first feel the pinch, and then the country which needs the highly trained product of the graduate school. We would soon be back where we were in 1958.

With all best wishes, I am,

Cordially yours,

Rev. THEODORE M. HESBURGH, C.S.C.,
President.

The following is from institution in the State of Iowa:

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY,
Ames, Iowa.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

NASA sustaining program very significant in meeting trained manpower needs. Has supported 61 Ph.D. trainees at Iowa State University. Urge Restoration of ten million to present funding level.

J. B. PAGE,
Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate College.

The following are from institutions in the State of Kansas:

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY,
Manhattan, Kans., June 19, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ECKHARDT: The National Aeronautics and Space Administration Sustaining University Program has provided valuable support for research in various scientific fields at Kansas State University. Research has covered the gamut from nozzle design for rocket vehicles within our Department of Mechanical Engineering, through complex biochemical studies related to metabolism performed in our Department of Biochemistry, to investigations of human performance as this may be related to the duties of the crew on a space mission.

The value of this support is manifold. It has been possible to support younger scientists with funds provided by NASA so that they might obtain sufficient recognition to seek continuing support from such agencies as the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, and the Department of Defense. Support by NASA has stimulated their interest in the space program and, accordingly, their work has not only provided valuable results but has increased their competence as scientists in fields of importance for our space program. Faculty members have been assisted in this research by graduate students, the interests of whom in turn have been influenced in a valuable way by the nature of this program. I heartily endorse the farsighted efforts of the Congress in its attempts to maintain this program at its present level.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. MCCAIN,
President.

THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS,
Lawrence, Kans., June 16, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
U.S. Representative from 8th District, Texas,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ECKHARDT: In response to your letter of June 14, 1967, to Chancellor Wescoe; I am happy to send you herewith one copy of our most recent proposal for renewal of the University of Kansas NASA sustaining grant. Although I believe you would find the entire proposal interesting and helpful, I am sure that the summary on pages 2 and 3 will provide in concise form the information you have requested concerning the effective operation of the NASA sustaining university program.

The University of Kansas has been far more than satisfied with the success of these NASA grants. They have assisted in a major way in the development of new lines of research in important interdisciplinary areas, and they have contributed most substantially to the development of an expanding advanced training capability as well as research effort in the broad field of space science.

If you should wish additional information, please call on me directly.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM J. ARGERSINGER, Jr.,
Associate Dean of Faculties.

The following are from institutions in the State of Kentucky:

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE,
Louisville, Ky., June 16, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
Eighth District, Texas, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ECKHARDT: I am writing with regard to your letter of June 14 concerning our sustaining university program under the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The program at the University is now under the direction of Dr. John A. Dillon, Jr., Dean of the Graduate School and Professor of Physics. Dean Dillon has had long and productive experience in research at Brown University before joining us last July.

The success of such a program must be judged on two criteria.

1) Does the program lead to meaningful research which strengthens science itself?

2) What impact does the program have on the University?

In answer to the first question, I would point out that our program involves faculty members and graduate students from the Departments of Biology, Chemistry, Engineering Physics, and Physics, who are working on problems in one way or another related to material science. A number of publications are about to emerge from this research, and the drawing together of the scientists from various departments in a common program has gone far toward breaking down some of the traditional barrier which have separated them. The various visitors we have had from NASA have all expressed satisfaction with the quality of the scientific effort being made.

In addition to the unifying influence this program has had, it has had other important impacts on the University's scientific program. It has enabled us to move more quickly into new areas (such as x-ray diffraction studies) and it has assisted some of the younger faculty members in starting research at a higher level than was possible previously. Thus it has greatly strengthened our programs in these related areas and has allowed us to advance much more quickly than would have been the case if this program had not existed.

Finally, it should be pointed out that the administration of the program from NASA Headquarters has been extremely thoughtful and helpful. Dean Dillon informs me that the outside administration has operated more smoothly than that of any other program with which he has been associated.

For all these reasons I want to offer my strong endorsement for the continuation of a program which has been ably administered, has advanced our scientific knowledge, and has been of great assistance to the University in developing its programs.

Sincerely,

PHILIP DAVIDSON,
President.

The following are from institutions in the State of Louisiana:

THE LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY,
Baton Rouge, La., June 19, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ECHKARDT: In reply to your letter of June 14, I am reviewing briefly some of the benefits that have resulted from the NASA Sustaining Research Grant to Louisiana State University. We have had this grant for only nine months; it was given to us in September, 1966. The grant is funded at present in the amount of $100,000/year.

Insofar as Federal funds are concerned, Louisiana State University has been a "have not" university in that until recently Federal funds and grants have been on the distinctly low side. Accordingly, we have derived a large relative benefit from the NASA grant since it has enabled us to initiate projects and developments which are growing and which will undoubtedly continue to grow. The following are some specific accomplishments which are attributable to the grant:

1. We have initiated a strong space-related research program involving 12 individual research projects in chemistry, physics, mathematics, mechanical, aerospace and materials engineering, and engineering mechanics. In general this research is of a basic nature, but some of the projects will have quite practical and technically useful results.

2. We have added one full-time faculty member and several others who are supported in part by the grant. This has strengthened our faculty considerably.

3. We have supported 10 graduate students who otherwise might not have been able to obtain graduate training.

4. As a result of this program, interest in NASA and space-oriented research has increased considerably throughout the University. We have had more contact with the NASA research centers and the resultant definition of areas of mutual interest has led to other research projects. This interest is reflected throughout the entire LSU System, not just the Baton Rouge campus.

5. In May a two-day symposium on "The Management and Technology of Space Exploration" was held on the Baton Rouge campus. This attracted many visitors and generated public and industrial interest in many facets of the space program.

6. Some of the research programs under the Sustaining Grant are broad in scope and require participation by faculty members from several different departments, crossing college boundaries in a few instances. This has set a pattern for truly interdisciplinary research in the University.

I hope that this information will be helpful to you.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. HUNTER,
President.

TULANE UNIVERSITY,
New Orleans, La., June 21, 1967.

BOB ECKHARDT,
Committee on Science and Astronautics,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Tulane University has no NASA sustaining program application submitted February 23, 1965. Revision submitted November 12, 1965. Negotiations for award unsuccessful.

FRED R. CAGLE,
Vice President.

The following are from institutions in the State of Massachusetts:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS,
Amherst, June 19, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
Committee on Science and Astronautics, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ECKHARDT: We were pleased to learn that through your efforts the Subcommittee on Space Sciences and Applications has restored $10 million to the NASA budget for 1968 to support the sustaining university program. Since 1965 we have participated in this program as recipients of contracts with NASA for Traineeships in the space-related sciences. The NASA Traineeship Program is unquestionably one of the finest conceived by the federal government to support graduate education in the U.S. This program not only permits us to support the most able students in the Space Sciences but also provides the facilities and equipment necessary for sophisticated research in these areas. We do not feel that any present federal program can replace the Traineeships now supported by NASA unless other federal offices supporting graduate education change their present policies.

At present we have sixteen of our most capable students being supported by the NASA Traineeship Program. Since our first Traineeships were awarded in 1965, most of the recipients of these awards will not receive their PhD degrees until the end of the current academic year. However two of our trainees who have completed their studies are now employed in industry conducting space-related research. One of these students is exploring problems in target recognition, decision-making, information processing, and controller dynamics. Another is supervising a research program dealing with man-computer decision-making in an antisubmarine warfare setting. Currently these two students are making an important contribution to the space and defense efforts of the U.S.

We hope to be the recipient of additional Traineeships as well as funds for research facilities in the future under NASA's sustaining university program. We congratulate you on your efforts to maintain the present level of expenditures of Federal government in this area and wish you every success in your floor fight in the House in support of your committee's report.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. LEDERLE,
President.

WORCESTER POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE,
Worcester, Mass., June 19, 1967.

Mr. BOB ECKHARDT,
Committee on Science and Astronautics, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ECKHARDT: Thank you very much for your letter dated June 14 to President Storke. President Storke is on vacation at the present time and I am taking the liberty of answering your letter in his absence.

At the present time, Worcester Polytechnic Institute is benefiting to the extent of $66,567 per year in the form of NASA Traineeships. The support has been of great value in the developing of our graduate study program and we are very much in hopes that future allotments of funds will not be decreased.

Sincerely,

M. LAWRENCE PRICE,
Vice-President and Dean of Faculty.

TUFTS UNIVERSITY,
June 20, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Respectfully urge reinforcement of NASA sustaining university program. Withdrawal of support would adversely affect our graduate program.

LEONARD C. MEAD,
Acting President.

The following is from an institution in the State of Michigan:

MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY,
Houghton, Mich., June 19, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ECKHARDT: In reply to your letter of June 14, Michigan Tech does not have a sustaining university NASA program at the present time. We have made several visits to the Washington office and have a proposal in preparation.

We support the idea wholeheartedly and think that it is unique in support of research for higher education. It helps overcome the grantsmanship activities of highly mobile professors. There is an element in any university of people who tie research grants to their own activities and then use them as negotiating points with other universities. Michigan Tech is small and has not experienced this as yet. However, the problem does exist and would be helped tremendously with the sustaining grant program. Since this program does require several departments working together, it forces cooperation and interdisciplinary research where such research would not previously have been possible.

Good luck at your hearings.

Sincerely,

R. L. SMITH,
President.

The following are from institutions in the State of Missouri:

THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI AT ROLLA,
Rolla, Mo., June 16, 1967.

Representative BOB ECKHARDT,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ECKHARDT: I sincerely appreciate your affording the University an opportunity to contribute to the information you are assembling in defense of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's sustaining university program.

Unfortunately, this campus does not participate in the N.A.S.A. Sustaining Grant program at this time. In July of last year, we submitted a proposal for research support from the program, and, from all reports, the proposal received very favorable recommendations for support from the reviewers, however, a grant could not be made this fiscal year because of fund limitations.

We feel that the lack of support from this program is unfortunate, inasmuch as the University allocated some $350,000 this year to this campus from State funds to support our Space Science Research Center, in which we have invested some $1.5 million in the past four years. The Center consists of three research groups: Materials, Cloud Physics, and Electronics, and involves 26 members of the academic faculty, 8 non-academic staff members and 43 graduate students pursuing thesis research on projects relevant to the space program. Inasmuch as our Sustaining Grant proposal is still under consideration for support by N.A.S.A., we are most hopeful that favorable consideration can be given to your Subcommittee's recommendation for an additional $10 million for the sustaining university program this forthcoming fiscal year.

I am pleased to report that this campus of the University does participate in the N.A.S.A. Traineeship program. Six graduate students have been supported this academic year by a grant from this program, and this represented a significant contribution to our graduate thesis research in space-related problems. We had requested a total of 16 traineeships for this forthcoming academic year, based on our current and projected level of space-related research; however, we were advised recently that only four traineeships were to be granted for this period. Since we cannot increase the commitment of State monies to this research activity, we have no other alternative than to reduce the number of graduate students participating in the program.

In my judgment, this has been one of the most imaginative and effective programs for the support of university research, and I sincerely hope the above may be of assistance to your Subcommittee in its effort to solicit additional funding for the program.

Sincerely,

MERL BAKER,
Chancellor.

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI,
June 16, 1967.

Representative BOB ECKHARDT,
Committee on Science and Astronautics, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

The NASA sustaining grant program continues to play a vital part in the growth of the Space Sciences Research Center at the University of Missouri's Columbia campus. The center was created in response to a recommendation by the Governor's Scientific Advisory Board and the Missouri Legislature has seen fit to support the growth of the center. The sustaining program seems to be a very appropriate way for State and Federal agencies to cooperate to the mutual advantage of each. The sustaining program has had solid impact on the educational program of the campus. By its very nature, the program is multidisciplinary. Numerous examples could be cited to show how the sustaining program has served as a catalyst in bringing together faculty of widely diverse interests to work on common problems. The education of students is greatly enriched by such interactions.

Numerous instances could be cited to show how research generated by the program has "spun-off" into other areas. Research results have been presented at a number of international scientific meetings. On this campus space-related research findings have been applied to such seemingly unrelated areas as crop growth and early detection of cerebral stroke.

Locally-administered grants help to balance and round out a typical university program. Through mechanisms such as this, the young research man can get his work started and the senior research man can experiment in new areas. In this way, then, both may contribute even more to the Nation's research effort through normal granting channels. This progression has been very noticeable in the Missouri program.

The university feels that the total educational experience it can offer its student has been greatly enriched by the sustaining program. NASA, of course, has pioneered in this area and is to be commended for its foresight.

ELLIS R. GRAHAM,
Associate Dean for Research.

The following are from institutions in the States of Minnesota and Montana:

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,
Minneapolis, Minn., June 19, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ECKHARDT: Under the Sustaining University Program of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the University of Minnesota has received grants enabling it to participate in programs of interest to both NASA and the University. Among these have been grants for facilities, graduate traineeships, and multidisciplinary research in space science and technology.

The two facilities grants awarded to the University of Minnesota have resulted in a two-story addition to a wing of the Physics Building to house the University's rapidly ex-

panding program in space physics and a Space Science Center building to accommodate an equally rapidly expanding University program in the physical, biological, medical, and engineering sciences related directly to NASA's mission. These facilities grants have been necessary to enable a state university to provide facilities for research programs at a pace which matches the growth at the University of experimental programs geared to NASA's interests. The pace of NASA's programs is an exhilarating one which has captured the imagination and enthusiasm of university scientists and in the recent past NASA has been quick to observe that it was necessary to aid the universities with expanded facilities if it were to capitalize on the interests of these university scientists. Naturally, much of the research carried on in these facilities constructed with NASA's help, although NASA oriented, has widespread application in our defense effort, in the public health field, and other elements of the public sector as well as in the civilian economy. Without suport of NASA for the expansion of experimental facilities at the University of Minnesota, newly developed or expanded programs in microbiological contamination, simulation of engineering control processes, properties of unusual materials, computer hardware, to name but a few, would have been severely limited. The facilities portion of the Sustaining University Program has enabled the University of Minnesota to carry out a wide variety of research programs which would have been otherwise impossible because of lack of suitable space.

The University of Minnesota was one of the first universities to participate in NASA's Graduate Traineeship Program. Under this program, fifteen graduate students per year have started in a traineeship of three years' duration in the space related disciplines. As a consequence, each year forty-five (45) graduate students have been enrolled in instructional programs and have been carrying out research leading to Ph.D. degrees. This is a significant contribution to the professionally trained manpower pool of the United States. The University of Minnesota has been disturbed to see NASA decreasing its support of the graduate traineeship program. There does not appear to be any leveling off of the national demand for Ph.D.'s in science, engineering, and related disciplines, and the University of Minnesota is not able with its own resources to compensate for such a decline in support of graduate traineeship programs by a major federal agency. Although a university such as the University of Minnesota contributes in many ways to the programs of federal agencies, a university is unique as a contributor of professionally trained manpower.

Since 1965, the University has been the recipient of a sustaining grant for multidisciplinary research in the space science and technology. This grant is step-funded and presently is running at a level of $400,000 per year. The sustaining grants provided by NASA have been a feature of its grants program of remarkable effectiveness. With the sustaining grant, the University of Minnesota has been able to initiate new programs and augment existing programs for which external support is essential at a pace unusual in a university environment. Since practically all of the administration of the sustaining grant is carried out by university personnel, the University through its Space Science Center has been able to initiate new programs without the costly delay inherent in seeking support for such new programs from federal agencies. This has been a particularly beneficial aspect of the sustaining grant since it has been possible to provide support for the new and younger members of the faculty who normally experience extensive delays in obtaining funds to mount new experimental programs. In addition, the Space Science Center has been able to identify University and national needs in the space related areas and with the sustaining grant has been able to take steps toward satisfying these needs.

For example, although there has been a serious national shortage of Ph.D.'s trained to carry out research in land-based astronomy, the University of Minnesota has not been able to generate the support necessary to become a Ph.D. granting institution in astronomy. With the aid of the Space Science Center through its sustaining grant, experimental equipment essential to the development of a Ph.D. program in astronomy has been assembled. This has acted as a catalyst and within a few years the University of Minnesota expects to join the handful of American institutions which produce Ph.D.'s in astronomy. In a similar fashion, the sustaining grant has been used to augment the University's research capabilities in electrochemistry. This augmentation of research capabilities in a field of such importance to both the defense and civilian economy would have been delayed several years if the sustaining grant had not been available. There are many more situations in which the sustaining grant has enabled the University of Minnesota to make major steps forward in its research capabilities. Among the fields which have derived benefit in this way have been control science, computer technology, bioengineering, etc. In the two years which the University of Minnesota has had the NASA sustaining grant, the grant has been used to initiate over thirty research programs. Many of these programs would not have been possible without the grant and the initiation of many others would have been seriously delayed. The effectiveness of the grant as an instrument of growth of research capabilities has been multiplied manifold by the flexibility inherent in its application. The sustaining NASA grant has been a major instrument in development of the University of Minnesota in the past two years.

Finally, it must be remarked that the effectiveness of NASA's sustaining university program is not as accurately gauged by the funds available at the University in the program as it is by the enthusiasm and interest which NASA has been able to generate with this program. The imagination which NASA has brought to its interaction with universities has generated in the university community an abundance of good will which should stand as a model for other federal agencies. The University of Minnesota is hopeful that the current decrease in the NASA university program is only a temporary reflection of the increasing demands on the national economy and not symptomatic of a trend away from an imaginative program. The University of Minnesota is pleased with the attention that the Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications has paid to the change in scope and direction of NASA's Program.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM G. SHEPHERD,
Vice-President, Academic Administration.

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY,
Bozeman, Mont., June 20, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
House of Representatives Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ECKHARDT: President Johnson of Montana State University has been away from the campus and your letter of June 14 reached my desk just this morning. I regret that our reply will not reach you before June 20 as you requested.

The sustaining university program of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has been of great benefit to Montana State University. During the past several years, the grant funds under this program provided the financial base for expanding and upgrading the activities of our Department of Physics. We now have a strong program in Physics with the funding having been absorbed by the University and by research grants from a variety of sources.

We are now using our sustaining university grant to develop faculty competence in biometeorology and in materials science in the same manner that we used these funds to develop our Department of Physics.

We have found the sustaining university program of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to be one of the most productive of the several Federal programs of support to higher education.

Sincerely yours,

ROY E. HUFFMAN,
Vice President for Research.

The following is from an institution in the State of Nebraska:

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA,
Lincoln, Nebr., June 19, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ECKHARDT: Chancellor Hardin has asked me to respond to your letter of June 14th regarding the effect of NASA's sustaining program at our institution.

NASA's support is relatively small but it plays a vital role in our programs of research and graduate education in the sciences and engineering. The support has been particularly useful in assisting us to secure much needed equipment.

We hope this important program can be continued and indeed expanded.

Sincerely,

JAMES C. OLSON,
Dean.

The following is from an institution in the State of New Mexico:

NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY,
University Park, N. Mex., June 16, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
Committee on Science and Astronautics,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ECKHARDT: New Mexico State University has had a NASA Sustaining Grant for $150,000/yr. for the last two years. This has been one of the most valuable grants ever given to the University. Approximately one-half of each year's appropriation went to the astronomy section to support the purchase of a very fine 24" telescope plus accessory equipment, all of which is now installed and in use. The University supplied land, road and building. Without this aid the University would not have been able to support the total cost of such a facility. The new telescope is already paying off in obtaining superb photographs of the planets which are of much value to NASA.

The remainder of the appropriation went to individual faculty in many departments of the University. Projects were supported in the fields of astronomy, geology, biology, biochemistry, chemistry, physics, economics, mechanical engineering and computer sciences. All together this year there were 22 faculty, 27 graduate students, 6 undergraduates directly supported by the grant. This resulted in 21 papers presented at scientific meetings, and 45 papers either published or in process of publication.

This grant is extremely valuable for the following reasons:

1. It gives a developing university more freedom to develop and support areas of strength.

2. It furnishes support for young unestablished researchers who have difficulty obtaining individual direct support from foundations.

3. It trains many graduate students who will be our future leaders in the space science fields.

4. It furnishes funds for equipment which

is not only valuable for research but also can be used in teaching.

5. It attracts promising young scientists and engineers to join the faculty as they know that support may be possible from the grant.

6. It develops a research atmosphere on the campus and stimulates research in departments that do not directly benefit from the NASA grant, such as the Arts and Humanities.

7. For developing universities that are determined to become centers of excellence, such as New Mexico State University, this is an essential type of grant.

New Mexico State University feels that there should be more active general support of the university grant. The appropriations for it should be increased. It is our firm opinion that money spent in this way is repaid several times over in better trained scientists and engineers and in results from research and in strengthening the universities in the sciences and engineering.

Sincerely,

R. B. CORBETT,
President.

The following are from institutions in the State of New Jersey:

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY,
PRINCETON, N.J.,
June 20, 1967.

Hon. ROBERT ECKHARDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

In reply to your letter of June 14 to President Goheen, we would like to reply as follows:

Under the NASA sustaining university program, Princeton University has applied for funds under all three major categories.

We have participated in the NASA traineeship program since its inception. These traineeships and their associated cost of education monies are of great importance in the graduate program of 13 of our science and engineering departments. They had become a major element in the planning of future graduate studies in all of the departments concerned. The unanticipated cutback in the program this year has already strained the resources of these departments and certainly any further cutback will force us to revise the number of students we can admit and train in these areas.

In 1963 we received a grant of $625,000 under the facility grant program for a basic research laboratory wing for aerospace propulsion sciences which has proved to be of invaluable assistance to our program in this area.

Last year we submitted a proposal for a multidisciplinary research grant involving five departments of the university. We are informed that the proposal was carefully thought out, responsive, and presented an excellent mix of basic and applied efforts. However, NASA indicated that it could not provide the necessary funds because of the reduction in the sustaining university program.

I hope that the above information will be of assistance.

RAYMOND J. WOODROW,
Director, Office of Research and Project Administration.

RUTGERS, THE STATE UNIVERSITY,
New Brunswick, N.J., June 19, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ECKHARDT: Dr. Mason Gross, who is on a speaking engagement in Canada, has asked me to respond to your letter of June 14.

We commend you for your efforts to maintain and strengthen the sustaining university program of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. For your information I am enclosing a concise statement of the participation of Rutgers-The State University in this program. As you can see, this support not only assists the space-related areas of study but contributes to improved levels of excellence in this University.

Your efforts to maintain the present level of support for this sustaining university program is in keeping with the contentions of the American Council on Education which emphasizes, "the need for a sustained commitment." The uncertainties in levels of Federal support, which we must live through during the annual appropriations process, make it extremely confusing and difficult to hire the best faculty, assure support for the best students and overall sustain the best in education.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES R. WATSON.

Rutgers, the State University—National Aeronautics and Space Administration schedule of grants awarded, NSG (T)-97

Academic years	Total award	Years	Number of trainees
1964-67	$162,600	3	10
Supplement No. 1 1965-68	189,600	3	12
Supplement No. 2 1966-69	178,000	3	12
Grand total	530,200		

The following Departments of the University have participated in the above figures: Engineering, Economics, Botany, Physiology, Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, Psychology, Bacteriology, Zoology.

The following are from institutions in the State of New York:

CLARKSON COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY,
Potsdam, N.Y., June 16, 1967.

Hon. ROBERT ECKHARDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ECKHARDT: In the absence of President Graham from the campus. I would like to take this opportunity to reply to your letter of June 14, 1967 regarding the National Aeronautics and Space Administration sustaining university program.

Clarkson College does not currently have a sustaining university grant but we are in the process of preparing a proposal for submission to NASA requesting support under this program. We feel very strongly that this is precisely the type of program which contributes most effectively to the growth and development of our graduate and research programs. We strongly urge the continuance of this program and if possible, the addition of funds to extend and strengthen it. In my estimation it is definitely unwise in times of national emergency to cut back contracts specifically designed to foster basic research and trained personnel of the type needed in a technological society.

Your efforts on behalf of this program will be greatly appreciated by technical schools like Clarkson College.

Sincerely,

RICHARD A. KENYON,
Associate Dean, Graduate School, Associate Director, Division of Research.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY,
Ithaca, N.Y., June 19, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
Committee on Science and Astronautics,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ECKHARDT: In the absence of President Perkins I am responding to your recent letter which calls to our attention the effort to obtain an increase of $40 million in the NASA sustaining university program for FY 68 and which notes that you have accepted responsibility for support of this amendment on the floor of the House.

Cornell University strongly supports this increased authorization and believes that virtually all universities that have been cooperating with NASA do likewise. We very much hope that your efforts are successful and that the House and ultimately the Senate will support this added authorization.

Cornell carries out most of its teaching and research in this area within its Center for Radiophysics and Space Research, of which Professor Thomas Gold is Director. This unit operates in a handsome new building, built with funds primarily provided by NASA. Cornell benefits from research contracts that come to us from NASA. It has also greatly benefited by NASA fellowships which have come in to us from the sustaining university program. Finally, we submitted some time ago and have under consideration by NASA a Multidisciplinary Research Support Program for continued efforts in a number of NASA-related areas.

From the standpoint of these various efforts, we have been greatly pleased by the caliber of NASA activities in working with universities. Almost all of the NASA policies have been enlightened, well managed, and well integrated with normal university teaching activities. Specifically the fellowship program has been an excellent one from the standpoint of the university. The policies and funding procedures for the multidisciplinary grants have also been excellent. Finally, NASA's management procedures for their research contracts have been quite satisfactory from the university standpoint. In summary, all of us have been impressed by NASA's wisdom and capabilities in its relations with universities.

However, one could argue persuasively that even before the recent cuts the NASA university sustaining program was too small. This program is for an agency whose total budget is close to $5 billion a year and whose activities are almost entirely in the fields of scientific research and technology. Engineering of the highest sort is vital to the success of NASA missions. Furthermore, many of the NASA missions have a strong component of scientific exploration, which implies that very close contact with university scientists is essential to maximize the productivity of these efforts. In light of this enormous commitment, even a $40 million per year sustaining university program seemed to most of us much too small and our effort in past years had been to get this very substantially increased on the simple grounds that in the long run the NASA missions would directly benefit. We were, therefore, dismayed when the program was cut to $30 million and when it was proposed that it be cut in FY 68 to $20 million. Cornell University strongly supports this restoration of the earlier proposed cut in this program.

Let me summarize my own feelings very briefly: (a) NASA is deeply involved in engineering and science; (b) NASA greatly benefits both in the short and in the long run from close interaction with universities; (c) NASA has shown itself capable of running a good university program, a program which is both sensible and frugal; (d) the recent cuts in the NASA sustaining university program should be restored and, over the longer pull, the program should be substantially enlarged. It is for these reasons that I strongly support your proposed increased authorization for FY 68.

I appreciate the opportunity to forward these comments to you. If I can help in any other way in presenting Cornell University's position on these various items, I shall be most pleased to do so.

Sincerely yours,

F. A. LONG.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY,
New York, N.Y.

Congressman BOB ECKHARDT,
Committee on Science and Astronautics,
Washington, D.C.:

As project director of our NASA university sustaining grant, I wish to add my support to

your effort to add ten million dollars to the 1968 authorization. The program has been most effective permitting university-wide basic research and has stimulated cross departmental and multidisciplinary activity. We feel this is money well spent, because it contributes to basic research of value to the national as well as space program. Our present grant of $30,000 per year is hardly sufficient for a university this size and further cuts would hamper VA number of current important projects. New York University is the largest private university in the U.S.A. and wish to continue making its contributions under the sustaining program.

JOHN R. RAGAZZINI,
Dean, School of Engineering and Science.

RENSSELAER POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE,
Troy, N.Y., June 16, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ECKHARDT: Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute finds a high degree of mutuality between NASA's programs for research and advanced technological education, and Rensselaer's mission in higher education. Without NASA's programs of support, higher education would be beyond the means of many highly qualified students with ordinary financial resources. NASA-sponsored programs at Rensselaer may be broken down into three broad categories: predoctoral training grants, research grants and contracts, and facility grants.

Rensselaer reecived its first predoctoral training grant from NASA in 1962. This grant provided funds for the support of 10 trainees for three years. The purpose of these grants are: first, to accelerate the space program, and second and more important to offer broad but intensive training in the space services. Presently NASA grants provide support for 45 trainees. Starting in September of this year this number will be reduced to 39 because of the reduction made in NASA's budget. These reductions if continued will result in a serious decline in the number of scientists and engineers trained in the space sciences.

Presently NASA is supporting 36 research grants having a total value of $463,800 on such topics as Computer Control of Nuclear Powered Rockets, Dispersion Strengthened Materials, Interdisciplinary Research on Solid Materials, Investigation of the Composition and Chemical Behavior of the Atmosphere of Venus, Studies of Radiation Damage to Various Materials in Rensselaer Linac Accelerator, Microwave Gaseous Electronic Research, etc.

Through a facilities grant of $1,500,000 from NASA a Materials Research Center has been constructed for Interdisciplinary Materials Research. This Center has provided space and facilities for 22 research scientists and engineers as well as providing space and facilities for the training of 94 graduate students.

In my opinion without this type of external support, Rensselaer would have been able to educate only about half the number of graduate students that have been trained in materials and space science and engineering, and Rensselaer would have been severely hampered in important investigations that have already been of considerable assistance to government programs, especially those of NASA.

As a result of these NASA sponsored programs largely funded through NASA's Sustaining University Programs, Rensselaer has been able to disseminate information about materials and space science which has been utilized by industry in carrying out NASA contracts. Among organizations which have used this information have been: Leeds and Northrup Company, Westinghouse Electric Corporation, Whirlpool Corporation, Bendix Corporation, Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corporation, and Texas Instruments, Incorporated.

Rensselaer's relationships with NASA have been gratifying and satisfying, and without NASA-sponsored assistance, Rensselaer would not have been able to have given as much service as it has to both the nation and to industry. I strongly urge the continuance of Congressional support for the NASA Sustaining University Programs.

Sincerely,

R. G. FOLSOM.

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
AT BUFFALO,
Buffalo, N.Y., June 19,1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ECKHARDT: The State University of New York at Buffalo strongly supports your amendment to the National Space and Aeronautics Administration authorization bill adding $10 million more to the NASA sustaining university program. While this university does not now have a sustaining university grant at present, we have had a grant application pending with NASA under this program since July 1966. NASA keeps telling us that our application is a good one and has a high technical rating, but they just don't have the funds.

Our application now pending with NASA involves some advanced biological research which we believe would be relevant to the solution of some of the outstanding problems of life support in space flight. We would like to get started on this program. Our application requested $1,100,000 per year, for a 5-year program, but we could get started on as little as $300,000 in the first year.

We urge the Subcommittee on Space Sciences and Applications to make a favorable recommendation on increasing NASA's sustaining university program.

Sincerely yours,

RAYMOND EWELL,
Vice-President for Research.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
June 19, 1967.

Hon. ROBERT ECKHARDT,
Committee on Science and Astronautics,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

The sustaining university program of NASA has enabled the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn to award NASA graduate traineeships to 65 young scholars during years 1963–67. To date 22 have earned advanced degrees including 7 doctorates and 15 masters in the fields of aeronautics, astronautics, electrophysics electrical engineering and chemistry. Many others of the group will soon complete their advanced degree requirement. The sustaining university program has also enabled the institute to centralize its aero-research facilities at the graduate campus in Farmingdale, New York. This research facility enables us to train graduate students in many interdisciplinary fields such as microwave circuitry, plasma theory and re-entry shock phenomena. NASA's sustaining university program is vital to a strong academic and research program at the Polytechnic in support of the nation's space effort, civilian economy and defense objectives.

ERNST WEBER,
President, Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn.

ROCHESTER, N.Y.,
June 20, 1967.

BOB ECKHARDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

University of Rochester has participated in NASA training grant for five years. Program has turned out a number of scientists with research and teaching skills in space science and technology. Rochester currently building a $2,000,000 space science laboratory with aid of $1,000,000 grant from NASA. Rochester plans to apply for sustaining university grant which would permit substantial increase in training in research in space science. NASA supported training and research contributes importantly to, and stimulates greatly general development of sciences and technology. Urge support of additional authorization for sustaining university grant.

ROBERT R. FRANCE,
Associate Provost,
University of Rochester.

The following are from institutions in the State of Oklahoma:

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY,
Stillwater, June 19, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ECKHARDT: I am glad to respond to your letter of June 14, 1967, regarding the University Sustaining Program of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Oklahoma State University has been a participant in this program since its inception. The program has been of great value to us in providing support for high-quality graduate students. We have exercised great care in selection of students both to be sure that the student is qualified, and that he is in an area that is within the broad interests of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. In addition, we have used the traineeship program to enhance the overall program of our University. It was, therefore, a great disappointment to have the number of traineeships for the period starting September 1, 1967, reduced by 50 percent.

Our institution, as is true of so many others, is always in dire need of support which can be allocated by the institution—even though it must also satisfy legitimate needs of the sponsor. Both the traineeship and the sustaining research programs of NASA fall in this category. In addition, we are badly in need of facilities in which to conduct space oriented programs. These needs are not adequately met by other agencies of the federal government nor does it appear that they will be in the foreseeable future.

I urge your continued support of the University Sustaining Program of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and of other similar programs which are so valuable in assisting institutions to build a base for expansion in areas of vital interest.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN T. EDMISON, Ph. D.,
Director.

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA,
Norman, Okla., June 19, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ECKHARDT: I appreciate the opportunity that you have given me to comment on the status of the Sustaining University Program of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Although the involvement of the University of Oklahoma in this NASA program is substantial, it is not so great as that of many other larger universities. My chief concern, therefore, is with the inevitable reduction in our Nation's production of highly trained and educated space related scientists (Ph. D.'s) and the smaller total space research effort at U.S. universities that such a cutback in funding will bring. The United States should be making every effort to increase the production of such scientists and the amount of such research during these crucial times.

Currently, the University of Oklahoma is

the recipient of a NASA Initiation Grant which is supporting the research of nine faculty members in engineering and science at the University of Oklahoma and ten graduate students.

In addition to this, 32 graduate students are currently supported by NASA Traineeships. During the past four years, this program has supported 11 students who have received master's degrees, and 6 students who have received the Ph. D.

I trust that this information will be helpful to you. I hope your efforts to add the $10 million for this important NASA program will be successful. If I can provide you with further information, please feel free to ask for it.

Sincerely yours,
GEORGE L. CROSS, *President.*

The following are from institutions in the State of Ohio:

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY,
Columbus, Ohio, June 20, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
Committee on Science and Astronautics, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ECKHARDT: I wish to support the subcommittee request for adding $10,000,000.00 for the Sustaining University Program to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Fiscal Budget for 1968. I think it highly important that the university programs be maintained on a high level in this important national program on space exploration, and I am happy to support this request.

Cordially yours,
A. B. GARRETT,
Vice President for Research.

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI,
Cincinnati, Ohio, June 19, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. ECKHARDT: Your letter of June 14, 1967, to President Langsam has been referred to my office for reply. We most certainly appreciate the opportunity to give you our opinion on the value of the NASA University training at the University of Cincinnati. I am giving below a brief summary of the values of this grant and how it has helped us in carrying forward the objectives of the University and of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

1. The Sustaining University Grant has enabled the University to initiate a general space oriented research program. This program includes new projects specifically designed to investigate space oriented problems and the expansion of on-going research investigations to study possible space applications.

2. The Grant has enabled the University to give support to young faculty members initiating their first sponsored research investigation. As is well known, the tremendous competition for research funds has made it extremely difficult for the young, unknown investigator to receive support. The Sustaining Grant is ideal for giving limited support to the young promising research investigator.

3. The programs initiated through the Sustaining Grant also have contributed to the initiation of a Space Science Seminar Series, in which various investigators present lectures on their studies to interested faculty members and graduate students. It also has enabled us to attract scientists from outside the University family to give seminars on topics of interest to the space program.

4. The Grant has also tremendously increased the interest of faculty and graduate students alike in the numerous problems associated with the space program. It also has given us the means to attract and support a higher caliber of graduate students.

5. The presence of the Sustaining Grant has also enabled the University to establish a better working relationship with the NASA Lewis Research Center in Cleveland, Ohio.

Sincerely,
HOKE S. GREENE,
Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The following are from institutions in the State of Pennsylvania:

DREXEL INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,
Philadelphia, Pa., June 15, 1967.

Hon. ROBERT ECKHARDT,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ECKHARDT: I am happy to respond to your letter of June 14, 1967, regarding the sustaining university program of NASA. I will first comment on the general merits of this program as I see them and will then discuss briefly its impact on Drexel.

As we see it, the principal merits of the SUP are:

(1) Funds from this source are exceedingly flexible. Consequently, they may be used as seed funds which motivate meaningful multi-disciplinary programs involving faculty and students from any and all segments of the institution. Such funds are sorely needed in higher education today.

(2) NASA, probably to a greater extent than any other federal agency, is in a position to couple government, industry and education in research and graduate study efforts which are in the best long range interests of all concerned. The SUP program has in our opinion been very intelligently administered, and has been the liaison unit for transmitting the frontiers of science through the development and management phases required for successful, technological operations. After all, NASA is engaged in what is probably the greatest adventure of mankind and should make every effort to continue its influence on the academic community through the SUP program.

(3) While we recognize the fact that there is always the danger of excessive duplication, it is our opinion that the federal support of higher education should be distributed through a wide spectrum of agencies, since each has a different philosophy. If all broad based university support were to be centralized in one group, such as NSF, it is highly probable that the government would lose the philosophical breadth which it must have in order to meet the diverse needs of many institutions, as well as the many divisions within an institution.

(4) Many universities are in the agonizing throes of reappraising their educational philosophy and goals. The University of California at Berkeley is such an example and a faculty committee chaired by Professor Muscatine has recently published a long list of recommendations, which specifically apply to Berkeley, but which pertain equally well to many other schools. One of their recommendations on graduate study is that universities should initiate more programs which focus on the specific problems of society or other current, National missions. There are very few sources of funds which fit this exceedingly important recommendation as well as the SUP program.

Drexel first received SUP funds in 1966–67. Doctoral work was initiated at Drexel in the Fall of 1965 and the SUP grant of $100,000 represented almost 10 per cent of our research budget last year. However, the benefits of the grant have gone far beyond its direct fiscal contribution. The attainment of what amounted to a "Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval" was of great assistance to our fund raising efforts with the industrial community. We firmly believe that the SUP grant generated at least twice its own value from private sources, which had not previously been available to us.

By coupling NASA funds with internal funds, we were able to initiate two major programs involving 10–12 faculty members and 15 graduate students. The impetus so provided by the SUP grant enabled us to build our Materials Engineering Department to a sufficient level that it has been successful in obtaining an excellence grant from NSF in the amount of $528,000. There is no question in our minds but that the NASA grant coming in a year earlier was a significant factor in obtaining the NSF grant.

We will initiate doctoral studies in the Electrical Engineering Department in September, 1967. Funds furnished to this group from the SUP grant again played a vital role in the development of the department, and has expedited its entry into doctoral studies by at least two years.

The continuation of an SUP grant is extremely vital to Drexel at this time, since we intend to transfer portions of these funds to other areas to seed new programs. Aside from our own and somewhat limited internal sources, we have no other support which gives us this flexibility. Consequently, I can say to you in all sincerity that we feel the NASA Sustaining University Program has been highly successful and is playing a vital role in higher education today. We certainly hope that the Congress will continue to support and expand this vital activity.

Sincerely yours,
W. W. HAGERTY, *President.*

LEHIGH UNIVERSITY,
Bethlehem, Pa., June 19, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ECKHARDT: Your letter to President Lewis has been referred to me because I am coordinator of the NASA Traineeship program at Lehigh University.

This year there are 28 traineeships in effect on the campus distributed among 10 departments. The first 3-year grant was awarded in 1963 and we have already produced about 6 doctorates. Support of this kind is effective in accelerating the progress of the student who would otherwise be delayed by the need to find part-time jobs.

In every award we have required that the proposed dissertation be truly related to the space sciences. Since the subject of the dissertation has a strong influence on the career decision of the student, I believe that our program is accomplishing its purpose of attracting Ph.D. graduates to the space-related scientific fields.

The merit of the traineeship program as conducted by NASA has been that it has been aimed toward a specific objective but with a flexibility in operation that makes it attractive both to universities and to students. In my contacts with NASA staff, I have been impressed with the efficiency with which the program is administered. Red tape and confusion have been at a minimum.

I hope that I have conveyed our enthusiasm for the NASA Traineeship program. If there is any further information that I can supply, I shall be pleased to do so.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT D. STOUT, *Dean.*

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Philadelphia, June 16, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ECKHARDT: I have your letter of June 14, 1967 concerning the amendment that you proposed to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Fiscal Year 1968 authorization adding $10 million for the sustaining university program.

I am most happy to write to you to indicate my support of the amendment for we feel that this program has been of great value in the graduate training of scientists and engineers at the University of Pennsyl-

vania. During the coming academic year (1967–68) there will be 38 graduate students in attendance at Pennsylvania because of this Federal program. It would be most desirable to increase the number next year, but such a step is, of course, dependent upon an increase in the Federal support that is available. The adoption of your amendment would most certainly contribute to the possibility of effectuating such an increase.

I appreciate your having written to me concerning this matter and I am very happy to have the opportunity to express my support of your amendment.

Very sincerely,

GAYLORD P. HARNWELL.

The following is from an institution in the State of Rhode Island:

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND,
Kingston, R.I., June 19, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ECKHARDT: The University of Rhode Island has appreciated its participation in the NASA university program, with its important Fellowship provisions. The program has operated successfully here, and we have looked forward to an increase in the number of Fellowships available to us. It would, therefore, be helpful to this University, and to others with a significantly greater participation in the NASA program, if your efforts at obtaining an additional ten million dollars for Fiscal '68 for the program were sustained by the Congress. May I add my voice to those of other university presidents urging favorable action upon your amendment.

Cordially yours,

FRANCIS H. HORN, *President.*

The following are from institutions in the State of South Carolina:

CLEMSON UNIVERSITY,
Clemson, S.C., June 17, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
Longworth Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ECKHARDT: With reference to your letter dated June 14 relating to the operation of the sustaining NASA program at Clemson University, we are happy to submit the following information:

NASA has had a considerable impact on the graduate training and research programs at Clemson University. Up to this point $290,400.00 have been available in NASA training grant funds and $42,870.00 in NASA research contract funds.

In regard to the NASA training programs, there has been a total of forty-eight students involved up to this time. There are presently seventeen enrolled in the training programs. The predominant training areas in this institution at present are in Chemistry and Chemical Engineering. Our research contract is in the area of Electrical Engineering.

We hope very much that you are able to be successful in amending the Appropriations Bill for NASA. This would be in the best interest of Clemson University.

Sincerely,

ROBERT C. EDWARDS, *President.*

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
Columbia, S.C., June 18, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ECKHARDT: The University of South Carolina is pleased to reply to your recent request for information about the operation of the N.A.S.A. sustaining university program here. Although we have participated in the program for only a short span of time, we already have come to realize its great importance both to our university and to our nation. The program is especially helpful to institutions such as this one which are in a critical stage of development into significant centers of teaching and research in the scientific areas.

At our institution a significant amount of support for seventeen graduate students in mathematics, chemistry, biology and various engineering disciplines has been contributed by N.A.S.A. in the past, with an additional three new traineeships to commence in the fall of 1967. To date none have graduated but several are approaching completion of their work. Thesis research studies of direct interest to N.A.S.A. and of importance to the national interest, such as the space propagation of microwaves, applications of electromagnetic field theory to antennae design, mathematical analysis of heart conditions via cardiograms and such have resulted from this support.

A second tremendous benefit of the N.A.S.A. sustaining university program has been the support given to our program of visiting professors. This University is not of the size that it can offer the full range of space science oriented courses and consulting services with its own staff. By careful choice of visiting professors of outstanding achievement whose expertise complements that locally available, many gaps have been filled. During the past several years, we have arranged for over thirty visiting professors supported by this program. They have been for varying periods of time ranging from several days to an academic year. They have given special seminars, courses, and consulting services. They have provided keen stimulation to our faculty and students in space related fields.

Additionally, minor items of equipment especially needed by graduate students and faculty for space related research have been provided. It has been possible to provide released time for faculty members to revamp several courses and to experiment with novel teaching techniques in areas of direct interest to the national space program.

We wish to commend you and your Committee for your wisdom in attempting to at least maintain the program's funding level. The sustaining university program is of vital importance to us and, we are sure, to a great many other universities. We earnestly hope, therefore, that the additional authorization for it, which is contained in your Committee's report, will be approved by the Congress.

Yours sincerely,

THOMAS F. JONES.

The following is from an institution in the State of South Dakota:

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
Vermillion, June 16, 1967.

Congressman BOB ECKHARDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ECKHARDT: In answer to your letter of June 14, 1967, I can report that The University of South Dakota has not been a part of the NASA sustaining university program. The University of South Dakota has been fortunate to receive support from NASA under the graduate traineeship program.

I would like to take this opportunity to support you in your efforts to maintain NASA's level of support for university research. They are to be complimented in this very worthwhile contribution to the overall science program.

Cordially,

EDWARD Q. MOULTON,
President.

The following are from institutions in the State of Tennessee:

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE,
Knoxville, June 19, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ECKHARDT: This is a reply to your letter of June 14 concerning the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's sustaining University program. The University of Tennessee feels that this is one of the most helpful programs and one of the best administered in the Federal Government.

Their traineeship program has been of great value to us and has given us much of the freedom which we need and desire. Their multidisciplinary research program has been equally as effective.

I should like to express my appreciation to you for your efforts in working against a program cut. I wish that the funds could be raised to their FY1966 level. In my opinion, it would be an extremely good investment of federal funds. Before the FY1967 cut took place I wrote to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration requesting that they maintain, or increase, their level of effort for this sustaining University program.

Whatever you can do in this regard will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

HILTON A. SMITH,
Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research.

NASHVILLE, TENN.,
June 17, 1967

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.:

Vanderbilt University does not have a NASA sustaining university program grant. Although having no direct operational experience with the program, we consider it most useful as a means of initiating new investigations in gaps between traditional scientific research fields. We had hoped that the program would be continued to the size wherein Vanderbilt might also participate.

R. R. PURDY,
Senior Vice Chancellor.

The following are from institutions in the State of Texas:

RICE UNIVERSITY,
Houston, Tex., June 16, 1967.

Congressman BOB ECKHART,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: It is a pleasure to respond to your inquiry concerning the significance of the sustaining university program of NASA and, in particular, concerning its impact at this University.

One of the important features of this program has been the NASA traineeships for graduate students. This is, in our experience, one of the best of the national programs in support of the graduate study of promising students in fields of great national importance. We were distressed to learn that the number of new awards available for this University was to be reduced from fifteen in recent years to nine for the coming year. We would strongly urge the restoration of the traineeships program to the earlier level because there is not only an increasing number of able students but there remains a critical national need for individuals trained to the highest level in engineering and the sciences.

Another phase of the NASA sustaining program which is of great importance at this University is a sustaining grant for research. This program is especially devoted to the provision of new instruments and other necessary expenses for young faculty members just initiating their research program. It also assists with certain necessary but less glamorous phases of our entire research program in Space Science and Technology. Here, as in the case of the traineeships, we find that the NASA program has been one of the most valuable parts of the Federal support of research in universities, and we would be very much distressed to see it diminished.

In view of the comments of the preceding

paragraphs, you will conclude with me that it is of very great importance to retain the NASA university sustaining program at the higher funding level. I am sending copies of this letter to Bob Casey and George Bush, and hope that they will assist you in your presentation of this matter.

With every good wish, I am,

Yours very sincerely,

K. S. PITZER,
President.

SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY,
Dallas, Tex., June 19, 1697.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ECKHARDT: On behalf of President Tate who is out of the city, I am happy to respond to your letter of June 14, 1967, with respect to the sustaining university program under the sponsorship of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in which Southern Methodist University participates.

NASA TRAINEESHIPS

Of the various fellowships and traineeships sponsored by the Federal Government, the NASA traineeships provide the greatest supplementary support for graduate programs. In addition to providing substantial stipends to the trainees themselves the NASA awards bring to the sponsoring university additional funds for expanding the departmental faculties by the appointment of adjunct professors and visiting lecturers, for the purchase of specialized items of research equipment needed by the trainees, and for improvement of the graduate courses offered to the trainees.

These supplements are invaluable to the University in our efforts to bolster doctoral programs already in existence and in the development of new ones, and we urge that nothing be done to curtail the NASA traineeship effort in its present form. For example, during the current year we have been able, by the use of the supplementary funds, to appoint visiting professors of distinction who offered special courses in applied mathematics, mathematical statistics, and low-temperature geochemistry. This has greatly enriched the instruction, not only of the NASA trainees themselves but also of graduate students of the mathematical, engineering, and physical sciences generally.

NASA MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH

SMU has participated since 1965 in the Multidisciplinary Research program in Space-Related Science and Technology—and now enters its third year at a level of effort of $100,000/year.

Guidance, direction and award of incremental research grants are made by a faculty research committee under direction of the Dean of Graduate School. These awards have resulted in the following:

1) Provided seed grants to permit young qualified but unsponsored faculty members to initiate research work related to the space agency interests.

2) Included involvement of graduate students, who were thus exposed to laboratory and theoretical space-related research under competent guidance.

3) Developed facilities (Electron Microscope Laboratory, High Intensity Magnetic Facility) on matching grant basis with 50% university funds from local donors.

4) Permitted establishment of systems approach relative to programs in materials research (Study of Environmental Effects on Electronic Processes) which could not have been undertaken without NASA support.

Competitive participation in this research by young faculty has produced support for significant and innovative ideas; and the published papers and theses resulting attest to its effectiveness.

Compared with other agency administration and methods of evaluation, the Sustaining University program has on the whole been outstanding in its concept, its procedures and its administration.

We would urge the continuation of this kind of research support, combining as it does the creative aspects of academic research, yet retaining a significant measure of mission-orientation and directed research effort.

Sincerely yours,

R. RICHARD RUBOTTOM, Jr.,
Vice President, Administration.

TEXAS CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY,
Fort Worth, Tex., June 16, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ECKHARDT: Chancellor Moudy has referred your letter of 6/14/1967 to my office for reply. We appreciate your interest in higher education and welcome the opportunity to comment on the NASA sustaining program.

We received our first NASA grant in September, 1964, in the amount of $51,900. We have since received three continuation supplements bringing our total award to $277,800. These grants have provided support for 20 different students enrolled in our doctoral program in space-related areas. In addition they have provided $124,800 for the expansion of our program through institutional allowances for the improvement of faculty salaries, library holdings, and course content.

Specifically, last year our total graduate fellowship program had the following structure:

Community funds (TCU/RF)	$47,567
University general funds	290,007
NASA	40,800
NDEA	44,920
All other	91,798

In other words the NASA grants have been of great importance to TCU as we have developed a significant program in the space-related sciences.

The NASA sustaining program was particularly well-conceived in that it was aimed specifically at replenishing a national resource which had been severely taxed by its needs. The NASA Traineeship program has provided additional manpower in the critical areas of science. Because of the far-sighted way in which the program was designed, we are able to produce about 1.5 Ph. D. graduates for every traineeship awarded us by NASA.

I would like to add a few comments about support for higher education in general. First, it should be noted that during this past year we had at TCU a total graduate enrollment in the sciences of 170 full time equivalent students. We had faculty and equipment capacity for another 45, but did not have research and fellowship support for the additional students.

Our funds are derived from three sources; private contributions, foundations, and federal grants. As you know, private institutions in Texas do not receive state money. Let me share with you a frustration and point of serious concern.

Yesterday, I was told by the president of a large Texas firm that he felt private firms and individuals should not use their limited resources to support fellowships, since our large foundations and the federal government are providing *generous* support.

In the Wall Street Journal of June 7, 1967, the following comments appeared relative to the country's largest foundation, the Ford Foundation:

"Thus, the foundation has sharply reduced outlays for Woodrow Wilson scholarships, which are given to graduate students in social sciences and the humanities. The stated reason: The Government now is doing more to support graduate study."

"In its reorganization, the foundation eliminated science and engineering as a separate program area; it will still consider special grants in these fields but likely won't spend much. One reason is that the Government now gives heavy support to these fields."

We learned last week that the House had slashed appropriations for NDEA, Title IV fellowships. This week we received your letter.

Are we spiralling into a situation where private individuals, philanthropic foundations, and all government agencies will abandon graduate education? The talented and *achieving* youth of our country are one of our most important resources. If we fail to develop this resource, future generations will suffer. The young men and women being trained in our graduate schools are the "seed corn" of our society.

I apologize for the length of this letter, but not for my serious concern. I hope these remarks will help you in your efforts.

Sincerely,

E. LEIGH SECREST,
Graduate Dean.

TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE,
Lubbock, Tex., June 16, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ECKHARDT: Dr. W. M. Pearce, Executive Vice President of Texas Technological College, has forwarded your letter of June 14 concerning the NASA sustaining university program on this campus to me for answering.

Although Texas Tech has not benefited markedly from this program, thus far, we anticipate an increase in support next year; and we should like to encourage you in your efforts to support this worthwhile program. In the past we have had one NASA supported research project, and we have been awarded thirty-two NASA Traineeships. Information concerning these two areas of support is attached.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER L. BROOKS,
Associate Dean, the Graduate School.

NASA TRAINEESHIPS AT TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL COLLEGE

Program began in the Fall of 1963 with six traineeships; continued in 1964 with six Traineeships; continued in 1965 with eight Traineeships; continued in 1966 with eight Traineeships; continued in 1967 with four Traineeships.

James L. Higgins, NASA Trainee in Psychology, received his Ph.D. in August, 1966, and is presently Assistant Professor at East Carolina College.

The following NASA Trainees are scheduled to receive their Ph. D.'s in August, 1967: Richard W. Geddes, Geology; Phillip W. Grayson, Chemistry; Brian K. Lambert, Industrial Engineering; Fernando C. Vidaurri, Jr., Chemical Engineering; Eugene Lynn Simmons, Chemistry.

RESEARCH SUPPORTED BY NASA

F. A. Wade—June 1, 1964 through August 31, 1965: Collection of Meteoric Dust Particles During Gemini Flight $24,474.00.

HOUSTON, TEX.

Congressman BOB ECKHARDT,
Committee of Science and Astronautics,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

The University of Houston greatly appreciate multi-disciplinary space related research grants. They contribute to education of some 30 graduate students and advance basic research in physics, chemistry, mathematics,

and chemical engineering. These grants are valued highly by students and faculty of this university.

Respectfully,

PHILIP G. HOFFMAN,
President, University of Houston.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS,
Austin, Tex., June 20, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ECKHARDT: In response to your request for information concerning The University of Texas' participation in an effective operation of NASA's Sustaining University Program, a summary is attached.

The University of Texas feels that the NASA Sustaining University Research Program is a very worthwhile and rewarding endeavor, but because of its nature and long-range objectives, the program is just beginning to bear fruit. Interest in the program and space activities in general here on our campus is high and encouraging. It is becoming apparent to our faculty and our students that the space program includes many of our most complex social and health problems.

We began our participation in the predoctoral research training program in 1963 with 10 trainees; in 1964 we had 12 trainees; in 1965, 15; and in 1966, 15. We have, however, only received 9 traineeships for 1967. To date the NASA-sponsored trainees have been in the sciences (physics, astronomy, chemistry, mathematics, and sociology) and engineering subjects (aerospace, chemical, electrical, and mechanical). For the coming year we will add 3 trainees in computer science and a botanist. There is a need for a larger number of trainees in the sciences and engineering fields. In addition, we would like to recommend other related fields such as sociology, behavioral sciences, economics, administration, and management.

The College of Business Administration of The University of Texas at Austin has been awarded three NASA Management internships at the Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston to begin a full year of work at the NASA Center this fall. We feel that this type of activity should also be expanded.

The opportunities for cooperative training and research between The University of Texas and the Federal Government made possible by the NASA Sustaining Research Program are invaluable in the training of future scientific and technological leaders.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY RANSOM,
Chancellor.

NASA SUSTAINING RESEARCH PROGRAM AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

Traditionally the universities have been the source of both new knowledge and highly trained scientific and technological manpower. We at The University of Texas feel that this will continue. In addition, we are attempting to add another dimension by providing the needed interdisciplinary specialists, managers, and administrators of our future technical and intellectual resources. These needs resulted from the impetus our national space programs have given science and technology. We are firmly convinced that one of the space program's prime benefits has been and will continue to be the providing of highly trained scientists, engineers, and management specialists that are able to work effectively as a team on large complex programs which incorporate many disciplines.

To accomplish our university's objectives of training the needed specialists for the last third of the twentieth century, we are employing many of the new methods and techniques pioneered by this Nation's aeronautic and space programs.

The University of Texas is one of the early participants in the NASA Sustaining University Program and is proud and gratified to be part of such an important activity. The NASA Sustaining Research Program objectives are: 1) to increase future supply of scientists, managers, and other specialists required in aeronautics and space-related sciences and technology, and 2) to improve the university's role and support of the NASA program by encouragement and creative multidiscipline investigations, development of new capabilities, and consolidation of space-oriented activities. In our estimation, we are beginning to successfully attain these objectives in our part of the larger NASA program.

The broad NASA program, with its long-range objectives, is really just beginning. We at the university began our participation in 1963 and are just starting to see the definite results of the effectiveness of the program to our university, to NASA, and to the Nation's aerospace programs at large. NASA's support of such a program is vital in continuing the stimulation and impact already made on our faculty and graduate students and, in turn, the impact that they have made and will continue to make on the National Aeronautical and Space Programs.

We are already seeing some of the side benefits of the specialized space program-oriented training as being applicable to many complex programs for the benefit of mankind. As an example, the solution of social problems by the utilization of the space-pioneered systems approach for the planning of future advanced communities and the benefits of space systems methodology and technology in our medical and health programs.

The greater part of the NASA support in the Sustaining Research Program to the university has come in the form of traineeships given to scientific and engineering doctoral students. Table 1 summarizes the 1963–1967 breakdown of NASA trainees to The University of Texas.

NASA trainees

	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	Total
Astronomy	1	2	1	1	2	7
Botany					1	1
Chemistry	2	3	2	3		10
Mathematics			1		1	2
Physics		4	3	3	1	11
Zoology	1		1	2		4
Aerospace engineering	1		1	3		5
Chemical engineering	1	1		1		3
Civil engineering	1					1
Electrical engineering	2	2	2	1		7
Engineering mechanics			3			3
Mechanical engineering	1		1	1	1	4
Computer sciences					3	3
Total	10	12	15	15	9	61

This program has operated on the basis of providing financial support for each trainee and dependency allowances and other direct support if required. In the early stages of the program our trainees had individually designed space-science programs, related interest, and participation in general development programs. As the number of NASA traineeships increased, so did interdepartmental interest. In other words, the NASA program has helped to generate interdisciplinary space-science and engineering interest across several fields. As a consequence, there is now a growing need for special equipment, for some particular facets of program development—such as the importation of lecturers and the holding of symposia, seminars, et cetera—and pressingly, in certain areas, an urgent requirement for curricula reorientation with emphasis on the space-sciences, engineering, management, and administration aspects.

The support of the program for 1967 has been reduced to only nine pre-doctoral students, and this will severely limit any attempts to bring in other related areas besides the sciences and engineering fields, such as the social, behavioral, economic, administrative, and management areas which have not yet been supported by the traineeship program.

The total number of masters and doctoral degrees is increasing at the university. As an example, in 1962 we had 474 masters, growing to 521 in 1964. The total number of doctoral degrees in 1962 was 215, growing to 244 in 1964. The College of Business Administration has begun a series of interdisciplinary projects in conjunction with the other colleges at the university, notably Engineering and Medicine. One of the primary areas of interest is the transference of aerospace technology to other programs for the benefit of mankind. The College of Business has 3400 undergraduate students. There are more than 210 students enrolled in the master's program in the Graduate School of Business, and more than 100 are enrolled in the Ph. D. program. The University of Texas at Austin grants more doctorates in Business Administration than any other university in the country.

Interdiscipline research is increasingly needed to provide the nation with the necessary skilled leaders to manage our country's programs. The space program has done much to point in the right direction and to afford models and techniques of accomplishing these goals. The University of Texas is cooperating with the Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston in their University Management Programs, and for the coming year three of our graduate management students have been chosen for the internship program. The Management Intern Program involves the selection of outstanding students in business and public administration. The selected students will receive rotating work assignments at the Manned Spacecraft Center.

The University of Texas is also participating in the NASA Sustaining University Program through research grants to conduct research in space and aeronautical sciences and technology. In general, the objectives of these grants are to provide research opportunities which will encourage the development of new research talents and interests responsive to project or discipline challenges likely to be encountered in the exploration of space, to augment and fill gaps in existing work, and to consolidate related research activities.

The university is performing several research tasks for NASA. As an example, our Aerospace Engineering Department is studying the "Theory and Analysis of Low Thrust Guidance Problems in Deterministic Linear Control," which will aid NASA in its space simulation and the design of models for guidance and control.

Other basic research includes the study of "Propagation and Dispersion of Hydromagnetic and Ion Cyclotron Waves in Plasmas Immersed in Magnetic Fields." Civil Engineering is performing investigations of

"Soil Modeling Problems Related to Impact Studies," which will help NASA in their spacecraft design and heat shield designs.

The Department of Electrical Engineering feels it has been very fortunate to have NASA support through research grants for solar system radio astronomy and for traineeships. The radio astronomy project has provided the university with a millimeter refractor and receiver which pioneered in the development of equipment for this frequency range. This has provided a return to NASA because when the time came for making studies of satellite communication to the earth, the university had the necessary equipment and experience to undertake this program immediately. We are currently calibrating for NASA the equipment which will be used on the initial tests for this new communication system. The support provided by NASA has permitted Aerospace, Electrical Engineering, and other departments to train men in the space-sciences and engineering fields (e.g., aeronautics, astronautics, space communications, and astronomy), and a number of our graduates are currently working in space-oriented programs. The traineeships through the Graduate School have been particularly beneficial because they permit the Ph. D. candidates to accelerate their course program before undertaking the dissertation research. Such NASA support speeds up the training of men to fill the extremely short supply of space-oriented engineers.

It is doubtful that most of the candidates would have been able to continue their advanced graduate work without NASA traineeship support. Our Department of Engineering Mechanics is of the opinion that in their experience the fact that 50 per cent of the students of any advanced degrees via NASA traineeship will be going into the teaching profession is reason enough to show the utility of this type of support.

We feel that the NASA research, fellowship, and traineeship programs have been of great value to the expansion and maintenance of standards of space-sciences and engineering at the University of Texas at Austin. This, in turn, has created interdisciplinary interest and support for space programs in important fields like management and administration.

The following is from an institution in the State of Utah:

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY,
Provo, Utah, June 19, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ECKHARDT: I have your letter of June 14th asking me for information to support your committee's report concerning the addition of 10 million dollars for the sustaining university program.

I regret that in good conscience I cannot do this. Over the years I have criticized the Congress of the United States for its profligate spending and for continually increasing the public debt at a time of prosperity when we ought to have been paying it off. I cannot now change my tune just because an appropriation happens to be in behalf of universities.

I think this is the time for the return of financial integrity to government.

Sincerely,

ERNEST L. WILKINSON.

The following is from an institution in the State of Vermont:

BURLINGTON, VT.,
June 19, 1967.

Congressman BOB ECKHARDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I understand that you are the author of an amendment to NASA's fiscal year 1968 authorization adding $10 million for the sustaining university program. I further understand that this additional authorization will be acted upon by the House of Representatives later this week. I would like to take this opportunity to indicate the University of Vermont's support of the sustaining university program. Over the past 2 years, Vermont has had NASA sustaining university grant which has had far-reaching effects on research and graduate training activities. The space science program has enhanced the atmosphere of enthusiasm for scientific inquiry and scholarly work. It has proved an outstanding example of how a university such as ours can more fully utilize its manpower resources by providing a focal point for research and graduate training. Drawing on the talents which exist in several disciplines in view of the successful contribution made to the study of science at the University of Vermont by the NASA sustaining grant program, I strongly urge that the $10 million additional authorization be approved by the House of Representatives.

LYMAN S. ROWELL,
President,
University of Vermont.

The following is from an institution in the State of Virginia:

CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA.,
June 20, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration university program vital to University of Virginia programs in medicine, engineering, and sciences. Grants of slightly over $600,000 in fiscal year 1966 supported training programs and research in astronomy, material science, physics, applied mathematics, biology, neurology, and pathology. Multidisciplinary training grants continuing in present year. Will seek support of your amendment by Virginia congressmen.

EDGAR F. SHANNON, Jr.,
President,
University of Virginia.

The following are from institutions in the State of Washington:

SEATTLE, WASH.,
June 21, 1967.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

The University of Washington is operating a multidisciplinary ceramic materials research program initially financed in part under the NASA sustaining university program. Strongly support continuation of at least the present level on funding for the NASA program.

CHARLES E. ODEGAARD,
President,
University of Washington.

The following is from an institution in the State of West Virginia.

WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY,
Morgantown, W. Va., June 20, 1967.

Mr. BOB ECKHARDT,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ECKHARDT: I'm taking this opportunity to report on the excellent results which have been obtained at West Virginia University's College of Engineering thru NASA's sponsorship of oriented research. This research is made possible by the NASA sustaining university program at West Virginia University. The funding of small scale research initiation projects has led to the development of our college as an additional technological research arm available to serve National Aerospace goals. Specifically; The funding of a bio-mechanics program has led to the $140,000 per year head injury study sponsored by the National Institute of Health and the National Institute for Neurological Diseases and Blindness. This study will provide basic data on the mechanism of head injury which will enable the design of an appropriate restraint system in all types of vehicle environments. The Mechanical Engineering Department is now actively involved in spacecraft temperature control research in cooperation with the Goddard Space Flight Center. The Aerospace Engineering Department has received subsequent funding from the National Science Foundation to support their activity in hypersonic flow phenomena.

In addition to the involvement of our professorial staff in research projects of national importance, the sustaining program has also acted as a base for the education of advanced technological personnel who invariably obtain employment in fields of high technology aerospace. The College of Engineering believes that the sustaining program is a major factor in the development of this University as a resource of high technology, research and advanced personnel who are vital to our Nation's progress and security.

Sincerely yours,

C. A. ARENTS, P. E.,
Dean.

The following are from institutions in the State of Wyoming:

THE UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING,
Laramie, Wyo., June 19, 1967.

Representative ROBERT ECKHARDT,
Subcommittee on Space Science, and Applications, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ECKHARDT: Enclosed is a statement on the value and need of NASA support for universities and, in particular, such small "emerging universities" as the University of Wyoming.

The University of Wyoming is presently applying for a SUP Grant and has NASA Trainees on the campus. The ability of the University to train space scientists critically depends on the increased availability of NASA funds to the University. Such funds have a beneficial effect on the University as a whole as well as on the particular projects or students directly financed.

Sincerely,

DEREK J. PROWSE,
Head, Department of Physics.

THE NEED FOR INCREASED SUPPORT FOR NASA UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS

The University of Wyoming is an "emerging university" trying very hard to initiate and support research programs for the benefit of the State and the Nation. It is the only university in the State and for this reason, any basic research in space science and any training of space scientists in Wyoming must be done at the University of Wyoming. The University has applied for a grant in the Sustaining University Program and hopes to be successful in getting NASA support for the initiation of new space research projects for the expansion of on-going projects and, most important, for the training of space scientists.

I personally have experience of two NASA SUP grants. One at the University of California at Los Angeles, directed by Dr. Willard Libby, supported me initially in a space science research project which has since grown into a major project of great importance in Cosmic Ray Physics. The training of space scientists at UCLA was aided immeasurably by the SUP grant; UCLA has turned out many excellent Physicists, geophysicists, chemists, and geologists to supply the ever increasing need of our national space program. It is all too easy to neglect the need for training competent space scientists in an all out effort to design and produce hardware for space vehicles; neglect to train sufficient competent personnel will, however, eventually abort the whole space mission.

My second experience of an SUP program has been that at the State University of

Montana at Bozeman directed by Dr. Irving Dayton. This particular grant was responsible for the initiation of numerous research projects of vital interest to the space program at a school where NONE previously existed. Some of these projects now thrive on their own with their own funding. They were initiated, however, through the SUP grant. Montana State is now on its way to National recognition as a major university and the NASA SUP grant can take a major share of the credit for this.

The University of Wyoming is in a rather intermediate position in that it is much smaller and less distinguished than UCLA, but it does have some on-going research programs in space which Montana State did not have before the award of the SUP grant. We feel that a grant to the University of Wyoming would, *in addition* to helping in space research, also help the University reach national recognition.

In addition to the SUP program mention should be made of the NASA traineeship program which supports graduate students during their study for their advanced degrees. The University of Wyoming has noticed with great dismay that NASA has been decreasing its support of this program. The University received four such traineeships regularly for several years; this was cut to two this last year due to an overall cut in the NASA appropriation for this purpose. Compared to the NASA overall budget, this program costs a negligible amount but its impact is not negligible as it provides the main source of supply of future space scientists. The University of Wyoming could easily train some twenty space scientists per year and, thus, could work to overcome the crucial shortage of such personnel. These students, however, require support and it is not unreasonable to ask that NASA invest some $5000 a year in producing these scientists. Failure to adequately support space science per se, as opposed to other branches, will produce shortages where they are most serious.

As chairman of the University of Wyoming SUP Committee and as Chairman of the Physics Department at the University, I strongly urge that increased funds be made available to NASA and, then, by NASA to the support of University programs.

DEREK J. PROWSE.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration the sum of $4,992,182,000, as follows:

(a) For "Research and development," for the following programs:

(1) Apollo, $2,521,500,000;

(2) Apollo applications, $444,700,000;

(3) Advanced missions, $6,200,000;

(4) Physics and astronomy, $131,631,000;

(5) Lunar and planetary exploration, $142,000,000;

(6) Voyager, $71,500,000;

(7) Bioscience, $41,800,000;

(8) Space applications, $94,500,000;

(9) Launch vehicle procurement, $150,700,000;

(10) Space vehicle systems, $36,000,000;

(11) Electronics systems, $39,200,000;

(12) Human factor systems, $21,000,000;

(13) Basic research, $21,465,000;

(14) Space power and electric propulsion systems, $44,000,000;

(15) Nuclear rockets, $70,000,000;

(16) Chemical propulsion, $49,000,000 of which $12,000,000 is to be used only for the large solid motor project;

(17) Aeronautics, $66,800,000;

(18) Tracking and data acquisition, $290,000,000;

(19) Sustaining university program, $30,000,000;

(20) Technology utilization, $5,000,000.

(b) For "Construction of facilities" including land acquisitions, as follows:

(1) Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, California, $5,365,000;

(2) Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Maryland, $565,000;

(3) Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, California, $3,125,000;

(4) John F. Kennedy Space Center, NASA Kennedy Space Center, Florida, $24,885,000;

(5) Lewis Research Center, Cleveland and Sandusky, Ohio, $2,115,000;

(6) Manned Spacecraft Center, Houston, Texas, $2,425,000;

(7) George C. Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Alabama, $870,000;

(8) Michoud Assembly Facility, New Orleans and Slidell, Louisiana, $2,010,000;

(9) Nuclear Rocket Development Station, Nevada, $16,500,000;

(10) Wallops Station, Wallops Island, Virginia, $740,000;

(11) Various locations, $2,880,000;

(12) Facility planning and design not otherwise provided for, $5,500,000.

(c) For "Administrative operations," $648,206,000.

(d) Appropriations for "Research and development" may be used (1) for any items of a capital nature (other than acquisition of land) which may be required for the performance of research and development contracts, and (2) for grants to nonprofit institutions of higher education, or to nonprofit organizations whose primary purpose is the conduct of scientific research, for purchase or construction of additional research facilities; and title to such facilities shall be vested in the United States unless the Administrator determines that the national program of aeronautical and space activities will best be served by vesting title in any such grantee institution or organization. Each such grant shall be made under such conditions as the Administrator shall determine to be required to insure that the United States will receive therefrom benefit adequate to justify the making of that grant. None of the funds appropriated for "Research and development" pursuant to this Act may be used for construction of any major facility, the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds $250,000, unless the Administrator or his designee has notified the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate and the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate of the nature, location, and estimated cost of such facility.

(e) When so specified in an appropriation Act, (1) any amount appropriated for "Research and development" or for "Construction of facilities" may remain available without fiscal year limitation, and (2) maintenance and operation of facilities, and support services contracts may be entered into under the "Administrative operations" appropriation for periods not in excess of twelve months beginning at any time during the fiscal year.

(f) Appropriations made pursuant to subsection 1(c) may be used, but not to exceed $35,000, for scientific consultations or extraordinary expenses upon the approval or authority of the Administrator and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.

(g) No part of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(c) for maintenance, repairs, alterations, and minor construction shall be used for the construction of any new facility the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds $100,000.

Mr. MILLER of California (during reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, it seems to me that we might proceed for a little while and that the gentleman from California might renew his request a little later. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Eighty-two Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 152]

Abbitt	Dow	Mize
Ashbrook	Edmondson	Moore
Ashley	Everett	Nichols
Berry	Evins, Tenn.	O'Hara, Mich.
Blanton	Fino	Ottinger
Bolling	Ford,	Pool
Brock	William D.	Resnick
Brown, Calif.	Gibbons	Roberts
Burton, Utah	Hawkins	Rooney, N.Y.
Button	Herlong	Roush
Carey	Holifield	St. Onge
Celler	Holland	Sikes
Cleveland	Ichord	Sisk
Conable	Kee	Thompson, N.J.
Conyers	Kluczynski	Williams, Miss.
Dawson	Kuykendall	Willis
Dent	McFall	Wright
Diggs	Mathias, Calif.	Wyman
Dingell	Meskill	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FLYNT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H.R. 10340, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 375 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MILLER of California (during reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first section of the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FULTON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

On page 1, line 5, strike the amount

"$4,992,182,000" and insert in lieu thereof the amount "$4,742,182,000".

On page 2, line 1, strike "(2) Apollo applications, $444,700,000;" and insert in lieu thereof, "(2) Apollo applications, "$194,700,000;"

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am proposing here a cut of $250 million in the Apollo applications program. The total sum requested by NASA for this program was $454,700,000. In the committee we cut that proposal by $10,000,000. I think it should be cut further—by another $250 million to give us a program of $194,700,000.

I have several reasons for proposing this cut. First, the state of our Nation's economy with current inflation, the war in Vietnam and its costs, and the technical personnel requirements for our supporting defense industries.

Second. The Apollo applications program is ordering hardware. It provides funds for the purchase of Saturn IB's and Saturn V's beyond what is programed for the Apollo lunar landing program itself. If the Apollo program is successful, we should have surplus boosters of both types from it. In fact, NASA's own witnesses have testified before our committee during two separate fiscal year authorization hearings that they expect anywhere from three to seven Saturn IB's and five to six or more Saturn V's to be left over from the Apollo program. It is my position that these can be used for the flights currently proposed for the Apollo applications program, rather than ordering new hardware beyond Apollo. If the Apollo program itself is a success, we will have surplus boosters. If we order more boosters now, we will have them sitting on the shelf and be faced with the expensive and unreasonable task of finding mission for them. That to me is putting the cart before the horse.

In support of this position further, I cite to you the report of the President's Science Advisory Committee published in February of 1967 which recommends:

The question of continued production of the Uprated Saturn I launch vehicle is less clear and in the panels' judgment needs further study. The payload capabilities of the Uprated Saturn I are not significantly superior to those of the Titan IIIM while the launch costs of the Uprated Saturn I are about double those of the Titan IIIM. (P.S.A.C. *Report* '67 p. 36.)

Statistically, the Saturn IB—the uprated Saturn booster—can put into a 105-mile circular orbit a total of 40,000 pounds of payload. The Titan IIIM can do the same with about 32,000 pounds of payload. The military is already producing Titan IIIM's and there are further economies of scale which can be realized here. To say that the technical capacity for assembling large boosters will be crippled by a cut in Apollo applications program is to fail to appreciate the tremendous complex the military has put together already for the Titan. To say that the manned space flight program will be ground to a halt by a cut in the AAP authorization is again to ignore the possibilities offered by the Titan IIIM.

With regard to those aspects of the Apollo applications program which call for boosters of the Saturn V capacity, I say they can use those left over from the Apollo program. If there are not any left over from Apollo's initial order of 15, I would say they are unsafe, and that we should get something new.

Over the years before the committee, I have repeatedly championed the development of new high-energy liquid fuels and solid propellants. We on the committee have this year put into the bill some $12 million which NASA did not even ask for, so that NASA can proceed with the development of a solid fuel rocket. These rockets are projected to have a purchase cost less than a third of the Saturn V. Their components can be reused—we will stop shooting expensive engines into outer space with no hope of recovery. If at the time of the Apollo applications projects, that is, 1971–72, we need additional boosters because the Saturn V's have not proved themselves reliable, I think they should be of the solid fuel type.

I have left the sum of $194.7 million in the Apollo applications for the continuation of the research and development activities that NASA proposes for this program. I strongly favor research into the high specific impulse fuels of boron and fluorine and some further consideration of alternative ways in which these experiments and tests can be conducted without the purchase of extra Saturn boosters.

Third, I am proposing a cut in the Apollo applications program along the thinking of the President's Science Advisory Committee report. That report recommends:

Before substantial funds are committed to the AAP plan to modify Apollo hardware or to utilize the orbital workshops for extended periods, a careful study should be made of the suitability, cost and availability of Titan III/MOL systems for biomedical studies of man for periods up to 60 days. NASA should also investigate whether delivery of these components could be speeded without interference with the MOL program if additional funds were contributed to MOL in the formative years of the program. (P.S.A.C. report 1967 p. 25.)

I believe that the manned orbital laboratory and the orbiting research laboratory should be cooperative programs—currently they are undertaken by separate agencies. The U.S. Air Force is producing the MOL system, and NASA the ORL. Again I refer to the PSAC report:

The next significant step in biomedical studies will involve extended duration flights of 100 days or more, and will require major redesign of MOL components, or major new developments based on Apollo hardware. The determination of the most effective and economical approach acquires a detailed study in which MOL components are explicitly considered as a possible alternative. NASA should initiate such a study as soon as possible. (PSAC Report p. 28.)

I do not believe that this type of cost-benefit reasoning has been applied to the currently proposed Apollo applications program. When I asked NASA specifically to consider such a cost-benefit or alternative systems approach, the reply I received was twofold:

The data that we have accumulated to date in the two NASA programs does not lend itself to an analysis by this (cost-analysis) approach. In achieving an R & D objective, it is not feasible to evaluate alternative approaches on a cost effectiveness basis because there are no standards or experience to judge by.

This to me indicates that NASA can profit by the recommendations of the President's Science Advisory Committee which has offered several excellent suggestions as to where the rigorous thinking and analysis demanded by a cost-effectiveness approach to programs can be applied. The lack of specific information on the Apollo applications missions is indicative of this other way of handling the funding. To ask the Congress to make intelligent decisions about the Apollo applications program on the current information level is to ask a scientist to describe an elephant when you only show him its trunk. Where we need the funds now is in the research and in the development; my amendment leaves such funds in the bill. I strongly recommend that the remainder be cut.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOSMER) there were—ayes 133, noes 61.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FLYNT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10340) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks in the RECORD in connection with the bill which has just been under consideration, and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking

the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma, the program for the remainder of this week, and the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, the minority leader, we have finished the legislative business that we intend to call up for this week, and will put over the bill we have been considering until next week, and I will announce the date later.

The business for next week is as follows:

Monday is District day—seven bills:

H.R. 10783—Omnibus anticrime bill for the District of Columbia; H.R. 10964—medical assistance for the District of Columbia under title XIX of Social Security Amendments of 1965; H.R. 8582—to increase the number of associate judges on the District of Columbia court of appeals; H.R. 7831—motor vehicle insurance amendments; H.R. 5799—to amend District of Columbia Uniform Gifts to Minors Act; S. 763—to add spouse of owner to motor vehicle registration; and S. 1226—transfer to District of Columbia court of general sessions right to waive premarital blood tests.

Also House Joint Resolution 652, continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968.

H.R. 10943, to amend and extend title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965, under an open rule with 3 hours of debate, and waiving points of order.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from Oklahoma yield to me at that point?

Mr. ALBERT. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Is my understanding correct that on this particular bill, H.R. 10943, the agreement is we will only complete general debate on that day?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct. In any event, even if part of the general debate is left, if it should run so late, that would be the first order of business the next day. If we should finish that up, we will go on as the program has been prepared.

May I say to the gentleman and to the House, Mr. Speaker, that it is evident from the business that we have listed that we do have important bills for Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, and the Members should govern themselves accordingly. We hope to finish all the bills on this program not later than early Thursday, but we do hope to finish all the bills that are on the program by the close of business on Thursday.

Tuesday—H.R. 10340, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration authorization, 1968—continuing consideration.

H.R. 2082—authorize travel, transportation, and education allowance for members of Armed Forces for dependents' schooling; open rule, 1 hour of debate.

House Resolution 514—creating Select Committee on Parking.

For Wednesday and balance of week—

H.R. 10918—Atomic Energy Commission authorization, 1968; open rule, 2 hours of debate.

Conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program will be announced later. Of course, Members are advised that conferees have been appointed on the railroad strike matter and if that matter should be determined by the conferees, it would have priority.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 26, 1967

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, we do not plan to call up any additional legislation this week and in view of that, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, as I recollect our colloquy, it was pointed out the recess would start at the conclusion of business on Thursday, June 29.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I got the impression also that we could expect consideration of some legislation on Thursday. I thought I heard the gentleman say a few minutes ago that it was hoped to finish this schedule on Wednesday, which would mean to me that there would not be any legislative business on Thursday.

Mr. ALBERT. We might have some business on Thursday. We may not be able to finish all of these bills that are on the schedule for Tuesday and Wednesday on time. We want to reserve Thursday but, of course, we will try to conduct matters for the convenience of Members. We do want to advise Members that the recess does not start until the close of business on Thursday and that we will probably have business on Thursday.

We may have conference reports and they will be in order to be considered on Thursday.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the distinguished majority leader whether it is proposed to adopt a recess resolution or will there be token sessions during the recess?

Mr. ALBERT. We expect to do that by resolution providing recess from the close of business Thursday, June 29, and for the House to meet on Monday, July 10.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

BREAKDOWN OF OUR GOVERNMENT AND ITS CAUSES

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the news headlines were "Guard Called Out in Cincinnati, Racial Strife Boils Coast to Coast, Los Angeles, Tampa, Montgomery," "Civil Rights Leaders Encouraging Riots, FBI Chief Charges," and the Washington Daily News, a local newspaper, one of a national chain, describing the Supreme Court had this to say in an editorial:

It often has been said the law is "what the Supreme Court says it is." With the present Court, the assertion has been more than a quip. These Justices have written into the Constitution and into the law meanings previous Justices had said were not there. They have broadened the Constitution to say things precise reading does not disclose. They have written a whole new book of law.

They have denied to Congress powers it long was assured it possessed, and which had seemed clear in the Constitution. They have upset state laws, state courts and even state constitutions.

The present Court has broken all the apparent restraints in the Constitution, reaching out boldly with revolutionary doctrine. Some of these decisions, as the Court's own dissenters have been the first to mark, have seemed downright whimsical.

Just lately, by a 5-to-4 vote, the Court erased a 1958 decision and knocked out a 1940 law in which Congress had set out the offenses by which an American might lose his citizenship. The present Court denied Congress any power at all to deprive a man of citizenship, no matter what his offense.

In a whole series of decisions, "justice" has been held clearly to favor the accused, regardless of the crime, regardless of evidence of guilt.

The Court laid down strict rules about confessions, but turned around and decided its own rules didn't apply to previous cases.

This had the practical effect of averting a general jail delivery, but consistency would have required the court to release hundreds of convicts.

In applying its "one-man-one-vote" decree, the court virtually ousted legislatures in many states, even overrode constitutions recently approved by state voters. Yet in the litigation over Georgia's governorship, the Court held there was nothing in the Federal Constitution "which dictates the method a state must use to select its governor."

Many of the states patterned their legislatures after Congress, where each state is entitled to two Senators and at least one House member regardless of population. But in batting down the state systems the Court simply said Congress was different.

This Court has been not merely interpreting and clarifying law—it has been writing it.

The first to say so have been the dissenting opinions of the divided Court. Just this week Justice Black, dissenting from the ruling

wiping out New York's wiretap law, accused the majority of usurping the policy-making power of Congress, and writing into the Constitution "words the Court believes the framers should have used but did not." Last week Justice Harlan flatly accused the majority of "amending the Constitution."

"Nothing in the letter or spirit of the Constitution," he said in an earlier dissent, "squares with the heavy-handed, one-sided action" taken by the majority.

Mr. Speaker, on yesterday there appeared in another local newspaper the following notice:

BANK PLAGUED BY BANDITS THROWS UP HANDS, WILL CLOSE

The holdup-plagued Southern Maryland Bank & Trust Co. branch at 829 Southern Ave., Oxon Hill, has decided it has had enough.

The bank will officially close the branch Friday at 8 p.m. and accounts will be shifted to the bank's main office at 3731 Branch Ave., Hillcrest Heights.

Announcement of the closing is made on large signs posted in the bank's windows. The signs list "conditions beyond our control" as the reasons for closing the branch.

These "conditions," police said, are the five holdups at the branch in the last 18 months. The bank, near the District line at South Capitol Street, was robbed twice in December 1965, in October and December of 1966 and again January 31.

Bank officials have scheduled a press conference tomorrow to announce further details of the closing.

Today's newspaper carries the headline: "Atlanta Boils, Stokely Dances." Then follows the story of Stokely Carmichael's speech which clearly incited the most recent riot in Atlanta, resulting in the death of at least one person.

In the same newspaper appears the President's plea for "Congress to Act on His Anticrime Measures—Teacher Corps, War on Poverty, Juvenile Delinquency Prevention, and the Safe Streets and Crime Control Bills."

Mr. Speaker, whatever the merits or demerits of the social, Great Society, or Federal monetary aid to local police forces programs advocated by the President, the present wave of lawlessness will get worse until we make punishment certain.

Present conditions are directly attributable to the Supreme Court and other Federal courts bound by it and to the Department of Justice and other executive departments who not only have condoned the taking of the law into one's own hands if it happens to be a cause in which the law-enacting judges believe, but actually in many instances have promoted such a course.

Mr. Speaker, I have pointed those facts out, citing chapter and verse year after year and do so again here today.

Like many of you I am a lawyer, I served as district attorney before becoming a Member of this body. Many of you served in that capacity and others were judges. All with that background of experience, I feel, will agree with me.

No one questions the value of the home and proper environment and training—but, historically, laws and law enforcement have been necessary.

Society itself is built around the absolute necessity that the individual must conform to general rules for the welfare of the group or society. You cannot burn your house if it endangers your neighbor's house. You cannot take your neighbor's property; for if that were permitted, why work and save to accumulate capital?

We know the influence for good or bad of television, of newspapers, public figures, and church leaders; but, from my years of experience as district attorney, when all is said and done, respect for and obedience to law is dependent upon certainty of punishment, which, of course, calls for detection, arrest, and conviction. While we can take actions to help with the first two, we will never restore law and order until we restore certainty of punishment, for as we see all around us, punishment of the individual today is not only uncertain but highly unlikely.

I quote from my closing argument when we passed the Antiriot Amendment in the House last year—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 15, page 19966—which I hope will be before us again soon:

We see on every hand the court's getting away from the rule on which orderly government was built, a general rule to the effect that if the record clearly showed the guilt of the defendant beyond a reasonable doubt, he or she would not be released on the public on some technicality and particularly a technicality raised by the appellate or Supreme Court itself.

It is said that Nero fiddled while Rome burned. It strikes me that is about what we are doing here.

At a time when our country is becoming the victim of the criminal, when our wives and daughters and we ourselves are afraid to walk our streets, we find the Congress spending these hours and days trying to protect the rights of irresponsible persons to sit on a jury.

We need to do something about crime and criminals. We need to make punishment more certain. We need to put the rights of an orderly and law abiding society ahead of the whims of the Supreme Court.

It is time to wake up here and quit fiddling. Rome is certainly burning, and if you do not believe it, read today's newspapers.

Mr. Speaker, doubtless the Congress will soon be dealing with the President's so-called anticrime measures. When we do, let us not fool ourselves. These suggested actions will scarcely touch the cure for the present breakdown of our society and the Congress will not effect a correction or change until we go after the Supreme Court and the Department of Justice, which promotes and supports the Court in turning loose criminals upon a defenseless public.

I urge the immediate consideration of several resolutions I reintroduced at the beginning of this session of Congress:

House Joint Resolution 142, to establish a commission to investigate the increase in riots and law violations, including loss of life and property, damage to or threat of damage to or destruction of the economy of States, counties, municipalities, or other political subdivisions, the causes thereof, and to recommend legislation that would grant States, counties, municipalities, or other political subdivisions additional rights to obtain injunctive and other relief to the end that the public welfare be protected;

House Joint Resolution 145, to establish a commission to investigate the increase in law violation, to determine the causes and fix responsibility for the breakdown in law enforcement, with the resulting destruction of life and property, to recommend corrective legislation, and for other purposes; and

House Joint Resolution 144, to establish the Commission for Reestablishing Constitutional Principles.

WRONG EMPHASIS PLACED BY NEWS MEDIA

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is one of the tragedies of our age that when a man burns a house he receives national notice, but when a man builds a house his accomplishment often goes unnoticed. Perhaps that is the severest wrong of the time in which we live, for we emphasize what is bad and pay little attention to what is good.

This peculiar, contorted outlook on life became painfully evident yesterday when four fine young Negro teenage boys from Atlanta, Ga., arrived in my office after walking 645 miles, which took 2½ weeks, to demonstrate their love and loyal support for our country and its soldiers in Vietnam. They carried an American flag from my Atlanta office, which they unfurled on the Capitol steps, and which they presented to you, Mr. Speaker. These young devoted Americans are Willie Hunter, Nathaniel Jackson, Douglas Sanders, and Charles Bailey.

When they arrived in my office they were not seeking publicity, but I felt that this was a story which should be told to the entire Nation. We called the three national TV networks and what was their response? One said flatly that they were not interested in this feat. A second said they would call back if they were interested and they never called back. A third said they would see if they could round up a camera crew and we heard nothing further. We called all the national news magazines, but none showed up.

Surely, this feat was something worthy of national notice: four trimly dressed, clean-shaven, well-mannered youngsters who were not protesting against something, but were trying to demonstrate their loyalty to their flag and their country. They wanted to show that the members of their race are first-class citizens and should support the U.S. flag wherever it flies. They are quite a contrast to the unkempt, unwashed, unshaven hippies and beatniks who are always in the news and who present such a terrible image of American young people.

To their everlasting credit, the two national wire services, and the correspondents for our Atlanta papers did interview as did the Evening Star here in Washington.

But the Evening Star's story, which I show here on last night's front page, is all too evident of what is wrong in America today. The exploits of these

four fine young men were "kissed off" in a three-column story, with a single-line heading and no pictures. Yet, immediately below it—emblazoned in five columns of pictures and six columns of copy that continued in two columns inside the paper—was a story about a band of shoeless, unkempt, unshaven hippies who walked through the White House yesterday. The story was carried under a six-column headline of considerably larger type than the story about the clean-cut youngsters who are standing behind their country. This morning's Post does not even carry the story, but does have a four-column picture and story of Negro rioters in Atlanta.

Maybe I get too angry at all this. Maybe I do not know what is supposed to make "news," but to me there is something far more appealing, far more wholesome and newsworthy about four young men who emulate what is good in America, than those who are the epitome of the sickness in our society. And I particularly felt their exploit was newsworthy since they came from a city where rebellious members of their race have stolen the headlines with 4 days of rioting and lawlessness that resulted in at least one death and several injuries.

Perhaps it is no wonder that so many young Americans are confused and are rebelling against constituted authority. It would seem to me that we ought to be using every possible opportunity to change this situation; to emphasize what is good in mankind and in our young people; to show the world that there are, after all, many fine young men and women who have learned that there are even yet some worthwhile values in honor, loyalty to your country, responsibility, and respect for authority. But apparently, much of the news media, including our national television networks, do not think so. Unfortunately, it is they who are to a large part forming public opinion in this country of ours.

AID AND AMERICAN INDUSTRY OVERSEAS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been interested in the activities of American business overseas. I have recently received from Mr. William S. Gaud, the Administrator of AID, an excellent letter and report on AID activities in cooperation with American industry doing business overseas.

Mr. Gaud points out that it is a specific goal of the Agency for International Development program to create an economic climate in countries receiving aid from us which will attract and utilize foreign investment resources He also points out that in the U.S. AID financed over a billion dollars in exports from all 50 States in fiscal year 1966.

Perhaps the most interesting aspect of AID's statement on private resources is its function as a catalyst to induce an expanded private sector in the economies which it aids.

Under unanimous consent I place in the RECORD Mr. Gaud's letter and the text of his statement entitled "Private Resources for Development," and urge every Member to read this important document:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C.

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRIEDEL: The use of private resources—both foreign and domestic—is central to A.I.D.'s efforts to help countries develop economically and socially. We believe that successful development programs take place when the full energies of private enterprise and private initiative are brought into play.

It is a specific goal of the A.I.D. program to create in aid receiving countries an economic climate which will attract and utilize domestic and foreign investment resources. Only through these sources are the capital and skills available which are needed to develop these nations beyond requiring concessional economic assistance.

In A.I.D. this policy finds realization through program loans, projects, and technical assistance, all of which not only assist importers, contractors, farmers, and others in the private sector of their nations' economy but also help stimulate policy reforms in economic and social areas.

In the United States we have financed over a billion dollars in exports from all fifty states in fiscal year 1966, including $181 million in agricultural and industrial machinery, $133 million in iron and steel products, and $214 million in chemicals and fertilizers. We also have about 1,500 technical service contracts with U.S. universities and other private groups.

The enclosed statement is from the A.I.D. presentation to the Congressional Committees which review our legislation. I send it to you in the hope it will help answer some of the many inquiries we receive from Members of Congress for a definitive statement on A.I.D.'s relationship to the private sector.

Should you need additional copies of the enclosed statement or if I may be of other assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM S. GAUD

PRIVATE RESOURCES FOR DEVELOPMENT

Those countries which are developing most rapidly—both in rising per capita incomes and strengthened institutions—are those where government policies, investments of self-generated savings and external assistance have combined to bring the creative forces of private initiative into full play. Taiwan, Israel, Greece and now Pakistan, Peru and Korea—specifics vary widely but a dramatic surge in productive private activity is common to all.

Awareness of this truth—derived from the experience of the past ten years—underlies A. I. D.'s direct assistance—program loans, specific programs and the means used to carry them out. Further, it has also sharpened the Agency's appreciation of its role in encouraging and assisting the widest possible participation in development by other American groups—State and local governments, private business and non-profit organizations.

Although the over-all climate for local and foreign investment is a composite of many factors, certain elements are basic: sound legislation and policies (fiscal, monetary, import, price and wage) adding up to a governmental framework which supports rather than inhibits private initiative; pluralistic private institutions such as labor, cooperatives and business groups which stimulate and channel individual creativity; skilled workers and responsible management; access to medium and long-term credit. A. I. D.'s entire program: its objectives, its project loans, loans to credit institutions and technical assistance—helps generate, shape and strengthen these prerequisites of a satisfactory climate for investment.

Similarly, the vital contribution to these objectives made by private U. S. resources is stimulated by A. I. D. in its role as catalyst. Information services, investment insurance, guaranties and loans—all are used to encourage responsible private American investment, bringing with it capital, skills and technology. Through the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid, the Technical Assistance Clearing House, the Partners of the Alliance and the International Executive Service Corps, A. I. D. endeavors to broaden the contribution by private non-profit groups.

Recognizing the increasing importance of its role, A.I.D. has made two major organizational changes. An Office of Private Resources has been established to coordinate the relations of the Agency with private groups and to strive for broader participation by them. Within the Office of Private Resources, a Private Investment Center has been set up to administer all of A.I.D.'s investment incentive programs as a single point of contact for present and potential U.S. private investors in the less developed countries.

THROUGH DIRECT A.I.D. ASSISTANCE

The close relationship between basic A.I.D. objectives and private sector growth is common to all A.I.D. programs.

Program loans, such as the $140 million loan to Pakistan in 1964 and the $50 million fertilizer loan to India in 1966, are conditioned on basic reforms in import and licensing procedures which give thousands of farmers and businessmen access to fertilizer, spare parts, raw materials and capital equipment exported from the United States.

Sector loans, in areas such as agriculture, support reforms in credit policies, distribution and price structures to give farmers the necessary incentive to increase their use of fertilizers, pesticides and high-yielding seeds.

Project loans, such as an $18.6 million loan to Korea for relending to Korean National Railways for locomotives, an $8.9 million loan to a Brazilian utility for power plant and transmissions facilities, and a $1.6 million loan to Nigeria to improve its telephone systems, finance the infusion of U.S. skills and equipment which help provide the transport, power and communications prerequisite to expansion of private economic activity.

Loans to intermediate credit institutions, such as the $8 million loan to the Ethiopian Investment Corporation, and the $2.1 million loan to the Agricultural Bank of Bolivia, open up to businessmen and farmers heretofore non-existent sources of long term capital vital to private sector growth.

Technical assistance is used in many ways to assist private sector growth—

To help Korean industrialists expand their exports through improved quality control;

To set up a productivity and investment center in Paraguay;

To develop small indigenous industries in Nigeria;

To improve the capacity of the private sector in Chile to participate in national planning;

To stimulate the formation of democratically oriented labor unions in Latin America and Africa;

To assist Brazil in drafting comprehensive capital markets legislation;

To develop a modern graduate school of business administration in Peru;

To establish an Inter-American Investment Promotion Center in the U.S. as a clearinghouse for investment opportunities developed by Latin American industrial development organizations. Face-to-face presentation, as recommended by the Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid, will be emphasized.

In carrying out these programs of direct assistance, A.I.D. relies more and more on private U.S. resources through the financing of millions of dollars of commodities and services.

A.I.D.-financed expenditures for U.S. commodities in FY 1966 were over $1.1 billion. Included were $181 million in agricultural and industrial machinery, $133 million in iron and steel products, $127 million in chemicals and $87 million in fertilizers. Exports from all 50 states were financed through A.I.D.

As of September 30, 1966, A.I.D. had 1,489 technical service contracts with private groups with a total value of some $509 million to carry out projects in 73 countries. A year ago, the number of such contracts was 1,366 valued at approximately $466 million.

Within this group 127 American colleges and universities held 307 contracts valued at some $220 million for research, surveys, training and technical assistance. About $194 million was for Technical Assistance projects by 74 universities in 39 countries.

Private American organizations play a particularly prominent role in the field of cooperative credit unions, agricultural credit societies and savings and loan institutions. A.I.D. has worldwide agreements with Credit Union National Association, Farmers Union International Assistance Corporation, Foundation for Cooperative Housing, Cooperative League of the U.S.A., International Cooperative Development Association, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, National League of Insured Savings Associations, and International Cooperative Training Center at the University of Wisconsin. These organizations supplied some two-thirds of the 357 advisers and consultants working on A.I.D. cooperative projects in 54 countries. During 1966 A.I.D. assistance affected 30,000 cooperatives and credit institutions with 9.8 million members in 46 countries. Some 2,500 new cooperatives with 500,000 members were organized, most of them agricultural. It is particularly appropriate that, in this fifth anniversary year of the Humphrey Amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, A.I.D. now has relationships, through contracting organizations, with all major national, regional and local cooperatives in the United States.

During the coming year A.I.D. will continue to devise new ways in which private U.S. resources can be brought into play in direct assistance programs.

In close cooperation with private business, A.I.D. will examine applications of Section 601(b)(8) of the FAA, under which Congress authorized, in situations where direct private investment is not readily encouraged, the use of private American firms to operate projects on a cost plus incentive fee contract basis with transfer of equity ownership to private investors at the earliest feasible time. Use of the authority as a new weapon in the War on Hunger seems particularly promising.

A.I.D. will start a pilot program, in cooperation with private industry, to test the applicability of the systems approach to finding the optimum answers to the complex problems of economic development.

A.I.D. AS A CATALYST

The previous section illustrated the many ways in which private sector growth is central to A.I.D.'s direct assistance activities and showed how A.I.D. uses U.S. resources—skills, institutions and commodities—to carry out this program. The present section summarizes A.I.D.'s role in generating broader and deeper participation in development by private groups, profit and non-profit.

In recent years there has been a growing awareness of the importance of this role. The President, the Congress, advisory committees, private groups and A.I.D. itself all have stressed its importance. The reports of the Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid and of the International Cooperation Year Committee on Technical Cooperation and Investment, the President's Foreign Aid message of February 1, 1966, and, most recently, enactment by the Congress of Title IX (Utilization of Democratic Institutions in Development) and Section 601(b)(2) of the FAA of 1966, are particularly prominent milestones. Accordingly, the President announced in his Foreign Aid Message of February 9, 1967, the creation within A.I.D. of an Office of Private Resources, responsible for the encouragement, support, stimulation and coordination of the already widespread activities by the U.S. private sector and the achievement of their even greater potential contribution to development.

The new Office will provide a central point of contact for both profit and non-profit organization, will administer A.I.D.'s private investment incentives programs, and will be charged with developing new means to broaden and deepen the contributions by other non-profit groups. It will be responsible for discharging the Congressional mandate to the President to "establish an effective system for obtaining adequate information with respect to the activities of, and opportunities for, non-governmental participation in the development process, and for utilizing such information in the planning, direction, and execution of programs carried out under this Act, and in the coordination of such programs with the ever increasing developmental activities of non-governmental United States institutions." (FAA of 1966, Section 601(b)(2).)

Stimulating U.S. private investment

A.I.D. incentive programs for American private investors have continued to expand and improve. Nevertheless, the volume of private American investment in the less developed countries, particularly manufacturing ventures, although growing, remains disappointingly small. Direct investment in manufacturing (including reinvested earnings) in all less developed countries has risen from $262 million in 1962 to $461 million in 1965, this in comparison to similar investment in Western Europe of $1,226 million in 1962 and $1,026 million in 1965. Given the enormous potential of markets in the developing countries and the tremendous contribution in capital, technology and skills which is made by private investment, it is evident that A.I.D. should further strengthen its efforts to stimulate private investment.

Private investment center

A.I.D. has decided to establish, within the Office of Private Resources, a Private Investment Center specifically designed to meet the needs of potential U.S. investors in the developing countries. Organized along the lines of a business corporation, it will provide a single point of contact in A.I.D. for U.S. investors. In addition to pre-investment information services, the Private Investment Center will offer investment survey insurance, specific risk political insurance, equity insurance, extended risk guaranties, and local currency and dollar financing. Authority is requested to use fee income from the insurance and guaranty programs for the administrative expenses of the Center.

A.I.D. believes that centralized administration of its private investment incentive activities will result in more effective across-the-board support to the U.S. investment community and should stimulate increased investment activity.

The advice and counsel of the International Private Investment Advisory Council, recently established in accordance with Section 601(c) of the FAA of 1966, will be of great value in guiding these efforts.

Information services

A.I.D. continues to expand its information services to the American business community. The *Businessmen's Information Center* serves as a central inquiry office for U.S. business firms and potential investors. The index to A.I.D.'s *Catalog of Investment Information and Opportunities*, a central reference covering over 1,600 basic data and feasibility studies, as well as current joint-venture investment opportunities, has been supplied to more than 47,500 organizations, firms and individuals. A special supplement on Southeast Asia, with a large amount of new material on specific investment situations in that area was issued in July 1966. Two hundred fifty *Industry Profiles*, each giving basic information on the establishment of a small or medium sized plant in a specific industry, have been prepared and made available to businessmen.

Investment surveys

Even when investor interest has been generated in a particular project, the businessman may hesitate to go forward because of the high costs involved in making the necessary detailed preinvestment feasibility and market studies. A.I.D. helps meet this problem through its Investment Survey Program under which it shares the cost of surveying potential investments in the developing countries. A.I.D. reimburses 50% of the survey costs if the investment is not made. Experience to date suggests that this program serves a useful purpose. A.I.D. is obligated for $725,000 as its share of 80 completed surveys in which the investment decision was negative. To date, 31 affirmative decisions have been made representing $70 million in planned investment by private U.S. firms. Thus for each dollar of appropriated funds, $90 in private investment has been generated.

A.I.D. is requesting an authorization of $4.8 million for the Investment Survey Program, the Catalog of Investment Information and Opportunities and the Industry Profiles project, to be available until expended. In addition, the proposed Foreign Assistance Act of 1967 would permit reimbursement of more than 50% of the cost of investment surveys (existing law limits reimbursement to 50%).

Specific risk political insurance

The Specific Risk Insurance Program protects investors against the political risks of expropriation, inconvertibility and damage due to war, revolution and insurrection. During the past year, a number of improvements have been made in the program in accordance with recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid.

The number of less developed countries where the A.I.D. investment insurance program has been instituted rose from 40 at the end of 1961 to 75 as of December 31, 1966. Additionally, the coverages available in five countries were expanded during 1966 and the program was instituted in Indonesia shortly after the year end.

Outstanding coverage under the Specific Risk Insurance Program rose from $479 million in 1961 to $3.1 billion by the end of 1966. New investment covered under this program in 1966 totalled $250 million.

In an effort to induce additional investment in less developed countries, the cost of coverage to the American investor was materially lowered during 1966 through a reduction in fees. The principal reduction was for inconvertibility coverage, down from one-half of 1% to one-fourth of 1% of the amount of insurance at risk. Also, a policy combining the existing coverages for losses due to expropriation and losses due to war,

revolution and insurrection was offered at a cost of seven-eighths of 1%, whereas the coverages singly had cost one-half of 1% each. Another significant cost reduction to the American private investor was made in the reduction of the "standby" fee for all coverages, which was reduced from one-fourth of 1% to one-tenth of 1%. "Standby" coverage is insurance which is reserved for future use. It is estimated that these fee reductions saved investors about $3 million in 1966 alone.

Coverage on convertibility losses has been increased from 95% to 99%.

During 1966, fees of $8.3 million were received. Three claims were paid totaling $217,000. Two were for inconvertibility, and one was for revolution damage. As of December 31, 1966, seven claims were pending totaling approximately $1.7 million.

Other accomplishments and innovations of the Specific Risk Insurance Program during 1966 included—

A newly revised handbook which was published both in English and in Spanish, and a French translation was begun.

Certain of the standard form contracts were revised for clarity and to take into account coverage and fee changes.

A new form contract aimed at stimulating use of the program by institutional lenders was introduced.

Newly revised forms and procedures were adopted in processing applications and contracts which materially increased efficiency.

A.I.D. is requesting a $2 billion increase in the authority to issue investment insurance—$1 billion for each of the next two years. Authority to expand war damage coverage to include "civil strife" is also requested.

Equity insurance

As a further means of encouraging U.S. investment, A.I.D. has developed a new equity insurance program. This program provides "all risk" coverage of up to 50% of any loss of equity or equity-like investment realized through bankruptcy or sale. The requested increase in authority for investment insurance specifies that not more than $125 million of the total authority would be used for this form of insurance over the next two years.

Extended risk guaranties

Under this program A.I.D. is able to provide greater protection for investors than the insurance available under the Specific Risk Program. Seventy-five percent of loan investments and 50% of equity investments can be protected from loss for any reason (other than commercially insurable risks) not due to the fraud or misconduct of the investor.

As of December 31, 1966, Extended Risk Guaranties for other than housing investments had been authorized for a portion of the financing of eight projects with coverage totaling $55 million, compared to four projects with $14 million in coverage a year earlier. The projects are a petro-chemical plant in Argentina, a carbon black plant in Colombia, a fish packing plant in Somalia, fertilizer plants in Korea, India and Brazil, a hotel in Nicaragua and a pulp and paper mill in Thailand. Total investment in these projects will amount to $310 million.

Through use of the extended risk guaranty authority, along the lines recommended by the Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid, A.I.D. is now able to attract long-term credits from U.S. institutional lenders, such as pension funds and insurance companies, to help finance important private projects. This opens up for the first time a major source of capital for private projects in the developing countries and does so through the use of the credit of the United States rather than appropriated funds.

A.I.D. is requesting a $200 million increase in this authority—$100 million for each of the next two years.

Housing guaranties

In Latin America, housing guaranties totaling $200 million have been authorized for 37 projects as of December 1966. Twenty-two of these projects, comprising 21,000 dwelling units, are under construction. In the Republic of China (Taiwan) a $5 million guaranty will result in the construction of approximately 1,400 units. In Thailand a $5 million guaranty will cover the construction of some 817 units. In Tunisia a $5 million guaranty will cover the construction of some 700 units.

Loans to American firms

Under the "Cooley" loan program A.I.D. can make available U.S.-owned local currencies to American firms and their affiliates. During FY 1966, A.I.D. authorized 41 loans in 15 countries, in foreign currencies equivalent to approximately $42.6 million. These loans were made for such varied activities as the production of pharmaceuticals in Greece, foodstuffs in Israel, animal feeds in the Sudan and in Peru, polyethylene in China (Taiwan), integrated electronic circuits in Korea, and for the establishment of development banking facilities in Pakistan.

The Food for Peace Act adopted by Congress in 1966 permits and encourages continuation and further expansion of this program. Although the Act provides that sales of agricultural products are to be converted from local currency to dollar payments over a five-year transition period, it also provides that local currencies may be accepted in lieu of dollars for specified purposes including local currency financing for U.S. firms and their affiliates.

Dollar loans to private American and local ventures are available through A.I.D. Most of these loans have been made for relatively large projects. It is hoped that the Private Investment Center will be able to expand the use of direct dollar authority for some of the smaller projects, with particular emphasis on the agri-business field.

Dollar loans are also available through intermediate credit institutions, such as industrial development banks, which have been established with A.I.D. assistance.

STIMULATING BROADER PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT BY PRIVATE NON-PROFIT GROUPS

Private non-profit assistance—technical assistance and emergency relief—is on the increase to the less developed countries through foundations, voluntary agencies and the like. It approaches nearly $750 million annually.

Voluntary agencies

Through private voluntary agencies, the American people have maintained a long tradition of help to peoples overseas. Assistance through private channels exceeded $400 million in FY 1966.

Since World War II, Federal assistance has been available to private agencies registered with A.I.D.'s Advisory Committee on Voluntary Aid. Registered voluntary agencies are eligible to receive U.S. agricultural commodities for donation in their own overseas programs. The cost of these provisions, and the cost of shipping them overseas is paid for through the Food for Freedom program. These food supplies, distributed through private channels, reached 72 million people in FY 1966; 36 million of these were children participating in school lunch programs.

In addition, the A.I.D. budget includes an annual amount ($6.3 million for FY 1968) earmarked to pay for the ocean transport of the registered agencies' own privately donated supplies. In FY 1966, $5.5 million of AID funds paid the costs of shipping about $65 million worth of supplies for such nonprofit voluntary agencies as the Church World Service, Catholic Relief Services, the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee and CARE.

The voluntary agencies also assist in disaster relief programs throughout the world. In FY 1966 they distributed $1.6 million in commodities, which included P.L. 480 foods, tents, clothing, blankets, medicines and other disaster supplies.

In addition to basic relief programs, the voluntary agencies are conducting educational, agricultural, health, nutrition, welfare, community development and self-help activities worldwide, to reach refugees, mothers and young children, orphans and needy families. These programs are conducted with and through local counterparts in the developing countries.

The primary purpose of the U.S. voluntary agencies overseas programs is a humanitarian one but in recent years stronger emphasis has been placed on training and development activities to help others attain the ability to take care of their own needs. To encourage their technical assistance programs, the Technical Assistance Clearing House, supported by A.I.D., published a directory of 500 U.S. non-private groups engaged in technical assistance abroad. A special addition, devoted to Far East Technical Assistance Programs, was issued in 1966.

International Executive Service Corps

The International Executive Service Corps (IESC), located in New York City, is a private non-profit organization directed and managed by a group of leading American businessmen. Its purpose is to strengthen private businesses in the developing countries through direct management assistance provided by a volunteer corps of experienced American businessmen. A.I.D. encouraged creation of the IESC and provides financial assistance for its development.

Under the IESC program, assistance to local management is made available upon request, and a fee at host country rates is charged for the service. During 1966 IESC received 367 requests from businesses, large and small, in 37 developing countries, and 154 projects were started. It is anticipated that 356 new projects will be started in 1967. The Service Corps has a roster of 2,150 experienced businessmen recruited by unpaid representatives of business in 38 American cities.

Tapping the vast reservoir of retired businessmen and mid-career executives to improve private enterprise in developing countries has been favorably accepted by businesses and governments overseas and is generating a successful partnership between American business and the U.S. Government here at home.

Some examples of completed IESC projects are—

A vegetable oil processor in Iran desired market research and sales planning assistance for its products. An IESC volunteer, retired as a managing director of Standard Brands, established useful new business and marketing practices for the local business and has been asked to return for a second period of assistance.

IESC volunteers with long experience with A & P Food Stores have materially assisted supermarket owners in Venezuela and Nicaragua to improve buying techniques, food cleanliness processes, and in achieving overhead reductions.

A commercial bank in Thailand assisted by a mid-career IESC volunteer from Chase Manhattan Bank revised its international lending practices and improved its internal accounting system.

A small family-owned company in Honduras wished to extend its lines of soaps, detergents, insecticides, shoe polish, etc. With assistance from an executive retired from Procter & Gamble, improved products and marketing techniques were established.

A producer of concrete building blocks in San Salvador sought IESC assistance to im-

prove its products and marketing. An IESC volunteer with 30 years' experience as the head of his own concrete block business introduced many techniques for product improvement and sales.

IESC management assistance has also been provided to heavy equipment manufacturers; glass and ceramic producers; textile, paper, plastic and rubber companies; mining operations; and construction concerns.

The IESC is managed by a Board of Directors of which David Rockefeller, President of the Chase Manhattan Bank, is Chairman. Philip D. Reed, former Board Chairman of General Electric, heads the Corps' Executive Committee. Frank Pace, Jr., former Secretary of the Army and past President of the General Dynamics Corporation, serves as President and Chief Executive Officer.

Partners of the Alliance

Through the Partners of the Alliance Program, A.I.D. helps provide a means by which U.S. private sector resources at the state and local level can more effectively participate in Latin American development. The goal of the Partners is to encourage cooperation between individual American citizens and private citizens groups and their Latin American counterparts.

At present 30 U.S. states and the District of Columbia are participating in Partner programs in 15 Latin American countries.

Recently A.I.D. made a grant to the newly-formed National Association for the Partners of the Alliance. The grant will be used to assist the Association in sponsoring, coordinating and expanding its program throughout the U.S.

Partners of the Alliance activities generally lie in the fields of: (a) educational exchanges and assistance projects; (b) health and preventive medicine programs; (c) joint investment and commercial ventures; (d) agriculture and cooperative projects; (e) cultural exchanges and community development programs.

Colorado, Connecticut, Indiana, Missouri, New Jersey, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Texas and Wisconsin have all sent large quantities of hospital and medical equipment requested by their Latin American counterparts. Connecticut alone has sent more than 20 tons valued at over $400,000 to hospitals and clinics in Paraiba, Brazil.

More than 150 schools have been constructed or assisted with equipment and supplies. Maryland and its Partner state of Rio de Janeiro have exchanged high school students for the past two years.

The Vermont Partners are sending a truck and 25 deep well water pumps, complete with drilling equipment, and pipe to the Honduran community of Choluteca. Vermont technicians will also provide the necessary technical assistance to install the pumps.

FAA'S EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, too often we tend to think of some of the purported big business agencies of the executive branch as being aloof or disinterested in the social and economic programs of the Government which are directed to helping the disadvantaged and striving in these difficult days to carry out the truly noble and historic goals that President Johnson has set for us on the Nation's homefront. It, therefore, gives me great personal satisfaction to announce that the Federal Aviation Administration last week completed its first 14-week experimental training course for NYC enrollees. This program was initiated by the FAA to assist NYC out-of-school enrollees to the GS–1 level of proficiency.

Although enrollees had been assigned to the Administration worksite for more than a year, it became apparent that one of the greatest hindrances to enrollees performing effectively in their assigned positions was their inability to communicate properly.

Using FAA funds, a 22-page training manual was produced which Administration-paid instructors used to provide training in fundamentals of speech, ability to reason, writing skills, and which helped the instructor provide guided practice in performing clerical duties.

Two 1-hour sessions were conducted every Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday for the 14 weeks. Speech improvement sessions were held the first hour on Tuesday and Thursday. The remaining 4 hours were utilized between writing improvement and clerical skills training.

Almost all of the enrollees were attending evening and night school in an effort to complete their high school education. Many felt the specialized training they received from the Administration course was aiding them to pass their high school courses.

In the hope of stimulating its regional offices to initiate similar programs for NYC enrollees, Mr. Don Higgins, EEO Coordinator for the Office of Personnel and Training, and Mr. E. L. Embry, Acting Chief, Personnel Programs Division, FAA, forwarded a copy of the manual with a memo which said, in part:

This program has helped identify our Washington headquarters as a preferential worksite to NYC placement officials and has resulted in referral of enrollees selected as having the most potential. An improvement in the job quality, morale, and attitude of enrollees has been noted due to this training program.

We feel this is a good example of what can be done in the special opportunity programs to improve the work performance and employability of our enrollees in these programs.

Speech improvement was taught by Miss Michelle Bien, a graduate student in speech therapy at George Washington University; grammar, written expression, and abstract reasoning was taught by Miss Doris Douglass, a graduate student in English at Howard University; and clerical skills training was conducted by Mrs. Phyllis Burbank, of the FAA.

Mr. Leo Powell, personnel staffing specialist in charge of equal employment opportunity programs for the Washington headquarters was the coordinator for the course development and provided the FAA administrative support.

NYC enrollees who successfully completed the course are: Readus Miles, Rose Rorie, Brenda Huff, Rosemary Blankett, Sandra Holbrook, Veronica Thompson, Betty Moore, Pamela Speaks, Franscenia Boyd, Alice Adams, Edith Bailey, Arnita Boyd, Patricia Williams, George Jone, William Green, Cynthia Matthews, Gloria Russell, Adrianne Bradshaw, Geraldine Riley, and Marjorie Collins.

BUILDING TRADE APPRENTICESHIPS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, all of us are familiar with the splendid work of the Urban League but one of its most recent undertakings has received little public notice. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to a recent story in the AFL–CIO News telling how the Urban League is now working with the AFL–CIO building trades unions to bring minority young people into apprentice programs. I include the article in the RECORD, as follows:

CRAFTS, URBAN LEAGUE JOIN IN APPRENTICE PLAN

BALTIMORE.—The Baltimore Building & Construction Trades Council will work in cooperation with the Urban League here in a federally funded program to recruit minority youth into building trades apprenticeship programs.

The project, which was initiated by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, will get underway immediately with the Urban League recruiting the youth from disadvantaged sectors of the community.

The Labor Dept., has granted the league a $46,000 Manpower Development & Training Act contract to carry out the program, called LEAP, for Labor Education Advancement Program. It is expected to recruit about 300 youths and place at least 30 in accredited courses.

At signing ceremonies in Washington, Assistant Sec. of Labor Stanley H. Ruttenberg told the parties that the objective of the Labor Dept. is "to try to work out in as many communities as we can, jointly, cooperatively, with the building trades unions and minority group organizations, programs to bring minority group members into apprenticeship training."

He noted that his department was engaged in several projects in East St. Louis, Detroit, Atlanta and Philadelphia.

AFL–CIO Civil Rights Dir. Don Slaiman and Executive Dir. Whitney Young of the National Urban League, both praised the program. Slaiman said it will help to bring the boys through the doors, once the doors are opened, "and if they're not fully prepared to compete, it prepares them."

Young asserted that "the various parties are certainly sincere in wanting to bring about a change with real bodies, not just words."

The project will include classes of from 25 to 75 youths, depending upon the number of apprenticeship openings at any given time. The youths will participate in mock interviews to prepare for actual screening sessions by apprenticeship committees. Funds are also being set aside for tutoring.

Guido Iozzi, president of the Baltimore Building & Construction Trades Council, said the program will be run by a joint committee of three representatives from the building trades union and three from the Urban League. He will serve as chairman.

LEAP was organized under the joint sponsorship of the National Urban League and the AFL–CIO through a grant from the Ford Foundation to help motivate and prepare Negro youth for participation in apprenticeships.

All federal and local agencies in the Baltimore area will be utilized in the program, the Labor Dept. announced.

KIWANIS INTERNATIONAL

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, next week, June 25–29, Kiwanis International will be meeting in convention in Houston, Tex. As a Georgian, I am proud to note that the 50th president of Kiwanis International comes from my home State. He is Dr. R. Glenn Reed, Jr., of Marietta, Ga. Dr. Reed is an oral surgeon and serves on the Governor's advisory commission on dentistry in the State of Georgia. He has been Young Man of the Year in his home county, and has been named one of the five outstanding young men of Georgia.

I am sure that I speak for all Georgians when I pay tribute to the great work of Kiwanis International, particularly in its service to youth. Kiwanis International is an association of nearly 5,500 Kiwanis Clubs in the United States, Canada, Mexico, the Caribbean, the Far East, and Western Europe. Kiwanis, which was organized in Detroit in 1915, now numbers more than 275,000 members. This men's service organization truly lives up to its motto—"We Build." In addition to Kiwanis International itself, Kiwanis sponsors two of the largest youth organizations in the United States and Canada. Key Club International is a high school boys' service organization. It was founded in Sacramento, Calif., in 1925. Today, it includes more than 80,000 boys in over 3,000 clubs, all of which undertake community service projects. The other youth group is Circle K International, founded at Carthage College in Carthage, Ill. This college men's service organization now numbers more than 700 clubs and over 13,000 members on college campuses.

During my fellow Georgian's year as president of Kiwanis International, the theme of this great service organization has been "Quality Leadership—Key to the Future." Its 1967 objectives have been:

*L*ove of God;
*E*nhancing the potential of youth;
*A*ctive promotion of free enterprise;
*D*emanding responsible news media;
*E*xcellence in literature and entertainment;
*R*espect for law and order;
*S*afety in all areas of activity;
*H*igh ideals of citizenship service;
*I*nternational understanding;
*P*ersonal involvement in the Freedom Leadership Program.

While the objectives of Kiwanis which I have cited above for this year, each year the objectives of Kiwanis International remain the same, and I think they are worthy of repeating. Mr. Speaker, they are:

To give primacy to the human and spiritual, rather than to the material values of life.

To encourage the daily living of the Golden Rule in all human relationships.

To promote the adoption and the application of higher social, business, and professional standards.

To develop, by precept and example, a more intelligent, aggressive, and serviceable citizenship.

To provide, through Kiwanis clubs, a practical means to form enduring friendships, to render altruistic service, and to build better communities.

To cooperate in creating and maintaining that sound public opinion and high idealism which make possible the increase of righteousness, justice, patriotism, and good will.

Mr. Speaker, not only am I proud that such an active organization is headed this year by a dentist from Georgia, but I am also concerned that the activities, particularly those involving our young people, to which Kiwanis is strongly dedicated could be affected by proposed regulations of the Internal Revenue Service. In the past I have not made it a practice to speak out on such matters which are before the Committee on Ways and Means on which I have the honor to serve. However, since these proposed regulations do hit in principle, if not in actuality, several hundred such organizations, I believe I should speak out at this time of paying tribute to a great service organization. Kiwanis, along with Lions International, to which I am proud to belong, and many other service organizations would find their income diminished due to these proposed IRS regulations at a time when community needs are increasing. I will not attempt to go into all the arguments surrounding these proposed regulations. There are already the special bills introduced by three of my colleagues on the Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. WATTS, Mr. BROYHILL, and Mr. BATTIN. However, I do want to express a serious concern over any proposals which would result in the lessening of the wonderful activities of Kiwanis, Lions, and other such groups. If changes in tax laws are to be made, they must originate in this House of Representatives and they must be the subject of adequate hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means. This much I will say.

Let me conclude, Mr. Speaker, by expressing my congratulations to Kiwanis International for having the wisdom to select an outstanding citizen of Georgia as its president during this year, and to wish Kiwanis the greatest success during its 1967 convention in Houston under Dr. Reed's able leadership.

HOW NOT TO CUT FEDERAL SPENDING

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, following is an article from the Wall Street Journal of June 21 by Norman C. Miller on the subject of "How Not To Cut Federal Spending." This is a good comprehensive article and has sound, constructive thought, which I recommend the Members of the other side of the aisle take the time to read. It follows:

How Not To Cut Federal Spending

(By Norman C. Miller)

WASHINGTON.—The avowed purpose of the debt-limit donnybrook the Republicans are staging in Congress is to force the Johnson Administration to cut spending. But the battle's principal accomplishment has been to reveal the impotence of Congress to cut the spending itself.

For, in persuading the House to reject the $29 billion debt-limit increase sought originally by the Administration, the GOP did no more than protest the prospect of enormous deficit spending. That may be a politically popular thing to do, but following up with actual spending reductions to pare the deficit is quite the opposite.

Cutting spending inevitably means making some group of voters howl. Accordingly, it is no surprise that Republicans are merely talking generally about slashing $4 billion of "non-essential" spending—without offering a specific list of activities they consider non-essential. The GOP grandly cedes to the President the nasty job of deciding exactly what should be cut, saying the Administration is better equipped than Congress to decide what is essential and what is not.

This position allows Republicans to deplore a worrisome deficit and continue their opposition to a tax increase, while they try to set up LBJ to take the rap from interest groups that would scream if spending were cut. Clever politics, maybe, but it probably won't force the President to reduce spending.

ARE THEY BLUFFING?

From the Democrats' standpoint, it looks as if the Republicans are bluffing in the debt-limit battle. Ultimate Congressional refusal to give the Administration some additional borrowing authority would threaten the U.S. with a financial crisis, and Republicans are quick to say they don't want that.

Thus, Administration forces will try today to push through the House a new bill that would lift the debt ceiling to $358 billion effective July 1. Moreover, this immediate $22 billion increase would be followed by an additional $7 billion rise a year from now, so the Democrats have hardly retreated at all from their original $365 billion proposal.

In a way, making a debt-limit bill the anti-spending instrument indicates the weakness of Congress' own will to economize. After all, before the Administration can spend it must get appropriations from the lawmakers. If they cut the money bills substantially, they wouldn't have to worry about huge debt-limit increases.

Certainly, if Republicans and economy-minded Democrats translated their general talk about spending cuts into votes against funds for specific programs, they could combine in the House to drastically slash the President's $144 billion appropriation request for the year that starts July 1. But that hasn't happened so far, though the House has completed work on five-sixths of the President's budget.

To be sure, the strengthened House economy bloc has hit hard at some infant Great Society projects like rent subsidies and model cities. But overall, only $2.8 billion, or 2.5%, has been cut from money bills the House has passed.

Moreover, many of the "cuts" undoubtedly will be restored later by supplemental money bills. Of the total reduction claimed by the House, almost $1.3 billion was "cut" from the military budget, though there is a bipartisan expectation that eventually $5 billion or so will have to be added to the Administration's war-cost estimate. Much of the reduction in non-military appropriations will probably be restored as well; in the current fiscal year, for example, Congress wiped out many earlier budget cuts when it voted a supplemental $2.2 billion for civilian activities.

Viewing the record of the House, Chairman George Mahon (D., Texas) of the Appro-

priations Committee sighs, "It is apparent that Congress isn't going to reduce appropriation bills and spending sufficiently to eliminate a deficit which appears to be unacceptable."

One reason for this situation is that most members of the House Appropriations subcommittees, despite their incessant talk about economy, are zealous defenders of spending for almost all well-established Federal activities. Moreover, as long as Congress examines spending proposals one by one, most of them look worthwhile, or at least politically popular. The piecemeal way the lawmakers handle the budget makes it easy to avoid choices between appropriations for separate programs. Yet Congress has resisted all suggestions for new budget procedures; members of the powerful Appropriations subcommittees enjoy their prerogatives and power, and they aren't about to change the system.

The inability of Congress to deliver on its perennially promised cuts is a source of despair to many lawmakers who are perfectly sincere in believing Federal spending is galloping out of control.

Rep. Wilbur D. Mills, the Arkansas Democrat who heads the Ways and Means Committee, is convinced Congress is going to have to call on private consultants "if effective controls are again to be established over Federal spending." He recommends establishing a Hoover-type commission to analyze the benefits of present and proposed Government programs in relation to their costs. With this information, Mr. Mills thinks, Congress might be persuaded to cut programs that aren't justifying their cost.

AN IRONY FOR MR. MILLS

It was ironic that Mr. Mills was the floor manager of the Administration's defeated debt-limit bill. For, in mustering a majority against the bill, Republicans cited the very problem worrying Mr. Mills: That Congress no longer seems able to control expenditures through the appropriations process.

Rep. John Byrnes of Wisconsin, the leading Republican spokesman on the debt-limit issue, argued that refusing to increase borrowing authority was the only way the House could make the President immediately reduce spending. He noted that the Administration could resort to unused borrowing authority granted in previous years to keep much of its fiscal 1968 spending plan intact even if Congress was of a mind to cut current appropriations requests.

Mr. Byrnes is correct. But he and others who are sincere about the need to cut spending would have a far stronger argument against a big debt-limit increase if Congress were actually in the process of reducing appropriations. In that case, the President would clearly be defying the will of Congress if he refused to cut spending on activities the lawmakers' votes had declared nonessential.

Simply to balk at a big debt-limit boost, however, is hardly a courageous mandate for cutting spending.

A THOROUGH CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF OUR FOREIGN POLICY TOWARD THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution proposing a thorough congressional review of our foreign policy toward the Soviet Union. The resolution calls for the House Foreign Affairs Committee to undertake a thorough review, with public hearings, designated studies, and other means, with particular contributions from Members of the House, representatives of the executive branch, and citizens from the private sector of our society.

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the Soviet Union is truly involved in aggressive actions against our forces in Vietnam and its major role is clearly seen in the Mideast conflict. We are also aware of the Soviet Union's subversive activities in Latin America and Africa. May I also point out that in the past two decades Greece, Iran, Korea, Hungary, the Congo, Dominican Republic, and Yemen have all been scenes of Soviet Union involvement contrary to the wishes of the peoples of those lands for peace under freedom.

U.S. policy toward the Soviet Union has contained questionable preconceptions and contradictions in fact and principle. The assumptions on which our foreign policy are based should be subject to proper review, especially at a time when the Soviet Union's propagandizing will be fully geared to exploit the 50th anniversary of the Russian Bolshevik imperiocolonialism.

May I remind the Members of the President's declaration in his 1967 state of the Union message that:

> The genius of the American political system has always been expressed through creative debate that offers reasonable alternatives.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I hope that my resolution will receive speedy implementation by the Committee on Foreign Affairs and that we can develop a comprehensive and progressive review of United States-Soviet Union relations.

Mr. Speaker, we must recognize that the policy of "building bridges" to the Soviet Union has many inherent dangers which have not been effectively discussed in our legislative branch of the Government. May I also remind the Members that the Soviet Union will embark on a worldwide propaganda drive for the forthcoming 50th anniversary of the Russian Bolshevik revolution and attempt to equate their dictatorial system with our American Revolution which properly symbolizes national independence, individual liberty, and freedom. Therefore, I believe that my resolution should be considered at the earliest possible moment by the committee in view of the obvious time element in many matters relating to the Soviet Union.

RHODES SCHOLARS FROM WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an article dealing with intellectualism in West Virginia. Among other things, it is reported that West Virginia students make higher scores on the American college testing program than the national average. The writer of the article says:

> West Virginia University is a school with a remarkable continuity of intellectual competence. West Virginia students, in terms of their intellectual and social accomplishments, have been an extraordinary breed indeed.

The clincher is that only one school in the United States has sent more Rhodes scholars to Oxford University than West Virginia University.

This may be a small matter about which to boast. But, Mr. Speaker, I am inordinately proud of this record.

Cecil Rhodes was that organizing genius who in the last century built a bastion for civilization in South Africa, and in the process accumulated an immense fortune for himself. He himself was driven by a raging vitality and an unquenchable spirit, and he believed that the advance of civilization could be maintained only by finding young men with qualities like his own. Accordingly, he set aside a considerable portion of his fortune to found scholarships at Oxford University, England. Requirements for appointment to those scholarships were listed under three heads: First, intellectual capacity and attainment; second, total involvement in the environment, evidenced by participation and success in a broad range of community activities; third, the power to enlist and hold the cooperation and help of his fellows—what we call leadership.

His formula for finding and training a superior citizen is as valid today as it was when it was first stated a couple of generations ago. The young man who is designated a Rhodes scholar is a marked individual. He not only has met the full challenge of life, but he shows unbounded promise for the future.

There are a number of prestige institutions in this land. Some of them trace their history back almost to the day when the Pilgrim Fathers landed on Plymouth Rock. Their towers are crowned with tradition and honor and intellectual dignity and grace. Their activities are supported by the munificence of grateful alumni and admiring friends. Their students are under the guidance of teachers whose scholarship is profound and whose devotion to the truth is unfailing. Their contributions to this Nation's greatness can never be fully enumerated and evaluated. I am proud of them.

Other seats of learning got a later start. Time has been lacking to accumulate powerful and influential alumni, or the wealth which dissolves educational as well as other problems. But these institutions too are just as zealous in leading their students along the paths of truth. Their officers and instructors are solid scholars and devoted Americans.

But in the last analysis, it is the students that count. The young men and women who throng the halls of West Virginia are of like flesh and bone and brain tissue with those who come in and go out at Harvard or Princeton, or, for that matter, at Oxford.

It is the crowning tradition of this country that success in life, by whatever measure you measure success, is not a function of family or wealth or social

position. It depends on the individual. The individual may demand what pay of life he asks, and get it.

We are anxious for the welfare and the success of all the youth of this land. But our own boys and girls of West Virginia are bound to us by ties of a love which is passionate and all-embracing. Their honorable achievements, great or small, clutch at our heartstrings. And that is the reason, Mr. Speaker, I swell with modest pride in calling attention to the report I have explained at this time.

The article referred to follows:

ANTI-INTELLECTUALISM MYTH—UNIVERSITY HAS 16 RHODES SCHOLARS

Dr. Ruel E. Foster, chairman of the West Virginia University English Department, backed up criticism with facts in defending WVU's intellectual image in the latest issue of "WVU Alumni News."

In an article entitled "The Myth of West Virginia's Anti-Intellectualism," Dr. Foster pointed out that only one institution in the United States has more Rhodes Scholars than West Virginia.

Sixteen WVU students have been awarded the scholarships, the latest being senior David C. Hardesty Jr., of Shinnston, the outgoing student body president.

North Carolina ranks ahead of West Virginia with 17 Rhodes Scholars, while the University of Chicago collected the same number as WVU.

The next-closest total is held by Duke University and its affiliate Trinity College. Graduates of the two schools have been awarded a combined total of 12 such scholarships.

Also of note, Dr. Foster wrote, is the fact that the first group of Rhodes Scholars was selected in 1904, and a Morgantown native and University graduate, Charles Frederick Tucker Brooke, was a member of that group.

In fact, Brooke performed so well that the president of WVU at that time, Daniel B. Purinton, received a letter from George R. Parkin. In that communique, the Rhodes official wrote from London that Brooke had taken "first class in the school of jurisprudence at Oxford."

"This is the third time," Mr. Parkin wrote, "that a first class has been taken by your West Virginia students."

Basing his comments on the premise "surveys show, statistics prove," Dr. Foster went on to reveal the currrent status of WVU scholars.

Relying on facts taken from the Carruth-Van Gilst Research Report of December, 1966, Dr. Foster pointed out the average composite score for a WVU freshman based on American College Testing program tests is higher than the national average.

The Carruth-Van Gilst report showed in 44 schools surveyed, the freshman classes had an average composite score of 21.4.

The University's average composite for incoming freshmen this past fall was 22.4.

The eminent professor, also retiring coach of the Mountaineer tennis team, admitted West Virginia is no Oxford, Princeton or Yale.

He did state, however, "West Virginia University is a school with a remarkable continuity of intellectual competence."

"West Virginia students," he went on, "in terms of their intellectual and social accomplishments have been an extraordinary breed indeed."

EXTENSION OF THE DRAFT LAW—A LEGISLATIVE JOB WELL DONE

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, some of us on the Armed Services Committee, who have been working since last year, for about 9 months, trying to perfect a new draft law, have been a little disturbed at some of the editorial comments that have appeared since the legislation was adopted the other day by this House and by the other body. I refer particularly to an editorial that appeared in the New York Times, which was highly critical of our legislation.

It may be of some interest to Members of the House to hear what was said on this same subject by the man who perhaps will be more directly concerned with this legislation than anybody else, namely the Secretary of Defense. Here is what Mr. McNamara had to say about the bill passed by this House:

The four-year extension of the draft law passed by the Congress is a major improvement over the present law even though it does not include all provisions I thought desirable. The bill does eliminate important inequities in the present system and it will assure an uninterrupted flow of qualified men into the Armed Forces. I have, therefore, strongly recommended to the President that he sign the bill as enacted.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, no bill is ever perfect as far as each Member of the House is concerned. Legislation is a process of compromise. But I believe the Members of this House ought to realize that the bill we passed was, as Mr. McNamara has said, an important improvement on the existing situation, and we can be proud of the job we have done.

First of all, it provided for a system of calling up young men under one particular year group, so that the long period of uncertainty can be ended for most young men.

Second, it provided for a fair and equitable method of selection, and it also gave the President the opportunity of requesting us to approve an even fairer system if, in fact, he can develop such a superior system.

Third, it allowed college students to complete their undergraduate career—and I am sure not many Members of the House wanted to change that situation—but it took steps to end the use of postgraduate study as a haven from the draft.

Fourth, our bill encourages the executive branch to deal swiftly and effectively with those who would flout this vital and essential law—and I am sure the American people want us to do that, too.

These are all substantial improvements in the draft law, Mr. Speaker, and, instead of being critical, I believe the country owes a debt of gratitude to the chairman of the committee who made this significant legislative achievement possible, the gentleman from South Carolina, the Honorable MENDEL RIVERS.

PERDICARIS ALIVE OR RAISULI DEAD

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, today is the anniversary of an incident occurring at a time when America's integrity and influence were recognized the world over.

In these days when lack of patriotism is widely evident, it is important to recall times of glory when none would have dared deface the Stars and Stripes or to raise the banner of an enemy combatant. Reliving experiences of an honored past may help to recapture a national spirit aglow with pride of citizenship.

On May 18, 1904, Ahmed-ibn-Muhammed Raisuli, a Moroccan bandit, captured one Ion Perdicaris, an American citizen, and his stepson, a British subject, from a residence outside Tangiers. Sultan Abd-al-Aziz IV, fearful that Raisuli would kill his hostages if a military force were sent in pursuit, did nothing until the matter was brought to the attention of President Theodore Roosevelt by Secretary of State John Hay.

On June 22, President Roosevelt ordered the American consul to relay this brief but explicit message to the Sultan: "We want Perdicaris alive or Raisuli dead."

Abd-al-Aziz evidently met the bandit's ransom demands, but those details are unimportant. The lesson to remember is that the captives were released unharmed on the night of June 24, just 48 hours after Teddy Roosevelt issued his ultimatum.

Someday America will once more enjoy the world prestige of that moment, but it will not come until a unified, intense love of country again prevails on the home front.

MINK IMPORT CONTROL

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, mink farmers in the United States are currently faced with a rising tide of mink imports which threatens to force many of them out of business.

Foreign mink imports presently make up about 40 percent of domestic utilization, and are expected to constitute nearly 60 percent by the end of this year.

In calendar year 1966 total mink imports into the United States amounted to more than $73 million, and pelt prices to domestic producers have been driven down as much as 50 percent below prices a year ago.

Because of this serious situation which

threatens the livelihood of U.S. fur ranchers, I am today introducing legislation designed to curb these excessive imports. My bill would limit foreign mink imports to 40 percent of our annual domestic consumption, and would impose a duty of 50 percent ad valorem on imports in excess of the quota allotment.

Mink ranchers in the State of Washington as well as in other parts of the United States have been hard hit by this influx of foreign pelts, and unless prompt action is taken to place reasonable limitations on these imports, our domestic producers face bankruptcy and extinction as an industry.

Mr. Speaker, immediate action is necessary to correct this inequitable situation, and I am hopeful that the House Ways and Means Committee will schedule hearings on my bill at the earliest possible date.

WHY DOESN'T THE PRESIDENT ANNOUNCE A DECISION?

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, it is a mystery to me that the President of the United States still has not announced his decision as to whether Americans, Russians, or both are going to be offered the chance to build the giant turbine-generator sets for the planned third powerplant at Grand Coulee Dam in the State of Washington.

My letter to the President last April 13, asking him to reject the expressed interest of the Russians in this project, was referred to the State Department for reply. The State Department favors foreign bidding on U.S. projects.

Since my brief speech to the Members of this body last Thursday, June 15—page 15938 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—I have received many letters and telephone calls agreeing with me that the Soviet Union must not be allowed to supply heavy electrical equipment for this project. It is gratifying to know that so many of our citizens agree that this is no time to be "building bridges" to Russia with American dams that are vital to our national security.

Grand Coulee Dam, Mr. Speaker, is a vital project for generation of electrical energy, reclamation, and flood control in the Pacific Northwest. The planned third powerplant, in which the Russians have expressed interest, will increase the power output of this dam, and this power will serve not only the Pacific Northwest, but will be fed through the Bonneville system throughout the western sector of the United States.

Leaving aside the facts of the cold war; of Russia's continuing intention to 'bury" us; of the fact that Soviet armaments are killing and maiming our boys in Vietnam; and of recent events in the Middle East which prove U.S. "bridge building" efforts have been to no avail; I would like to point out that any decision which could result in Russian manufacture of this heavy equipment could be very much regretted by the United States if the equipment did not operate properly. No country on the face of the earth has ever built equipment this large.

An example of the kind of problems that can occur, actually did happen last year in the State of Washington. "Worldwide" bidding of the kind urged by the State Department, was invited in the supplying of giant transformers in connection with the power output of the dual-purpose atomic reactor at Hanford. This, as far as I am aware, was the only foreign-built equipment supplied. The first transformer was built in England, and failed when it was tested. Then, an Austrian-built transformer was delivered. After 2 weeks of operation, it too failed. That was last December, Mr. Speaker, and the transformer had to be shipped back to Austria for repairs. It is not scheduled to be reinstalled until next August. That is a period of 9 months from failure to repair and reinstallation.

I do not mention this in a derogatory reference to any foreign country or product. I point out these facts to show what can happen when a foreign product proves to be defective and cannot be repaired in this country.

Heaven help the United States if we invite unfriendly countries to take advantage of us.

According to my information, Mr. Speaker, the President has not announced any decision as to whether he is going to agree with the State Department and give the Russians a chance at this project, or whether he is going to support American workers and American free enterprise. I do not think we can have it both ways, as suggested by some of the President's advisers, to the effect that Americans build half the project and other countries, presumably Russia, can build the other half.

Mr. Speaker, I pray that there will come a day when we will live in a peaceful and trustful world. There may come a day when the Soviet Union will have demonstrated by word and action that it is really interested in world peace. There may come a day when the cold war is over. But, Mr. Speaker, that day is not yet. And these cold, hard facts make it clear to me that the President must decide that the Soviet Union has no business in tinkering with United States projects that involve the security and well-being of the American people.

I urge that the President, without any further delay, make his views known on this subject.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION ACT

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to provide assistance to local educational agencies for coping with the unique educational needs of children from non-English-speaking, low-income families. We can no longer ignore the acute educational problem which involves the millions of children from culturally diverse homes.

My congressional district has one of the largest Portuguese populations in the United States, as well as thousands of French Canadians. The linguistic, cultural, and psychological handicaps suffered by a child who must learn a foreign language before he can even begin to grasp content material result in high dropout rates and overall low academic achievement among children from these homes.

Since passage of the new immigration regulations in 1965, the city of New Bedford has been inundated with Portuguese immigrants from the Azores. Presently, the superintendent of schools, Dr. James Hayden, is struggling to see that the rudiments of English are taught to 700 school-age children. More are arriving every day, and the New Bedford school system is strained past capacity. Fortunately, title I Elementary and Secondary Educational Act funds were available to New Bedford to set up the emergency program. All too often, however, when confronted with the need to establish priorities for title I funds, local school officials neglect the non-English-speaking children. At best, these children are put into special classes to learn English as quickly as possible, then thrown to sink or swim in the regular curriculum. They suffer from not only limited vocabularies but also the psychological disadvantage of being a year or more older than their classmates.

The Bilingual Education Act will emphasize the concept of bilingual schooling, in which two languages are used as media of instruction. The linguistically handicapped pupil will be able to progress without demoralizing grade retention by learning the "three R's" in his native tongue while mastering English as a second language. Freed of the fear and frustration arising from unsuccessful school situations and repression of his native culture and tongue, he will develop with courage and confidence in his ability to achieve scholastically and contribute significantly to his adopted culture.

Mr. Speaker, as culture and language gaps are bridged through the sharing of experiences and knowledge, many heritages and languages will be maintained and developed in the United States. Well educated, bilingual citizens will be an incalculable asset to our internationally oriented society. We can no longer afford to deny the special needs of the children from non-English-speaking, culturally diverse homes. By enacting the Bilingual Education Act, we will take a giant stride toward the goal of equitable treatment of all Americans, whether they speak English in their homes or not. The following fact sheet outlines the major provisions of my bill:

FACT SHEET ON BILINGUAL EDUCATION ACT

PURPOSE

Amends the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide assistance to local educational agencies in establishing bilingual education programs.

GRANTEES

Local educational agencies and institutions of higher education co-sponsoring programs upon joint application to the Commissioner.

USES OF FUNDS

For planning and development of programs, including pilot projects to test the effectiveness of plans, and to develop and disseminate special instructional materials.

LIST OF ACTIVITIES

Provide high-quality educational opportunities for children from non-English speaking homes.

Pre-service and in-service training programs for teachers and teacher aides involved in bilingual education programs.

Programs to upgrade the quality of the entire program of schools where large proportions of the children come from non-English speaking, low-income homes, including construction, remodeling, or renovation of facilities.

Intensive early childhood programs for pre-school age and kindergarten age children.

Bilingual and bicultural education programs for elementary and secondary school children to acquaint students from both English speaking and non-English speaking homes with the history and culture associated with each language.

Supportive services for students, including: guidance and counseling, remedial instruction, summer programs, psychological and social work, health and nutrition, efforts to establish closer cooperation between school and home, adult education programs, particularly for parents of children served.

OTHER PROVISIONS

Maintenance of effort is required.

Reports to the Commissioner of Education.

Participation by full-time, non-public school students.

Sums authorized

	Million
Fiscal year 1968	$5
Fiscal year 1969	10
Fiscal year 1970	15
Fiscal year 1971	15
Fiscal year 1972	15

DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS

By the Commissioner of Education on the basis of criteria designed to achieve equitable distribution of assistance among communities in which the number of non-English speaking persons from low-income families constitute a substantial proportion of the population.

BIPARTISAN U.S. WORLD FOOD STUDY NEEDED

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, members of the House Republican task force on agriculture are pleased to be joined today by other Republican Congressmen in introducing legislation to establish a bipartisan U.S. World Food Study Commission.

This Nation's response to the impending world food crisis must be rational and effective. In planning our course of action, full consideration must be given to the needs of American agriculture.

As the task force statement says:

The United States cannot play an effective role in feeding the hungry world, and fight a war, unless American agriculture is assured that its productive efforts will be equitably rewarded.

Present low farm prices, the alarming increase in agricultural imports, and the extent to which American agriculture was shortchanged by the Kennedy Round Trade Agreement at Geneva point up the urgent need for a penetrating inquiry into all aspects of the approaching world food shortage.

If we plan wisely, the American farmer could use this opportunity to flex his productive muscle and improve his financial position.

The proposed U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission could well be the catalytic agent that would help provide food to hungry mouths of the world, while maintaining our food strength during time of war, and bring economic vitality to American agriculture.

As task force chairman, I hereby insert our statement into the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT OF THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN TASK FORCE ON AGRICULTURE, JUNE 22, 1967

Recognizing the seriousness of the impending world food crisis, we firmly believe that the United States cannot play an effective role in feeding the hungry world, and fight a war, unless American agriculture is assured that its productive efforts will be equitably rewarded.

Present low farm prices, the alarming increase in agricultural imports, and the extent to which American agriculture was shortchanged by the Kennedy Round Trade Agreement at Geneva point up the urgent need for a penetrating inquiry into all aspects of the approaching world food shortage. Indeed, current national problems of inadequate farm income, low farm prices, reduced markets, and lack of effective import controls must be given major consideration in any programs this Nation may devise and implement to help meet world food needs.

Because of such conditions, we urge the immediate establishment of a bi-partisan U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to evaluate the present and future food needs of the United States, and to suggest the manner in which we can best plan our agricultural productivity and technical assistance to food-deficient countries.

The world is rapidly losing the race between an adequate food supply and a growing population. At the same time, the American farmer is fast losing out as his production costs and farm debt hit record-breaking highs. The farm parity ratio now stands at a dismally low 74. Last year 122,000 farms were forced out of business, and the Department of Agriculture has predicted that another 82,000 farms will be wiped out in 1967. Farm production expenses rose 9%, from $30.7-billion (1965) to $33.2-billion (1966). Farm debt increased 10%, from $41.6-billion to $45.8-billion.

Today's low farm prices, further aggravated by a deluge of agricultural imports that usurp vital markets, threaten the future of our productive capability. Consequently, we can't afford to rush blindly into a gigantic feed-the-hungry-world project.

At Geneva, according to recent reports, American agricultural interests got the short end of the bargaining table. What was originally heralded as an opportunity to benefit the American farmer is now expected to be a sell-out to foreign interests.

We must get the best minds together in a concentrated, bi-partisan effort to grapple with these problems and come up with constructive, feasible recommendations. Recognizing that the United States must maintain its food strength during time of war, our proposed Commission could well be the motivating force in the effort to alleviate world food shortage, and bring an adequate financial return to the American farmer.

The experience of World War II, when full industrial and agricultural production was accompanied by domestic food rationing, should have taught this Nation that its ability to produce its own food and fiber must never again be jeopardized.

On the international scene, the threat of widespread famine is validated by a glance at future projection of population figures and world food needs. At the present annual growth rate of 2%, world population, now over 3-billion, will double within a generation and zoom to 24-billion within a century. The underdeveloped countries now have an annual food grain deficit of 16-million tons. This deficit will rise to 42-million in 1975 and skyrocket to 88-million tons in 1985—based on current agricultural production, population, and consumption trends.

We realize, too, that agriculture's technical know-how is concentrated, to a great extent, in one sector of the world, while the ugly, omnipotent threat of famine pervades the other. It is estimated that between now and 1980 these underdeveloped countries will add five times as many mouths to feed as will the developed countries.

In view of the foregoing, and as members of the Task Force, we are pleased to be joined today by other Congressmen in introducing legislation "To establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordination Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in light of present and projected world food and population trends." This is similar to legislation the Task Force drafted and sponsored in the previous Congress.

The Commission would be made up of the broadest possible membership. The 18-member group would be composed of four Congressmen, four Senators, and ten others to be appointed by the President. Of the ten, one each would come from the Departments of State and Agriculture, and the rest from outside the Federal Government, to be representatives of farm organizations, private agricultural trade, Land-Grant and State colleges and universities, and other agricultural groups.

Our legislation outlines a 15-point program for the proposed U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission:

(1) A determination of the extent to which United States domestic agricultural production could be utilized to meet United States domestic needs, necessary reserves, and help meet world food needs as well as domestic prices which are fair and profitable to American farmers.

(2) An examination of present and projected world food needs, related to present and projected world food supply and population levels.

(3) An evaluation of the internal agricultural complexes of food-deficit countries to determine the causes of their inability to meet domestic food needs.

(4) An appraisal of the effects which such action could be expected to have on United States agricultural and total economy, and the probable effects of such action on the economies of other countries of the world.

(5) A study of the future domestic and foreign dollar market potential for United States agriculture.

(6) An examination of the influence that agricultural commodities stored in United States bins has on world prices for these commodities.

(7) A study of the effects United States shipping rates have on the sale of agricultural commodities abroad.

(8) An analysis of the results of past operations under Public Law 480, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, with particular reference to agricultural production and utilization in recipient countries, effects on United States agricultural export for dollars, and the projected development and operation of such programs in the future.

(9) An exploration of the possibilities for more effective use of the excess foreign currencies which have accumulated under past Public Law 480 programs.

(10) A study of past and present United States agricultural aid and economic development assistance to foreign countries, with particular reference to its effects on recipient countries, the degree of coordination among participating United States agencies, the effectiveness of family planning programs, and other related factors.

(11) A determination of the extent to which duplication of programs and administrative inefficiency exist among United States agencies involved in these foreign assistance activities.

(12) An exploration of alternative ways of financing possible United States programs designed to help meet world food needs.

(13) An analysis of the manifold technical, mechanical, diplomatic, bureaucratic, political, and other barriers to present and future United States programs designed to assist food-deficit areas of the world.

(14) A review of the potential of other food-surplus countries of the world for assistance in meeting world food needs, and a study of methods for coordinating such assistance.

(15) An investigation of any other areas which the Commission may find pertinent and related to United States and world food problems.

POLITICAL INVOLVEMENT OF OEO

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. GARDNER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, I have become increasingly alarmed at the political involvement of the Office of Economic Opportunity, as illustrated by Operation Breakthrough in Durham, N.C. Operation Breakthrough is a community action program funded by OEO.

On June 14, 1967, I inserted into the RECORD a brief report detailing the political activities of Operation Breakthrough during a May 13, 1967, municipal election held in Durham. At that time, I stated that Operation Breakthrough employees, for a period of 3 months from December to March 28, 1967, 5 days per week during working hours, researched registration and voter lists for 10 precincts in Durham. In addition, these same employees contacted unregistered voters and persuaded them to register and used Operation Breakthrough automobiles to transport them to the polls to register. Then on election day Operation Breakthrough employees, using their own cars, contacted and delivered voters to the polls and furnished them with sample ballots telling them how to vote. These same poverty workers recruited students from nearby universities to pursue the same method of influence on election day.

Also in my June 14 statement, I inserted a copy of a letter I sent to Sargent Shriver requesting a ruling on whether the political activities of Operation Breakthrough violates the Economic Opportunity Act—section 202(b), 42 U.S.C. 2782(b) 0—and OEO instructions established in an OEO CAP memo 50–A, dated December 1, 1965. Mr. Shriver's reply, dated June 15, 1967, stated that the political activities of Operation Breakthrough did not violate any Federal laws, civil service regulation, or OEO regulations. At this point, I would like to insert Mr. Shriver's letter into the RECORD:

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY, EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Washington, D.C., June 15, 1967.

Hon. JAMES C. GARDNER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GARDNER: Thank you for your letters of June 14 and 15, with the enclosed report of John R. Buckley.

As I indicated to you during our telephone conversation, this Agency had sent its own Inspector to Durham, North Carolina, to review charges of illegal political involvement of employees of Operation Breakthrough, a Community Action Agency funded by this office. Our investigation revealed that no Federal law, Civil Service regulation or OEO regulation was violated by Operation Breakthrough or any member of its staff.

We have reviewed the report of Mr. Buckley and found nothing in it that would indicate a violation of Federal law, Civil Service regulation, or OEO regulation.

We find the instructions William R. Pursell, Executive Director of Operation Breakthrough, issued to his staff regarding non-involvement in prohibited political activities an accurate reflection of OEO's policies. As I indicated to you in our telephone conversation, it is permissible under this Agency's legislation and regulations for Community Action programs to engage in voter registration drives. I am sure you know numerous civic organizations including the League of Women Voters long have been engaged in insuring that all eligible Americans are registered so that they may exercise their choice on election day. Operation Breakthrough employees conducted such an effort.

In regard to the matter of Operation Breakthrough employees participating in political activities on election day, both our Inspectors and Mr. Buckley found that these activities occurred on their own time. The automobiles that were used to transport voters to the polls were the private property of those employees who were engaged in that activity on their own time.

The Civil Service Commission as Mr. Buckley indicated in his report ruled in 1955 that Durham Muncipal elections were non-partisan. A flier distributed in Durham before the election contained the following text:

"Attention Republicans, Democrats and Independents! This Saturday's Municipal Election is Non-Partisan! Every registered Citizen of Durham can vote regardless of party affiliation!"

As you indicate in you letter to me you, too, believe that a non-partisan election "very likely would not be considered a violation of Chapter 15, Title V, U.S. Code."

OEO CAP Memorandum 50–A specifically states in outlining the explicit instructions on political activity on the part of CAP employees the following:

"Certain non-partisan political activities are permitted. These are activities in connection with campaigns for office which are run on a non-partisan basis and are of a strictly local character—that is, completely unrelated to issues and candidates identified with national and state political parties."

I am frankly surprised that because we disagree about existing OEO policies that you suggest that my disagreement has "been motivated by partisan politics."

This Agency, in the nearly three years of its existence, scrupulously has enforced all regulations governing political activity on the part of its staff or any staff member of any Agency covered by our regulations. In those isolated instances where we have uncovered such activities, we have acted on them promptly whenever they were substantiated without regard to any political party involved.

For example, in 1965 our Inspectors uncovered an instance in Carlinville, Illinois where young men and women, ineligible because they did not meet income requirements, were enrolled in a Neighborhood Youth Corps program after referrals by local Democratic political leaders. The program was cancelled by the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

In the summer of 1965, our Inspectors uncovered a similar case of ineligibility because of income in Kansas City, Kansas, which included also referrals by local political figures of ineligible enrollees who were found on the payroll. Neighborhood Youth Corps froze the funds of this project and negotiated an agreement with the city to repay the Federal Government for the cost of ineligibles in the program.

More recently, this Agency instructed the United Planning Organization in Washington that an employee of a delegate Agency was in violation of OEO regulations, because that employee was also the head of a local Democratic political organization. The employee resigned after UPO told him he could not hold the job and the political office.

In April of this year, our Regional Office reprimanded the Director of a State Technical Assistance Office for making a partisan political speech and immediately referred the case to the Civil Service Commission.

Incidentally, these cases were reported fully in the daily press at the time they were uncovered by this Agency, and we took action.

Furthermore, I don't believe the suggestion that our actions and statements are motivated by "partisan politics" is consistent with the fact that the Regional Director, who supervises and is responsible for programs in the Mid-Atlantic Region which includes Operation Breakthrough, is affiliated with neither major political party. He is an independent voter.

Finally, this Agency this year has allotted more money to states governed by Republicans than to states governed by Democrats.

I assure you that we shall continue to pursue vigorously any allegation of improper activity, political or otherwise, that is prohibited by our Act and our regulations. When we find such improper activity, we will, in the future as we have in the past, order prompt remedial action regardless of the political label of those who are involved.

Sincerely,

SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director.

PS.—Incidentally, you appear still to believe that I denied the facts in your investigation. I said that our investigation, conducted at the request of Congressman Gallifianakis, did not show any violations of our Act or our regulations.

The allegations against Operation Breakthrough have been substantiated by documented proof compiled by John R. Buckley, minority investigator for the Education and Labor Committee. Mr. Buckley spent 2 days in Durham, June 2 and 3 of 1967, compiling his evidence. This evidence includes signed statements from Operation Breakthrough employees, pictures, and other items which all prove that Operation Breakthrough was involved and did participate in the Durham municipal election on May 13, 1967.

During the last several weeks a great deal has been said about the proper role of Operation Breakthrough. May I say that I am deeply concerned with the poor living conditions of many of our citizens, in fact, all Americans are deeply concerned with the alleviation of poverty. Poverty is a national disgrace and deserves the attention of all American citizens. However, I find it difficult to correlate how copying registration voter lists, registering voters, and supplying sample ballots to voters will help to raise the poor out of their economic and social plight. Our investigation has brought out that a poverty program that was designed for community action for the poor has developed into a political action program. I do not see how a registration drive and the creation of a political machine of a Federal agency will not raise the poor to a better standard of living.

Although I am talking about Durham, N.C., this political activity could set a national precedent. The Durham Operation Breakthrough is only an example of the danger we face. This same situation could conceivably take place in Portland, Oreg.; Chicago, Ill.; Miami, Fla., or any city in our Nation. It is for this reason that the buildup of a political machine by OEO or any Federal agency needs to be stopped and stopped now.

The creation of a federally subsidized political machine is not one of the goals of the poverty program.

Consider for a moment the effect which this political activity, as now practiced and sanctioned by OEO, would have upon the political structure of the United States. A registration drive, as conducted in Durham by Operation Breakthrough during a nonpartisan election will have long-term results in a general election for State and Federal officials. Those persons who are registered will be eligible to vote during a partisan or general election. It would not be impossible for a congressional or presidential election to be won by the voters registered by OEO-sponsored agencies, as could have occurred in the 1960 presidential election.

The final results of the Durham registration drive by Operation Breakthrough in five target precincts, shows that those candidates supported by the Operation Breakthrough campaign received a majority of 10 to 1 and 20 to 1, but lost the election by 9 to 6.

This brings up another vital point, the difficulty in distinguishing between "partisan" and "nonpartisan" elections. Whenever one slate of candidates is supported over another slate, then elements of politics enter into the election. This is precisely the situation which took place in the Durham municipal election. The sample ballots which were passed out to the voters registered and carried to the polls by Operation Breakthrough employees, favored one slate of candidates over another. A copy of one of these sample ballots is included in Mr. Buckley's report.

Durham is not the only city in which CAP of the OEO has conducted intensive registration drives. Houston, Tex. and Cincinnati, Ohio have also experienced such political activities. If this is taking place in these three cities, one wonders if OEO is not conducting such registration drives throughout the United States by its 1,050 CAP's. It is evident that our tax dollars, spent in support of OEO programs, have been squandered on building a political machine. The immediate and most urgent need of the poverty program is to raise the living standards of the poor and not to engage in political activities.

Politics should not be an integral part of any Federal program, and it is the duty of this Congress to prohibit any further creation of a federally subsidized political machine.

I enlist the support and assistance of my colleagues and all interested citizens in this effort to correct a situation which could endanger the entire political structure of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the report prepared by an investigator of the Education and Labor Committee.

REPORT DATED JUNE 19, 1967, MADE BY JOHN R. BUCKLEY, MINORITY CHIEF INVESTIGATOR, EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C., OF OPERATION BREAKTHROUGH, DURHAM, N.C., WILLIAM R. PURSELL, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

SUMMARY

On June 2, 1967, Operation Breakthrough employees advised that during the past year Operation Breakthrough has conducted a voter education community action program in Durham, North Carolina. In conjunction with this program, during the period January–March, Operation Breakthrough neighborhood workers reviewed voter registration books in the office of the Durham Board of Elections and copied registration lists. On April 1, April 8, and April 15, 1967, Operation Breakthrough employees, using the agency's automobiles, transported several hundred Durham citizens to Durham polling places for the purpose of registration. On April 29, 1967, Operation Breakthrough employees, using personally owned vehicles, transported Durham citizens to the polls during the municipal primary election. On May 13, 1967, Operation Breakthrough employees, using personally owned vehicles, transported Durham citizens to the polls during the municipal general election. On June 3, 1967, Mr. J. F. Steele, Jr., prominent Durham resident and unsuccessful candidate for U.S. Congress in 1966, furnished a signed statement alleging numerous Durham citizens had complained to him that employees of Operation Breakthrough had engaged in wide-spread political activities during the Durham municipal general election, the Durham primary election and the voter registration days prior to these elections. Mr. Steele's statement is set forth in details. On June 2, 1967, Mr. William R. Pursell, Executive Director of Operation Breakthrough, stated Operation Breakthrough employees participated in a voter registration drive early in 1967. According to Mr. Pursell, he issued specific instructions that Operation Breakthrough facilities and vehicles were not to be used during the primary and general municipal elections. Mr. Pursell stated he had been in contact with OEO officials during the period of registration and election and that he was confident that activities of Operation Breakthrough employees were not improper and not in violation of either the Hatch Act or the Economic Opportunity Act. He explained that it is permissible to use community action facilities and vehicles in connection with voter registration drives and that it is not improper for employees to involve themselves in political activities in a non-partisan election.

According to Operation Breakthrough Council, Mr. Robinson Everett, the Civil Service Commission in 1955 ruled the Durham municipal elections were non-partisan and involvement by U.S. Government employees would not constitute a violation of the Hatch Act. Statements and photos obtained establishing Operation Breakthrough employee and agency vehicle transported Durham residents during voter registration. Statement and photos obtained establishing Operation Breakthrough employees, including Mr. Lawrence Kelly, Administrative Assistant to the Director, participated in transportation of Durham citizen to the polls during municipal general election. Mr. A. C. Sorrell, member, Operation Breakthrough Board of Directors, advised there is wide-spread concern in Durham regarding Operation Breakthrough's political activity. On May 13, 1967, during the municipal general election, he interviewed a girl at a Durham polling place. She stated she was a student at the University of North Carolina and that numerous students at the University of North Carolina and Duke University had been recruited by Operation Breakthrough employees to transport voters to the pools. Results of voting in ten precincts researched by Operation Breakthrough employees reflects candidates recommended on Durham Committee on Negro Affairs political brochure polled substantial margins. Mrs. Geoffrey Hamilton, Secretary to the Directors, Operation Breakthrough, advised she had distributed cards soliciting votes for candidate for Alderman, Mrs. R. O. Everett, on May 13, 1961.

The card illustration contained the following information:

"THE DURHAM COMMITTEE ON NEGRO AFFAIRS RESPECTFULLY RECOMMENDS THE FOLLOWING:

"FOR MAYOR

"(Vote for One)

"FOR ALDERMAN WARD 2

"(Vote for One)

"FOR ALDERMAN WARD 4

"(Vote for One)

"FOR ALDERMAN WARD 6

"(Vote for One)

"[No designation appears]

"1A: R. W. Grabarek.
"(x) 2A: Paul Hardin.
"3A: Sidney Booth.
"(x) 4A: Mrs. R. O. Everett.
"5A: Walter A. Biggs.
"(x) 6A: J. Tom Freeman.
"(x) 7A: Vance E. Fisher.
"8A: Ollen M. Lane.
"9A: Luther H. Barbour.
"(x) 10A: C. E. Boulware.

"Campaign Headquarters: Carolina Times (682–2913), 436 Pettigrew Street.

"(May 13, 1967.)"

On June 2, and June 3, 1967, Mr. G. F. Steele, Jr., 3928 Notteway Road, Durham, North Carolina, was interviewed as a result of his complaint to members of the Education and Labor Committee, U.S. House of Representatives, that personnel of Operation Breakthrough had engaged in improper political activity during the 1967 Durham

municipal elections. Mr. Steele's information was incorporated in the following signed statement which he furnished on June 3, 1967:

DURHAM, N.C.,
June 3, 1967.

EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I respectfully call to your attention improper political activities of certain personnel of Operation Breakthrough and the North Carolina Fund, both of which are OEO-sponsored agencies.

I make reference to activities surrounding the municipal general election in Durham, N.C. on May 13, 1967, the primary election on April 29, 1967, voter registration days on April 1, 8 and 15, 1967, and certain other activities of approximately two months' duration preceding April 1, 1967.

During the month of March, 1967, several local citizens advised me that persons known to be staff members of Operation Breakthrough were then engaged in a program of copying names of registered voters from the voter registration books at the office of the Durham County Board of Elections. The people who called this activity to my attention stated that their concern was based on the fact that Operation Breakthrough personnel were copying names of voters from the negro areas only, and the negro citizens of Durham traditionally "bloc vote."

On April 1, 1967, which was the first day that the registration books were open for new voter registration prior to the municipal election, I received calls from a number of local citizens advising me that Operation Breakthrough personnel were engaged in an apparently organized drive to register negro voters.

After receiving several calls of this nature, I personally visited a number of precincts and observed several people involved in what did in fact appear to be an organized registration effort. These activities apparently were organized in the following manner: (1) one or more persons were stationed at each of the various polling places with a list of names; (2) a number of people were driving automobiles and transporting prospective voters to be registered at the polling places, and (3) each prospective voter thus brought in to register first would check in with the person or persons stationed at the polling places as specified above. It should be noted that this activity included only negro voters. although some of the precincts involved are of a racially mixed population.

During the following week, I visited the office of Operation Breakthrough and discussed this matter with the Executive Director, Mr. William R. Pursell. I pointed out to Mr. Pursell my concern over the unhealthy atmosphere created by this activity, and the resultant effect of causing a "Black-White" vote on election day. I also expressed my concern over any activity which might be interpreted as political in nature, and asked for his cooperation in seeing that his employees took no further action that might be considered as politically motivated.

Following the two final registration days of April 8 and April 15, I received additional complaints of a similar nature and was, further, informed that photographs had been taken of these activities.

On April 29, the primary election day, and on days following, I received additional complaints of political activities of certain people described as employees of Operation Breakthrough and the North Carolina Fund. Again, these activities involved only negro voters. The specific complaints alleged that these employees were engaged in activities similar to those observed during the voter registration period; that is, some persons being stationed at the polling places with what appeared to be lists of voters, and some individuals driving voters to the polls. It was observed that voters thus transported were checked off the lists handled by those persons at the polling places. Furthermore, said voters were seen to have in their possession slips of paper which have been identified as a list of recommended candidates.

Similar activities were observed on the general election day, May 13, 1967. It should be noted at this point that the lists which were used at some of the polling places to check off the names of those who had voted were printed by some type of electronic machine.

The election day activities observed are described as follows: at all precincts that are predominantly negro or racially mixed, people were stationed with "check-off" voter lists. Drivers would bring voters to the polling places in vehicles displaying signs reading "Vote today—use this car." The voters would leave the cars and confer with the people who had the "check-off" list. The voters would then enter the polling places. After voting, they would be driven away in the same cars. These cars were observed following the same procedure throughout the day. Printed lists of recommended candidates were seen in the vehicles and also were seen in the hands of voters as they entered the polling places. Some of the drivers of the described cars were identified as staff members of Operation Breakthrough. Others were identified as students at nearby universities. Some of the students stated that they were driving at the request of Operation Breakthrough staff members. The activities described above involved only negro voters.

It is my opinion that these activities are outside the realm of programs envisioned by members of Congress when they passed the Equal Opportunity Act of 1964. I believe that this fact is borne out by the action taken by Congress in amending this act in 1966 after there was an indication of political activities in OEO-sponsored agencies. I further believe that no public funds should be furnished to any organization that is politically involved or whose employees are actively involved in politics.

It is the expressed opinion of many local business and civic leaders that Operation Breakthrough has become ineffective, largely because of political involvement in this and in past elections in Durham County. I therefore respectfully request that the Education and Labor Committee follow whatever course of action deemed necessary in order to assure the people of Durham that any Federal funds allotted to Durham will be handled only through organizations whose staff members are totally dedicated to helping our poor, and that under no circumstances will any tax money be spent that in any way could build or aid in the building of a political machine.

Very truly yours,

G. FRED STEELE, Jr.

On June 2, 1967, Mr. A. C. Sorrell, 323 Foster Street, Durham, North Carolina, a member of the Board of Directors, Operation Breakthrough, advised he has been concerned over the political involvement of Operation Breakthrough employees during the past six months. He stated his concern is shared by numerous businessmen and community leaders in Durham.

Mr. Sorrell complained to the Executive Director of Operation Breakthrough in a letter dated May 15, 1967. A copy of this letter and replies from Operation Breakthrough, dated May 17 and May 19, 1967, follow:

MAY 15, 1967.

Mr. WILLIAM R. PURSELL,
Director—Operation Breakthrough,
Durham, N.C.

DEAR BILL: I would like to restate my displeasure with the political activities of Operation Breakthrough. As a member of your Board, I am requesting that a written report be furnished me as to the activity of all personnel in the election Saturday. I am referring to their time, both on and off the job.

Please give this matter your prompt attention.

Very truly yours,

A. C. SORRELL,
Vice President.

DURHAM, N.C.,
May 17, 1967.

Mr. A. C. SORRELL,
Clark & Sorrell, Inc.,
Durham, N.C.

DEAR MR. SORRELL: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 15, 1967, in which you requested information regarding the activities of our staff members on May 13, 1967.

I have given this request serious consideration and have decided that, because the information requested regards personnel matters, and because of my responsibility to keep the Executive Committee and Board of Directors fully informed on all matters relating to our organization and further upon the advice of the President of the Board of Directors, Dr. Charles Watts, your request should properly be referred to the Executive Committee at its next meeting scheduled for May 18, 1967. Dr. Watts has agreed to make this matter a part of the agenda for the meeting.

I shall inform you of the decision of the Executive Committee regarding your request.

Sincerely yours,
OPERATION BREAKTHROUGH, INC.,
WILLIAM R. PURSELL,
Executive Director.

OPERATION BREAKTHROUGH,
Durham, N.C., May 19, 1967.

Mr. A. C. SORRELL,
Clark & Sorrell,
Durham, N.C.

DEAR MR. SORRELL: In reply to your letter of the 15th and pursuant to my communication of the 17th, I would like to inform you that the Executive Committee of Operation Breakthrough met in regular session on May 18 and declared itself to be in substantial agreement with my opinion and that of the President, Dr. Charles Watts, regarding the proper disposition of your request.

As requested we are making available to you a list of Operation Breakthrough employees who were engaged in agency activities on election Saturday, May 13, 1967. The employees, with their job titles, and the nature of their activities are:

Mrs. Marla Hamilton; Administrative Secretary. Activity relating to the Operation Breakthrough exhibit for the Allied Art's Spring Festival of the Arts at Y.W.C.A.

Miss Edna Cole; Driver. Regularly scheduled N.Y.C. enrollee pick-up and delivery.

Mr. Richard Wescott; N.Y.C. Work Supervisor. N.Y.C. Work supervision at Children's Museum.

This list is, of course, the product of a preliminary investigation and is only as complete as the limitations of such a survey allow. A final record will be compiled from data made available through our regular monthly payroll accounting procedures. This can be forwarded to you, upon request at any time after June 7, 1967. You may rest assured, however, that it will contain no authorization for the expenditure of Operation Breakthrough funds for any election-related activities which may have occurred on the Saturday in question.

Community Action Program Memorandum No. 50–A (December 1, 1966) sets forth a summary description of the restrictions on political activity applicable to the personnel employed by Operation Breakthrough. As you will no doubt recall, paragraph 3 on page 4 of that document is particularly germane to the situation presented by Saturday's municipal elections. It reads:

"Certain non-partisan activities are permitted. These are activities in connection

with campaigns for office which are run on a non-partisan basis and are of a strictly local character—that is, completely unrelated to issues and candidates identified with national and state political parties. For instance, elections for local school boards and other local offices are frequently run on a local non-partisan basis. If a state election law provides for a non-partisan ballot for a particular local office or class of local offices, or provides that the local office is considered non-partisan, the campaign for that office or class of offices qualifies for the exception. Local agencies and their employees should note, however, that if a particular candidate or slate in a non-partisan election actively seeks partisan support or identification, the campaign of that candidate or slate will be considered to have become a partisan campaign."

In light of this unequivocal exemption from restriction I felt at the time of the election that I could not in justice interfere with the dictates of individual conscience. The Executive Committee has made it clear that they feel any investigation into the private citizenship activities of the 190 Operation Breakthrough employees would be a tedious, time consuming waste of Operation Breakthrough funds and an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

Any specific charges which may be brought against any individuals in our employ will be courteously received and thoroughly investigated, but I must, on the instructions of the Executive Committee, decline to honor your request for a "written report" of personnel activities "off the job."

Very truly yours,
OPERATION BREAKTHROUGH, INC.,
WILLIAM R. PURSELL,
Executive Director.

Mr. Sorrell advised that on May 13, 1967, he visited a Durham polling place during the municipal general election. While there he engaged a young lady in conversation. On the seat of her car were a number of political brochures captioned "The Durham Committee on Negro Affairs respectfully recommends the following:" (Copy of the brochure attached to this report).

According to Mr. Sorrell, the young lady told him that she was a student at the University of North Carolina and that students from that University and Duke University had been recruited by Operation Breakthrough employees to transport Durham residents to the polls.

On June 2, 1967, Mr. E. B. Cranford, Jr., 312 Watts Street, Durham, North Carolina, was interviewed and he furnished the following signed statement:

To whom it may concern:

"I have furnished the following information to John R. Buckley, who identified himself to me as an Investigator, Education and Labor Committee, U. S. House of Representatives. No promises or inducements were made to me and I will be willing to testify at any type hearing or proceeding regarding the information furnished.

"On Saturday, May 13, 1967, the day of the Durham, North Carolina, municipal elections, I made observations at several polling places in Durham, North Carolina, between the approximate hours 7:45 a.m.–4:30 p.m. Included were the Whitted School, the Bragtown School, the Forest Hills Club House and the Lakewood School.

"During the day I took several pictures of activities in the vicinity of the polling place. I have identified, marked, and furnished eight photos to Mr. Buckley. In these photos are vehicles and drivers that I observed on several occasions transporting different groups of people to the polls.

"I have marked a yellow political brochure, size approximately 3" x 10" captioned 'The Durham Committee on Negro Affairs respectfully recommends the following.' This brochure illustrated the voting lever in the vote position for candidates for Mayor and City Aldermen. Of the people transported in the vehicles in the photos mentioned above, I observed that approximately fifty per cent carried yellow slips of paper approximately 3" x 10" when they left the cars. These slips resembled the political brochure I have described.

"I certify the above is a true and accurate statement to the best of my knowledge and recollection.

"E. B. CRANFORD, Jr.,
"Durham, N.C.

"Witnessed: John R. Buckley, Minority Chief Investigator, Education and Labor Committee, U.S. House of Representatives"

On June 2, 1967, Mr. Joseph Bernard High, 219 North Dillard Street, Durham, North Carolina, advised that on April 1, 8, and 15, 1967, he served as an observer at Durham polling places during voter registration activity. He furnished the following affidavit which had been prepared previously:

"AFFIDAVIT

"Durham, County, N.C.

"Joseph High, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

"That he is a resident of Durham County, North Carolina; that during the month of April, 1967, he personally observed a 1965 Ford bearing North Carolina license number ET–4280 transporting Negro citizens of Durham County to the voting polls, for the purpose of registration as a voter in Durham County and the City of Durham.

"JOSEPH HIGH,
"Affiant.

"Subscribed and sworn to before me, this 11th day of May, 1967.

"CHARLES N. SHIMON,
"Notary Public.

"My commission expires: January 22, 1968."

On June 3, 1967, Mr. William R. Pursell, Executive Director, Operation Breakthrough, advised that a 1965 Ford bearing 1967 North Carolina license ET–4280 was an Operation Breakthrough vehicle.

On June 3, 1967, Mr. Sigmund Meyer, Chairman, Durham County Board of Elections, Wachovia Building, Durham, North Carolina, advised that early in December, 1966, three individuals came to the office of the Board of Elections and requested books containing names and addresses of registered voters. These books are broken down by precincts. According to Mr. Meyer, these persons returned on a regular, almost daily basis, until late in January. At that time, Mr. Meyer advised them that due to space limitations in the office he requested that only one of the three come to the office. On the following day, Mr. John Edwards, Operation Breakthrough employee, came to Mr. Meyer's office and complained about the reduction of from three to one having access to the registration books. Mr. Meyer told Mr. Edwards that, if he could make arrangements for space on the same floor for the reviewers, he would make the registration books available to them.

Mr. Meyer stated that during conversations with the individuals he learned that they were Operation Breakthrough employees. He explained that it was the policy of the Board of Elections not to require identification to any legitimate inquiry concerning registrations.

Mr. Meyer stated the Operation Breakthrough personnel appeared at his office on a regular, continuous basis during the period December, 1966, to March 28, 1967, from Monday through Friday. On some days during December and January he made entries in a notebook concerning their appearance. He said it was his practice, but not a rule, to keep such notes. He discontinued this in February, 1967.

Mr. Meyer advised that he observed that Operation Breakthrough personnel conducted quite extensive research, copying names and addresses from the registration books. He recalled that during their visits he made available registration books of the following City of Durham precincts: 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 17, 18 and 22.

On June 5, 1967, Mr. Meyer furnished the following results of the Durham general elections:

"Results of Durham general elections, May 13, 1967

"Precinct No.	For mayor		For alderman, Ward 2		For alderman, Ward 4		For alderman, Ward 6		For alderman at large [1]	
	Grabarek	Hardin	Booth	Everett	Biggs	Freeman	Fisher	Lane	Barbour	Boulware
6	655	531	483	655	628	492	710	253	603	361
8	261	288	193	306	229	282	371	75	172	316
9	529	152	431	221	508	148	477	80	276	169
10	106	675	35	656	63	634	601	57	82	839
11	130	1,156	40	1,118	64	1,085	1,035	52	75	1,295
12	69	471	26	475	34	473	407	19	31	558
13	81	722	32	749	43	715	690	50	52	400
17	127	228	64	275	92	223	235	59	87	250
18	392	407	334	420	304	452	499	122	195	480
22	369	268	315	299	272	342	417	72	197	249

"[1] Furnished by G. F. Steele, Jr., June 5, 1967."

Mr. Meyer furnished the following schedule pertaining to the City of Durham's 1967 municipal elections:

"CITY OF DURHAM 1967 MUNICIPAL PRIMARY AND MUNICIPAL GENERAL ELECTIONS

"Durham County Board of Elections: Sigmund Meyer, Chairman; J. V. Ingram, Secretary; Charles N. Fuller, 320 Wachovia Bank Building, Durham, N.C., Telephone: 682–4747.

"To the Registrars of City Precincts of Durham:

"The following is a calendar of the dates to be observed by you in the coming Municipal Primary and Municipal General Elections:

"March 29: The Registrars will meet at the City Hall (Council Meeting Room) at 10:00 o'clock A.M., Morris Street, 2nd Floor, for instructions and afterwards pick up registration books, etc.

"April 1: The Registrars will remain at the polling places from 9:00 o'clock A.M. until sunset for additional registration of voters. Sunset 6:37 o'clock P.M.

"April 8: The Registrars will remain at the polling places from 9:00 o'clock A.M. until sunset for additional registration of voters. Sunset 6:43 o'clock P.M.

"April 15: The Registrars will remain at the polling places from 9:00 o'clock A.M. until sunset for additional registration of voters. This is the last day for registration of voters for the coming Municipal General Election. Sunset 6:48 o'clock P.M.

"April 22: Challenge Day for the Municipal Primary Election. On this date the Registrars will remain at the polling places from 9:00 o'clock A.M. until 3:00 o'clock P.M.

"April 26: At 10:00 o'clock A.M. the Registrars will meet at the City Hall, 2nd Floor, for instructions and pick up poll books, etc.

"April 29: Municipal Primary Election. The polls will be open from 6:30 o'clock A.M. until 6:30 o'clock P.M. After taking the prescribed oath, open the polls and conduct the election. After 6:30 o'clock P.M. tally the ballots, make duplicate returns, mailing duplicate copy that night to the Chairman of the Board of Elections at 320 Wachovia Bank Building. *Immediately* after tallying the ballots telephone the results to 682–4747 or 688–4205, or 682–2621, or 688–8181.

"May 1, Monday: The Municipal Primary Election returns will be canvassed at the City Hall (Council Meeting Room, 2nd Floor) at 10:00 o'clock A.M. Registrars will deliver the original set of returns brought with them, as well as the registration, poll books and miscellaneous supplies. Statement of account, original return and voting machine keys should be brought to the City Hall. Everything else should be delivered to the Board of Elections office.

"May 10: The Registrars will meet at the City Hall (Council Meeting Room), Morris Street, 2nd Floor, at 10:00 o'clock A.M., for instructions and afterwards pick up registration books, poll books, etc., for Municipal General Election.

"May 13: Municipal General Election. The polls will be open from 6:30 o'clock A.M. until 6:30 o'clock P.M., for the General Election. After 6:30 o'clock P.M. tally the ballots, make duplicate returns, mailing duplicate copy that night to the office of the Board of Elections, 320 Wachovia Bank Building. *Immediately* after tallying the ballots telephone the results to 682–4747, 688–4205, 682–2621, or 688–8181.

"May 15 Monday: The Municipal General Election returns will be canvassed at the City Hall (Council Meeting Room, 2nd Floor) at 10:00 o'clock A.M. Registrars will deliver the original set of returns brought with them, as well as the registration books, poll books and miscellaneous supplies. Statement of account, original return and voting machine keys should be brought to the City Hall. Everything else should be delivered to the Board of Elections office, 320 Wachovia Bank Building, Durham, N.C., Phone 682–4747.

"DURHAM COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS,
"By: SIGMUND MEYER, *Chairman*.
J. V. INGRAM, *Secretary*.
CHARLES N. FULLER, *Member*.

"Note: Keep this calendar of dates for future *information* and *reference*, also all Notices, Letters, etc., you receive at any time from the Durham County Board of Elections.

"It may be possible that it will not be necessary to have a City Primary Election, this will depend upon the number of candidates filing notices. If there is no Municipal Primary Election you will be advised about it sometime after 6:00 o'clock P.M., Friday, April 14, 1967, which is the final filing date and hour for candidates.

"There is to be no further registration of electors between the Municipal Primary and the Municipal General Election.

"Please note: *All meetings for this election are at the City Hall 2nd Floor, Morris Street, City.*

"For voting machine service call office of Durham County Board of Elections, 682–4747."

On June 2, 1967, Miss Charsie Hedgepeth, Program Coordinator and Miss Joan Burton, Community Worker, Target Area A, were interviewed in the offices of Operation Breakthrough. Miss Hedgepeth acted as spokeswoman with an occasional comment from Miss Burton.

Miss Hedgepeth advised that during the past year Operation Breakthrough has conducted a Voter Education Program involving an effort to contact a maximum number of Durham's poor. The program was designed to explain to the poor the importance of registering and voting.

According to Miss Hedgepeth, early in 1967 Operation Breakthrough began reviewing registration books in the office of the Board of Elections. These books were available daily, Monday through Friday. Lists of registered voters were compiled. Using the voting lists and tax maps, door-to-door canvassing in the target areas was commenced and several hundred of the poor were registered on three successive Saturdays in April, 1967. Miss Hedgepeth estimated that approximately 500 were registered in Target Area A.

Miss Hedgepeth said Operation Breakthrough automobiles were used to transport the Durham citizens to the polling places for the purpose of registering on April 1, April 8, and April 15, 1967, and this effort was considered the end product of the one year Voter Education Program.

Miss Hedgepeth explained that Operation Breakthrough community workers are assigned to specific geographic areas in what are considered target areas in Durham. On the days of the municipal primary and general elections (April 29 and May 13, 1967) Operation Breakthrough employees, on a voluntary basis and using personally owned cars, transported numbers of the poor to the polling places to vote.

Miss Hedgepeth and Miss Burton were shown photos taken in the vicinity of the polling places on May 13, 1967, Miss Hedgepeth stated she recognized Operation Breakthrough employees, but declined to identify them, other than a photo of herself where she appears on the passenger side of a two-door Volkswagen.

Miss Hedgepeth and Miss Burton were shown a political brochure captioned "The Durham Committee on Negro Affairs respectfully recommends the following (candidates for Mayor and Aldermen)." When asked if these brochures were distributed to the people transported to the polls, Miss Hedgepeth replied, "No, it wasn't necessary, they knew who they were going to vote for."

On June 2, and June 3, 1967, the investigator met with the following officials of Operation Breakthrough:

Dr. Charles W. Watts, President, Board of Directors, and Chairman of the Executive Committee.

Mr. Robinson Everett, Attorney for Operation Breakthrough.

Mr. William R. Pursell, Executive Director.

Mr. Scott Puckett, Assistant Director.

Mr. Lawrence Kelly, Administrative Assistant to the Executive Director.

Mr. Aden Field.

Dr. Watts expressed concern over the public charges made by Fred Steele (G. F. Steele, Jr.) that Operation Breakthrough employees were engaged in improper political activity. He stated that the anti-poverty program in Durham suffers from this adverse publicity and that to his knowledge there have been no violations of existing laws or OEO regulations. He indicated Operational Breakthrough members and staff feel they have complied with regulations pertaining to political activity and, if there has been noncompliance, they want to be apprised of the specifics in order that necessary steps can be taken to correct the situation.

On June 2, Dr. Watts requested that Operation Breakthrough be advised of the specific allegations or charges which have been made by Fred Steele regarding improper activity of Operation Breakthrough employees. The investigator advised that if the complainant, Fred Steele, had no objections, a list of specifics would be furnished the following day.

(On June 3, 1967, Mr. Fred Steele furnished the following statement in response to the request of Dr. Watts: "During the Durham, North Carolina, Municipal elections of 1967, and for the period preceding the elections, including Registration of voters and the primary elections, employees of Operation Breakthrough were engaged in political activity in an effort to elect a slate of candidates." Mr. Steele declined to furnish Operation Breakthrough with specific evidence or charges because he felt the evidence should first be reviewed and evaluated by members of the House Education and Labor Committee and the Office of Economic Opportunity or the U.S. Civil Service Commission.)

Dr. Watts furnished the following signed statement reflecting his views concerning the Congressional inquiry and the matter of charges that Operation Breakthrough was involved in improper political activity.

JUNE 3, 1967.

STATEMENT OF DR. CHARLES WATTS, PRESIDENT, BOARD OF DIRECTORS, OPERATION BREAKTHROUGH

Along with some of the staff members, I have conferred with Mr. John Buckley, minority counsel to the House Committee on Education and Labor. We have generally discussed the functions and purpose of Operation Breakthrough and the laws, regulations, and directives that apply to it. I have explained to Mr. Buckley that under our interpretation of the applicable laws, which was checked with officials of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Durham municipal election is a local non-partisan election and not subject to the restrictions that apply to partisan political activity. Moreover, I have emphasized that Operation Breakthrough had repeatedly apprised its personnel that no support by the organization should be given to any candidate in the municipal election, and that, although each staff member retained his private rights as a citizen in such an election, he was not to use the organization's funds or equipment, nor his compensated official time, to participate in political activity. Mr. Pursell and I have furnished Mr. Buckley with prior statements by us and with other documents which amplify our position.

Mr. Buckley has informed us that, despite our request to be allowed the opportunity to learn of and refute any specific allegations which either have been made, or may be made by Mr. Fred Steele, or anyone else, no such opportunity can be provided us at this time. He explained further that these allegations could only be made known to us with the consent of Mr. Steele, which Mr. Steele has refused to grant up to this point.

Accordingly, any further comment by us should await the moment when we know what are the specific charges against our organization. Anyone is entitled to know the accusations against him and to confront his accuser. We trust that this right will be fully recognized by any Committee or other group that may receive charges against Operation Breakthrough. Of course, when and if specific charges of improper action are brought against Operation Breakthrough by Mr. Steele or any other citizen, I shall be glad to answer those charges and to call for appropriate action from the Executive Director of Operation Breakthrough.

OPERATION BREAKTHROUGH, INC.,
DR. CHARLES WATTS,
President.

Photos taken by E. B. Cranford, Jr., on May 13, 1967, in the vicinity of Durham polling places were shown to Operation Breakthrough officials present at the conference.

Mr. Lawrence Kelly, Administrative Assistant to the Executive Director, acknowledged that he appeared in one of the photos. He advised that on May 13, 1967, he transported voters to the polls in the Durham municipal general election. He said he did so at the request of the Neighborhood Council and that he felt this activity was proper inasmuch as the election was non-partisan.

Mr. Robinson Everett, attorney for Operation Breakthrough, advised it was his opinion Operation Breakthrough has been in compliance with OEO regulations and directives. He said that in 1955 or 1956 the U.S. Civil Service Commission had ruled that the Durham municipal elections were non-partisan and not covered by the Hatch Act.

Mr. William R. Pursell, Executive Director, furnished the following material pertaining to the Operation Breakthrough controversy:

OPERATION BREAKTHROUGH, DURHAM, N.C.

MEMORANDUM

To: All staff members.
From: William R. Pursell, Executive Director.
Date: May 11, 1967.
Subject: Use of facilities and vehicles on election day May 13, 1967.

This is to officially inform you that no vehicles and/or facilities of Operation Breakthrough are to be used in any way in support of any individual or slate of candidates in the General Election on May 13, 1967. This is to be interpreted as meaning that only normal Saturday program activities will be allowed on this day. It is also to be interpreted that no vehicles and/or offices can be used to get voters to the polls. It is further to be interpreted that no staff members will be reimbursed either in salary or compensatory time for election related activities on this day.

Due to the fact that this is a non-partisan election and in compliance with CAP Memo 50–A, each staff member may, if he so desires, be involved as a private citizen according to the dictates of personal conscience.

WRP.

STATEMENT ISSUED BY DR. CHARLES WATTS, PRESIDENT, BOARD OF DIRECTORS, AND MR. WILLIAM PURSELL, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Mr. Fred Steele's allegations against Operation Breakthrough at his press conference Tuesday morning were sensational and without foundation. It was extremely disappointing that Mr. Steele found it expedient to use Operation Breakthrough as a political football again. It is surprising that Mr. Steele can align himself with those who fear registration and voting by the poor of Durham, and who would raise a false racial issue in a matter which is both non-partisan and non-racial.

Mr. Steele's allegation that Operation Breakthrough sought to register only Negro voters in its ongoing citizen education program is false. The white voters registered through our efforts will take issue with Mr. Steele on this matter. It is obvious for anyone to see that the limited resources and staff of Operation Breakthrough cannot be spread over the entire county. The citizen education efforts were concentrated within defined target areas, where extensive poverty and Negro population are unfortunately combined. These are the same target areas where Operation Breakthrough has been working all along.

Any "unhealthy division" among the city electorate is more properly laid to the inflammatory statement of Mr. Steele than to the work of Operation Breakthrough.

Mr. Steele's further allegation that Operation Breakthrough made improper use of its staff is also false. Staff members of Operation Breakthrough are authorized and encouraged by Federal regulation to be active as individual citizens in local, non-partisan elections. Those who are so active receive no pay or compensation for these activities.

On April 28, the Executive Director of Operation Breakthrough issued an order, in line with OEO directives, prohibiting the expenditure of any Operation Breakthrough funds in support of activities on election day, and forbidding the use of agency vehicles in support of such activity.

A prompt investigation of vehicle schedules and reports by drivers and supervisors substantiated the fact that none were used.

Operation breakthrough invites Mr. Steele to make his alleged "evidence" public so that the charges may be fairly judged by all.

Mr. Pursell stated, "If the existence of accurate information which has not yet come to my attention can be fairly established, I am willing to consider it and take appropriate actions."

The Director strongly stated however that private non-paid individual participation in non-partisan election activities is a citizen's right and privilege.

The intent of Congress as expressed in the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 has been clear from the beginning. "Maximum feasible participation" of the poor in the workings of our society surely includes the proper exercise of a citizen's right to register and vote. Attacking the encouragement and support of citizens who are poor and who seek to express their concerns through voting is hardly in keeping with the established concept of American Democracy.

SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT REGARDING OPERATION BREAKTHROUGH NON-INVOLVEMENT IN PROHIBITED POLITICAL ACTIVITIES, WILLIAM R. PURSELL, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, OPERATION BREAKTHROUGH, MAY 28, 1967

In a 1966 amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 Congress extended the limitations on political activities contained in the Hatch Act to include the employees of Community Action Agencies. Under the Hatch Act is a specific provision in 5 U.S.C. Section 1503 permitting nonpartisan activity. It reads:

"Section 1502(a)(3) of this title does not prohibit political activity in connection with—

"(1) an election and the preceding campaign if none of the candidates is to be nominated or elected at that election as representing a party any of whose candidates for presidential elector received votes in the last preceding election at which presidential electors were selected; or

"(2) a question which is not specifically identified with a National or State political party.

"For the purpose of this section, questions relating to constitutional amendments, referendums, approval of municipal ordinances, and others of a similar character, are deemed not specifically identified with a National or State political party."

In addition to the restrictions of the Hatch Act, the 1966 amendments preclude the use of program funds, the provision of service and the employment or assignment of personnel in a manner supporting or resulting in identification of a Community Action Program with any particular political activity or any activity designed to further the election or defeat of any candidate for public office.

On December 1, 1966, the Office of Economic Opportunity issued a memorandum (Memorandum 50–A) which explained these limitations in detail. It pointed out the restrictions are imposed by the United States Civil Service Commission and that in addition to the Hatch Act requirements, applicable to Federal agencies generally, Community Action Programs were subject to stature based requirements relating to political activity. In brief, these preclude: employees from identification even on their own time with the activity of any recognized political party; use of local agency equipment for political activity; and the conduct of political activity as part of official personnel employment or assignment.

It is my understanding as a Durham resident that municipal elections such as those taking place on April 29 and May 13 are non-partisan political elections. When I voted on those days, I saw no label or designation indicating a candidate as a Democrat, Republican or the representative of a third party. I noted that the newspapers consistently referred to the election as non-partisan. But to make doubly certain that this was indeed true, I specifically checked on April 25 with both the Durham County Board of Elections and the League of Women Voters. One candidate for the City Council in the fourth ward had been active in Republican politics last fall but I am sure that he was not in any way identified on the ballot as a Republican candidate. No one has in fact provided *any* evidence that either of these elections could be construed as a partisan election within the meaning of the Hatch Act as it has been consistently interpreted by the Civil Service Commission, the agency which Congress directed to interpret the Hatch Act, or by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

I checked personally by telephone with the regional analyst of the Office of Econonic Opportunity and with the office of the Inspector General of OEO; and they confirmed my interpretations of the statute. In repeated inquiries directed to these persons and to other qualified interpreters, I have always received the same positive confirmation.

In addition to these precautions, on May 11th, prior to the May 13th run-off, I issued the following memorandum to all staff members:

"This is to officially inform you that no vehicles and/or facilities of Operation Breakthrough are to be used in any way in support of any individual or slate of candidates in the General Election on May 13, 1967. This is to be interpreted as meaning that only normal Saturday program activities will be allowed on this day. It is also to be interpreted that no vehicles and/or offices can be used to get voters to the polls. It is further to be interpreted that no staff members will be reimbursed either in salary or compensatory time for election related activities on this day.

"Due to the fact that this is a non-partisan election and in compliance with CAP Memo 50–A, each staff member may, if he so desires, be involved as a private citizen according to the dictates of personal conscience."

In a further effort to avoid any misunderstanding I directed that the various offices of Operation Breakthrough, which frequently are kept open on Saturday, be closed on May 13, 1967, and I personally inspected them to insure that they were in fact closed. Furthermore, in accord with my instructions only one of the eleven vehicles operated by Operation Breakthrough was in use at all on Saturday, May 13, 1967; and it was used solely to transport N.Y.C. enrollees to the John Umstead Hospital and back. No staff member of Operation Breakthrough performed any official duty in connection with the May 13, 1967, election. Only a supervisor at the Children's Museum, another supervisor on duty at John Umstead Hospital and one bus driver engaged in transporting N.Y.C. enrollees can be ascertained to have performed official duties on that date. To a limited extend I was myself on duty but only to assure that my earlier instructions were being complied with.

All the requirements or laws and regulations have been honestly complied with to the fullest extent of my knowledge and ability. As Executive Director I have vested in me only such authority over the private lives and activities of Operation Breakthrough employees as Congress has authorized. It is my belief that any unwarranted attempt to extend this authority would raise the serious question of constitutional infringement.

CAP EMPLOYEE INVOLVEMENT IN NON-PARTISAN ELECTION ACTIVITIES

The Executive Director of Operation Breakthrough is guided in the formula-

tion of policy concerning employee political activities by national OEO regulations and by the policy decisions of the OBT Board of Directors.

OEO permits certain non-partisan political activities "in connection with campaigns which are run on a non-partisan basis and are of a strictly local character . . . ." (see CAP Memo 50–A, page 4, para. 3).

The Executive Director documented the non-partisan character of the May 13 election:

1) By a phone call to Mrs. Ann Hunt of the Durham League of Women Voters, placed by Mr. Ben Ruffin, Area C Coordinator, at the Director's request on the morning of April 25th.

2) By phone calls to the Durham Board of Elections, placed by Aden Field, Administrative Assistant, and Lawrence Kelly, Senior Administrative Assistant, at the Director's request on the same morning.

3) For further documentation, a clipping from the April 26th issue of the Durham Sun, and a pamphlet from the League of Women Voters are included.

The Executive Director placed a call to Dr. Charles Watts, President of the OBT Board of Directors, at approximately 12:45 p.m., April 25th, and secured his opinion as President that it was the intent of the OBT Executive Committee, in its only relevant action in May of 1966, only to bring OBT policy on election activity into consistence with that of OEO; and that this action does not preclude the activity of OBT employees in the upcoming non-partisan election.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING, OPERATION BREAKTHROUGH, INC., MAY 18, 1967

The following members of the Executive Committee were present:

Dr. Charles Watts.
Mr. David Currie.
Mr. William D. Higgs.
Mr. Julius Corpening.
Mrs. Christine Strudwick.
Miss Delois Vines.

The following members of the staff of Operation Breakthrough were present:

Mr. William Pursell.
Mr. Gerald Underwood.
Mr. Scott Puckett.
Mrs. Louise Crosby.
Mr. Lawrence Kelly.
Mr. Ed Stewart.
Mr. James Pilgrim.
Mrs. Maria Hamilton.

1. *Approval of the minutes of the Executive Committee meeting of April 20, 1967:*

Mr. Currie moved that the minutes abovementioned be approved as written. This motion was seconded by Mr. Higgs and unanimously voted.

2. *Board Retreat*: Mr. Pursell stated that the answers from the questionnaires that were distributed to the Board members at the last meeting indicated the same response as the previous questionnaires: although the Board had officially approved retreat in principle, an insufficient number of members were actually able to attend. Reviewing the correlation of the answers, he stated that no more than ten members would be able to attend a retreat at any given date. Mr. Currie moved that the Board rescind its approval of a retreat. However, there was no second to this motion. Mr. Corpening then suggested the possibility of an informal meeting in a comfortable setting in Durham to discuss the report. Dr. Watts pointed out that Operation Breakthrough had a responsibility to act in terms of the North Carolina Fund Report. Mr. Corpening asked whether it would not be valuable to divide the report up into sections and assign these sections to a subdivided Board. Mr. Currie stated that there would be some virtue in the Operation Breakthrough staff's reporting to the Board what actions had already been taken as a result of the report. Mrs. Crosby asked whether it would be helpful for the staff to make a report of the main features of what action had already been taken by Operation Breakthrough and then let the Board deal with the remaining portions. Mr. Corpening then suggested that a subcommittee composed of members of the Executive Committee and the staff of Operation Breakthrough intensively review the report in the light of what has already been done and what ought to be done. Dr. Watts stated that he thought that this was a workable plan. Mr. Pursell added that he thought that it would be excellent for such a subcommittee to take an evening and come to grips with the report pulling out the features that have been implemented and then presenting the full Board with a complete report.

Mr. Corpening moved that the Executive Committee approve the formation of an ad hoc subcommittee of several members of the Executive Committee and Operation Breakthrough staff to study the North Carolina Fund Report. This motion was seconded by Mr. Higgs and unanimously approved.

First asking for any volunteers for this subcommittee, Dr. Watts appointed the following: Mr. David Currie, Chairman, Miss Delois Vines, Mr. Victor Bryant, and Mrs. M. H. Thompson. Mr. Pursell asked that the appointment of the staff members be withheld until he had made an evaluation of the responsibilities being created by individual staff members. Mr. Higgs suggested that he employ the talents of Mrs. Crosby before she left Operation Breakthrough at the end of May.

3. *Summer Head Start:* Mr. Pursell stated that for four weeks the Office of Economic Opportunity had been promising that any day the approval of the Summer Head Start Proposal would be signed. Despite daily contact with Washington, this approval has not yet come. However, they have given Operation Breakthrough their assurance that the grant would be signed minus only $3,000 from the proposed plan. This $3,000 is the result of the deletion of the positions of medical-social coordinators. Unfortunately, the Office of Economic Opportunity often does not look at proposals from a local viewpoint and cuts positions which appear from their point of view to be low priority. These positions may be reinstated, however, by the additional use of volunteer services from the school systems in place of other funded positions. Mr. Pursell, stating that May 1 had been the school's deadline. emphasized his concern that if the proposal is not signed by Friday, May 19, 1967, the school systems will not be able to function responsibly. Mr. Corpening asked if Mr. Sanchez was aware of this problem. Mr. Pursell answered that he had told Mr. Sanchez this and had told him of the County School system's being asked to operate a Follow Through program which might be hamstrung by long delays in approval. The Office of Economic Opportunity did give Operation Breakthrough the staffing patterns for the program and this relieved the situation somewhat; however, they neglected to specify the money allotted to each position. Apparently, he pointed out, the proposal is in the typing pool of the Office of Economic Opportunity and cannot be signed until it is completed. Mr. Pursell stated that he had offered the use of his secretary but they had stated that this was not necessary.

4. *Letter from Mr. A. C. Sorrell:* Mr. Pursell read both the letter he had received from Mr. A. C. Sorrell, requesting information about the activities of Operation Breakthrough's employees both on and off the job on Saturday, May 13, 1967, and his response to Mr. Sorrell. This stated that he would bring Mr. Sorrell's request to the attention of the Executive Committee. Reviewing the situation which culminated in Mr. Sorrell's request, Mr. Pursell stated that undoubtedly the members of the Executive Committee had read of the accusations thrown at Operation Breakthrough for its activity in "political affairs." Reading from CAP Memorandum 50–A, which dealt with the restrictions on CAP agencies of their political activities, Mr. Pursell called the Executive Committee's attention to page 4 which specifically exempts individuals employed by a CAP agency from regulation of their activities as private citizens in "non-partisan" elections. However, no grant funds can be used to influence the outcome of any campaign, non-partisan or partisan. This paragraph precluded Operation Breakthrough from participating in Saturday's election; it did not preclude individuals from participating in the officially non-partisan election if they desired to do so. Mr. Pursell stated that he had checked with the Office of Economic Opportunity prior to the election to see if his interpretation was in compliance with theirs. OEO had reported that any individual employed by a CAP agency could participate in a non-partisan election only if he were doing so on a non-working day with no compensatory time afforded him. On April 25, Mr. Pursell added, he checked with the local board to make sure that this election was in fact a non-partisan election. Many of the staff members were involved in both the primary and the election; no vehicles, however, were used in any way relating to these elections. After the primary, when Mr. Fred Steele accused Operation Breakthrough of using Federal funds in the activities relating to the primary election, Mr. Pursell made an intensive check to see if any vehicles had been used, even though he had issued memorandums stating this was specifically prohibited. His check proved that no vehicles had been used in any way except in previously programmed activities. On Saturday, May 13th, the Operation Breakthrough offices were locked so that no one could accuse Operation Breakthrough of carrying on political activities. In his letter to Mr. Sorrell Mr. Pursell expressed his reservations as to both the propriety and practicality of investigating 190 employees on a non-working day. He pointed out that no evidence had been given that any person had violated any guideline, but Mr. Sorrell had requested an investigation of all staff members. Dr. Watts added that Mr. Victor Bryant, who was unable to attend the meeting, had called him to express his feelings that Operation Breakthrough should not suppress information in answering Mr. Sorrell's letter. Dr. Watts stated that he had asked Mr. Bryant to get in touch with Mr. Sorrell to invite him to come to the Executive Committee meeting so that he could present his views.

Mr. Currie asked how many members of the staff would normally work on Saturday. Mr. Pursell stated that normally very few were required to work on Saturday. No one is scheduled to work except some of the Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees and the drivers who are expected to drive the enrollees to their jobs. Mrs. Crosby pointed out that at the end of each working month every employee turns in a time sheet which lists not only actual required hours of work but all hours that were spent on the job. These time sheets are approved by the immediate supervisor of each employee and checked by the Business Office. Mr. Higgs asked if it would be possible to get these sheets now in the middle of the month to check to see who had worked on Saturday. He stated that he felt that perhaps the appropriate way of handling Mr. Sorrell's request would be to direct him to the pertinent sections of CAP Memo 50–A, giving him the names of these individuals that were on the job but stating that the affairs of the employees off the job were not in this instance a proper concern. Mr. Pursell pointed out that after a preliminary investigation he had only found two people who had worked on Saturday, Edna Cole, a driver, and Dick Wescott, a N.Y.C. Supervisor at Children's Museum. He also

pointed out that Mr. Sorrell had already received a copy of CAP Memo 50–A. Dr. Watts stated that he felt that there must first be specific allegations before an intensive investigation can be held or it becomes a witch-hunt. Mr. Sorrell should make specific charges before Operation Breakthrough could make a blanket investigation of all its employees. Mrs. Crosby suggested that any information regarding employees' on the job activities should be withheld until the official time sheets had been turned in at the end of the month, so that in the event of an honest mistake Mr. Pursell would not be unfairly held officially responsible for his initial figure of how many people had actually worked on Saturday. Mr. Higgs suggested that any initial report to Mr. Sorrell could be defined as being merely a preliminary investigation. Mr. Currie stated that off-the-job activities of Operation Breakthrough employees were a concern of the Board's. Dr. Watts stated that while it was a concern of the Board, it was, nevertheless, the prerogative of each individual. Mr. Puckett pointed out that although such individual action was allowed in non-partisan elections, it was not allowed in partisan elections. In no way, can a CAP employee participate in any political activity, even, for instance, in holding an office in an organization like the Young Democrats. Mr. Corpening suggested that a general statement about what work was done on Saturday would be a sufficient answer to Mr. Sorrell. Mrs. Crosby pointed out that Mr. Sorrell also requested information concerning the off-the-job activities of employees. M. Higgs stated that he did not think that they could make such information available. Dr. Watts emphasized that such activities were at the discretion of the individual and that to investigate these activities and make the information available to Mr. Sorrell would be a breach of responsibility by Operation Breakthrough. Mr. Underwood added that while it was the Board's responsibility to protect the organization it was also its responsibility to protect the employees by affording them security in their jobs. Dr. Watts stated that it would not be their position to hide the activities of anyone, but this type of investigation could not be undertaken as it would be a disservice to subject all the employees to a blanket inquisition without any specific charges. Mr. Corpening stated that Dr. Watts should relay the message to Mr. Sorrell that the Executive Committee would be glad to discuss its position with Mr. Sorrell at any mutually convenient time. Dr. Watts then stated that from this discussion he and Mr. Pursell would write a letter to Mr. Sorrell indicating the Executive Committee's consensus.

5. *Progress Report on the Proposal:* Calling the Executive Committee's attention to the July 1st deadline, Mr. Pursell stated that already the staff of Operation Breakthrough had spent many hours discussing and planning the type of programs that will be needed for next year. These plans have been discussed with the North Carolina Fund, with the United Organization for Community Improvement, and with Leonard Slaughter, who came down from the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington. Operation Breakthrough has two years of experience and knowledge in back of it; what is needed now is a creative and viable plan. In some areas, such as health and social work, unless Operation Breakthrough comes up with a creative plan, it is very likely to lose whole programs entirely, as OEO has placed these programs, without sufficient regard for local content standards, on the bottom of its priority list.

Mr. Higgs then asked what had happened to the budget revisions sent into the North Carolina Fund. Mrs. Crosby and Mr. Pursell explained that they had been approved in essence for two months, which effectively barred any use of them.

Mr. Pursell then introduced Mr. Scott Puckett. Describing the Community Development Component, Mr. Puckett stated that as it is set up now the program activities were distinctly divided between service delivery and community organization which doesn't deal with the problem itself but helps organize a community to solve their own problems. There are many reasons why this component needs to be reorganized. First of all, Operation Breakthrough, unless it comes up with a newly descriptive but similar program, will lose many of the service-oriented programs, such as health, social work and home economics since these programs as now described are in disfavor with OEO. Secondly, efforts to deal with specific problems have not been as significant as they could have been due to Operation Breakthrough's lack of knowledge concerning the various organizations that constantly must be dealt with, in areas such as housing, welfare, health, etc. Another problem is that the demand for community development is greater than Operation Breakthrough's supply. Flexibility is greatly needed; an approach that will span all kinds of problems and areas is crucial.

Operation Breakthrough envisions a reorganization of its Community Development Component that will divide it into two sections: a geographic section and a problem area section. Two administrators will be responsible for the overall direction of the program, a director and an assistant director. The geographic section will be composed of four teams serving the area that is presently being served. Operation Breakthrough has commitments in these areas that it must honor. Two field supervisors will correlate the geographic sections of the component. A reserve geographic team is also envisioned both as a temporary source of additional manpower and as a training ground for new staff members. The problem area section will also be divided into four teams, each team studying a particular problem and the local solutions available, such as in housing, education, welfare and health. All the teams will spend 50 per cent of their time in what can be termed regular operations, 25 per cent of their time in training and 25 per cent of their time in planning. This is an important breakdown of time which will allow this component to function at maximum capacity both in long range and short range perspectives. The teams in both areas will be organized according to a ladder of ability structure affording vertical job mobility.

After a further discussion of the reorganization of this component, the meeting was adjourned until the following Thursday.

ADDENDUM

On June 16, 1967, Mr. L. G. Holleman, Rosebriar Community, Durham, North Carolina, advised that he was a supervisor for an on-the-job training program administered by Operation Breakthrough. Mr. Holleman related that on May 12, 1967, at approximately 4:45 p.m. he was approached in his office by Mr. Aden Field, an Operation Breakthrough supervisor. According to Mr. Holleman, Mr. Field requested Mr. Holleman and two staff members to "help us out in the elections tomorrow." Mr. Field further requested that Mr. Holleman and his staff members bring their personal vehicles. Mr. Holleman said that he would agree to this provided Operation Breakthrough's Director "put it in writing." Mr. Holleman said, subsequently, he received a telephone call from William R. Pursell, Operation Breakthrough's Director, and Mr. Pursell told him to "forget it."

On June 17, 1967, Mrs. Geoffrey Hamilton, 862 Louise Circle, Durham, North Carolina, advised the staff investigator that she was the secretary to the Director of Operation Breakthrough. In the presence of Operation Breakthrough's Counsel, Mr. Robinson Everett, Mrs. Hamilton stated that on May 13, 1967, during the Durham municipal elections and from 7:30 a.m. to 9:30 a.m. she handed out cards requesting prospective voters to vote for Mrs. R. O. Everett (Alderman, Ward 2). According to Mrs. Hamilton, she handed out these political cards at the West Durham Community Center polling place.

Mrs. R. O. Everett, successful candidate for Alderman, is the mother of Mr. Robinson Everett, Counsel for Operation Breakthrough.

FIVE MILLION MISSING TURKEYS

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Richard Larkin, Chief of Programs Analysis, Poultry Division, Consumer and Marketing, of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, recently acknowledged that the Department found 5 million turkeys it had lost. Last summer the Department had erroneously underestimated the American turkey population by 5 million and now they have found the discrepancy. This humorous-sounding anecdote had rather sad effects, however.

The prediction published by the USDA is one of the bases for production schedules and purchasing plans by the turkey growers and distributors. Secretary Freeman himself emphasized the significance of the Department's use of statistical reporting when he stated in his 1966 annual report to the President:

> The accuracy of production estimates becomes vital as crops move into close supply-demand situations.

The Department's turkey population error contributed to a higher than normal price for turkey last year, and overproduction and plummeting prices resulted this year.

Right now turkey production is at an alltime high and prices are at 20-year record lows. The Wall Street Journal noted:

> This year's big crop was encouraged primarily by favorable prices in 1966.

Those prices were inflated by poor USDA statistical procedures.

Along with this overproduction, exports have dropped off because of Common Market tariffs against our products. The profits of the American turkey producers are being gobbled up by high costs and low prices.

The soaring production of turkeys in this country is closely related to what producers think the market needs will be. The Department of Agriculture makes predictions on the size of the turkey population and this gives producers and distributors information on how to act in the market. The record high 1966 market prices were clearly stimulated by the USDA announcement and this induced producers to expand production for 1967.

I am concerned by the fact that there

obviously has been a careless attention to accurate detail in statistical reporting. I well recall statements made last August by Congressman ALBERT QUIE on this floor. He pointed out that demand was consistently understated and carryover overestimated by USDA for several crops, leading to cheaper prices. At that time, it was estimated farmers might have lost as much as $1 billion for corn, wheat, soybeans, and grain sorghums due to depressed prices caused by inaccurate statistics.

Now we hear that the Department of Agriculture has found the 5 million missing turkeys. This makes the statisticians happy in the Department of Agriculture, but the turkey farmers are distinctly unhappy.

Turkey prices are at their lowest levels in 20 years. Herbert Beyers, general manager of the Norbest Turkey Growers Association, a sales group headquartered in Salt Lake City said:

> Generally, the turkey industry is operating at prices below the cost of production.

Mr. Speaker, our President seems to feel that he can run the Government year after year taking in less than he spends, but turkey farmers cannot.

In another area, turkey growers are not pleased with the back seat American agriculture got at the Kennedy round trade negotiations recently completed in Switzerland. While America agreed to lower her tariffs on almost all imports, the Common Market countries are raising theirs. Turkey exports dropped 21 percent below 1966 levels in the first quarter of this year.

Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that the American turkey producers have been hit on all sides. Farm costs have risen precipitously in the past months, and parity is 74 percent—lowest since the depression years of the 1930's. The export markets have dropped off, and last year's high market stimulated overproduction this year.

It is ironic that one of the blows came from a statistical error. That is the kind of world we live in. I hope the situation has been remedied in this particular corner of the Department of Agriculture. There are certainly enough other things that have got to be fixed up in that Department without worrying about statistics.

SLUGGISH REFORM BILL

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of Tuesday, June 20, 1967, contained an editorial entitled "Sluggish Reform Bill," which referred to the lack of progress on congressional reorganization in the House of Representatives.

The Monroney-Madden-Curtis congressional reform bill, S. 355, passed the Senate by a vote of 75 to 9 on March 7, 1967, and since March 9 has been pending in the Rules Committee in the House of Representatives.

Although there are practically no outward signs of progress except for the occasional enactment of congressional reforms, many of which were contained in our omnibus bill, there have been informal efforts made, which hopefully will lead to action by the House. Democratic members of the joint committee have sought to meet some of the objections of chairmen and Democratic House Members to various provisions of the bill, and three committee prints have appeared, embodying these modifications. Also, as the editorial notes, my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING], introduced his bill, H.R. 10748. Mr. BOLLING inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 14, 1967, pages 15857 through 15860, his comparative analysis of the provisions of S. 355 as it passed the Senate, Committee Print No. 2, and the Bolling bill.

Neither I, nor my Republican colleagues on the joint committee, the gentleman from Missouri, the Honorable DURWARD HALL, and the gentleman from New Hampshire, JAMES CLEVELAND, have had any part in the efforts on the majority side to arrive at some compromise.

It has been our position that the Senate-passed bill represents the consensus arrived at unanimously by the 12 members of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, and recommendations contained in the final report of the joint committee, Senate Report No. 1414, filed July 28, 1966, and that is the proposal which we still support. We recognize, of course, that the House will work its will on this measure and individually there are provisions in the bill and phraseology which need perfection and improvement, but this task, in my judgment, is one which should be performed by all of the Members of the House in full and free debate and consideration.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation has to do with the Congress itself, its procedures and its structure, and reorganization is uniquely appropriate for action by the House as a whole, since all 435 Members are knowledgeable and competent in the field of congressional procedure. It is of no great consequence to me precisely what kind of a bill is reported from the Rules Committee, although my personal view is that the Rules Committee ought not to start from scratch and rewrite the bill, which the 12 members of the Joint Committee produced after 2 years of arduous study and consideration. It was my view that the Rules Committee should consider only the changes in the bill made on the floor of the Senate, and the 39 amendments which were adopted.

It is my hope that the leadership and the Rules Committee will see fit to report promptly, either S. 355 as it passed the Senate, or even a modification of S. 355, and grant an open rule providing for adequate general debate so that the House may work its will and move this important legislation toward final passage.

The editorial I referred to is as follows:

SLUGGISH REFORM BILL

A few persistent members of the House of Representatives are courageously struggling to save the reorganization bill passed by the Senate. They might be called the realists of the House. The established leaders of that body seem to care little whether the reform efforts initiated by a joint Senate-House committee might come to naught. But the realists know that failure of the bill would cause another grave sag in the prestige of Congress.

The latest compromise designed to appease old-line committee chairmen was offered by Representative Bolling. As a member of the Rules Committee, Mr. Bolling is in an excellent position to understand the complaints about the Senate bill and to know what will be necessary to dislodge the measure from a potential Rules death-trap. Some of the concessions he has made, particularly in restoring prerogatives of committee chairmen, may be unfortunate, but as a practical matter some means must be found of getting the measure out of the Rules Committee and of passing it on the floor. The most important thing is to get the measure into conference where the final bill will be drafted in any event.

We do not share the belief that the bill is of little importance because it is only half a loaf or less. The lobbying provisions alone would be worthy of enactment as a separate bill. The same is true of the provision relieving Congressmen of their hangover of responsibility for the naming of postmasters, the strengthening of the Legislative Reference Service and the improvement in information resources available to Congress.

Beyond the need for these and other specific reforms is the need for a show of congressional willingness to put its own house in order. The public is well aware of the fact that this bill would leave untouched numerous grave defects in the operations of Congress. But it would be a beginning. We do not see how members of the House can face their constituents if they fail to enact these relatively modest reforms that the joint committee and the Senate worked so hard to perfect.

INTELLIGENCE GAP HAMPERS ECONOMIC POLICYMAKERS

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, M. J. Rossant, writing in the New York Times of June 21, 1967, supports the conclusion of the minority members of the Joint Economic Committee in their March 17, 1967, report that limitations of economic statistics and forecasting "raise grave doubts about the ability of Government to 'finely tune' its policies to the needs of the economy."

Mr. Rossant compares the administration to the Egyptian Army in its disappointing penchant to be caught by surprise by economic changes. Their slow recognition of the threat of inflation in 1966 and their inadequate preparations for the current slowdown are examples of how their radar is blurred by faulty forecasts and imprecise data.

He emphasizes several statistical series which must be improved before realistic diagnoses and sensible cures for the ail-

ments of the economy are possible. Among the improvements he emphasizes is the development of comprehensive data on job vacancies. As we did in our minority report, he urges that a job vacancies series would "help policymakers determine with greater certainty whether aggregate demand at any particular time was deficient."

Mr. Rossant's analysis leads him to the conclusion that "Until improvements are made in these areas, forecasting may be hazardous and fine tuning downright dangerous." The administration lacks the intelligence to make sophisticated economic adjustments.

This article offers fresh proof that the Johnson administration's "push button" economic policy is unworkable without better economic data and forecasting. It also suggests several areas, especially job vacancies, where better data is urgently needed. Therefore, I include it at this point in the RECORD:

THE INTELLIGENCE GAP—ECONOMIC POLICYMAKERS TRY TO BASE PRECISE FORECASTS ON IMPRECISE DATA

(By M. J. Rossant)

There's fresh proof that the Johnson Administration is trying to formulate precise policies to "fine tune" the economy on the basis of statistical intelligence that is anything but precise.

Geoffrey H. Moore, director of research for the National Bureau of Economic Research, provided the proof in calling for improvements in information on wage trends and other vital statistics in the nation's "stock of basic economic measurements."

While the National Bureau is scrupulously nonpartisan in its research activities and while Dr. Moore studiously refrains from direct criticism of the Administration's policies, the discrepancies he notes in wage statistics make plain that Washington's economic intelligence has glaring gaps.

Writing in the National Bureau's annual report, Dr. Moore states that "we do not really know, within, a reasonable narrow margin, what the recent trend of wages has been."

This admission from one of the country's top scholars in one of the country's most respected research institutions helps to explain the impracticality of the Administration's wage guidepost and its failure to frame more accurate forecasts and more appropriate policies.

The Administration, of course, doesn't concede that its forecasts or policies are faulty. But, like the Egyptian army, the economic policy makers have often been caught by surprise.

Thus they were slow to recognize the threat of inflation that created distortions and pressures on the economy in 1966. And their radar was again blurred and their preparations inadequate for the slowdown now taking place in business activity.

What is most disappointing about the Administration's effort is that, despite its elaborate machinery and its wealth of information, it has not done as well in forecasting as some private seers. Obviously, the Administration has put too much trust in questionable intelligence.

But, though they have made big mistakes, it is unfair to label the Administration's policy makers as the Egyptians among economists. Once the policy makers were aware that they were on the wrong track, they were quick to take corrective action.

Since this year's slowdown became apparent, for instance, Washington has eased credit, increased spending and cut taxes for business, which was not the prescription it had originally concocted.

But the Administration's control over policy gives the policy makers a special advantage, enabling them to make their predictions come true. Nevertheless, they have still gone awry. Money has been tighter, the deficit far bigger and the slowdown deeper and longer than had been expected even after corrective action was taken.

* * * that the policy makers can influence activity but that they do not have the intelligence—or the weapons—to call economic turns or make sophisticated economic adjustments. They may lay things on with a trowel well enough, but fine tuning seems beyond their grasp.

The ability to come up with a realistic diagnosis of what ails the economy and sensible policies for curing it requires more than an improvement in wage statistics. There also are serious discrepancies in information on inventories, retail sales, productivity and defense spending. These discrepancies have made it difficult to tell where the economy is, much less where it may be going.

Arthur F. Burns, chairman of the National Bureau, recently noted still other trouble spots where intelligence—and policy making—is deficient.

"We need to develop comprehensive data on job vacancies, so that it will no longer be necessary to guess whether or when a deficiency in aggregate demand exists," he said. "We need to improve our measures of price and costs, so that inflationary pressures can be recognized more promptly. We need to develop quarterly projections of Federal revenues and expenditures, similar to the information now compiled by the Government on business sales expectations and investment intentions, so that the changing requirements of fiscal policy can be evaluated better than in the past or at present."

These gaps do not exhaust the list. Dr. Burns himself wants more information on the state of the labor market, the problem of seasonal unemployment and "the subtle forces that shape the state of confidence." It is clear, too, that more intelligence is needed on the impact of monetary policy, which has not been working in the way the policy makers have hoped.

Until improvements are made in these areas, forecasting may be hazardous and fine tuning downright dangerous.

FAIRPLAY FOR OTEPKA

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, several times during the past few days I have remarked on the State Department hearings concerning Otto Otepka. This matter long ago was removed from the realm of an internal Department matter and placed into the context of national security, the right of the American people to know the facts concerning public figures, the question of loyalty of Government employees, and use of unprincipled tactics by Government departments in attempts to cover over their own misdoings.

To my previous remarks I would now like to add an article from the June 24, 1967, issue of Human Events which points out several ways in which the State Department has "tried to hinder the hearings."

It now appears that, after dropping 10 of 13 charges against Otepka—evidently to avoid having to broach their highly suspect actions—the State Department has eliminated tape recordings made from wiretaps installed on Otepka's telephone, and is seeking to keep key figure John Reilly out of the harsh light of testimony.

The circumstances which surround the Otepka case cannot go unchallenged. Neither can the precedent setting decision to classify the testimony, thus removing from the scrutiny of the public and the press.

A total and thorough examination of this fantastic coverup must be made.

The above-mentioned article follows:

THE SECRET OTEPKA HEARINGS

"What's the department hiding?" That's the question that appears to pop up among observers of the State Department hearings involving Otto Otepka, the former high-ranking security officer who was fired three and one-half years ago after challenging the department's security procedures.

Secrecy appears to be the hallmark of the case. The department, for example, refuses to open the hearings to the public or the press; neither will it permit transcripts to be read. When the department explained that certain documents to be introduced were confidential, Otepka's attorney, Roger Robb, exploded: "Every one of those documents has been made public in the published hearings of the Senate Internal Security subcommittee on the case. Even if they are to be classified, there is no excuse for secrecy on the remaining portions of the transcript. There is no precedent for such a ruling.

For years, too, the government has blared forth the charges that Otepka has been guilty of declassifying and mutilating confidential documents, but recently the government mysteriously threw out 10 charges against Otepka relating to his alleged document "mutilation." Apparently, this was done to "cover up" reprehensible action by the department itself.

The *Government Employes Exchange*, the factual Washington paper covering the activities of federal employes, revealed that reliable information had it that the Justice Department decided to expunge the charges since Otepka had "obtained positive information" regarding the persons who had actually mutilated the documents and, in the event these charges were pressed, Otepka would be able to expose the real culprits. Thus, said the *Exchange*, the charges were dropped.

Last week the department was again attempting to throw a cloud of secrecy around the case by attempting to thwart Otepka from bringing out the full facts. Otepka and Robb asked the department to produce two tape reels of conversations of Otepka obtained through a secret tap put on Otepka's office telephone back in 1963. Evidence of the secret tap, whose installment was against federal law, came to light through hearings conducted by the Senate Internal Security subcommittee. But Irving Jaffe, who is pressing the case against Otepka before the State Department's hearing examiner, informed Robb that these reels have now been conveniently "erased."

The department has tried to hinder the hearings in other ways as well. Both Otepka and Robb have also requested the department to call in John Reilly, who was thoroughly involved in the Otepka matter when he was with the department and had knowledge of the telephone tapping. Indeed, Reilly initially failed to tell the truth about his knowledge of the "tap" and, when he reversed his position under threat of a per-

jury indictment, he resigned his department position but then wound up in a plush job with the Federal Communications Commission.

Though initimately involved in the Otepka matter, the department has not been urging Reilly to make an appearance at the Otepka hearings. Thus the State Department continues its weird performance in the Otepka affair.

OIL SUPPLIES OF THE FREE WORLD AND THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BROTZMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, "blackmail" is a blunt word, not normally to be found in the diplomatic lexicon. But I cannot find another term to adequately describe a statement by President Hourari Doumedienne of Algeria which appeared in the news media of the world this week.

Basically, President Doumedienne—far from joining in the effort to calm the antagonisms which touched off the brief, violent Middle East war—is urging the Arab countries to cut off oil supplies to the United States and Western Europe for 1 year.

This strikes me as a desperate effort to gain through international blackmail a bargaining position which could not be won on the battlefield.

It also further underlines a simple truth—that the United States and Western Europe cannot any longer afford to be dependent upon the oilfields of the Middle East, because the political instabilities which led to the current crisis will not likely pass for many years, and perhaps decades.

Mr. Speaker, the free world has lived in fear of losing the oil supplies of the Middle East for many years. We have been forced, by the implied and sometimes overt threat of having these tremendous oil reserves lost to the free world, to pay tribute to blackmailers and perpetuate the reign of tyrants.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has in the palm of its hand the means to end all future free world dependence upon the Middle East for oil, not only by ourselves but by Western Europe, as well.

Interestingly, this alternative to Middle Eastern oil—a resource known as oil shale—also offers the United States a way out of its balance-of-payments dilemma. It could add, very conservatively, $5 million to the credit side of our balance of payments, and thus give us, for the first time in several years, an inflow of gold.

Oil resources which dwarf the combined reserves of the Arab nations lie in the oil shale beds of the United States, which are centered in Colorado, Wyoming, and Utah.

An estimated 2 trillion barrels of oil are contained in these shale beds. This is 70 times the known petroleum reserves of the Nation and perhaps five times the crude oil reserves of the entire world.

For the past 50 years there has been talk of developing a great industry for the extraction and refining of shale oil. Both the Federal Government and private industry have invested money in basic research.

Last January the Interior Department announced a five-point program to mildly stimulate the development of technology and regulate the development of a shale oil industry.

The drafting of this policy was a step in the right direction, if only because it filled a vacuum and gave the Nation a baseline from which to proceed.

However, the defects in the policy soon became evident. For one thing, it was a low-gear program at a time when the Nation's interests suggested a shift into high gear.

For another, it placed obstacles in the path of private industry which could not help but discourage expenditure of risk capital on a large scale.

The Denver Post ably described these defects in the Interior Department's policy in an editorial last Sunday. The editorial said, in part:

> The U. S. Department of Interior has shown real fear in having private industry develop oil shale. Interior Secretary Stewart Udall's proposed shale research and lease program shows he's afraid of his shadow.
>
> He's afraid of allowing oil firms to be competitive, afraid of permitting them to develop their own confidential research techniques—above all—afraid of letting them have a profit incentive which might bring them into shale production.

The Post also suggested that the oil firms might intensify their efforts to develop the technology and make a beginning on privately owned oil shale deposits, rather than waiting for a workable leasing arrangement on the richer deposits which occur under public domain lands.

As this Colorado newspaper put it:

> The United States cannot afford to be in a position of potential subservience to every small war and palace coup which flares in the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, almost on the eve of the outbreak of the war in the Middle East I wrote a letter to President Johnson expressing concern over the possible unavailability of Middle East oil to the free world, and suggested that the Interior Department examine further means to accelerate the development of a substantial shale oil production capability in the United States.

I was notified by the White House that the matter would be passed along to Mr. Udall for comments.

Last week I received a letter of acknowledgment from Mr. Udall, but no comment on whether the Interior Department is studying means to encourage the shale oil industry to shift into high gear.

In view of the statement by President Doumedienne and other recent Far East developments, I am again writing to the President and Mr. Udall strongly urging positive actions toward this end.

MORAL AND ETHICAL CHALLENGE TO COLLEGE GRADUATES

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 11, I had the distinct privilege of delivering the commencement address at Pacific Union College in Angwin, Calif. In this address, I attempted to outline society as I see it today and present a moral and ethical challenge to these young and aspiring graduates.

This, Mr. Speaker, was a very pleasing experience for me to be able to speak to these young people who, in my judgment, are exceptionally well qualified to meet the challenges being posed to our younger generation. In the hopes my remarks may be of interest to my friends and colleagues in the Congress, I am including the full text of my remarks in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE DON H. CLAUSEN, AT PACIFIC UNION COLLEGE, ANGWIN, CALIF., ON JUNE 11, 1967

Mr. President, distinguished members of the staff and faculty of Pacific Union College, students of the graduating class of 1967, ladies, and gentlemen:

To the graduating class, 1967 of Pacific Union College, I congratulate each of you who today receive your degrees thus ending one stimulating chapter in your lives. Please be assured that our Nation and our State anxiously look forward to having you participate in all the vast panorama of endeavor that awaits you.

I am vividly reminded as I stand here before you, of the great transition each of you is about to make in your individual lives. I refer, of course, to the transition from *campus* responsibilities to *personal* and *family* responsibilities. Today, you are students in search of the many questions that confront mankind but tomorrow, you will be responsible citizens seeking the answers to those questions. And then, one day, perhaps you will be among the leaders who make the decisions—who suggest the answers and then attempt to gain popular support for them. These transitions, quite frankly, are the most important transitions in life toward maturity and service to your fellow man.

My message to you this morning is really quite simple, because I want to talk to you primarily about *your place* in a rapidly changing world and about *your responsibilities and opportunities* in that world. Unlike most commencement speeches, however, I did *not* come here to tell you all the timeworn cliches about "milk and honey" or that "everything is a bed of roses". I am here to tell you that society has become *intensely* competitive and affluent.

Quite honestly, our society has become almost *too complex* and *too impersonal*. On the plus side, however, I think we are becoming *more honest* with ourselves and with the world. No longer, I would remind you, are the natives of Ugandi or Swahili willing to trade trinkets or ostrich feathers for *either* Christianity or Democracy. No longer can we assume that man will accept *either* Christianity or Democracy as we once had imagined. No longer, here at home, can we rely on the old adage that the average American will believe whatever he reads in his evening paper. Mounting complaints of *"managed news"* and the existence of a so-called *"credibility gap"* are ample proof of this change.

This, we are told, is the *"Affluent Society"*. But affluence, with its many opportunities for education and recreation, has, in my

judgment, introduced *some compelling new problems* of its own making. Problems which, I feel and I think you will agree, are disturbing.

The advent of this high standard of living, which has really blossomed just in the time you have been in school, has brought with it some words and terms that are now "everyday household usage". Words such as crime rise, LSD, broken home, demonstrate, psycadellic, and protest.

Protest, as a matter of fact, has become fashionable and for too many, words like dedication, decency, loyalty, patriotism and trust have become outworn and old fashioned—or, put another way, definitely not cool. Pseudo-leaders with their phony slogans find it relatively easy to attract the *lazy* and the *indifferent* these days. The *lazy* because they have no time or drive to seek truth or facts. The *indifferent* because they fail to understand their National heritage or the proper relationship that exists between individual rights and national purpose. It is an easy trap to fall into and many appear to have taken the plunge.

The best evidence of this trend, perhaps, is what has happened in the Haight-Asbury District of San Francisco. Here, a colony of "Hippies" has literally taken over and I would draw your attention to the fact that most of them exist in a world of "make believe" which, for them, means that they don't work, don't wash, don't believe and—saddest of all—don't care.

Why has this happened in America? Millions of people who are concerned are asking this question. I believe there are several reasons and I would like to spend a few minutes examining them.

I contend that one of the "Side Effects" of our society has been a gradual but steady decline in individuality. Specifically, I am referring to loss of individual identification, individual recognition and individual accomplishment.

Today, a man's name and address is not sufficient to identify him. Instead, we have been barraged by identification numbers; social security numbers, ZIP code numbers, credit card numbers, area code numbers, drivers' license numbers, auto plate numbers—ad infinitum.

For too long, we have seen an alarming trend in America—a trend that says: "Let George Do It"—"Let the Government Do it"—"pass the buck" to someone else. There was a time when liberty and justice were cherished goals. Today, however, in too many quarters, it's become a "What's In For Me" attitude or "How Can I Lean on Someone Else to Carry Me Through Life"?

We all recognize these to be problems of an effluent society, but, to you and me who know better—we must assume the task of "throwing ice water in the face of America" to wake up America before it is too late. Unless this trend is reversed, I believe an internal crisis is in the making that will over-shadow all of our international conflicts—and this bothers me very much.

In many ways, instead of becoming a Great Society, I am more inclined to believe *we are becoming a Drowning Society*—drowning in our own affluence.

One of the historical problems of mankind which accounts for many of our present day problems has been *"Man's Inhumanity to Man"*. I refer here to the ageless and continuing exploitation of human beings through religious persecution, slavery, colonialization, discrimination and domination. I refer also to people and governments that *"take and never give"*, those that devalue human dignity and human resources.

I need not remind you that it was this *lack of "Christian Ethic"* that led to the founding of this country. It *fanned the flames* of the American Revolution and it *sowed the seeds* for the Great American Experiment. And, tragically, it *spawned* the American Civil War; plaguing us even today in attempting to resolve our *Number One* domestic problem in America—*Civil Rights*.

In my judgment, it is futile for Americans to think for one minute that they can resolve civil rights problems by resorting to *"Black Power"* or *"White Power"*. Power, of any hue or nature, is not the answer. *What America needs*, more than anything else in dealing with the problems of segregation and discrimination, is a *change in attitude and a change of heart*. We must, in the years just ahead, become more concerned about the character of the individual than we are now about the color of his skin. After all, *what color is God's skin?*

As we seek to develop a Great Society in America, we all know too well, that this can only occur through the *development of Great People*—great people are a dedicated people, humble, intelligent, creative, honest, productive and determined to make the most of the time allotted to each of us on this earth.

But, under no circumstances can we *"pass the buck"* or shirk our responsibilities if we expect to remain the *Great Nation* that carries the hopes and aspirations of people everywhere who desire to remain free. History has proven that it is the government which places *maximum* emphasis on individual responsibility that requires the *minimum* in personal restrictions; thereby *maximizing* your individual opportunities and personal freedoms.

With the granting of personal liberties, however, goes a considerable amount of personal risk. It can only work if you and I stand squarely in front of the mirror and ask ourselves—*am I doing my part? Am I carrying my fair share of the burdens?*

The *"do nothing" person* and the *"I don't want to get involved types"* are just as guilty as the person who overtly acts against the best interests of society.

Many of you have shared my complaint about Big Government. Let me say here and now, we are all to blame for this dangerous trend. Quite frankly, the private and the independent sectors have not kept pace with the rapidly increasing sociological changes of our times. When this occurs, the people turn to that force in our Society where they think their "call for help" will be answered—Government! Therefore, and I say this in all sincerity, unless these problems are resolved in some other way, your government is going to get bigger and bigger.

At this point I am going to say forthrightly—business organizations, church organizations and people outside of government are going to have to expand their efforts to meet the growing demands of people if we are to avoid the problems of the seemingly inevitable Welfare State. Private organizations must tackle social projects on a broader scale. Business must involve itself more completely with all the problems of society.

I am happy to tell you that this type of thinking among business leaders is becoming more and more prevalent. Business and industrial leaders, over the years, have developed vast capabilities for solving very complex production and marketing problems. These talents must now be put to use to reshape the America of the future.

The problems of urban housing, transportation, vocational educational training, employment clinics, management consultant services, job-referral services are but a few of the tasks that must become an integral part of the business or corporate structure of the future.

Having concentrated thus far on the domestic scene, let us direct our attention momentarily to the International scene because, unfortunately for those who would wish it otherwise, America's responsibilities and commitments do not stop at the water's edge.

In the greater sense and for reasons that transcend international politics and diplomacy, the burning question of our day is whether Christianity or Communism will contribute more to man's desperate need to come of age; to advance his education and to enlarge his capacity for accepting the ever increasing responsibilities history and the space age have and will thrust upon him.

History reminds us that no non-Christian nation ever made democracy work and we have already concluded that no government that exploits its people has ever survived. How then, you might ask, does one explain the success and the longevity of Communism? Well Communism—although Godless—is considered to be, by many, a religion in and of itself. To those people of the world who have known exploitation from whatever quarter—Communism has an appeal. It promises land reform, food for the hungry, national purpose and a strange kind of equality wherein the State satisfies all needs; human, intellectual, personal and spiritual.

The one glowing chink in the armor of Communism for all mankind to see is the fact that for people who have known true freedom—Communism has had to be forced on them with guns and terror. Cuba, China and South Vietnam are a few of the leading examples as was Korea. What a price we are paying for this exploitation!

What, then is the answer?

There are some things we do know about this problem. One is that Christianity and Democracy both have a natural and genuine appeal for troubled people and nations seeking an answer. But all the foreign aid money in the world is not worth a cent in winning the hearts and minds of these people and these nations unless it gets to the people who need it.

Quite frankly, the only effective approach to these problems that I can see is accelerating the advancement of the Christian Ethic. This seems to be the logical middle ground between the exploitive colonialist policies of the past and the threatening Communist tentacles of the present.

The Cold War, in my opinion, could be referred to as "Ideological Warfare". Freedom, liberty, independence, and capitalism, with justice under law, on the one side and atheistic, totalitarian Communism on the other. In the final analysis, the Christian doctrine, its interpretation and presentation, must be more dynamic and viable than ever before if it is to make man more responsive in shaping the course of history, than Marxism.

You, the graduating class of 1967 are an exceptionally fine representative group of an exploding generation. In spite of reports to the contrary, this is one of the finest generations of Americans ever to reach for the helm of leadership. You are bigger, healthier, more intelligent, more industrious, more concerned and more aware of what is going on than any previous generation.

The staff and faculty of this great college, under the dynamic and effective leadership of President Rittenhouse, have prepared you well for this assignment. And, in spite of any misgivings you may have to the contrary now—you are well qualified for the task that lies ahead of each one of you.

During his campaign for the governorship of California, Ronald Reagan said: "There are no quick or simple solutions to the problems we face—but there are solutions". Governor Reagan, of course, was alluding to the problems of the State of California but this same analogy, in my view, has nationwide and even international application.

Decision making is not always easy and problem solving is not always popular. This is the moment in history when, as a people, we need to deal with our problems at home and abroad in a prudent and mature manner. The moment is at hand when parents are worried over the future of their children—citizens are afraid for their safety on the

streets—the decent and law-abiding are concerned about the way America is heading.

They're asking: "Which way America?"

They're seeking a new and positive alternative! America needs a new moral awakening! This young, vigorous and restless generation can be a responsive and responsible generation and I'm convinced it will be!

Well believe me, you are about to get your chance. You're on the launching pad of a new decade that will chart the course of history like it's never been charted before.

I believe America is destined to play a key role in God's master plan. In my opinion, this generation of Americans is being called on to exercise dynamic and creative leadership to prove to the world that Christianity is best.

And this I believe we can do providing we "wake up" to the facts that surround us and take a page or two from the history that built this great Christian Nation—Providing America offers the world positive alternatives as fresh and startling—as big and bold and different as the Birth of America; an experiment which drew to our shores hundreds of thousands of early day "missionary" volunteers and "Peace Corpsmen" who were disillusioned with the old world.

The America of those days was a land where everybody knew he was needed—each and everyone had a purpose—to grow food to keep people alive, to reach for a musket to defend liberty, to raise his voice in the shaping of history.

Really now—how different are things today? People the world over are still in need of growing food to stay alive. They are willing to sacrifice for freedom and defend their liberty. And voices, in and out of legislative halls, are shaping history—both good and bad.

But look at the equipment we have available to help carry forward the message to show others how the American Miracle has worked for us and how it can work for them. Telephones, transoceanic cables, radios, television, satellite communication systems, nuclear power capability for future merchant vessels and aircraft of varying types are all available for use in modernizing the world and to answer our problems and create a free and satisfying society.

All that is needed is the will—the determination to follow through!

No young American today is stopped by the idea of change. Change is the substance of life and something we must recognize as inevitable and take it in stride. Every young person today must be future-oriented because the last third of this century demands a new type of person to live in it.

Thousands of young Americans are already embarked on that road. They have accepted the challenge that the future of this nation and world depend, not on one man or one party, or on someone else—but on them.

This moment of crisis in our history could well become a moment of creativity where commitment replaces cynicism and every element of the Nation is swept together in the excitement of building something new—the organization and mobilization of a Freedom Offensive—thus making Freedom a force to be reckoned with as we shape the future.

History could record the year 1967 as the decisive moment when the majority of our citizens yielded to the pressure of the extremist few and permitted America to come apart at the seams, thus opening the way for an end of freedom. Or, it could be the year when enough Americans cared enough about their country to pay the price of freedom and open a new day of hope for the world.

I am convinced that if a resurgence of Christianity can ever occur in these United States, that we will achieve new heights—previously only dreamed of—in attaining true individual rights and freedoms. And I am equally as convinced that if we can spread this philosophy across the globe, the world will have found a permanent alternative to war.

Inasmuch as I am speaking to a graduating class and an audience that is strongly oriented toward acceptance and advancement of the Christian Doctrine, I would like to share with you some observations I have made. You may or may not agree with all that I am going to say at this point but with a daughter and her husband in this graduating class, I would hope they, at least, will listen. What I have to say is intended to be constructive and hopefully stimulate you into action to make the good job you are doing now an even better one.

It is always alarming when a Christian hears such pronouncements as "God is Dead", "Christianity is Fading" and some theologians are even saying: "That while God was once a useful concept, it is now more of a hindrance than a help to man".

Recently a Gallup Poll was taken on the subject: "Is religion increasing its influence on American life or losing its influence?". 57 percent said it is losing its influence. I repeat, 57 percent of our population said religion is losing its influence on American life. Ten years ago, this view was held by 14 percent. This is shocking!

No one can deny that Christian churches are going through some gigantic convulsions as far-reaching as they have ever known. While church attendance is diminishing, discussion and debate on religion are at an all-time high.

And speaking of the church attendance, recently my good wife and I visited the church in Denmark that my Grandfather attended when he was a boy. There were three people in attendance. On leaving, I asked our driver if this was typical of the trend in Danish churches and, if so, why? He said: "Yes, regrettably this is happening and the principal reason for this occurring, in my judgment, is due to the fact that the Government collects the taxes and pays for the church expenses and the clergy. With no collections or direct personal financial commitment, the people seem to lose interest in church affairs."

With this experience, I came away more determined than ever to point out the importance of keeping church and state separate and the absolute essentiality of sustaining full religious liberty in this country and hopefully, someday, in the world.

Just as business is adapting itself with computers and modern communications equipment, those responsible for advancing the Christian Cause must recognize the "signs of the times" and update their techniques in order to capture the minds and the imagination of men and women on the move.

There is increasing competition among people for their attention. Television, sports events, social gatherings, travel opportunities, leisure time activities are but a few of the church's "competitors" in this fast moving age we live in.

If Christianity is to survive, it must once again become a viable force and an influence in our society. God is an expansive force which impels people to extend themselves.

America must be prepared to move rapidly to fill the spiritual void. It must organize and mobilize its Christian forces from every walk of life and it must demonstrate by both faith and deeds on an International scale, that there is New Hope—that there is a better way—that there is an alternative to war—an alternative to hate—and an alternative to Man's Inhumanity to Man. Never, in my opinion, has a song been written that is more reflective to the signs of our times than "Onward Christian Soldiers"!

If you were to ask me what you, as an individual, could do beyond your formal education, or in conjunction with it, to prepare yourself for the future I believe lies ahead and which I have outlined, I would suggest two things: Become multi-lingual and learn to fly.

Modern living has become without a doubt, more challenging because of the overall impact created by great advances in transportation and communications. And it is in these areas that we can achieve maximum success in reshaping the America of the future and preserving and extending our way of life.

Communication is vital to understanding. Those, in my view, who will be most effective in international affairs and in winning the minds and hearts of people everywhere in the future—will be those with a multi-lingual capability. Fluency in Spanish, German and French will be essential for the immediate future while fluency in Russian and Chinese will later become equally as essential.

One of the truly great challenges which has faced electronic engineers for years, is how to develop and perfect a portable, simultaneous language translator. Think, for a moment, of the tremendous possibilities of a machine that would instantly translate the spoken word into the language of the listener.

And think for a moment, if you will, of the great potential of aircraft in the service of God and man. Much of our aviation and space development, however, has resulted from the use of aircraft as tools of war in the 20th Century. But I would remind you that the year 2000 is only 33 years away. And I would suggest to you, that the 21st Century will see aviation assume an even greater role for the uplift of mankind in the greater cause of peace.

I'm going to pause briefly to pay my compliments to you for your far-sightedness in establishing your Flight Training Center here at Pacific Union College. While I realize the program was initiated primarily to equip students, preparing to serve in the mission field, with more utility and flexibility in remote places of the world, I'm sure you also realize you have permitted many of your students to embark on new careers in the vastly expanding aviation and aerospace fields.

I submit to you, that the airplane will do for the world what the wheel and the automobile have done for America—providing we have the sense to use it for constructive rather than destructive purposes.

Today, business is taking to the air, domestically and internationally, with an expected 400 percent increase in the next ten years. Air passenger and air cargo traffic will double in the next five years.

These increases will require facilities and communication systems—all manned by qualified personnel. The doctor, the lawyer and the businessman who is qualified as a pilot will be way out in front when it comes to meeting his competition.

Every corner of this earth, especially the dark corners, must be injected with the spirit of freedom, if our way of life is to be protected and sustained.

This concept has prompted me to coin the phrase: "Let's Put Wings On Americanism" by developing an Airborne Freedom Offensive—hopefully to win the Cold War and promote lasting peace and justice on this earth. Contrary to what appears to be a dark and dreary International picture, it does fall within the realm of possibility, providing we have the foresight, will and determination to make the necessary commitment.

We certainly have, without a doubt, the equipment and the technical capability of organizing and mobilizing this kind of an effort. I have even suggested that the "Hospital Ship *HOPE*" people consider converting surplus aircraft carriers to hospital ships to permit the utilization of aircraft to extend their area of operation and effectiveness.

Missionaries have pioneered use of the airplane as a potent factor in extending "people-to-people" programs and for carrying the word of God on the wings of their aircraft. As such, we have seen the great potential of flight as a result of their devoted efforts.

As I think of you, about to leap headlong into the fullness of life, I am reminded of Alexander the Great when he became virtual ruler of the world. One day, according to fable, he came across a philosopher who was lying on his back in a meadow and meditating. Alexander stood before the philosopher and said: "Name your wish and it will be granted. I am a patron of the arts and culture and I will gladly underwrite any project which you may select." The reposing philosopher thought a moment and then said: "You may do one thing for me, Your Highness, please step aside—you are standing between me and the sun!"

As you leave these hallowed halls, let nothing stand between you and the sun. Don't be satisfied with the status quo.

I believe one of the greatest challenges you face today lies in the answer you provide to these questions: "Will I, as an individual, make a contribution to my country, and to my fellowman, as I take my place in society? Will I use my ability and my energy in such a way that it will be said of me, the world is a better place because of me?"

I ask you to think about this because I believe the world awaits your answer!

Henry Drummond, a Scottish scientist, university lecturer and trained for the ministry, had a profound effect on the college campuses of the 1800's and this is the program he put to the young men of his day:

"The world in which we live is an unfinished world. It is not wise, it is not happy, it is not pure, it is not good, it is not even sanitary."

"Humanity is little more than raw material. Almost everything has yet to be done to it."

"Christ never intended to finish the world singlehanded, but announced from the first that others would not only take part, but do 'greater things' than he."

"Men must live among men. Men must influence men. Organizations, institutions, churches, have too much rigidity for a thing that is to flood the world. The only fluid in the world is man."

"Men, then, are the only means God's Spirit has of accomplishing his purpose."

Which way America?

ONE MAN'S REPLY TO DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Martin Luther King has, through various public expressions, charged that "the United States is the greatest purveyor of violence in the world," and, in the process, has become a controversial individual.

There are, however, at least two sides to an issue, and I would like to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD one of the other sides—as expressed in a sermon by a pastor of a church in my congressional district—thereby giving balance to the situation. The sermon follows:

"ONE MAN'S REPLY TO DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING"

(Sermon by The Rev. Matthew L. Winters on April 30, 1967 at Trinity Lutheran Church, Camp Hill, Penna.)

Grace be unto you and peace from God our Father and our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen.

Certain things should be made clear before we get into the body of the sermon this morning. The first is—I do not expect each and every one of you present here this morning to agree with everything that I have to say. Rather, I hope that I can challenge your thinking this morning, that I can prompt discussion among you, your family, and your friends, and certainly I hope that I can lay upon your conscience the need for prayer in these troubled times. The item of prayer I do not consider to be the least. I think all too often today we neglect this channel of power and influence in our world. So, I would urge that every one of you who agrees or disagrees with me would take it upon himself to pray for guidance for our nation and for peace in our world, each and every day in his personal devotions.

Secondly, let me quickly say that the sermon is only indirectly concerned with civil rights. The argument that I have with Dr. Martin Luther King is his stand on Viet Nam and not his stand on civil rights. I believe that both of us are concerned with civil rights, and even though we may disagree at times, yet our paths in this very important aspect of American life are much closer together than is our stand on Viet Nam.

In the third place, let it be clearly understood that I am not standing before you this morning as one who advocates war and who rejoices in war and bloodshed. I can honestly, from the depths of my heart, say that I hate war. I hate war with a passion that only a civilian soldier who was called upon to wear his country's uniform, can hate war. I hate war because I have seen the devastation and the cruelty of it. As many of you know, I walked through the streets of Hiroshima a few short months after the explosion of the atomic bomb. I saw what a bomb like that can do. I saw the burned faces of the civilians who suffered because of that bomb. I talked with individuals who were caught up in the events that surrounded the dropping of a single bomb, from a single plane, that destroyed a single city. I assure you, to prevent war and the use of nuclear armaments in this day and age, I would do anything within my power.

Finally, let me quickly state that I am a Christian, one who believes deeply and sincerely that the love of God which we know in Christ Jesus is the greatest, most powerful force in the world: I truly believe that the love of God is the only thing that can bring peace to our world, and that you and I and everyone else who goes by the name of Christian should do everything within our power to bring that love of God to bear—within our individual lives; within the life of our community; and within the life of the world. I believe that this love of God binds me to all men, whether they are Russian or Chinese, whether they are English or Italian. I believe that this love of God which I know in my life does not allow me the luxury of excluding any man, regardless of his country, regardless of his race, whether he be yellow, black or white.

Having said this, I read from the third chapter of the book of Ecclesiastes: "To everything there is a season and a time to every purpose under Heaven: a time to be born and a time to die; a time to plant and a time to pluck up that which is planted; a time to love and a time to hate; a time of war and a time of peace."

When Dr. Martin Luther King says, "The United States is the greatest purveyor of violence in the world," I take issue with him! I take issue with him on that statement! Can it be that he is unaware of the facts of history of our world today? Has Dr. King forgotten the conservative estimates that when the Chinese communists took over the mainland of China, fifty million people lost their lives by execution. Fifty million people were put to death because their sole crime was that they happened to be land owners, or happened to be persons who were minor civil officials in the preceding government, or happened to be followers of the Christian faith. Fifty million people, by conservative estimate!

Has Dr. King forgotten the tremendous toll of lives in the conflict in Korea? A war, let me quickly say, to refresh Dr. King's memory, started not by the United States and the *free* world, but by the forces of communism—a war that was as bloody as any that has been fought in the 20th century. Does he forget that it was China and North Korea who were most involved in starting that war against a nation to the south who wanted nothing but peace and security?

Has Dr. Martin Luther King already forgotten the freedom fighters of Hungary? Has he forgotten how Russian tanks and soldiers moved into that small country without any mercy and completely stamped out the rebellion, and under a flag of truce invited the leader of the freedom fighters to a conference and then immediately imprisoned him and put him to death shortly thereafter? I have talked to members of the freedom fighters who finally settled in Buffalo, New York. Let them tell you whether they think America is the greatest purveyor of violence in our modern world.

When I mention China, when I mention Korea, and when I mention Hungary, I am only mentioning the outstanding examples. We have no idea of the numbers of people who were put to death in the Soviet Union because they resisted the revolution or because they maintained their belief in God. We have no idea of the numbers who in Eastern Europe were imprisoned in communist concentration camps because they wanted freedom and liberty rather than the slavery of communism.

Especially in my heart are those three Baltic countries—Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. Has Dr. King ever thought about them? It was my privilege to know intimately a pastor of a congregation of Estonian Lutherans in Buffalo, New York. It was my privilege to sit down and talk to those men and women to hear of the brutality of communism in that little land. I have a book in my library at home that was given to me by that congregation. The name of the book is "The Partisans." It is signed, "From the Church Council, Estonian Evangelical Lutheran Church, Buffalo, New York, to Pastor and Mrs. Matthew L. Winters, with gratitude. This is a heroic story of the fighting of the sons of Estonia against godless communism for the liberty of all mankind." Forgotten now by many of us is the valiant effort made by those small nations along the Baltic Sea. Can Dr. King in good conscience make the statement that America is the greatest purveyor of violence in the world today?

Let Dr. King talk about napalm. Let him talk of the bombing of civilians in North Viet Nam. But let me quickly respond to this by saying that I am positive that we are doing all within our power not to bomb the civilians of North Viet Nam. It is one of those horrible facts of war that civilians do get killed. But I do not believe that there has been a war fought in modern times when a nation has been so concerned about the civilian population as are our American fliers when they go over the targets of the enemies. If you doubt this, all you have to do is to look at what the British planes did to Dresden during the second world war. All you have to do is think of what we did to Hiro-

shima. All you have to do is think of what the Russians did to Berlin when they completely leveled the city without regard to the civilian population. I think that America today is trying to wage a war, in a gentlemanly humane sort of way, hard as that is to do, and as often as accidents do happen.

Has Dr. Martin Luther King forgotten about the fifty thousand or more civilians that the Viet Cong and the forces of North Viet Nam have executed, men and women whose only crime is the fact that they are school teachers or village leaders? This past Thursday, it was my privilege to hear Dr. Davis of Boiling Springs, speak to our Kiwanis Club. Dr. Davis had spent two months in South Viet Nam as a medical doctor, working with the civilians. He spoke to us of the situation in Viet Nam and he bore out even more dramatically than the stories in our news magazines what he had seen with his own eyes—how civilians were tortured and killed by the Viet Cong. He said that their manner of killing these persons would make the average American sick, not an easy, merciful death with a bullet, but a very diabolic, lingering, torturing sort of death. This, too, is part of the picture of the violence in Viet Nam.

Then I would ask Dr. King, since he condemns our nation for its violence and for its bloodshed, about the other side of the coin. What nation in the world gives away more food, more clothing, more medical supplies to those who are in need than the United States of America? What nation in the world provides the largest number of Christian missionaries carrying the gospel of Christ to all men, regardless of color or nationality? What nation has a larger group of young men and young women who go out and work in foreign lands, than do we in America through our Peace Corps? What other nation has soldiers who, while they are fighting war, take their own spare time to build school rooms, to build wings on hospitals, and to carry on services for orphanages? I truly believe that I can throw out my chest and be proud of every young man and woman wearing an American uniform in South Viet Nam today. I think these are some of the finest young people in our world, and I think they are doing a magnificent job. I know for a fact that many, many of them have not left their Christianity at home, but are working out that Christianity in that nation so torn by violence today.

Dr. King goes on to compare the use of our new weapons in Viet Nam to the Nazi use of medical experiments on concentration camp inmates. I find it hard to believe that he really believes this. I would like to think that Dr. King got carried away by his own rhetoric. I would like to think that in the heat of the moment he forgot what he was saying. To compare waging of war to the best of our ability and with as much protection for the civilian population as possible in South Viet Nam to the Nazi medical experiments of World War II! I find it hard to believe that any American could say this.

Martin Luther King says, "Let us save our national honor—Stop the bombing! Let us save American lives and Vietnamese lives—Stop the bombing! Let our voices ring out across the land to say that the American people are not being vain, glorious conquerors—Stop the bombing!" Well, Dr. King, I think history shows that we are not being vain, glorious conquerors. We do not have to stop the bombing to prove that! I believe that America's attitude toward its enemies is perfectly illustrated in the case of Germany and Japan at the end of World War II. In these two situations you see the type of conquerors we are. What do we want in Viet Nam? Do we want to conquer it for our own use? Do we want to enslave the people? Do we want to establish an American colony? I don't believe so. I grant you that all of the issues and all of the turmoil in that Southeast Asian country is pretty mixed up. But I still believe what our President says . . . and he had better mean what he says, because that is the reason I am supporting him.

We are in South Viet Nam to give the people of that country an opportunity to set up a free nation without the shackles of communist slavery about their neck. This is the reason our President has told us that we are there, and if it is not, then he must answer to us. But if it is, then we must give of the very best that we have to preserve the freedom of the people of South Viet Nam. Communism must be stopped! There is no freedom, there is no liberty under communism! How well that is illustrated to the American people when Joseph Stalin's daughter defects to the United States, when she finds that she can no longer take the thought control and the religious persecution that is a part of her native land. Can any American go to the Berlin wall and see that massive concrete and barbed wire structure built to keep the slaves of East Germany in, and then doubt the battle that we are fighting? I would be surprised. Communism is not freedom! Communism is not liberty! Communism is not hope! It is American democracy, bred and nurtured in the American faith, that is still the light of the world today!

Communism cannot be stopped by guns alone. I believe that. But there are times when, God help us, it is the only way. I don't like it! I don't like to see men taking up arms against each other. But sometimes this is the only thing we can do. Dr. King asked college students and other young Americans to boycott the draft. Is this the way we show our appreciation for the freedom and liberty for which others have sacrificed so that we may enjoy it? Is this the way we save our national honor, by saying, "As long as I am free, I don't care about the rest of the world?" Is this the way we save American and Vietnamese lives, by saying "Better Red than dead?" If so, I don't want any part of it.

I am afraid that the words of Patrick Henry are much more my sentiment, "Give me liberty or give me death." I will fight to preserve the freedom and liberty that I have enjoyed and hope that my children will enjoy. I will fight and not be apologetic about it.

As Christians and Americans, we should never stop praying and working for peace in our world. Our President and others in places of authority should constantly be encouraged to seek peace, to try over and over again, no matter how many times they are rebuked, to try to sit down and negotiate, to sit down at a peace table to bring peace to our world. In effect, we Christians are to wage peace every bit as hard as nations wage war. Our nation should be an example of peace in our world. This is something that we should underline for the world about us. Even while we are bearing arms, our ultimate hope, our love, our desire for all mankind, is a time when agencies like the United Nations can settle all the disagreements of mankind in a peaceful manner. But then, let us not be afraid to stand up and be counted. Let us never forget that freedom and liberty are not won by expediency and compromise. The cost of freedom is sacrifice and devotion, dedication and righteousness. Let us never forget that communism is the greatest enemy in the world, to both freedom and democracy, to both Christianity and religious freedom. Let us pray as hard for the conversion of the leaders of the communist world, as we hope for victory. Let us practice our Christian faith as devoutly, as our men in uniform carry out their task.

Could it not be possible that almighty God has brought America to this moment of history?—This nation which has been formed out of all the nations and races of mankind;—This nation which is built upon Christian values and standards and faith;—This nation which is blessed with ideals and freedom and concepts of equality;—This nation which has developed into the most powerful nation in the world? Is it not just possible that God has brought us to this moment to confront communism, the most powerful challenge that Satan has ever thrown at this world? And if this be the case, may you and I as Americans be worthy of it, by placing the challenge, the judgment, the guidance of the Cross of Jesus Christ above the Stars and Stripes, but placing everything else below Old Glory.

On January 21st, 1776, in a small church in Woodstock, Virginia, Pastor Peter Muhlenberg in a dramatic gesture, took off his preaching gown and stood before his congregation clad in a uniform of a colonel in the American Revolutionary Army. Using the text which I have used this morning, he said, "There is a time for peace; a time for war," and walked out of that church that day, recruited some 300 persons to go and eventually join Washington's army at Brandywine—there to save the day for the American forces. Nothing so dramatic this morning, but I wish God would give me the power to rip aside all the disloyalties to God and country in my life, my love of luxury, all of my fear of standing up and speaking out, and standing before you clad only in my love of God and my devotion to country, so that I could place upon your heart the challenge of our world today; that I could urge you to a greater commitment to God and in that greater commitment to God, the power to rise up and face the challenge of those who would destroy religion, of those who would destroy our nation and its liberty.

Dr. Martin Luther King must walk his way, but I hope in his mind and his heart, he realizes that there are Christians and Americans, both black and white, who must take a different pathway on the issue of Viet-Nam;—walking that pathway to preserve his freedom and liberty to speak out against our way. Amen.

MILESTONE PROPERTY TAX LAW ENACTED IN NEW JERSEY

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the importance of the local property tax in providing revenue to State and local government. In 1960, it produced approximately $25 billion for local governments and school districts, and accounted for over 87 percent of their total tax revenue.

While this tax is a prime revenue producer, it also has a rather notorious reputation due largely to inequitable tax assessment procedures. Yet, major reforms on the assessment front seem to move at a glacial pace.

It is, therefore, with a sense of hope and enthusiasm that property tax reformers view the recent major breakthrough in New Jersey. Last month, Acting Governor Sido L. Ridolfi of New Jersey signed a law which provides for the qualification, certification, and examination of tax assessors. This has been widely hailed as a milestone in property tax legislation. In signing the bill, Act-

ing Governor Ridolfi, who was sponsor of the legislation, stated that probably no other single factor is so important as tax assessments being made by well-qualified persons in insuring that the burden of the tax is distributed equitably among the taxpayers.

The law provides that the director of the New Jersey Division of Taxation shall examine all persons applying for the position of tax assessor, and the successful applicants will receive the tax assessor certificate. The new law also provides that after July 1, 1971, no assessor may be appointed or reappointed, elected or reelected, as tax assessor unless he holds a tax assessor certificate.

Another important feature of the law is the provision of tenure for assessors. Under the law, one may acquire tenure of office upon reappointment or reelection after having received a tax assessor certificate and having served as tax assessor for at least four years immediately prior to such reappointment or reelection.

The law empowers the director to revoke or suspend a tax assessor's certificate for dishonest practices or willful or intentional failure or neglect, or refusal to comply with the Constitution and laws relating to the assessment and collection of taxes.

The Governor's news release also noted, Mr. Speaker, that the signing of this law fulfilled one of the key recommendations of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations calling for the professionalization of tax assessors and certification after examination.

Along with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN], I sponsored legislation in the 86th Congress to create the Advisory Commission and I have been privileged, along with my distinguished colleague from North Carolina, to represent this House on the Commission since its creation in 1959. During the intervening years, the Advisory Commission has published many reports dealing with problems of State and local government, but none have been more widely acclaimed than the report on "The Role of the States in Strengthening the Property Tax."

This is a source of personal satisfaction to me because I had an opportunity to vote both in favor of placing this subject on the Advisory Commission's study agenda and in support of the policy recommendations set forth in this report.

It is my sincere hope that the New Jersey legislation will not only improve the administration of the property tax in New Jersey, but will serve as an example to other States seeking to improve their tax and thus improve their major source of revenue as well as strengthen State and local government.

Under leave to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, I also include an informative column on the subject of the new law by John O. Davies, the Gannett News Service correspondent at the State capital, published in the June 12 issue of the Plainfield Courier-News.

The column follows:

CXIII——1068—Part 13

TAX ASSESSORS LAW—STANDARDS SET FOR VALUATION JOBS

(By John O. Davies)

TRENTON.—Under a new state law, the business of assessing your property for taxing purposes is gradually approaching the non-political professionalism such critical work warrants. At present some 900 assessors process the valuations throughout the state on which local property taxes approaching $1.5 billion are based.

Notices already have been mailed by the State Division of Taxation to all assessors that examinations will be held next spring for the tax assessor certificates—without which, after July 1, 1971, few assessors will be allowed to serve in office.

Exceptions will be granted to assessors who have served continuously from next July 1 on through reappointment or re-election. Assessors who can prove successful completion of special courses at Rutgers University also may be certified without taking the state tests.

These are the highlights of a new law upgrading the increasingly complex task of determining the property value of homes, businesses and industries on which taxes are levied. It was signed May 4 and Tax Director William Kingsley already is setting up the first examination program.

Under the law, tests will be held in March and September of each year.

An important aspect of the statute is its provisions granting tenure to assessors who are reappointed or re-elected after receiving a certificate who also have had at least four years in office prior to their new terms.

Tax collectors were granted similar tenure privileges if they passed Rutgers courses in their vocations under a 1966 law.

As in the case of the tax collectors, the assessors' law will eventually take these local officers out of politics by protecting those with proof of professional qualification—the state certificates—from the perils of seeking re-election or reappointment. Tax division officials say about 300 of New Jersey's assessors are elective and that close to 150 are either elected or re-elected or appointed or reappointed throughout the state yearly.

The tax division feels that some problems might arise among elected assessors who may qualify for tenure possibly after having been defeated in a local election but prior to the expiration of their term in office. Assessors, according to the division, customarily take office on July 1, many months after an election.

According to William G. Coward, head of the State Division of Local Government, this problem has not developed under the 1966 law providing for certification and tenure of tax collectors.

He recalled cases involving the tax collectors of Westville and South Plainfield who filed as primary election candidates but later obtained certificates. In each case, Coward said, a county court ordered their candidacy withdrawn from the primary ballot on the grounds tenure had been won.

Kingsley listed these key points of the new law:

"After July 1, 1971, no assessor may be appointed or reappointed, elected or reelected, as tax assessor unless he holds a tax assessor certificate. This limitation does not apply in the case of an assessor who shall have served continuously in office from next July 1 to the date of reappointment or re-election.

"Under the law, one may acquire tenure of office upon reappointment or re-election after having received a tax assessor certificate and having served as tax assessor for at least four years immediately prior to such reappointment or re-election.

"Tenure may also be acquired by assessors who, on or before June 30, 1969 shall have received a tax assessor certificate while actually in office as assessor and who, on or before June 30, 1969 shall have served as assessor for at least four consecutive years."

SENATE RESOLUTION, STATE OF ILLINOIS

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the diabolical foreign policy maneuvers of the Kremlin are visible in the Middle East. With the administration pursuing its plans to subsidize Eastern European Communist governments through trade agreements, it was with great pleasure that I noted the Senate of the State of Illinois adopted a forceful resolution urging a halt to this policy of the administration which truly represents a national disaster in foreign affairs. I insert this resolution, sponsored by Senators Robert W. Mitchler and James C. Soper, at this point in the RECORD:

STATE OF ILLINOIS, 75TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY, SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 56, OFFERED BY SENATORS MITCHLER AND SOPER

Whereas, Our nation is involved in a struggle for human freedom against the forces of communism in Viet Nam; and

Whereas, Thousands of our service men have already paid the supreme sacrifice and thousands more risk their lives daily; and

Whereas, Some within our country find pleasure in lawless demonstrations, draft card burnings and other forms of opposition to the cause for which so many have given their lives; and

Whereas, Some nations with which we trade continue to supply our enemy with goods, thus supporting the forces of communist aggression; therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Senate of the Seventy-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the House of Representatives concurring herein, that for the reasons mentioned in the preamble, we declare our support for our fighting men in Viet Nam, and strongly urge the President and the Congress to stop all trade with countries supplying goods to the enemy and refrain from establishing any new trade "bridges" with the Soviet Union and satellite nations; and be it further

Resolved, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded by the Secretary of State to the President of the United States, and each Congressman from Illinois.

Adopted by the Senate, April 12, 1967.

SAMUEL H. SHAPIRO,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD E. FERNANDES,
Secretary of the Senate.

Concurred in by the House of Representatives, June 15, 1967.

———,
Speaker of House of Representatives.
FREDRIC B. SELCKI,
Clerk of House of Representatives.

SITUATION IN GREECE

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, completely obscured by the developments in the Middle East is the situation in Greece where necessary changes were made in the government to prevent anarchy and a possible Communist takeover. As a continuation of my remarks I ask leave to insert at this point an interview reported by Mr. Ray McHugh, Washington manager of the Copley News Service, based on his recent conference with the new Prime Minister of Greece, Constantine Kollias.

ATHENS.—"This Government has no ambition to carry on the burdens of office. Since the day it took office its fundamental aim has been to return Greece to parliamentary government as soon as possible."

Prime Minister Constantine Kollias spoke slowly with emphasis, obviously anxious that the interpreter relay the full meaning.

A short man with a little moustache and dark-rimmed spectacles, he seemed uncomfortable, almost out of place behind the huge desk in the red-carpeted room. A pudgy figure in a dark blue suit and a thickly knotted gray and black tie, Kollias looked like a man who would rather be doing other things than running the Greek Government.

But Kollias also looks like a man who is determined to see a job through.

"I have already told the American ambassador that even if Greece is left to stand alone in its struggle for freedom and democracy, it will continue that struggle," he said in an exclusive interview.

Nettled by foreign press criticism of the military regime he heads and concerned about the "review" of American aid programs to Greece, Kollias said Greece needs no reminders or lectures about the basic values of democratic government.

"The history of this land is soaked with the blood of its citizens," he said.

"We do not have to prove that Greeks know how to fight for freedom and democracy."

His voice had a tart quality.

"The government has set as its aim the reconstruction of the political and economic ruins left by the corrupt policies of political parties who ignored the national interest for strictly partisan goals and spent the national treasure in a selfish bid for votes."

Once this reconstruction job is finished, Kollias said, his regime, placed in power April 21 in a bloodless coup by army colonels, will step from the scene.

He said a committee of 20 specialists has been drawn from a cross section of the Greek society to revise the national constitution. It has been instructed to report within six months.

"When the draft is completed," he said, "the government will review it and then submit it to the people for approval at a referendum.

"If approved, the government will then select the proper time for election of a new parliament."

Kollias declined to set a time limit for his army-installed regime, but the head of the Greek Supreme Court emphasized several times during the interview that "The government has decided this should come as soon as possible."

From the United States, he said, Greece "Expects not only material but moral support."

Though disappointed by Washington's review of military aid to Greece—an implied disapproval of the power grab—the prime minister said Greece will proceed to ask more help from the United States.

Washington, he indicated, has not yet realized that the colonels saved Greece from political chaos and a well-organized Communist plot to seize control of the country and take it out of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The plot, said the Prime Minister, was organized in conjunction with Greek Communist exiles and the Communist governments of Eastern Europe, principally Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Romania.

"It is an indisputable fact, that the Union of the Democratic Left (EDA) leftist party in Greece was headed by five exiled Greek Communists who are in an eastern country," said the Premier. "The EDA took direct orders daily from the Communist Parties in Eastern Europe."

The Prime Minister mentioned no names, but he said some Greek political leaders in recent months openly adopted extremist EDA slogans and accepted Communist support in a bid for victory in elections that had been scheduled for May 28.

This was an obvious reference to George Papandreou, former Premier and head of the Center Union Party, and his son, Andreas, former University of California professor and the most controversial figure in Greek politics.

Greece has moved from one political crisis to another since 1964 when the elder Papandreou was named Premier, then resigned in a clash with King Constantine over efforts to establish political controls in the military.

Kollias declined to comment on the activities of the younger Papandreou. He pointed out that the man has been indicted on charges of high treason and he said it would not be proper for him to discuss the case in view of his jurist background. He did say, however, that the "Aspida" group in the Greek army—with which the younger Papandreou was allegedly allied—sought to overthrow the monarchy, seize power and take Greece out of NATO into a neutralist phase that could easily have been a prelude to communism.

Other Greek officials dismiss fears voiced in the United States that young Papandreou might be executed. Greek law does not provide the death penalty on the charges he faces, said one high official.

"Besides," he added, "We have no intention of creating any martyrs. This has been a bloodless revolution and we have given our pledge to King Constantine that it will continue to be bloodless."

Kollias indicated that he does not believe that most Greek political figures who accepted Communist help were themselves Communists.

"They thought they would use the Communists and their methods and slogans to gain power," he said. "Then they thought they could deal with the Communists. But the Communists had other plans."

In the early days of April, the prime minister said, there was increased infiltration of Communist guerrillas into Greece from Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Albania. He said this was accompanied by the reactivation of Greek Communists who had been released from prison by previous governments, or had been allowed to return from exile.

"We also have evidence that large numbers of Communist guerrilla fighters were brought to the Greek-Bulgarian and Greek-Yugoslav borders in early April," said Kollias. "They were concentrated particularly in the Skopjie region of Yugoslavia."

These forces, he said, were made up largely of Greek Communists who fled to eastern Europe after defeat in the 1947–49 civil war. They also were believed to include some indoctrinated Greek-born youths who had been kidnaped by the Reds during the civil war and raised in Communist countries.

"We do not know the exact size of these forces," Kollias said. "We know there were several thousand. Some estimates speak of tens of thousands."

The headquarters of the Greek Communists in exile has been in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Romania at various times, he said. It is now believed to be in Bucharest where a radio station that calls itself "The Voice of Truth" is broadcasting daily propaganda tirades into Greece.

"It is an indisputable fact," he repeated, "that Communists in Greece were receiving direct orders daily from the Communist parties in eastern Europe."

Sharing borders with three Communist states and harboring centuries-old Balkan suspicions, Greece has been slow to join the Western trend toward coexistence and rapprochement with eastern Europe. Athens' governments had taken small steps in the last two years under prodding from Washington, but this movement has now been halted by the new government.

Does Kollias expect Greek Communists at home and in the neighboring satellite countries to turn now to guerrilla tactics and terrorism?

"It is completely out of the question," he said. "The army revolution has asserted itself so effectively throughout the country that any Communist uprising would be crushed.

"The revolution has gained the highest confidence from an overwhelming majority of the people. They know that it has saved them from political chaos and that it is dedicated to restoring stability so that all can prosper."

Kollias appeared at an armed forces display at Salonika and was greeted by more than 100,000 persons. It was in Salonika that George Papandreou was to speak on April 23.

Word that Communists planned major street disorders and a possible grab for local power touched off the revolution of the colonels—a startlingly swift, efficient maneuver based on a NATO contingency plan to deal with internal subversion.

After more than an hour in the huge, high-ceilinged office of the old royal palace, Kollias rose from behind his desk to end the interview.

"Do not take my word for all this," he said. "I could be giving you propaganda. Go out into Athens and into the country. Talk to the people. They will tell you that this revolution has saved Greece.

"We have no illusions about the Communist countries. They attack us every day. But it is important, very important, that our friends and allies understand that we are still dedicated to NATO, freedom and democracy."

Mr. Speaker, Members should be reminded of the fact that the State Deparment and the administration do not approve of the new Government in Greece but are merely maintaining formal but "cool relations," an interesting contrast to the frantic policy of building bridges to accommodate the Soviet Union.

STATEMENT ON MIDDLE EAST BY POLISH GOVERNMENT-IN-EXILE

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the president of the Polish Government-in-exile, August Zeleski, has expressed the concern of his Cabinet over the Soviet

involvement in the Middle East crisis. I deem it especially significant that the Polish Government-in-exile adopted a very practical statement at the height of the armed conflict in the Middle East. I insert the statement in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT OF THE POLISH GOVERNMENT [IN-EXILE] OF JUNE 6, 1967, ON THE POLISH NATION'S ATTITUDE TOWARD THE WAR IN THE MIDDLE EAST

LONDON.—At a Cabinet meeting on 6th June 1967 presided over by Prime Minister Aleksander Zawisza, the Polish Government [in-exile] drew up the following statement in respect of the Polish nation's attitude towards the war in the Middle East:

"The Government of the Republic of Poland [in-exile] declare that the attitude towards the present armed conflicts in the Middle East by the so-called "Government of the Polish People's Republic"—actually an agency of imperialistic Communist Russia's occupation of Poland—is contrary to the sentiments of the Polish nation.

The representatives of the Warsaw regime, in their invariable parrotting of Russia must also on this occasion support her attacks on the Israeli nation as also the imperialistic aim of Egypt—merely one of the elements in the totality of Russia's subversive plans. But the Polish nation, with its keen realization of the wrongs inflicted upon the weaker nations by the powers that be in this world, is particularly moved by this fresh attack on the Israeli nation and state, an attack long prepared and supported by Russia.

The Israeli people have during the last few decades recovered their age-old heritage neglected for the whole centuries past by intruders with an alien culture. They have transformed the land by the effort of mind and hands, in the sweat of their brow, into a built-up, developed and prosperous country which arouses the envy of their neighbours and evokes their chauvinism so skillfully directed and exploited by the destroyers of peace in the world—with Russia as the ringleader.

We observe and admire the courage of the Israeli people in the determined and devoted defence of their country. It inevitably reminds us of our own, still so recent fights, often shoulder to shoulder with representatives of this people, in the defence of our own native country—then our common motherland.

This brings on the thought and the desire to reciprocate towards the Israeli nation, to come to its aid in these difficult times. But we Poles in exile are at present powerless in the military sense whilst the Communist regime's authorities of occupation in Poland stifle every noble reaction of the Polish nation, now deprived of their liberty behind the Iron Curtain.

May our heartfelt thoughts and moral support be with you in the heroic efforts of your patriotic nation and may our voice calling for justice, also for the Israeli nation and state, reach the powers of this world still plunged in their egoism and blind to the future as they passively regard the organization of international crimes. Just as the Ribbentrop-Molotov conspiracy was aimed against Poland, so now the Kosygin-Nasser conspiracy is directed against Israel.

The western powers should remember that, whilst handing over Poland to imperialistic Communist Russia was the beginning of their difficulties with Russia and of growing international complications, the handing over of Israel to the Russo-Egyptian combine could mark the beginning of their decline and the undermining of our civilization.

It is sincerely to be hoped that those who slumber during the coming storm will awaken in time."

"SEND ME A BORE ROD AND A PAINT BRUSH"

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. MCCLURE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCLURE. Mr. Speaker, two worried parents in my district have sent me a letter they received from their son, a marine in Vietnam. He wrote them as follows:

Our M–16s aren't worth much. If there's dust in them, they will jam. Half of us don't have cleaning rods to unjam them. Out of 40 rounds I've fired, my rifle jammed about 10 times. I pack as many grenades as I can plus bayonet and K bar (jungle knife) so I'll have something to fight with. . . . If you can, please send me a bore rod and a 1¼-inch or so paint brush. I need it for my rifle. These rifles are getting a lot of guys killed because they jam so easily.

The parents now ask me: "What can I do, more than send a bore rod and a paint brush?"

The Pentagon assures us that the M–16 is a superior weapon to the M–14 because of its suitability to jungle warfare. They say that malfunctions are due to improper cleaning and lack of maintenance.

Evidently those using the rifles in Vietnam feel differently.

It is indeed a strange war. We are not being told the full story.

I think we have a right to know how effective these weapons really are.

I think we have a right to know if there is a shortage of cleaning rods.

I think we have a right to know what effect this is having on morale.

I think we have a right to know if a significant number of casualties are attributable to faulty equipment.

And then I wish someone would tell me how I can relieve the minds of the families of our fighting men when I harbor the same doubts as they do.

CONCESSIONS AND OUR POWER BALANCE

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. MCCLURE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection?

Mr. MCCLURE. Mr. Speaker, I am very alarmed at the regularity with which the Johnson administration allows our military and scientific superiority over the Russians to decline. In a world in which we are totally committed to outproducing, outmaneuvering, outarming, and, hopefully, outliving the Soviet system, we consistently betray ourselves.

In past weeks, Congress has given a good deal of attention to two of the methods we are using to defeat ourselves. Many Members of Congress have noted the economic concessions we offer the enemy in Vietnam by proposing to trade with the Communist bloc countries. We have also heard recently that the balance of power may indeed be thrown out of balance by the Soviet antiballistic-missile system. The Secretary of Defense finds that the only defense is an adequate offense.

But now I understand, Mr. Speaker, that this administration intends to offer still another concession to the enemy, Incredibly, I find that the Atomic Energy Commission intends to invite the Soviet Union to use the 200-billion-electron-volt nuclear accelerator that will be built at Weston, Ill. Are we to understand that the Soviet Union's ever-increasing fund of scientific knowledge will be supplemented by the Atomic Energy Commission?

Mr. Speaker, the Soviets are pulling ahead of us in this field. Although the largest nuclear accelerator in existence today is the 33-billion-volt machine at Brookhaven, the Russians will open experimentation on their own 70 billion-electron-volt equipment at Serpukhov next year.

This will give them more than double our present ability to conduct sophisticated experiments in high energy fields and matter constitution. Since we would prefer not to have the Soviets move ahead of us in this field, we will build a still larger and more complex machine at Weston. With this in mind, I find it difficult to believe that we now plan to invite the Soviet scientists to take advantage of these facilities.

Although I am assured that our scientists at present cannot foresee any military applications which could be developed from the accelerator, I feel that our folly is obvious.

If we are to continue to subscribe to principles which are opposed to those of the Soviet Union, and if these principles are to be defended by superiority of knowledge and balance of power, then we must immediately stop granting aid to our enemies.

MORE MEDICAL SCHOOLS NEEDED

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, on June 1 of this year I called the attention of the House to the large number of foreign medical doctors practicing in the United States and pointed out the need for new medical schools so that the richest nation in the world could adequately supply its people with needed and qualified medical assistance. I am reminded today as we are asked to authorize an expenditure of $4 billion for the space program how woefully short we are in appropriating and planning for the future health of our country. While I realize that dollars alone cannot build, staff, and maintain medical schools, I am convinced that this Congress through its appro-

priate committee must begin immediately to require necessary planning and to appropriate necessary funds to protect future generations of Americans. Aside from the $4 billion the committee recommends we authorize today for the space program, it is estimated that we are spending 10 times that sum to put a man on the moon and directing more billions to explore extraterrestrial space. Since World War II we have poured untold billions into foreign aid and are today spending an estimated $2 billion per month to fight a war in Southeast Asia to protect the peoples of that area from Communist aggression. If we can do all of this, I find it impossible to believe that we cannot spend whatever money is necessary to build and staff necessary medical schools to produce the additional physicians required to preserve the American standards of health. I have heard it said that the most difficult thing today for a young man to do is to gain admission into a medical school. How many times have I heard—and you, my colleagues, heard—qualified, able, motivated young men anxious to serve their fellow man in medicine complain that in spite of high grades in college and ability to pay the cost of medical school training, they are denied admission because of lack of space in our medical colleges. The time is now. Our responsibility is now, and we must act now. I urge the appropriate committees of this Congress to immediately take whatever action is required in order to commence construction and staffing of the necessary number of new medical schools so that the needs of the 1970's can be anticipated and the funds started in the 1960's. This is a vital and necessary need of the country and demands immediate attention.

JUNE 24, 1915, THE DAY OF CHICAGO'S WORST DISASTER

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, June 24 of this year falls on a Saturday. June 24, 1915, also was a Saturday. It was one of the darkest Saturdays in the history of Chicago—that June 24 of 52 years ago.

It was on that day that 812 persons died in the Chicago River at Clark Street when the steamer *Eastland* turned on its port side in 20 feet of water. It was the city's worst disaster.

On that day of tragical disaster Gov. Edward F. Dunne was absent from the State and I was the acting Governor of Illinois. My memory is vivid of the hours I spent helping to carry to conveyances the lifeless bodies of the victims of that terrible accident as they were lifted from the lake. I have never known such a day of anguish.

Later I served on a board of inquiry appointed by Mr. Secretary Redfield and aided in framing recommendations that were enacted into law by the Congress and have prevented similar disasters on the Great Lakes for the more than half a century intervening.

Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the following article from the Chicago Tribune of June 19, 1967:

The 2,000 to board the vessel were picknickers, the employes of Western Electric company, their families and friends, bound for Michigan City. Those lost were drowned or suffocated below decks of the excursion ship, which had a length of 300 feet and a 38-foot beam.

On that morning, the tanks had been emptied to make the vessel ride higher in the water with the gangplanks level with the dock. Passengers streamed aboard, and the Eastland began to list, first to port, then to starboard. The crew began pumping water into the tanks.

However, before they were full, passengers began to gather on the port side and the water in the untopped tanks sloshed to port also and this caused the ship to turn on its side.

Tugboats and other small craft in the vicinity raced to the rescue, picking swimmers from the river while other persons scrambled aboard the Eastland and cut holes in her exposed side and pulled survivors thru them.

Rescue work continued all thru the day and night. But this was not the end of the Eastland. The vessel was righted and refloated by salvage crews and towed to a northern Indiana port until a group of Chicago business men, headed by the late utilities magnate, Samuel Insull, purchased her. The group believed the United States might become involved in World War I and would have use for the ship.

When the United States did enter the war, the Eastland was sold to the navy for just what Insull and his colleagues had paid for her. She was renamed the U.S.S. Wilmette and the intention was to send her to the east coast. A section of her bow had to be removed because she was too long for the locks then in use in the St. Lawrence river. Once in eastern waters, the bow section would be replaced.

The war ended, however, before this could be done so the vessel was reunited in the Great Lakes. It was used as a navy training ship in the period between wars and during World War II.

At the close of the second war, there was no further naval use for the Eastland-Wilmette. She was old—built in 1903—and was destined for the scrap heap. That was her end in 1946.

CRIME IN THE STREETS OF AMERICA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, fear rules the streets of American cities, as assault, robbery, rape, and plunder continue to run rampant. Men, women, and children are not safe from thugs and hoodlums in the streets, in the parks, in the subways, even in their own homes.

It is an incautious girl or woman who dares to walk home alone late at night, or even to drive a car in dark, deserted streets. Men look over their shoulders and avoid the shadows. Almost every door bears both a chain and a lock, and is rarely opened without trepidation.

I cannot accept this as a way of life in the cities of our Nation. There must be a way to stop the prowling hood, and to make our cities safe for their people again. I am convinced that such a way can be found by the Congress, and we must waste no more time in setting out to find it.

A joint resolution introduced in this House by the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] proposes a broad, deep, and determined investigation which can lead the way toward the solution of this, one of our most pressing and depressing urban problems.

In offering this proposal, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] has once more demonstrated his legislative leadership and his dedication to the welfare of all the people of America. I feel privileged today to introduce a similar resolution for the same purpose.

The resolution would establish a joint committee of seven Members of the House and seven Members of the other body to investigate the basic causes of crime. Armed with the power and prestige of the Congress, this committee would be able to study crime in greater depth than has ever been attempted.

Such a study would probe deeply into each level of law enforcement—local, State, and Federal. Through the testimony of spokesmen for all enforcement agencies, it would seek the underlying causes of the crisis of fear in American cities, and the basic needs for ending it.

This is our opportunity to throw the spotlight of inquiry into the deep-rooted apparatus of organized crime, and its corrupting influences on law enforcement.

This is our chance to study the reasons why our people have lost a great measure of confidence and respect for those in whom they entrust their safety, and the safety of their property.

This is one of the most pressing and crucial domestic problems that faces us throughout the Nation today. We can delay no longer in attacking it and solving it.

THE GREAT UNMET NEED IN FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, during the recent debate on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act extension, the attention of the Congress was drawn to the acute need for an adequate educational program for young America. The purpose of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and many other Federal programs is to improve the standards of education, and to a large measure they have been successful. But despite the sincere effort of Congress and the great steps forward, one serious problem has not been dealt with which often interferes with the effectiveness and the orderly progress of Federal aid to education. This is the need for continuing appropriations to carry forth plans and commitments made by the various school districts and commitments which are required in time for proper planning for the ensuing school year.

Though I shall cite examples in California, I am sure that a similar situation

exists all over the country. In California the law requires that teachers be notified by March 15 if they are to be retained for the following school year. With the uncertainty of ESEA funds, a school district never knows whether to speculate and retain teachers employed in ESEA-financed programs, or to dismiss them and hope to rehire them in the fall of the year. Speculation is unsound financial planning, but dismissal results in poor continuity of a program. Good, experienced teachers are always lost under such circumstances. Similar problems exist in planning for optimum utilization of facilities and materials for all phases of a school program.

Mr. Speaker, in recognition of the fact that the appropriations process simply cannot be concluded by the March 15 date which precedes the beginning of a fiscal year on July 1, I have suggested that this Congress pass a continuing resolution which would appropriate 75 percent of the commitment which each local school district or each State received in the prior fiscal year as a guaranteed appropriation against the fiscal year which begins on the following July 1.

Mr. Speaker, in other matters this has been done repeatedly throughout the 15 years in which I have served as a Member of Congress from the 10th District of California. When the fiscal year expires on June 30, and assuming that final action has not been completed on the appropriation for various departments, it is traditional for Congress to pass continuing resolutions allowing those departments to continue in operation until final action is taken upon the appropriation for the departments affected. My resolution, House Joint Resolution 412, would apply this same principle to the acute needs of the school districts across the Nation who must have an assurance that at least 75 percent of their expected ESEA funds will be forthcoming and available for whatever plans they make. If we are to have intelligent use of Federal funds, certainly they must be guaranteed in time for intelligent planning to be made at the local level.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no more dramatic and convincing method of proving the necessity for my resolution than to read into the RECORD the statements of school administrators from throughout my congressional district who endorse the principle embodied in House Joint Resolution 412. Mr. Speaker, these are people who are directly involved in the administration of school matters. They do not deal in theory. They must make plans in advance and they must be responsible for assuring that those plans can be implemented with funds which will be available when needed. Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I submit a series of letters from practical educators in the 10th Congressional District:

PALO ALTO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Palo Alto, Calif., May 1, 1967.

Hon. CHARLES GUBSER,
House Post Office,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. GUBSER: The Board of Education has taken action, as you requested, to support H. J. Resolution #412. We enclose the Resolution which was unanimously adopted on April 17, 1967.

The Board appreciates your concern in attempting to resolve a financial problem faced by most California school districts as well as others throughout the nation.

Sincerely yours,

AGNES C. ROBINSON,
President, Board of Education.

RESOLUTION

Whereas: California law requires school boards to make firm financial commitments in their annual budgets; and

Whereas: There is extreme delay between the time when these firm financial commitments must be made and the time when the amounts of federal funds to be received is known; and

Whereas: National and state associations concerned with public school financing are unanimous in their recommendations that Congress and the President consider a means of solving this problem; and

Whereas: Congressman Charles Gubser has introduced a joint resolution in the House of Representatives to help solve this problem;

Therefore let it be resolved that: The Board of Education of the Palo Alto Unified School District go on record in support of H. J. Resolution 412; and

Be it further resolved that: The President of this Board of Education inform Congressman Gubser of this action; and

Be it further resolved that: The President of this Board of Education be authorized to notify such other members of the House and Senate as in the Board President's opinion is appropriate.

(Unanimously adopted by the Palo Alto Unified School District Board of Education on April 17, 1967.)

LOS ALTOS SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Los Altos, Calif., March 27, 1967.

Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GUBSER: Thank you for the information concerning House Joint Resolution No. 412 that would assure the appropriation of Federal Funds for school purposes well in advance of the beginning of a school year.

Please be assured that I support you wholeheartedly in this effort to make planning for educational programs possible with some degree of insurance that money will be available during the coming year. I appreciate your efforts on behalf of the public schools and wish you continued success in your support of our programs.

Sincerely,

LAWSON SMITH,
Superintendent.

MOUNTAIN VIEW-LOS ALTOS
UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Mountain View, Calif., April 24, 1967.

Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHARLES: Your letter of March 17, 1967 addressed to the members of the Board and Administrative Offices of this District, accompanied by H. J. Resolution 412, showed a keen insight on your part into the difficulty of a California school district in attempting to prepare a budget without knowing the extent of income from Federal (or State) sources.

Your suggestion that Congress consider a continuing resolution authorizing the United States Office of Education to obligate funds well in advance of present time procedure will do much to facilitate intelligent planning, both for fiscal purposes and for the programs which are funded.

Sincerely yours,

A. BLAINE HUNTSMAN,
Superintendent.

LOS GATOS UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Los Gatos, Calif., April 28, 1967.

Re Federal Assistance to Education.

Hon. CHARLES GUBSER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GUBSER: This is a hearty personal endorsement of your attempt to stabilize the appropriation of federal funds (H.J. Res. 412). In addition, some general comments regarding federal assistance to education.

Categorical aid has been of great value to our nation, but I would hope that in the future a general education bill could come about for the following reasons:

1. Categorical assistance prevents good overall long range plans. Sporadic financial shots in the arm provide sporadic types of curriculum.

2. A general finance bill would offer school districts the choice of solving their individual problems. Local communities are in a better position to understand their problems than are those at the State and National level. We know our parents, our children and we are intensely aware of how we can best improve our own instructional program.

3. A general finance bill should include money for building purposes. Every special program needs a building facility.

4. Please, in any bill, offer at least a three year plan or longer. In general, annual planning is a waste of money!

5. An attempt to send funds directly to local school districts would be recommended. Local school boards and administrators are very frustrated dealing with State consultants who appear to feel local people inadequate to cope with their own needs.

In conclusion, education needs your help. We appreciate your interest and wish to cooperate in any way possible.

Cordially,

DON EDDIE,
District Superintendent.

MOUNTAIN VIEW SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Santa Clara County, Calif., April 24, 1967.

Congressman CHARLES S. GUBSER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: The Board of Trustees of the Mountain View School District has received your letter of March 17, 1967, with the attachment.

Your resolution on the use of federal funds for education is under consideration by members of the Board of Trustees.

Sincerely,

Mrs. GAIL URBAN MOORE,
President, Board of Trustees.

GAVILAN COLLEGE,
Gilroy, Calif., April 18, 1967.

Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
House Post Office
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHARLIE: Enclosed is a Resolution adopted by the Gavilan College Board of Trustees commending you for your interest in legislation which will assist junior colleges to receive their share of federal funds for projects more quickly.

Unfortunately, Gavilan College is not in a position to request federal funds in the near future because we do not have the matching money, but this bill will be appreciated by other junior colleges, I know.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH SCHRODER.

RESOLUTION COMMENDING REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES GUBSER FOR HIS PROPOSED LEGISLATION FACILITATING THE EARLY RECEIPT OF FEDERAL FUNDS FOR COLLEGE CONSTRUCTION

Whereas, junior college districts throughout the United States have become dependent on federal funds for assistance in building facilities, and

Whereas, the receipt of such federal funds

lightens the burden on the property taxpayer, and

Whereas, federal funds on approved junior college projects are often funded long after project approval, thereby slowing the building program for junior college districts waiting for receipt of such funds,

Now, therefore, be it resolved, the legislation proposed by Representative Charles Gubser which permits the advancement of a prorata share of the federal funds for an approved federal project is hereby endorsed by the Gavilan Joint Junior College District Board of Trustees.

Dated this 14th day of April 1967.

ELLIS BOGLE,
NORMAN L. CURRIE, M.D.,
K. W. TITUS,
BONNIE L. SIMONSEN,
BRUCE JACOBS,
GEORGE W. THOMAS,
Gavilan Joint Junior College District Board of Trustees.

SANTA CLARA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Santa Clara, Calif., April 14, 1967.

CHARLES S. GUBSER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHARLIE: Thank you very much for your interest and concern for the problem so well expressed in your letter of February 27th, to the Honorable George H. Mahon.

Best personal regards,

L. C. CURTIS,
Superintendent.

SANTA CLARA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Santa Clara, Calif., March 30, 1967.

Hon. GEORGE H. MAHON,
Chairman, Appropriations Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Santa Clara Unified School District wishes to respectfully express to you its full support of the Honorable Charles S. Gubser's expressed means of this and other school districts avoiding the problem of hiring a sufficient number of teachers for Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs without full knowledge of whether or not federal funds will be forthcoming to meet the budget requirements.

If this and other districts could be assured of at least seventy-five percent of the anticipated allocation it would greatly facilitate planning.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

W. A. WILSON,
President, Board of Education.

CAMPBELL UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Campbell, Calif., April 4, 1967.

Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GUBSER: Thank you for your letter of March 17, 1967 and the copy of H.J. Resolution 412.

The Campbell Union School District Board of Trustees expressed their approval and appreciation of your action at their meeting on Thursday, March 30, 1967.

You will be receiving additional letters of approval and support from our Board members and administrative staff members.

Thank you for your interest and efforts.

Very truly yours,

NEAL ROYER,
District Superintendent.

CAMPBELL UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Campbell, Calif., April 6, 1967.

Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GUBSER: Recognizing that late appropriations of funds for the various federally supported programs such as E.S.E.A., create problems in staffing and planning for the use of such funds, I would like to offer support for your resolution, H.J. Res. 412, which is an attempt to assure the appropriation of federal funds for educational purposes well in advance of the beginning of a school year.

I appreciate your efforts in this regard.

Very truly yours,

GALEN D. WILCOX,
Principal, Quito School.

FREMONT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Sunnyvale, Calif., April 6, 1967.

Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GUBSER: Members of our Fremont Union High School District Governing Board are happy to hear of your concern about federal assistance to schools and your wish to be advised by us on action to be taken.

We believe that general assistance to the schools, rather than specific categorical aid as adjudged by federal and state authorities, is the best means of federal support for education. We, at the local level, know better in which fields we need assistance.

What we need most in federal aid is earlier approval of federal grants so we can plan more effectively for their use. Since we must prepare our budget in April for use in the following fiscal year (July 1–June 30), it would be helpful to know how much in matching funds we will need and the amount of outright grants. At the present we must budget for all categorical items even though many of them may not be approved.

Since we are in a fast-growing area with a yearly increase of 10 per cent or more students, we are nearing the maximum taxing point on private property. Our school population growth outstrips our tax base increase—so much so that even with increased state and national aid we are hard pressed to balance our budget. In fiscal 1956–57 we had 2334 students, $34,704 in assessed valuation per student, and $443 in cost per student. Our current year shows we have 10,800 students, about $27,100 in assessed valuation per child, and $743 cost per student. The $7604 drop in assessed valuation is the result of getting students faster than value increase. The result is that we have $106 less to spend from local tax sources while costs per student have gone up $300. We must offer an excellent educatioal program to attract parents needed for highly technical work in our electronic, space, research, and computer industries.

Greater federal assistance seems to be the only answer to our problem.

Sincerely,

GOVERNING BOARD,
By HELENE H. MADSON,
Clerk.

CAMPBELL UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Campbell, Calif., April 4, 1967.

Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
Town and Country Village
San Jose, Calif.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GUBSER: I greatly appreciated your letter in regard to your efforts to secure an earlier appropriation of federal funds for educational purposes, in advance of the beginning of the school year. This has always been a problem for us, for the very reasons stated in your resolution.

I shall be most happy to make your efforts on our behalf known to my colleagues and to my community so that we may give you every support at this end.

Yours sincerely,

KATHRYN L. MERRY,
Principal.

FREMONT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Sunnyvale, Calif., April 6, 1967.

Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GUBSER: As a member of the Fremont Union High School District Governing Board, I and the other members of the Governing Board are very happy to hear of your concern and action in connection with federal assistance to the schools. We have had many problems, particularly in the areas of categorical aid and late approvals. These problems have created real hardships on the part of administration and teachers and, we believe have contributed greatly to an ineffective use of the program. Earlier approval and a long period of time to implement each approved program would be very helpful. General assistance would also give the local Governing Board the ability to make the best use of the money, where needed, in a local district. We believe that we have the best information available as to the best uses for federal assistance.

Please be assured that the federal assistance is very much needed and is greatly appreciated. Some remedial action in the procedures would greatly improve the overall picture. Thank you again for your interest.

Sincerely,

GOVERNING BOARD
By LAWRENCE E. DIDIER,
President.

CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF
ADULT EDUCATION ADMINISTRATORS,
March 29, 1967.

Congressman CHARLES GUBSER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HONORABLE GUBSER: Thank you for your letter concerning the H.J. Resolution 412 relating to allocating of federal funds for school purposes before the first of July or sooner. Both our National and State associations feel that this is a very urgent matter, if public school programs are to be able to function under the legal structure of the State. The California Association of Adult Education Admin., California Council of Adult Education, and National Association of Public School Adult Educators, all support this position. As a member and officer of all three associations, I can guarantee you their support in your effort to promote this Resolution. The two California Associations have membership of 2,500 and the National Association has a membership of 1,600 from the 50 states. I am sure that there will be other associations who would be glad to support your Resolution and I will send copies of this letter to them so that you may know of their support.

Sincerely,

Dr. RAYMOND T. MCCALL.

FREMONT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Sunnyvale, Calif., April 4, 1967.

Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GUBSER: Thanks for your letter of February 27 in regard your proposal for assistance to school districts in implementing Federal Aid.

Mrs. Helene Madson, a member of the Fremont Union High School District Governing Board, and I expressed our feelings in regard this problem when we visited your office in February. Under current policy, final approval for federal projects is received too late in the school year to allow for any degree of efficiency in the use of the monies involved. It is essential that we be allowed to either receive approval of projects at a much earlier date, or extend the period of approval for an additional year. Your suggestion for earlier approval of a project

would naturally have many advantages over extended use time. As indicated in your letter, projects involving personnel must have approval before the end of the preceding year in order for the school district, and the personnel involved, to plan for the following September. I believe that your suggestion would greatly improve the total program.

I have presented a copy of your February 27 letter to all members of the Governing Board and all are very much in favor of your proposal. They ask that I express their thanks for your consideration and assistance.

Sincerely yours,

EARL A. GOODELL,
Acting Superintendent.

APRIL 4, 1967.

Hon. GEORGE MURPHY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MURPHY: I am replying to your letter of March 16, 1967, to Mr. A. C. Stevens, Jr., former Superintendent of the Fremont Union High District. Mr. Stevens retired as of January 1, and I have been appointed as Acting Superintendent. I would like to express our great appreciation for any action that you may take in support of legislation to assist the school districts in implementing federal assistance.

Problems have developed in two major areas: (1) categorical grants as opposed to general grants, and (2) approval dates.

I would like to express the thanks of the Governing Board and the administration for your efforts in bringing about remedial legislation for categorical grants. Also, any help that you can lend to legislation to insure earlier approval of projects would be appreciated. Experience has shown that approvals received after September 1st create a real hardship. Some assurance must be given to the districts before the closing of school in the preceding school year in order to take advantage of early hiring of personnel. It is almost impossible to arrange for employment of personel involved in these projects after the opening of school. Also, the late start in a given school year does not give us full time for planning and maximum use of the project during the school year. In other words, the money is used inefficiently and unwisely in a rush program.

Thanks again for your consideration and for any help that you can give to solving the problems of federal projects, particularly in the two areas mentioned above.

Sincerely yours,

EARL A. GOODELL,
Acting Superintendent.

GEORGE MAYNE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL,
Alviso, Calif., April 3, 1967.

Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GUBSER: Your Joint Resolution 412, dated March 8, 1967, is most appreciated by the administrators of California. As an administrator of a school that utilizes many of the federally funded programs for children of indigent families, I have found it most disconcerting to project for the next school year.

All administrators who have utilized monies from federally funded projects will deeply appreciate your efforts.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES R. LUNDINE,
Principal.

SUNNYVALE SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Sunnyvale, Calif., April 3, 1967.

Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GUBSER: Please accept my heartfelt appreciation and commendation for your recommendations to Chairman Mahon regarding the changing of timing in the funding of Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

As one who serves on the firing line in administering a program financed by E.S.E.A. Title I, I am very aware of the difficulties we face each year in securing top notch school personnel in the face of unknown appropriations.

It would make for better continuity of program for these disadvantaged children if your plan for obligation 75% of the allocation were implemented by the Congress. On behalf of all of us in Santa Clara County involved in the programs under the E.S.E.A., let me say that we support you to the utmost.

Very truly yours,

MARGARET S. JESSEN, Ph. D.,
Coordinator-Compensatory Education.

APRIL 3, 1967.

Hon. GEORGE H. MAHON,
Chairman, Appropriations Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The opportunity to provide a higher level of educational opportunity for disadvantaged children in California schools has been very enthusiastically received by educators in this state.

Just last Friday, March 31st., did we receive notification of the actual amount of monies we may definitely count on to expend on this program. Although every cent appropriated for education of our children is gratefully received, it can best be utilized if we could be notified of a near approximation of the monies being allocated to the districts in the spring prior to the school year involved. Most of the key teachers are notified of intent to hire following Easter vacation interviews.

The districts and therefore the nation would receive more for their money spent for Compensatory Education if this crucial problem of timing for funding could be resolved. Anything that you can do in conjunction with your committee would be greatly appreciated by school people and parents of children being served by the most effective expenditure of federal funds in our history.

Very truly yours,

MARGARET S. JESSEN, Ph. D.,
Coordinator-Compensatory Education,
Sunnyvale School District.

SUNNYVALE SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Sunnyvale, Calif., April 3, 1967.

Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GUBSER: Thank you for your letter of March 17, 1967 regarding the timing of appropriation of federal funds for education.

I agree with you that there is a need to look at the timing of these appropriations so as to assure good judgment and economies in the use of these funds.

My observation at the school level is that many federal funds are being made available for school programs and equipment before adequate planning has been made for the use of this money. I am afraid this money has not always been used as wisely as it should be. Certainly the timing of the appropriations contributes to how wisely or unwisely the money is used.

I am also concerned about the number of special allocations for specific 'earmarked' programs, both at the state and federal level. I observe that these special allocations frequently tend to unbalance the educational program because of the inequitable support they give to one segment of the program.

I appreciate your newsletters and support you in the efforts you are making for education and other projects pertinent to the welfare of the people in Santa Clara Valley and the nation as a whole.

Sincerely yours,

CLAYTON E. CHANTRILL.

SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATION CENTER,
San Jose, Calif, March 3, 1967.

Rep. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GUBSER: Yesterday Dr. Timpany gave me a copy of your joint resolution requesting continuing appropriation for education bills in March.

You are to be commended upon the introduction of this measure. If adopted, it will ease one of the critical problems facing local school districts. I am taking measures to generate support for the resolution.

Next week the national committee for Title III of the ESEA will meet and recommend Title III projects for funding. Santa Clara County has several projects awaiting funding. Our Center has been instrumental in preparing the application for these projects. I would appreciate hearing about the success of these projects from your Washington office. The Office of Education usually provides congressmen a catalog describing funded projects.

In the past, you have been able to furnish me a copy of this catalog. It has been very helpful. I would very much appreciate receiving a copy of it again.

The following Santa Clara County projects were submitted on January 15, 1967:

1. Project *Follow Through*—Alum Rock Union Elementary School District
2. Project Renaissance—Santa Clara County Superintendent of Schools
3. A Revitalized High School Social Science Curriculum—Fremont Union High School District.
4. Computer Counselor—Palo Alto Unified School District
5. Self Enhancing Education—Cupertino Union School District
6. S.P.A.C.E. Supplementary Education Center—Santa Clara County Superintendent of Schools
7. Community Service Through Sheltered Work Experience—East Side Union High School District

Thank you for your continued assistance.

Sincerely,

DUANE L. BAY,
Director.

CASSA,
Burlingame, Calif., April 4, 1967.

Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GUBSER: A recent copy of your H.J. Res. 412 has crossed my desk. This association wishes to indicate complete support of the resolution. It recognizes one of the most critical aspects of certain problem areas in dealing with federal education programs. Thank you for your interest on behalf of public schools.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM N. MCGOWAN,
Executive Secretary.

FOREST HILL SCHOOL,
San Jose, Calif., March 30, 1967.

Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GUBSER, I have read your proposal to assure the appropriation of Federal Funds for educational purposes in advance of the beginning of the school year. Let me heartily endorse your resolution to this effect.

As a school principal, and I know that I speak for many of my fellow educators, the present program puts us in a position of having to wait until Fall to hire teachers for our Title I Reading Program. As you know, most of the good teachers are hired during the period of Easter vacation, or at least by end of June. We are then put in a position of scrambling to find teachers at the last moment.

We are very appreciative of the good work that E.S.E.A. funding has done for education and I feel that your resolution will make the total educational effort even better through pre-planning. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

FRED PETERSON,
Principal.

SAN JOSE VOCATIONAL CENTER,
San Jose, Calif., March 31, 1967.

Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GUBSER: This is written to express our appreciation to you for your efforts by means of H.J. Res. 412 to make it possible for school administrators to conduct their business on a reasonably efficient basis. As you are well aware, it is necessary in this state to make an early commitment to teachers who would be working in programs financed from federal funds provided in the Elementary Secondary Education Act, even though their services would not begin until the following July.

Since school administrators would have no assurance that allocations from federal funds would be available until September or October of any given year, it has been necessary to advise teachers engaged in these programs that we cannot give them a contract at the same time that other teachers in our school districts are awarded their contracts.

The consequences of this procedure are far reaching and make it almost impossible to find and hold well-qualified teachers. Since the efficacy of such a program certainly depends to a great extent on having good teachers, the net result is that this procedure tends to defeat the original purpose of the act.

Whatever can be done to remedy this situation certainly should be done without any delay. Your resolution of March 8 seems to be a step in the right direction and we sincerely hope that you will have unlimited support among your legislative colleagues to approve this resolution.

Once again, I would like to express our appreciation for the fine type of service you are rendering your constituents.

Very truly yours,

J. L. ANDERSON,
Director.

DAVID STARR JORDAN JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL,
Palo Alto, Calif., March 28, 1967.

Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GUBSER: Thank you for your letter of March 17 containing information about your resolution on appropriations for education bills.

My personal experience has been with NDEA over the period since its original passage. I have had the opportunity to see the virtual revolution in such areas as foreign language that the bill has fostered. However, of late years, the uncertainty of appropriations and their lateness have been a problem that has made the Act of little value to us in the schools. Response at the district level to the circumstances has been to have double budgeting of items that are being requested through NDEA, the use of second priority items in NDEA proposals, and a general turning away from the act as a means of really improving educational programs. This is lamentable, since the intent of the act was to improve instruction in the areas covered by it.

It is certainly commendable of you to not only perceive the difficulties caused by late appropriations but to do something about it. I would like to add my word of support in the matter and to express my appreciation for your activity in this regard.

Yours sincerely,

FRANK E. SEELEY,
Principal.

BRACHER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL,
Santa Clara, Calif., March 28, 1967.

Hon. CHAS. S. GUBSER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have just finished reading your resolution H.J. Res. 412 which would provide for continuing of appropriations for educational programs. If this much needed resolution is passed, it will allow better planning and consequently a wiser expenditure of federal funds. I wish to express my strong support for your resolution. Please let me know if there is any further supportive action which I can take.

Sincerely yours,

QUENTIN R. TAYLOR,
Principal.

LOS ALTOS HILLS, CALIF.,
April 1, 1967.

Hon. CHARLES GUBSER,
Washington, D.C.:

This telegram is in support of H.J. Res. 412, which you are sponsoring. It is important that colleges be able to anticipate with reasonable certainty availability of funds for various programs. Without such assurance, planning for quality programs will be hampered.

CALVIN C. FLINT,
President, Foothill College.

EL QUITO PARK SCHOOL,
SARATOGA, CALIF., *March 28,1967.*

Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This is in reply to your letter of March 17 pertaining to the appropriation of federal funds for educational purposes. You may certainly rely upon me for support of your efforts to ensure that federal funds would be appropriated well in advance of the beginning of a school year.

We in the Moreland School District have been fortunate enough to receive some federal aid and it has helped pupils progress tremendously, primarily because we have concentrated on remedial instruction. Our biggest problem relative to this program is inherent in the fact that we cannot hire teachers on a permanent basis since funds. for this program are not obtainable before the school year has started. Thus, the teacher who was engaged in remedial instruction has assumed a teaching position which starts at the beginning of the school year; therefore, we must recruit remedial teachers in October and usually cannot start our program before January. I cite this example to show that we really need an ongoing program, and this can be made possible only as federal funds are available at the beginning of the school year.

I sincerely hope that every educator will lend you their wholehearted support in this matter and that you will be successful in the passage of House Joint Resolution 412.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. GOMES,
Principal.

GILROY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Gilroy, Calif., March 29, 1967.

MR. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GUBSER: I wish to state that I'm very much in favor of H.J. Res. 412.

As an administrator in education, I feel it would help to solve an acute problem in the hiring of our staff members.

Yours sincerely,

FRANK D. GINELLI,
Principal, El Roble School.

GILROY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Gilroy, Calif., March 31, 1967.

Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. GUBSER: Thank you for your letter requesting my support of your resolution 412. It is an excellent move in the right direction. We are very hampered by the present ruling. I am sure others, working more closely to the problem will offer more specific recommendations than I could, but if there is any way in which I can help, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

ALICE STAR JORDAN,
Principal, Glen View School.

MORELAND SCHOOL DISTRICT,
San Jose, Calif., March 28, 1967.

Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GUBSER: The Moreland School District is currently laying out its design for continuation of several supplementary educational programs for the coming school year. Among these is a $47,000 project financed under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. This compensatory education program requires the employment of three full time teachers, three teacher aides, one part time nurse, one part time director, and one part time clerical assistant.

In accordance with California Law, the district has already made commitments to the certificated employees, even though we have no assurance regarding the continued funding of this already evaluated and approved program. This is a matter of considerable concern to the Board of Trustees and administration of this district since this program could not be continued within the limitations of local revenues.

May this letter serve as an expression of our full support of your Joint Resolution 412 and as encouragement for you to pursue the course of action proposed in your communication of March 17, 1967.

Respectfully,

EUGENE J. RIORDAN,
President, Board of Trustees.

MARSHALL LANE SCHOOL,
Saratoga, Calif., March 29, 1967.

Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GUBSER: Your letter of March 17, regarding your resolution to assure the early appropriation of federal funds for educational purposes, was received and appreciated.

I concur with the provisions of your resolution and commend you for your alertness and interest in administration of these programs.

Please be assured that you have my total support in this matter.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY PERREIRA,
Principal.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
March 30, 1967.

Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GUBSER: I am in receipt of your letter of March 17 relative to H.J. Resolution 412 which you have introduced. I like the terms of this bill very much and I think its passage will contribute a real service to all

areas that require funds through the Federal Educational Programs.

You may depend upon my wholehearted support on this legislation.

Very truly yours,

HUGH C. JACKSON.

THEODORE F. GRANT SCHOOL,
Los Altos, Calif., March 29, 1967.

Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GUBSER: Thank you for your recent letter concerning H.J. Res. 412. I am most pleased that you have shown such interest. May I assure you that I will be most willing to support you in this matter.

You will be pleased to know that Mr. Mahon will be in receipt of a communication from me very soon.

Thank you for your continuing support of free public education, I am

Yours sincerely,

VIC NORTON,
Principal.

SAN JOSE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT,
March 29, 1967.

Hon. GEORGE H. MAHON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MAHON: The House will have before it shortly Resolution No. 412, proposed by Congressman Charles Gubser. This particular resolution is an enabling act which releases federal funds for educational programs.

You should be aware that unless such a resolution is adopted immediately, serious financial problems are created for California schools. In our district alone (San Jose Unified School District), ninety positions hinge upon the appropriation of federal funds. Unless we are assured that those funds are forthcoming, we cannot hire the teachers to fill those positions.

If we cannot hire those teachers, they are bound to be hired by other districts because of the already great shortage of teachers in this state.

I sincerely hope you will give this resolution top priority and do that which is necessary to expedite its passage.

Sincerely,

RONALD S. GILPATRICK,
President.

MARCH 30, 1967.

Hon. GEORGE H. MAHON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MAHON: It has recently come to my attention that the Honorable Charles S. Gubser, Representative of the 10th District, State of California, introduced House Joint Resolution #412 on March 8, 1967.

I have read a copy of this joint resolution and feel that adoption of this resolution would serve to remove one of the barriers that local school districts face in applying and planning for federal funds under NDEA, the Elementary and Secondary Education Acts, and the Vocational Act.

I have been involved in assisting teachers and administrators in the Palo Alto Unified School District in planning and writing proposals for federal funds since the beginning of NDEA. Each year we are faced with the uncertainty of the allotment of federal funds through the state to educational proposals submitted by local school districts. Anything which could facilitate local school districts in making intelligent plans prior to local budgeting would be a boon. Each year this school district wastes hundreds of hours of teachers and administrators time in planning with no certainty that federal funding will be continued for continuing projects or that new projects will be approved. Most teachers and many administrators are becoming discouraged with the process and are beginning to take the attitude that the whole process is not worth the support which ultimately is received.

I would urge you to give support to Representative Gubser's resolution which, I understand, is now in the hands of the Appropriations Committee.

Sincerely,

RAY P. RUPPEL, *Principal.*

LEROY ANDERSON SCHOOL,
San Jose, Calif., April 4, 1967.

Hon. GEORGE H. MAHON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you in support of Representative Charles S. Gubser's proposed H.J. Res. 412.

Proper budget planning in the public schools necessitates the procedures outlined in this resolution. With more federal funding seemingly a realistic expectation for the future, it will be even more important that local districts be able to approach budget sessions with some firm commitment from the federal government as to the amount and type of funds to be granted.

I solicit your affirmative action on H.J. Res. 412.

Respectfully,

JAMES C. NASON.

CUPERTINO UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Cupertino, Calif., March 30, 1967.

Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GUBSER: Thank you for calling our attention to House Joint Resolution No. 412 which you introduced on March 8. This Resolution certainly strikes at the heart of one of our major problems in dealing with Federally supported programs.

Enclosed you will find copies of a letter we sent to Mr. Mahon and members of Congress from our area. We certainly hope the Resolution will pass.

Thank you for your continued interest and support of our schools.

Sincerely,

CHARLES KNIGHT,
Superintendent.

CUPERTINO UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Cupertino, Calif., March 30, 1967.

Hon. GEORGE H. MAHON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MAHON: On March 8th, Mr. Charles Gubser, Member of Congress from the Tenth Congressional District of California introduced House Joint Resolution No. 412. This Resolution if passed would authorize the U.S. Office of Education to obligate funds for the succeeding year not to exceed 75% of the current year's obligation for certain Federal Programs. In this manner, local school districts that are involved with Federal Programs would be able to plan effectively for those programs and at a time in keeping with the budget calendar in most states.

I would like to indicate our support of this measure. A major problem we have faced is the necessity of holding back on the commitment of the district to certain federal programs because of uncertainty of the funding of those programs. This involves everything from program planning to personnel procurement and I think has resulted in less effective accomplishments than would have been possible had we been at liberty to plan freely many months in advance of actual operation.

From the point of view of the Cupertino School District in California and most of those in the field of education in this area, the passage of this Resolution would be a great boon to effective planning for federally connected programs. We certainly urge you to support it. Thank you for any consideration you give this suggestion.

Sincerely,

CHARLES KNIGHT,
Superintendent.

CUPERTINO UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Cupertino, Calif., March 30, 1967.

Hon. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. YOUNGER: On March 8th, Mr. Charles Gubser, Member of Congress from the Tenth Congressional District of California introduced House Joint Resolution No. 412. This Resolution, if passed, authorize the U.S. Office of Education to obligate funds for the succeeding year not to exceed 75% of the current year's obligation for certain Federal Programs. In this manner, local school districts that are involved with Federal Programs would be able to plan effectively for those programs and at a time in keeping with the budget calendar in most states.

I would like to indicate our support of this measure. A major problem we have faced is the necessity of holding back on the commitment of the district to certain federal programs because of uncertainty of the funding of those programs. This involves everything from program planning to personnel procurement and I think has resulted in less effective accomplishmnts than would have been possible had we been at liberty to plan freely many months in advance of actual operation.

From the point of view of the Cupertino School District in California and most of those in the field of education in this area, the passage of this Resolution would be a great boon to effective planning for federally connected programs. We certainly urge you to support it. Thank you for any consideration you give this suggestion.

Sincerely,

CHARLES KNIGHT,
Superintendent.

CUPERTINO UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Cupertino, Calif., March 30, 1967.

Hon. W. DONLON EDWARDS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. EDWARDS: On March 8th, Mr. Charles Gubser, Member of Congress from the Tenth Congressional District of California introduced House Joint Resolution No. 412. This Resolution if passed would authorize the U.S. Office of Education to obligate funds for the succeeding year not to exceed 75% of the current year's obligation for certain Federal Programs. In this manner, local school districts that are involved with Federal Programs would be able to plan effectively for those programs and at a time in keeping with the budget calendar in most states.

I would like to indicate our support of this measure. A major problem we have faced is the necessity of holding back on the commitment of the district to certain federal programs because of uncertainty of the funding of those programs. This involves everything from program planning to personnel procurement and I think has resulted in less effective accomplishments than would have been possible had we been at liberty to plan freely many months in advance of actual operation.

From the point of view of the Cupertino School District in California and most of those in the field of education in this area, the passage of this Resolution would be a great boon to effective planning for federally connected programs. We certainly urge you

to support it. Thank you for any consideration you give this suggestion.

Sincerely,

CHARLES KNIGHT,
Superintendent.

CUPERTINO UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Cupertino, Calif., March 30, 1967.

Hon. GEORGE H. MAHON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN, Recently I have become aware of House Joint Resolution 412 introduced by Rep. Charles Gubser, member from California. May I offer my full support for his timely consideration.

This is the propitious moment when school principals and school district administrators wrestle with all the financial data that is inherent in budget formulation. The mere fact that the twenty-five square miles which encompasses our school district is comprised of only homes means that the burden of revenue is thrown on the backs of our local taxpayers. Our tax base is rather meager in comparison to our surrounding area so that state and federal monies make our programs go.

Cupertino School District is a nationally acclaimed elementary school district mainly because of the imaginative and innovative attitude that prevails. Much of this success, however, is tied to special funds available from the federal government. When we are faced with the dilemma of being unsure of federal funding and its procedures, the "mills of the gods" which have been slowly grinding, come to an anxious halt.

I implore you to weigh judiciously the welfare of the 22,000 youngsters of our school district against the present funding procedures of our federal monies and support Rep. Gubser's resolution.

I am appreciative of your efforts on behalf of education.

Sincerely yours,

JACK CASEY,
Principal, Ortega School.

MONROE SCHOOL,
San Jose, Calif., March 29, 1967.

Hon. GEORGE H. MAHON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Great and lasting benefits have come to local school districts through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act funds which have been appropriated yearly through Congress. The timing of these appropriations has, however, caused considerable stress and problems at the local level of which I will mention a few.

We are required by law to notify teachers by March 15th if they are not being retained for the following school year. With the uncertainty of ESEA funds, we never know whether to speculate and retain them or dismiss them and hope to rehire them in the fall. The former is unsound financially and the latter results in poor continuity of the program as good experienced teachers in these programs are lost. Similar problems exist in planning for optimum utilization of facilities and materials for all phases of the school program. Should drastic changes be made on any given year with regard to appropriation of ESEA funds, we would by necessity drop some of these endeavors and by commitment, try to absorb others within the abilities of our local funding.

You are urged to lend your influence and support to a program which would provide continued funding beginning February or March of each year through a continuation resolution as suggested by Representative Charles S. Gubser. House Joint Resolution 4112, as presented by Mr. Gubser, would be a giant step toward solving these problems for us at the local school level.

Sincerely,

ROBERT D. LANDRETH,
Principal.

SUNNYVALE BOARD OF EDUCATION,
April 14, 1967.

Hon. GEORGE H. MAHON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In the latter part of February of this year, our school superintendent, Dr. Henry Molino and I discussed with Representative Charles S. Gubser of our area the major problem we face annually relative to developing budgets with minimum income information. This problem has been accentuated in recent years as the Federal Government has more and more participated in funding various educational programs throughout the country. Our district has participated in a number of these projects and feel significant progress is being made in up-grading many aspects of our educational offerings to children.

In discussing this matter with Mr. Gubser, it was our definite impression that concerns by school districts nation-wide were very similar to ours. In fact, we were able to point out that this was one of the major concerns at the American Association of School Administrators Convention in Atlantic City which we had just attended.

We are fully cognizant of the complexity of this problem. However, the concept of a continuing resolution as suggested by Mr. Gubser seemed to us to have real merit which should be given careful consideration. We would surely have more information than we now currently enjoy. It is, therefore, the feeling of the Sunnyvale Board of Education that your Committee given serious consideration to the concept of a continuing resolution or whatever measure may be necessary in order to provide a reasonable and systematic means for school districts to plan their budget year. I can assure you that by means of a continuing resolution whereby our school district would be guaranteed at least 75 percent of the previous year's allocation, preliminary plans would make a great difference in our budget development.

The Sunnyvale Board of Education sincerely trusts that your Committee will give serious consideration to this proposition.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. JACQUELINE T. RAY,
President.

J. BOHNETT SCHOOL,
April 10, 1967.

Hon. GEORGE H. MAHON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is to urge your support of Congressman Charles Gubster's resolution, H.J. Res. 412, concerning adequate time for school districts to make educational plans based on Federal funded projects. It is an established fact that many districts are "gun shy" of committing themselves to any Federal programs for fear of inadequate or no financial support. Therefore, the intent and purpose of legislature establishing such programs is lost. Only the wealthy districts can chance having to carry the load themselves. The needy districts, for which such legislation was primarily designed, do not participate.

Sincerely,

LELAND DUGAN,
Principal.

Mr. Speaker, if I had alerted school districts across the entire State of California instead of my own congressional district, and across the entire Nation, instead of my own congressional district, I am confident that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD bearing the endorsements of my proposal would be at least 2 feet thick for this day. Here we have heard from the men and women who are actually out in the field, working with the provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. They know that one of the grave defects in the program is the fact that the appropriations process, through no fault of the House Appropriations Committee nor the membership of this House, simply cannot provide the assurance that funds will be available in sufficient time to provide for sensible and proper planning at the local level. In the interests of efficiently spending Federal aid dollars and in the interests of providing better education, I respectfully request all Members of the House to seriously consider supporting my resolution, House Joint Resolution 412.

In particular, I respectfully request the members of the Appropriations Committee to give consideration to bringing forth a continuing resolution like that which is suggested in my proposal.

NEWARK'S NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS PROGRAMS ARE DOING THE JOB

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, Project COPE in Newark, N.J., has achieved special success with almost 800 enrollees. An extensive supportive services program, under the auspices of the Manpower Administration, Department of Labor, has meant that many young men and women have returned to school or found permanent jobs, rather than become, or remain, dropouts.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps, a program of the Labor Department's Bureau of Work Programs, provides work training for low-income youths between the ages of 16 and 22, and is the springboard for this cooperative effort to mobilize the network of social and manpower agencies in order to open up new pathways to occupational and professional opportunities for youth.

Thus, COPE—Career Oriented Preparation for Employment—has concentrated on the total needs of the enrollees and has achieved unusual results. Administered by the Jewish Vocational Service, under the aegis of the United Community Corp.—the local community action agency—the experimental NYC project has received $882,399 from the Bureau of Work Programs and from the Office of Economic Opportunity. Almost $200,000 in Federal money provides group and individual counseling services, remedial education for out-of-school enrollees, job placement and referral services, and followthrough help for NYC terminees.

The extra Federal investment has paid off. Albert Ascher, the former director of COPE, said:

> I'm sure that if we did not have these services, we would have lost more kids.

The statistics support his statement. Of 780 youths, 350 have terminated. About 100 of these have jobs in private industry or public agencies and an equal

number have returned to school full time. Seventy were forced to leave because of illness, age, or because they moved out of town and about the same number quit outright.

COPE employs a staff of 27; 10 of these are qualified counselors, and they hope to be able to hire four more in order to lower the counselor-enrollee ratio to a figure nearer 1 to 50. The counselors meet the young people on their own levels. They talk with each young person individually and lead group sessions which generate a powerful impact on the youths. In these meetings the young people themselves draw out the timid and restrain the boisterous. They are free to discuss a wide range of topics; a recent meeting, for instance, covered subjects ranging from the place of the Negro woman in American society to the desirability of a wage raise to $1.40 an hour. Here the enrollees learn to express their problems and work out solutions together.

COPE has hired four ex-NYC enrollees as field aids. They recruit on a door-to-door basis, track down those youths who fail to report to work, and check up on those who have left NYC projects to take permanent jobs. In their rounds, they have found that COPE's graduates last longer in permanent jobs than do other youths.

About two-thirds of the COPE enrollees are out of school. They work 30 hours a week, earning $1.25 an hour. The other enrollees still attend school and work 15 hours. One major result of the NYC program has been to develop new careers in social work, which these youths, who were thought to be unemployable, fill. Sixty new positions have been created at hospitals or agencies and are now staffed by former NYC enrollees.

The Manpower Administration Bureaus at both the national and local levels work closely with NYC sponsors. For COPE this means that the New Jersey State Employment Service, the Youth Opportunity Center, and MDTA skill centers and private contractors help in recruitment, job placement, and referral. YOC, established by the Bureau of Employment Security, also aids in screening, testing, and counseling applicants, and MDTA programs accept ex-NYC enrollees for further training.

Recently COPE and the city of Newark's Neighborhood Youth Corps project have become part of another coordinated approach to increase the employability of disadvantaged youth—a NYC–MDTA concurrent enrollment program. This program provides 100 out-of-school enrollees with the opportunity to combine work experience in the morning with training at the MDTA skill center in the afternoon. In addition, a remedial education course, integrated with job training, helps these and other out-of-school youth to qualify for better jobs. The emphasis here is on informal small classes—the structured large classroom is out. Instead the students are encouraged to participate in classes and the subject matter is related to their abilities and needs.

NYC programs involve the total community in their projects by having representatives of local welfare and social agencies on their governing boards. They therefore can play an important role in establishing policy, for not only do they provide many of the work stations and much of the supervision on the job, but they also provide direct services for the youths and their families. On the staff is an agency coordinator who serves as a liaison between the agencies and COPE. In this way COPE can coordinate and utilize all of the available resources. However, the directors feel that there are still some missing links. Health services and nursery facilities for working mothers are two components they hope to add in the future. A medical board has already been established to advise on the medical and dental needs of NYC young people.

By integrating all of these services with job training, the Bureau of Work Programs through its sponsoring agencies insures that the NYC experience will enable today's disadvantaged youth to enter the competitive employment field tomorrow on an equal footing with their fellow workmen.

WHOSE WAR IN VIETNAM?

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I was extremely disturbed to read news reports to the effect that Premier Nguyen Cao Ky of South Vietnam has determined that 600,000 American troops will be needed to continue the war in Vietnam. I sincerely hope that President Johnson will weigh carefully all the implications of Premier Ky's pronouncement and the action he recommends.

I would remind the President of his often-expressed feeling that American soldiers should not be sent half way around the world to do a job that is properly the responsibility of South Vietnam and her Asian neighbors. I think there can be little doubt that, by any rational criteria, the war in Vietnam has already become basically our war, and not South Vietnam's.

This does not mean that the United States can turn its back on the situation in Southeast Asia. What mistakes might have been made are history now; it is the present and the future that must concern us. I always have been and will continue to be firmly against unilateral withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam. As I have stated on many occasions, to do so would merely encourage Chinese Communist military adventurism and would drown the voices of moderation in the Communist world. Our involvement in Vietnam is a fact. Our soldiers are fighting and dying. They deserve our support.

But that does not mean that they must become pawns in Premier Ky's game of political chess. He has conducted an intensive campaign for the presidency of his country and the timing of his pronouncement is quite clearly part of his campaign strategy.

Are we going to permit Premier Ky, or any other Asian leader to formulate our foreign policy? Who is going to decide what the national interest of the United States is, the people of this Nation or political opportunists abroad? Is U.S. foreign policy inevitably to be one of reaction to Communist initiatives, or will we find the courage and the imagination to create a policy based on the aspirations and beliefs of the American people?

We have escalated the war in Vietnam markedly since 1965, but we are no closer to military victory now than we were then. Our escalation has been matched by escalation from the north, and the result has been an increasingly tragic toll in lives and dollars. Unfortunately, some military pressure apparently is necessary to convince North Vietnam that we are resolved to protect the independence of South Vietnam and the right of her people to self-determination. But our military resolve must be matched by initiatives toward a peaceful and responsible resolution if we are to avoid becoming bogged down in an interminable Asian land war, which so many of our military experts have warned against.

Let there be no confusion over the possibilities for a quick military victory in Vietnam, such as Israel achieved over the Arab nations. It is one thing to fight in a desert where the enemy is clearly identifiable and quite another to wage jungle warfare where most of the time the enemy is either underground or indistinguishable from innocent civilians.

I profoundly hope President Johnson will see clearly where the interests of the United States lie in appraising Premier Ky's call for another massive escalation of the war in Vietnam.

A BILL TO AMEND THE FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 19, 1967, I introduced H.R. 3098 which would amend the Social Security Act to require that drugs provided by or under programs receiving Federal financial assistance, must be prescribed and furnished on a nonproprietary or generic basis.

I have today introduced another bill which would extend the labeling provisions of H.R. 3098 to pertain to all drugs sold by prescription. This bill would amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to require that in the labeling and advertising of all drugs sold by prescription, the "established name" of such drugs must appear each time the proprietary name is used.

Those people who require drugs have, in many instances, been charged excessive prices for prescription drugs sold under a brand name. This practice is

not only harmful to the general public, but is especially detrimental to the elderly and unemployed who find it difficult enough to meet their expenses. For example, 1,000 doses of dextroamphetamine sulfate cost $1.15 to the druggist. This same drug sold under a brand name costs $22.60—a difference of $21.45. An even more extreme example is predisone which is sold at $10.16 for 1,000 doses. The cost of this identical drug under a brand name, however, is $170—a remarkable difference of $159.84. Obviously this situation must be remedied immediately.

The effect of my bill would be to permit the pharmacist to fill a prescription which calls for a drug by brand name, with the "established" drug of the same identity and quality. As a result, this drug can be sold at a considerably lower price to the consumer.

Mr. Speaker, both of these bills warrant careful consideration if we are to hope for a drastic decrease in the price of drugs—a decrease which would allow the elderly, unemployed, and general public to purchase these drugs at a realistic cost. I urge the support of our colleagues in enacting this much-needed legislation.

NEGRO HISTORY MUSEUM COMMISSION

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. NIX] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill for the establishment of a Negro History Museum Commission.

Negroes have played an important role in the development of these United States. A role that is not always accurately or completely chronicled in the history books.

Negro explorers have been a vital force in many of the pioneer movements in this country and without. A Negro was the first man at the North Pole with the Byrd expedition.

Negro scientists have labored long and hard and successfully in fields of medicine, space, and technological improvements.

Negro industrialists and businessmen have contributed much toward fashioning a better way of life.

Negro accomplishments have been many.

Their recognition has been small.

Therefore, I have submitted this bill in the hopes that an important phase of the history of this country shall be recognized and respected.

LITHUANIA, LATVIA, AND ESTONIA HAVE A RIGHT TO BE FREE AND INDEPENDENT—27 YEARS IN THE COMMUNIST-RUSSIAN SLAVERY

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HELSTOSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, since June 15, 1940, the Baltic States have been suffering in the Soviet captivity. The Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by force of arms.

The Baltic States have never experienced in their long history through centuries such an extermination and annihilation of their people as during this Soviet occupation since June 15, 1940. During the last 27 years the countries lost more than one-fourth of their entire population. Hundreds of thousand of Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians were murdered by the Kremlin despots or died in exile in Soviet slave-labor camps and prisons in Siberia and other places of Communist Russia. At least 20 percent of the present population of Soviet-occupied Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia are not the Balts, but the Soviet colonists. The genocidal operations and practices being carried out by the Soviets continue with no end in sight. Bearing in mind that all of the murdered and deported people have been the most educated, courageous, industrious, comprising the strongest elements of the countries, the losses in population become more terrible and almost fatal to the survival of the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian nations.

But let us now return to the details of the Soviet occupation of Lithuania. At the same time that the forces of occupation were entrenching themselves and the mock elections were being carried out in 1940, leaders and active members of all non-Communist political parties and thousands of public officials were arrested. This was but a prelude to one of the most despicable acts of modern times; namely, the mass deportations that ensued. Interrupted only by a temporary Nazi occupation of Lithuania from 1941 to 1944, when the Soviets reoccupied Lithuania, these deportations went on for about a decade. People from every walk of life, even old and dying people, were put on cattle freight cars for the 3-week journey to Siberia or remote areas near the Arctic Ocean. The number of all the deportees amounted to about 20 percent of the population, or 600,000 Lithuanians. In 2 nights alone of June 1941, 34,260 Lithuanians were deported to the horribly miserable conditions of the slave-labor camps. The consequent death toll of these deportees was very high.

With the increase of physical terrorization by the Soviets, a strong Lithuanian underground resistance organization was formed and fought the Soviets. It was an heroic and widespread resistance movement, but it was a costly one; after the war about 30,000 died in battles with Russian Communists.

If we demand for freedom for all nations in Asia and Africa, we should do exactly the same thing in Europe. The Baltic States—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—are more than 700-year-old nations and they have the same—or even more—right to be free and independent as any new country in any part of the world. We should have a single standard for freedom. Its denial in the whole or in part, any place in the world, including the Soviet Union is surely intolerable.

It is my wish that the House adopt the foregoing resolution:

Whereas the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation; and

Whereas all people have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, cultural, and religious development; and

Whereas the Baltic peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been forcibly deprived of these rights by the Government of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union, through a program of deportations and resettlement of peoples, continues in its effort to change the ethnic character of the populations of the Baltic States; and

Whereas it has been the firm and consistent policy of the Government of the United States to support the aspirations of Baltic peoples for self-determination and national independence; and

Whereas there exist many historical, cultural, and family ties between the peoples of the Baltic States and the American people: Be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the House of Representatives of the United States urge the President of the United States—

(a) to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and

(b) to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples.

NEW JERSEY–NEW YORK AIR POLLUTION

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HELSTOSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to speak in behalf of the New Jersey-New York air pollution bill. In these modern times air pollution has indeed become a rather complex problem as well as a very serious one. Pollution reduces our yield of crops, damages our property, is harmful to our health, lessens our enjoyment of life, and is offensive to our senses.

Facts indicate that air pollution is associated with numerous respiratory ailments such as chronic bronchitis, bronchial asthma, lung cancer, chronic constrictive ventilatory disease, nonspecific infectious upper respiratory disease, and pulmonary emphysema. It has been shown that the "common cold" and other respiratory tract infections occur more

frequently in areas which have a higher pollution level.

Air pollution presents a great hindrance to transportation on land, water, and air, because it reduces visibility. Any source of dense smoke close to a modern highway or throughway can be an extremely serious threat to travelers. Air pollution is a big factor in fog formation which no doubt aggravates the visibility problems preventing many airplanes from immediate landing and often causes very long and tiring delays.

One need only recall the greatest and most publicized air pollution catastrophe at Donora, Pa., in October of 1948 to see just how serious the air pollution problem can be. In Donora, one-third of the population of 14,000 became ill, and 17 persons died.

Many men have lost a large amount of work hours due to ailments suffered from air pollution. This reduces their earning power, and thus has a large effect on the overall economy of the affected areas.

The first identifiable Federal program in air pollution was Public Law 159 passed by the 84th Congress in 1955. It was an act to provide for research and technical assistance relating to air pollution control.

I have always felt it my duty to do something to help curb the serious air pollution which has harmed my neighbors, friends, and all in the United States. I feel that the greatest difficulty is in the lack of knowledge on the part of the residents of the local communities concerning the air pollution problem as it really exists. As the mayor of East Rutherford, N.J., in 1957, I fought hard to do something about the air pollution problem. After several years of effort in this regard, I finally succeeded in ridding the area of dumpers; but, the problem is still quite serious. In my final remarks as mayor of East Rutherford to the council I suggested that two things be done:

First. The adoption of a regional plan for the municipality to help bring about a solution to this air pollution problem.

Second. The authorization of a special professional study to compare the air pollution in the area with that found in other areas and recommend an overall control plan.

It has always been my contention that air pollution is not limited to the bounds of any one municipality and I have always advocated regionalizing the control of air pollution through a control commission.

In 1965, I cosponsored the Clean Air Act Amendments. The passage of these amendments by Congress recognizes the crisis facing the Nation, and the pressing need to be of help to our cities, communities, and States in numerous ways:

First. Having Federal standards set up to control the motor vehicle, which no doubt is one of the most common pollution sources.

Second. Expanding Federal research, training and technical assistance activities.

Third. Authorizing Federal abatement action on interstate and intrastate problems which cannot be solved by existing programs.

Fourth. Awarding matching funds directly to local and State agencies to help develop, establish, or improve control programs, especially those dealing with regional air pollution problems.

This legislation has helped, and will continue to help our States and communities, particularly with those problems they cannot resolve alone. But it is still their responsibility to meet the challenge of their specific problems. It is equally the responsibility of each and every one of us to give our active support to the State and local efforts to put an end to and prevent air pollution.

Air is a necessity for survival. It is also necessary that it be cleaned, just any kind of air will not do. Air cannot be manufactured to suit our requirements and since it is irreplaceable, we must make every effort to conserve it to the best we can. The essentials for the rapidly intensifying problems of air pollution are public understanding and support. The question to be resolved is how to combat widespread air pollution. With a concentrated and united attack upon this problem we can take a large step forward to meet it face to face, for the cleanliness of our communities and for the betterment of our health.

This joint resolution which I am cosponsoring with my colleagues to consent to and enter into the Mid-Atlantic States Air Pollution Compact, creating the Mid-Atlantic States Air Pollution Control Commission as an intergovernmental, Federal-State agency is indeed unique. This resolution with its rigid standards and controls, will allow us to achieve great progress in curbing air pollution and to make our New Jersey-New York metropolitan area a better place to live.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 1—ORGANIZATION TO FIGHT CRIME

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on January 10, of this year, introduced House Joint Resolution 1, to establish a Joint Committee To Investigate Crime. A companion resolution has now been introduced in the Senate by the Honorable FRANK MOSS. I would like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation for so distinguished a cosponsor. Senator Moss is not new to the field of crime legislation. He introduced the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965, the only major piece of legislation passed in this area to date. His support for this resolution is particularly gratifying.

I want at this time to urge the support of the House for this resolution. I welcome cosponsorship on the Senate side of what I consider to be one of the country's most important issues, that of crime in our cities. I would like at this time to urge my colleagues in this body to cosponsor this legislation which I have previously forwarded to them in my letter of June 12. I want to thank my colleagues who have already seen the necessity of cosponsorship of my bill. They are the Honorable JAMES M. HANLEY, the Honorable JOHN E. MOSS, the Honorable ROBERT L. F. SIKES; the Honorable ALPHONZO BELL; the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA; the Honorable CHARLES H. WILSON; the Honorable SEYMOUR HALPERN; the Honorable JULIA BUTLER HANSEN; the Honorable SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, and the Honorable WILLIAM R. ANDERSON. The resolution would establish a committee composed of seven Members of the House and seven Members of the Senate, to be appointed respectively by the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate. In both cases, no more than four Members would belong to the same party. The purpose of the committee would be to make continuing studies and investigations of all the aspects of crime in the United States.

The need for a Joint Crime Committee was most recently recognized by the Republican task force on crime in its support of a bill to establish a Joint Committee on Organized Crime. While organized crime in this country clearly demands immediate and comprehensive investigtion, it is my belief that we on the Hill must go much further in our investigation of the causes, effects, and control of crime. We would gain very little by limiting the scope of a joint congressional crime committee to organized crime alone.

The National Crime Commission's task force on science and technology report, released Saturday—June 4—concluded that the greatest single need throughout the Nation's law-enforcement and criminal-justice system is basic research. According to this report, we know far too little about the effectiveness of our current crime control measures, which cost the Nation more than $2 billion a year which in itself is one-tenth of the national crime loss, a costly means for such inadequate results. It is precisely to this need that the joint congressional committee which I have proposed would address itself. The committee would be authorized to make continuing studies and investigations of crime, including, and I quote from the resolution:

(1) Its elements, causes, and extent; (2) the preparation, collection, and dissemination of statistics thereon, and the availability of reciprocity of information among law enforcement agencies, Federal, State and local, including exchanges of information with foreign nations; (3) the adequacy of law enforcement and the administration of justice, including constitutional issues pertaining thereto; (4) the effect of crime disturbances in the metropolitan urban areas; (5) the effect, or indirectly, of crime on the commerce of the Nation; (6) the treatment and rehabilitation of persons convicted of crimes; (7) measures for the reduction, control, or prevention of crime; (8) measures for the improvement of (a) detection of crime, (b) law enforcement, including increased cooperation among the agencies thereof, (c) the administration of justice; and (9) measures and programs for increased respect for the law.

The concern of this Congress has been religiously supported by the number of bills, well over 600 in the House, intro-

duced this season aimed at crime. This concern is as unprecedented as it is equally overdue. Domestic order is the first responsibility of government on all levels, but, to be effective, crime control legislation and programs must be based on a sound knowledge of the components of crime and the alleys of its control. This we lack until responsible action has been taken. It is my belief that a joint congressional investigating committee is the necessary first step toward effective Federal action in the control of crime.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to call attention to the contribution to this effort made by the Evening Star Broadcasting Co.—WMAL-AM/FM/TV. As you know, this is one of Washington's outstanding broadcasting stations, which has often spoken positively on solutions to various aspects of the total effort to eradicate crime. As many persons and organizations sought for better solutions to crime, WMAL took up the call for a Joint Congressional Committee on Crime as the most logical national clearinghouse of crime information. So far as I know, this was the first broadcast station or newspaper to make such a proposal, beginning as early as last November 27, before the beginning of the 90th Congress. Since my introduction of House Joint Resolution 1, WMAL has been generous in its support of my resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD various editorials broadcast over the past 8 months by WMAL, relating to this matter, as follows:

EDITORIALS BROADCAST BY WMAL/AM/FM/TV ON JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON CRIME

WEEK OF NOVEMBER 27, 1966

Crime is rapidly becoming—if it is not already—our most serious domestic problem. At the same time, recent court rulings have caused increasing confusion over what law enforcement agencies can and cannot do. In-depth studies, such as that to be completed in January by the National Crime Commission, are providing new insights into the causes and effects of crime. Meanwhile, Congress is sure to be faced with complex new crime legislation in the next session.

A war on crime in the late 1960s cannot be fought with 1920 weapons. This is why Congress should thoroughly digest all the new rulings and findings before acting on new crime legislation. To accomplish this, we recommend establishment of a Joint Congressional Committee on Crime, similar to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. This committee should serve as a national clearing house to explore all aspects of crime within the Federal jurisdiction, on a continuing basis.

It is necessary to improve law enforcement procedures at all levels of government. But only Congress has the diversity to bridge vast sociological, practical, legal and political considerations that complicate the total national crime problem.

WEEK OF DECEMBER 4, 1966

A Federal Justice Department study says an "Agency for Criminal Law Reform" should be established for the District. The Justice Department wisely recognizes that a war on crime in the late 1960s cannot be fought with 1920 weapons. A permanent and independent agency is necessary to bring orderly improvements to District court, correctional and police procedures.

The Justice Department proposal is a good approach to solving local crime. But a total national assault on crime is also needed on a permanent and continuing basis. We are convinced that a Joint Congressional Committee on Crime should pick up the attack when the National Crime Commission ends its work in January. The committee should serve as a national clearing house to study all aspects of crime, within the Federal jurisdiction.

It is necessary to improve law enforcement procedures at all levels of government. But only Congress has the diversity to bridge vast sociological, legal, practical and political considerations that complicate the total national crime problem.

WEEK OF DECEMBER 18, 1966

The current controversy over FBI use of electronic detection devices is another example of the need for a Joint Congressional Committee on Crime. The controversy rages around whether the FBI used electronic eavesdropping devices with or without official approval. The question immediately turns to—which official approval? Justice Department and FBI officials have been issuing conflicting guidelines on use of electronic devices for nearly 40 years. Out of the confusion the FBI now emerges branded an ogre with a snooping device in every office wastebasket.

What law enforcement officers can and cannot do with electronic devices must be settled once and for all. But guidelines should be drafted this time by the elected Congress, rather than by appointed administrators. To do a good job, Congress will need objective knowledge. A Joint Congressional Crime Committee should be established to gather knowledge regarding use of electronic devices, as well as all the changing patterns of law enforcement.

WEEK OF JANUARY 15, 1967

President Johnson's call for sweeping legislation providing Federal aid to local and state police departments must be studied very carefully from many points of view. It makes the need for a continuing Joint Committee on Crime in the Congress even more urgent.

President Johnson said that a Federal police force is repugnant to the American people and we agree. Whether massive Federal aid to local and state police departments could lead to a Federal police force is a question that should be answered.

There should be a Joint Congressional Committee on Crime to study every facet of this problem. In fact, the Joint Committee should delve into every aspect of crime. Only Congress has the diversity to bridge the vast social, economic, legal and political questions that complicate efforts to control crime.

WEEK OF FEBRUARY 12, 1967

President Johnson has sent Congress a message asking vast Federal aid to local and state law enforcement agencies. The spiral of crime undoubtedly justifies Federal action. The President wisely placed the Federal Government in the role of a helper—rather than a controller—of state and local law enforcement agencies. Nevertheless, involvement of the Federal Government in grassroots law enforcement activities raises unanswered and controversial questions.

One of the most repugnant thoughts to most Americans is the possibility of a Federally-dominated police system. And Federal aid in other programs, such as education, has always meant a degree of Federal control.

Therefore, the President's message must be carefully considered. We believe a detailed analysis should be undertaken by a Joint Congressional Committee on Crime. In fact, Congress should equip itself for a long and detailed study of all the social, economic, political and legal questions complicating the war on crime. We urge Congress to establish a Joint Committee on Crime without delay.

WEEK OF MAY 22, 1967

The ever-growing menace of crime requires greater Federal attention. Congress will inevitably be faced with complex legislation to help control crime. The question is whether Congress will be prepared to act intelligently on crime legislation.

This is why we have been urging creation of a Joint Congressional Committee on Crime since last November. This is why Florida Congressman Claude Pepper introduced a resolution to establish a Joint Congressional Crime Committee early in January. If Congress is to develop meaningful crime legislation, it must sift all available information and develop new studies of its own.

Organizations and private citizens should join us in urging that House Rules Committee Chairman William Colmer set early hearings on Congressman Pepper's resolution. A Joint Congressional Committee on Crime, serving as a national clearinghouse of crime information, would be a vital link in the nation's defense against ever-increasing lawlessness.

FRIDAY, JUNE 9, 1967

We applaud the rapid bi-partisan progress being made toward establishment of a Joint Congressional Committee on Crime.

On the Democratic side, Florida Representative Claude Pepper and Utah Senator Frank Moss are leading the drive. Similar Republican action has been taken by Virginia Representative Richard Poff and Florida Representative William Cramer.

We urge that all Congressmen add their influence to establish a Joint Congressional Committee on Crime. The committee will carry on a day-to-day study of the causes and effects of crime—our most critical domestic problem. It will serve as a national clearinghouse of information for legislators, police and corrections officials at the Federal, state and local levels.

Only Congress has the diversity to bridge the vast social, economic, legal and political questions that complicate an all-out national war on crime. As we have said since last November when we first proposed its establishment, a Joint Congressional Committee on Crime is the best weapon for spearheading the attack.

WORK AND TRAINING FOR ECONOMIC INDEPENDENCE

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of Poverty and Human Resources Abstracts contains an interesting piece by Dr. Sar A. Levitan which takes a hard look at three Economic Opportunity Act programs—the Job Corps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, and work experience and training. Dr. Levitan, a well-known economist, is currently engaged in a study of the poverty program under a grant from the Ford Foundation. I commend this article to all of my colleagues who are interested in seeing how well the administration is carrying out the mandate which we have given them:

WORK AND TRAINING FOR ECONOMIC INDEPENDENCE

(By Sar A. Levitan, the George Washington University)

The Economic Opportunity Act was sold to the nation as a measure to rehabilitate the poor, placing them on the road to economic independence. "The days of the dole in our country are numbered," President Johnson declared on signing the law. Sargent Shriver

also made it clear, even before assuming responsibility for the direction of the antipoverty program, that he was not "interested in running a handout program or a leaf-raking program. . . ."

After nearly three years and a commitment of $4 billion, it is appropriate to examine the extent to which the Act has been implemented. It is recognized that the impact of some antipoverty measures, no matter how successful, will not be discernible for years. As yet these measures will have had no effect upon stimulating economic independence. The economic benefits of Head Start, for example, may not be apparent for years since the senior members of this group have not yet passed their eighth birthday.

Fortunately, it is not necessary to delay a tentative assessment of the economic impact of the antipoverty program for another decade. In placing emphasis upon breaking the bonds of poverty, several programs inaugurated under the Economic Opportunity Act stressed job creation and training. An examination of these programs should be relevant to reaching some judgment about the extent to which the measures have led participants to achieve economic independence. The original Act made explicit provision for three such programs: Work Experience and Training, the Job Corps, and the Neighborhood Youth Corps. The first serves recipients of welfare and other needy adults, while the others are limited to youths. Other job creation and training programs have been added, but this paper is devoted exclusively to the three programs initiated under the original Act.

Thus far, a total of $1.8 billion has been allocated to these programs, distributed as follows:

Work Experience and Training—$324 million;

Job Corps—$698 million;

Neighborhood Youth Corps—$777 million.

AN INTERESTED OBSERVER'S LAMENT

One would expect that information would be available to estimate the contributions of these manpower programs to the economic independence of the nearly one million participants. Such information, however, is scarce and inadequate.

The Bureau of Work Programs in the Department of Labor, responsible for NYC, and the Bureau of Family Services of the Welfare Administration, responsible for work experience, have conducted few evalautions. Although more than a billion dollars of public funds has been committed to these two programs, only a fraction of one million dollars was devoted to evaluating the extent to which the programs are achieving their goals.

Moreover, officials responsible for the Neighborhood Youth Corps and Work Experience and Training Programs have not released any serious study evaluating their efforts. Indeed, the Bureau of Family Services has not yet taken steps to assure that an evaluation of its program would be available in the future.

Only the Office of Economic Opportunity, under pressure from Congress, has undertaken sophisticated efforts to evaluate the Job Corps. The agency has initiated internal studies to measure the educational achievement of corpsmen while they are in training and the effect of the experience on the employability of enrollees after they leave residential centers. As a result of these studies, Congress and the public can make judgments on the need of residential training centers for disadvantaged youth. Observations about the Neighborhood Youth Corps and Work Experience and Training, on the other hand, must be gleaned from inadequate statistics of doubtful merit.

A number of factors have contributed to the paucity of information. Only the Job Corps conservation centers are administered directly by federal agencies—the Departments of Agriculture and Interior. Both the Bureau of Work Programs and the Bureau of Family Services distribute funds to diverse contractors at state and local levels who actually administer the projects. The small federal staffs, preoccupied with project approval and daily administrative chores, have placed low priority on program evaluation or the collection of program data.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps simply failed to develop an adequate operational reporting system, though the resources and talent were available within the Department of Labor. The Office of Manpower Planning, Evaluation and Research developed a comprehensive reporting system of MDTA programs which could have been applied to NYC. Apparently NYC did not desire to utilize the capability available in the Labor Department.

The Welfare Administration's long tradition of permissive administration is also a formidable obstacle to evaluating program effectiveness. Funds appropriated by Congress for most Welfare Administration programs in the past have normally been allocated to the states on a formula basis, requiring the states to match federal funds. Federal administrators have usually had little control over project administration. In the case of the Work Experience and Training Program, the projects were 100 percent federally-financed and the Welfare Administration was not tied down by strict formula allocations. Despite the greater potential for federal program direction, the traditional practices prevailed. The reports submitted by most state and local project administrators remain inadequate and incomplete, reflecting the laxity in central evaluation.

The development of computerized reporting systems, designed to gather uniform data for all projects funded by a program, has provided additional problems. The instructions for preparing reports have been misinterpreted or interpreted differently by project administrators. The information submitted, therefore, is often not usable by the programed computers.

Finally, the apprehension that a well planned and well conceived study might indicate that program objectives are not achieved can lead the administrators to opt for "evaluation" based on a few selected anecdotes rather than risking more rigorous objective analysis, which may be unfavorable. For nearly two years Job Corps officials attempted to justify their program with sketchy and carefully chosen data. The Office of Economic Opportunity embarked upon the development of sophisticated operational data to evaluate the program only after continued Congressional and public questioning of the effectiveness of the Job Corps and criticism of the highly subjective data presented in its defense. Literally, it took an act of Congress for the Job Corps to develop the data which have turned out to be quite favorable for the program.

WORK EXPERIENCE AND TRAINING

The goal of the Work Experience and Training Program (Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act) is to help welfare recipients and other needy adults to become self-supporting. It was hoped that the work experience and training gained on the projects, as well as the additional supportive services, would help the enrollees to find work.

Available evidence, though limited, raises questions as to whether the goal of the program is being achieved. Although about a third of former enrollees during the first two years have secured jobs, it is doubtful whether participation in the program has significantly contributed towards their securing employment. Despite the image of second and third generation welfare recipients employable recipients of public assistance remain on relief rolls for an average of less than nine months. Therefore, it is not unexpected that many participants in the Title V program, who average five months on a project, would secure employment upon completion or even before completion of their course of training or Title V work experience. It is also known that one of every two relief recipients remains on public assistance after terminating participation in a project.

While some blame the Welfare Administration for the lack-luster performance under Title V, several built-in obstacles in our public assistance system militate against the success of the program. In most states, all earnings of relief recipients are deducted from the assistance they receive. Since the jobs open to recipients frequently pay little more than the basic needs provided by public assistance, there is little incentive to accept a job. The incentive is further reduced by the difficulty which a recipient will have in returning to the welfare rolls if he should lose his job. In order to motivate welfare recipients to achieve economic independence, there is a need to provide incentives not available under present legislation.

The obstacles do not fully explain the shortcomings of Title V projects. The Welfare Administration and the welfare agencies at the state and local level, with a few notable exceptions, have had only limited experience with work and training programs; thus they may not be providing participants of the program with meaningful skill training. Congress has already reacted to this situation by providing that the Department of Labor assume responsibility for work-training and employment related services, while the Welfare Administration retains the responsibility for providing basic support, remedial education and other supportive services. Though Congress made this change in October 1966, the two Departments spent more than eight months in reaching an agreement to divide the responsibility for the administration of Title V. Whether the divided responsibility will improve the quality of training and work experience on Title V projects is a matter of conjecture.

While Title V leaves much to be desired as far as achieving its statutory goal is concerned, condemnation is not in order. The administrators of the program could not publicly claim credit for some of its most socially useful projects. In a number of areas, Title V projects have become the employer of last resort. Here projects saved thousands of families from dire want and deprivation. For nearly two years, Title V funds supported some 6,000 families in depressed eastern Kentucky where no alternative employment opportunities were available and the state made no provision to support employable adults. The eastern Kentucky experience has been duplicated in other areas, though on a smaller scale. Given the legislative mandate, the reluctance of administrators to claim credit for these programs is understandable.

In conclusion, it would seem that most Title V projects have provided little meaningful work experience and training. The program has probably failed to help many participants achieve self-support. However, the funds expended under the program have, by and large, achieved a useful social purpose by providing or supplementing basic income for more than 150,000 families.

NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

Hard data on the impact of NYC are even scarcer than information for Title V. However, NYC has enjoyed popularity with Congress which authorized more money in 1966 for the program than was requested by the Administration; and in May 1967 Congress appropriated additional funds as part of a supplementary appropriations bill. Under these circumstances of popular acceptance, there has been little incentive for administrators to develop data on the impact of the program. Why tempt fate when it is not at

all clear that a hard-nosed analysis of the operations would justify the Congressional enthusiasm?

The reasons for Congressional support are not difficult to find. NYC has distributed its funds with a minimum of fuss and has provided income to as many as half a million youths—the exact number is not known—from poor families. Though occasionally children from more affluent homes were the beneficiaries, Congress has overlooked such indiscretions. It has continued to bestow its blessings upon the program, despite the little that is known about its effectiveness in enhancing the employability of enrollees.

Even a close observer is hard put to pinpoint the goals of NYC. Half of its funds for fiscal 1967 have been allocated to support in-school youth (who normally receive $1.25 an hour for a maximum of 15 hours per week) and summer programs. The assumption is that the income provided serves as an incentive to enrollees to stay in school and to continue their education. Regrettably, this claim rests on the assertions of interested parties and no solid data has been developed to support it.

The out-of-school NYC program seems to be a mixture of work experience, income support, anti-riot insurance and "aging vat." Thus far, NYC has failed to evaluate the effectiveness of these programs which vary widely among the thousands of communities depending upon the ingenuity, resourcefulness and ability of sponsoring organizations and administrators. There is little doubt that NYC has provided income support to many impoverished youth and their families. The program has also benefited from the widely held impression that it provides anti-riot insurance. Though this justification is rarely mentioned officially, it seems to have been the basis for the recent Congressional approval (May 1967) of an additional $47 million for summer programs. The rationale of NYC as an "aging vat" is based on the fact that unemployment rates among youths decline as they mature from teenagers into adulthood. There is room, therefore, for a program which would provide youth with some income and work during their early years in the labor force.

Congressional approval of NYC has not been universal. In authorizing $325 million for fiscal 1967, Congress indicated concern for the quality of training provided by NYC and authorized the Department of Labor to use NYC funds for on-the-job training with private employers. The Department's Bureau of Work Programs has dragged its feet in implementing this Congressional mandate.

The recently introduced Republican Opportunity Crusade places emphasis upon OJT by authorizing the Department of Labor not only to reimburse employers for training NYC youths, but to subsidize them for up to 25 percent of the wages paid during training. The rationale for the proposal is that private employers, even with government subsidy, will provide meaningful work thus eliminating much of the make-work which has been so common under NYC projects.

JOB CORPS

In contrast to the confusing and sometimes conflicting missions of NYC, the primary goal of the Job Corps is clear—to provide education and training for youth from impoverished homes who have failed in school, who have no salable skill and frequently not even a rudimentary preparation for work. Residential facilities are provided on the assumption that in order to rehabilitate some youth, it is necessary to remove them from their home environment. A secondary goal of the Job Corps conservation centers, where more than 40 percent of the males are enrolled, is to perform work "directed primarily toward conserving, developing, and managing the public natural resources of the Nation . . ."

After two years of operation, the Job Corps has initiated a series of operational reports attempting to measure the achievements of enrollees. The data indicate that an enrollee who spent about nine months in a center improves his reading ability by 1½ grades and his arithmetic comprehension by two grades. In the absence of acceptable norms, this level of achievement is difficult to evaluate. However, data clearly indicate that the longer a corpsman remains in a center, the more likely he is to be employed and to use his training.

The available data support the idea of providing residential centers for certain disadvantaged youth. However, the Job Corps has not succeeded in motivating enrollees to remain in the centers for enough time to permit the education and training to have its effect. Only one of every three enrollees completes his course of training. Based on cost-benefit studies, the Job Corps claims that the experiment has paid off. Nevertheless, too many youths drop out and the prescribed training period is itself too short. A survey by Harris Asssociates showed that less than half of those who completed their Job Corps training thought they had received adequate preparation to get a job in the occupation for which they were trained.

Moreover, considering the high cost of maintaining a youth in the Job Corps—exceeding $8,000 a year—it is necessary that youths who require residential training be identified and that other youths be assigned to alternative programs. Thus far, the selection of a youth for the Job Corps, NYC or some other program is determined by fortuitous circumstances.

Some educators have also questioned the basic premise of the Job Corps. They have argued that it is a romantic notion to expect the rehabilitation of youths from city slums or rural areas after a stay of eight or nine months in the centers. These critics suggested that removing youth from their environment is an impediment rather than a help to their rehabilitation. This argument was persuasive with many Congressmen and the 1967 Republican bill proposes turning the Job Corps over to vocational authorities who would make it part of community skill training centers.

CONCLUSION

A review of the three original Economic Opportunity Act work and training programs casts serious doubt whether these efforts achieved the formal goal of the legislation—namely that these programs should lead to economic self-support. Experience indicates the difficulties of accomplishing this commendable goal.

Evaluation of the Work Experience and Training Program provides evidence supporting a program of work relief to alleviate deprivation. The government would assume the responsibility as an employer of last resort, even if the endeavor does not succeed in preparing participants to compete effectively in the market. If the alternative is complete deprivation or public assistance, work relief with participants performing useful labor commensurate with their ability and skill is certainly to be preferred.

It is more difficult to argue for an income-support or work-relief program for youths whose work life is still ahead of them. Too many NYC projects seem to lack meaningful remedial education or training components and the experience gained on the NYC assignments is of doubtful value. Congress has recognized this weakness and has provided authority to place enrollees with private on-the-job training to gain work experience which would help them become more competitive in the open market. There is an urgent need to strengthen the training and work experience of NYC projects.

The idea of providing residential centers for certain educationally deficient youth from impoverished homes appears sound. The challenge of the Job Corps is to provide incentives and to motivate more enrollees to remain long enough to acquire skills which will help them to achieve economic independence.

The experience of the three programs indicates the difficulty of designing and administering mass projects which lead to the economic self-sufficiency of the poor. It is not surprising, therefore, that much of the antipoverty funds has been expended on traditional relief measures to meet age-old problems. We have the economic resources. The challenge is to develop effective programs.

MID-ATLANTIC STATES AIR POLLUTION COMPACT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MINISH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the able Dean of the New Jersey delegation and our colleagues from the States on New Jersey and New York in introducing legislation for the Federal Government to consent to and enter into the Mid-Atlantic States Air Pollution Compact, creating the Mid-Atlantic States Air Pollution Control Commission as an intergovernmental Federal-State agency.

There are few problems more urgent than pollution abatement. It is essential that our public authorities take effective and concerted action to deal with these steadily growing hazards to the health and welfare of the American people.

I read recently that one humorist, only half jokingly, had warned foreign visitors to America not to drink the water nor breathe the air. This has especial significance to our New Jersey-New York metropolitan area which welcome millions of visitors annually and which is considered to have the greatest concentration of air pollution of any metropolitan area of the Nation. The seriousness of the situation can be seen from the findings of the Air Pollution Conference held in the metropolitan area in January of this year by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:

First, there was extensive meteorological and photographic evidence that pollution originating in New Jersey is transported to New York, and that pollution originating in New York is transported into New Jersey.

Second, the New Jersey Turnpike Authority showed that air pollution contributes to visibility restrictions that endanger the safety of traffic.

Third, Representatives of the Airline Pilots' Association, the Air Transport Association of America, and the Federal Aviation Agency, showed that decreased visibility due to air pollution demands special measures to insure the safety of aircraft operations.

Fourth, widespread damage to vegeta-

tion by sulfur dioxide occurs throughout the area.

Fifth. Deterioration, damage, and destruction of materials, including historical and architectural art objects and monuments, was attested to by several experts in their respective fields.

Sixth. The total economic burden to the 17-county bistate area was detailed by a consultant in environmental health and safety to the U.S. Public Health Service, who made a thorough analysis and evaluation of the myriad factors involved. This study indicated that the annual cost of air pollution in this area is $3 billion. This is an average of $200 per person per year, or an average of $620 per year per family.

Air, which is tasteless and colorless, should be odorless. Air, which we thought was free, unlimited, and invigorating, has been replaced by fog, smog, sulfur, carbon, and nitrogen dioxides.

All the essential ingredients of an air pollution disaster are present in the mid-Atlantic airshed—the factories, the powerplants, the apartment houses, incinerators, open air fires and oil refineries, chemical smokestacks, bunker No. 6 fuel oil, soft coal, and millions of fast-moving vehicles spewing out their lethal exhaust. All that are needed are the proper meteorological conditions of still, stagnant, cold, moist air. The pall of death and disease would soon be upon us. A forecast of what can happen occurred Thanksgiving 1966 when smog enveloped the metropolitan area—that near disaster was avoided solely because nature relented and the winds dispersed the mass of polluted air into the atmosphere.

Our interest in controlling and reducing the air pollution that arises from all these sources must be translated into action now. The States of New Jersey and New York are to be congratulated upon this compact which sets an example to the remainder of the Nation. Congress recognized the need for a concerted attack upon pollution problems in the passage of the Clean Air Act of 1963. It owes it to the States of New Jersey and New York to take prompt action on this legislation so that these States can move ahead without delay in this essential antipollution fight. I urge immediate attention to this resolution.

ADDRESS OF CORNELIUS J. HAGGERTY TO AFL–CIO BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION TRADES DEPARTMENT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, more than 4,200 building trade workers recently met here in Washington as representatives from all over the Nation to the 12th legislative conference of the AFL–CIO Building and Construction Trades Department.

Cornelius J. Haggerty, president of the department, made the keynote address to delegates who represented 3,500,000 workers. Since they were here from every State and every congressional district in the Nation, I am sure that all of us will be interested in what Mr. Haggerty said. Under unanimous consent I place the transcript of his address in the RECORD at this point:

Delegates, I want to first of all extend a warm welcome to each of you in this 12th Legislative Conference of the Building and Construction Trades Department. I want to especially sincerely thank you for being here today and this week to take part in the effort to make our views known to Congress during their consideration of the many legislative issues which are of such vital importance to our Nation, to the world security, and peace in the all American way of life.

Many groups come to Washington during Congressional sessions to express their opinions to their representatives in Congress. Many come in their legislative endeavors as unencumbered as do we. No group has ever shown such evidence for the good of all of our Nation. No group has ever been so concerned with legislation which would benefit every segment of our society as have the Building and Construction Trades.

Our program is not limited to Building and Construction Trades, nor is it confined to labor issues—rather it is a program that equates with our motto—We Build America.

It is on that theme that I would like to open this conference this morning.

We are building trades men. We build America. I would urge each of you delegates here to conduct your discussions with your representatives on Capitol Hill, keeping that thought in mind.

Further, I would urge each of you to impress upon your representatives the fact that we are not here with hat in hand, rather we are here representing the largest segment of organized labor, the most geographically distributed group of organized labor, the most politically intelligent, politically astute group of organized labor in the United States.

You might tell them that there is not a city, a county, a town or a village in this country that is not covered by a building trades local union.

You might tell them that our 18 International and National Unions have over 8,400 local unions in over 600 cities throughout the 50 States, with over 3.5 million members. And you might add that we are here to urge that they give our request favorable consideration.

We want to know exactly where they stand. They are our representatives, and we are entitled to know. It should be no secret. In their replies we want an honest, sincere answer.

I would urge each of the delegates in your visits to get that kind of a reply to your queries. Later in the sessions I will discuss this in more detail. We want detailed and exact reports on each visit so that we know exactly where we stand. It is up to you to furnish that detailed information. Again let me repeat that we are not interested in further study.

Now, with these few opening remarks, I would like to go into a little more detail about our program.

Situs-Picketing for a good many years has been our number one major objective. In the last Congress the Situs-Picketing bill was favorably reported by the appropriate committees in the House up to and including the Rules Committee. The bill was scheduled for a vote in the House. In an unprecedented move, the Chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee refused to allow the bill to come to a vote. Rather than go into a long discussion of that parliamentary procedure, I think it suffices to say that we lost passage of the bill at that time, but, I believe, only temporarily. The bill, H.R. 100, is now again pending before the Rules Committee. Over 100 statements representing many organizations were presented on our behalf in favor of the bill.

This year one of the largest organizations in the construction industry—a management association—has gone all-out to defeat our legislative program, especially the Situs-Picketing bill. They have literally spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in an all-out attempt to convince not only the public but the members of Congress that Situs-Picketing would disrupt the stability of the construction industry.

This organization just recently sponsored a meeting here in Washington of 35 national organizations, all against Situs-Picketing. What a roster—NAM, Chamber of Commerce, National Auto Dealers, the Associated General Contractors, and about 25 others.

Their main speaker was Senator John McClellan and the theme, of course, was how Situs-Picketing would destroy America.

It was the same pitch as we heard about the 25c minimum wage—Social Security—unemployment compensation, aid to education, and so on.

I mention this to alert you to expect this approach when you go to the Hill.

I would like to go into detail on each of the many legislative problems with which we are of course concerned—I can't do that in this conference because of time. I know that our speakers will touch on most of these in one way or another—before you leave today you will certainly have heard every approach to our legislative positions.

In general our program contains liberal and progressive policies which would benefit all of America.

The legislative goals of the Building and Construction Trades Department are not selfish. They are not designed to benefit only organized workers. They are not designed to benefit any one class in our economy. Rather they are aimed at making our nation a better place for all of us—a stronger and a more secure country—a nation which is at once the envy of all the people of the world and the goal which they seek to achieve.

The delegates will notice that a number of our listed legislative objectives are familiar. Many of them have been before the Congress for a long time.

This is no cause for discouragement. While the legislative process is often painfully slow, we do make headway from time to time.

May I again point out to you that the Situs-Picketing Bill (H.R. 100) is the most important labor bill pending before the Congress. Our opponents are increasingly active and strong.

In order to secure passage of this bill, we must all be ready and willing to work together. We are counting on your help while you are here to personally contact your representatives in Congress and convince them to vote for this legislation.

Every Building Tradesman has a duty and an obligation to do his part. I know you will make a good contribution in your contacts with Members of Congress. With your full cooperation, we will get the job done successfully.

Let that be the prevailing spirit of this Conference.

I might point out to you that we would appreciate very much, as I mentioned in this short statement, detailed reports of your contacts with the Congress when you report back on Thursday. The forms will give you the required spaces for this purpose. And I would suggest that you not use just a generality of your findings with a certain Congressman or Congresmen, but that you take the form and individually set forth for us, for our benefit in the office, just what is the position of

Congressman John Doe or Jane Roe. If you do that, we won't have, as we have had in the past, forms showing there are 30 Congressmen from X State, 20 good, 10 bad. That is not enough for us. I would appreciate your taking these forms in view of the fact we have cut out the Thursday reporting roll call of the States, and get the reports to us in the office of the Federation.

MOVING EXPENSES

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TUNNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, last year, and again this year, I introduced legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that construction workers shall be allowed the deduction for moving expenses without regard to the length of time they are employed at their new location. It has recently been brought to my attention that seasonal and migrant farmworkers face a similar problem due to the nature of their employment and I am introducing an amended bill today which would bring them under the provisions of my earlier legislation.

At the present time, the law does not allow a deduction for moving expenses unless "during the 12-month period immediately following his arrival in the general location of his new principal place of work, the taxpayer is a full-time employee, in such general location, during at least 39 weeks."

For all practical purposes, neither a construction worker nor a seasonal or migrant farm employee can benefit from this provision which is so beneficial to other workers. Farmworkers, for example, may move many times during the year. I see no reason why construction workers and farmworkers should be denied the benefit of this tax provision simply because of the nature of their employment.

DAN PARKER: AMERICAN WRITER

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I learned with deep regret of the death on May 20 of a friend and distinguished citizen of my hometown of Waterbury, Dan Parker.

Dan Parker rose from the position of reporter for Waterbury newspapers to that of conducting one of the most famous and widest read sports columns in the country.

Others have celebrated the noted sports writing of Dan Parker; his vivid and accurate use of dialect and his discovery and popularization of offbeat Broadway characters. Some, too, have paid tribute to his fine personal qualities; his warmth, his kindliness, and his loyalty.

I should like, however, in this brief notice to emphasize one quality of Dan Parker that has perhaps not been sufficiently recognized—his development over the years into one of the great American artists in English prose.

He never wrote a bad sentence, nor a lazy sentence. His standards were impeccable and he scorned the shoddy, the hackneyed, and the second rate. Many of us hoped that in his later years he would devote himself to the writing of pure literature, but that was not to be.

In these days when the creation of a logical and coherent English sentence seems to become increasingly more difficult, Dan Parker shone out like a beacon light. May his example be an inspiration for coming generations of Americans.

As a fitting tribute to Dan Parker, I include herewith a column by Bob Considine entitled "Dan Parker: Best-of-Breed."

[From the Baltimore News-American, May 24, 1967]

DAN PARKER: BEST-OF-BREED

When the word came over the wire that Dan Parker was dead, I sat down at the beat-up typewriter I've been using since I worked for him on the New York Mirror and tried to think of some new way of saying he was best-of-breed.

The words didn't come. So I now fall back to something I wrote about him in a recent book named "It's All News to Me." Goes like this:

He was the last and in my estimation the greatest of a breed of sports columnists who was prepared to back up anything he wrote, not with a lawyer but with his bulk, heart, and, on occasion, fists. He was in the tradition of Bat Masterson, Sheriff Bill McGeehan, Boze Bulger, Dave Egan (who editorially asked for contributions to a fund for a Boston cabdriver who ran over Casey Stengel), and Tommy Laird (who didn't like something a San Francisco Seals player shouted to him, tore out of the press box, picked up a bat, and chased the terrified player the length of the field and out the center field gate.)

"Incorruptible Dan Parker wore no man's collar. Let the business office of the Mirror clutter his sports pages with the ads of the horse-touting services and Dan would continue blasting them in his column. Let Jimmy Johnston threaten him with multimillion dollar suits or physical harm (which was ludicrous in view of Dan's 6-feet-5 altitude and 230-pound tonnage) and Dan would continue to refer to the bantam-sized promoter as the Boy Bandit.

"Everybody wrote that Primo Carnera was controlled, by The Mob, but Dan named the mobsters. One of them who came under Dan's withering scorn sent a platoon of goons to Times Square one night to buy up and tear up all copies of the Mirror delivered to the area's newsstands. Dan called Carnera a tottering tower of Gorgonzola whose opponents were bribed or terrorized into taking dives. Then one tense night the two men met on stage at a New York boxing writers banquet. Dan was the only sportswriter in the land big enough to look Primo straight in the eye. For a moment the two stood facing each other in the suddenly quiet place. Primo then assumed a fighting stance. Dan promptly extended his hands, like a kid about to plunge into a swimming pool, and dived onto the stage, which all but brought down the house, literally. It was the perfect pantomine of any of Primo's fixed fights.

". . . He had the most delightful sense of humor of anybody in his field and possibly the truest ear for the language since Lardner . . .

"Dan heard, and presented to the American language, fight manager Joe Jacobs' shuddering remark during a terribly cold World Series in Detroit: "I shoulda stood in bed!" He heard the guy yell from the top gallery at the Garden at two fighters who had failed to throw a single punch halfway through the first round: 'Hit him now, y' bum, y'got the wind witcha!' He duly noted for posterity Charley Dressen's elegy, "The Giants is dead.' . . .

I treasure Dan Parker's description of Tony Galento's fistic style:

"Tony uses the Ely Culbertson, or approach system," Dan wrote. "He approaches an opponent wide open, as if inviting a liver massage. After getting what he wants, he switches to the Irish attack, better known as "the back of me fist to you!" next, he tries "The Shoemaker's Revenge,' or (giving it the heel.)"

His previews of the annual St. Patrick's Day parade up Fifth Ave. are part of the literature of journalism. His poetry was spell-binding. He composed an ode to the first Jewish bronco buster ever employed by the Garden's rodeo, which began:

"I'm an old cowhand
From the Concourse Grand."
What a wonderful talent Dan.

FIFTY CLERGYMEN SUPPORT ISRAEL

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, on the 9th of June 1967, 50 clergymen, representing Protestant, Jewish, Catholic, Greek Orthodox, and Mormon faiths, met and by unanimous agreement adopted a resolution on behalf of the State of Israel.

This resolution was presented at two mass meetings in Las Vegas attended by over 1,500 Jews and Christians, and received a standing ovation.

In an accompanying letter signed by Rabbi Aaron S. Gold, of Temple Beth Sholom, and three prominent Nevans, Mr. Hank Greenspun, Mr. Jack Entratter, and Mr. Al Benedict, the fervent hope was expressed that our Government will act with courage in supporting freedom and justice for the State of Israel.

Under unanimous consent, I insert this resolution in the RECORD at this point, and urge my colleagues here in the House to read it, and to bear in mind the courageous efforts Israel made to survive as a nation, which deserves our support and gratitude.

CLERGYMEN'S RESOLUTION ON BEHALF OF ISRAEL

At a meeting held on Friday afternoon, June 9, 1967, at Temple Beth Sholom, and attended by over 50 clergyman representing Roman Catholic, Mormon, Jewish, Protestant and Greek Orthodox faiths, it was moved and unanimously agreed upon to offer the following resolution on behalf of the State of Israel, to be presented to the proper agencies of the United States Government and the United Nations:

1. We, as clergymen, cannot be neutral

where an issue of freedom and justice is involved. We, therefore, raise our voices to state unequivocally that we believe the cause of Israel is just and right.

2. We favor direct peace negotiations and not an armistice between Israel and her Arab neighboring states, and that these negotiations are to be based on the fact that Israel is a sovereign state, meeting with Arab sovereign states, all participants having full rights and responsibilities in the international community. We further favor a permanent peace settlement as an outgrowth of these negotiations.

3. We favor that the old city of Jerusalem remain under the sovereign jurisdiction of Israel, thus insuring free access to all faiths, at all times, to the holy places located there.

4. We are in favor of Israel's borders becoming viable and defensible.

5. We hold that the following water ways should be international waterways: The Mediterranean Sea, The Suez Canal, The Gulf of Aqaba and the Straits of Tiran, and we favor free and unmolested passage through them to all nations, including Israel.

Signed by the Resolution Committee:

Father James Adams, St. John's Greek Orthodox Church; Reverend Marion Bennett, Zion Methodist Church; Dr. Aaron S. Gold, Rabbi, Temple Beth Sholom; Reverend Douglas Harrell, First Methodist Church and President, Clark County Ministerial Association; Reverend Joseph Kohn, Cantor, Temple Beth Sholom; Father Tally H. Jarrett, Christ Episcopal Church; Father Patrick Toomey, St. Viator's Catholic Church; Mr. Reed Whipple, President, Stake of Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints.

In line with the views expressed in this resolution I had already on the 20th of June joined several of my colleagues in introducing a resolution urging the President to work for five objectives in achieving peace in the Middle East.

This resolution calls upon the President to oppose preconditions for negotiations that would require "the relinquishment of Israel of territories possessed" at the time of the cease-fire.

The five objectives to which I urge the President to address himself, using all diplomatic resources and the United Nations are:

First, Arab acknowledgment of Israel's existence and sovereignty.

Second, freedom of passage for all nations, including Israel, in the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba.

Third, final settlement and acknowledgment of Israel's boundaries by the Arab States.

Fourth, effective restrictions on the flow of arms into the Middle East.

Fifth, resolution of the refugee problem in the Middle East.

I urge the President to oppose preconditions to negotiations requiring Israeli withdrawal from territory held to avoid repeating the mistakes of 1956 which led to a resumption of hostilities 11 years later.

By United Nations declaration Israel legally deserves the status and rights of a sovereign nation and the territorial integrity which such status entails.

PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE PROGRAM

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest efforts of the Federal Government is the Partners of the Alliance program. This vital part of the Alliance for Progress depends primarily on the efforts of private citizens to build important links between citizens of the United States and citizens of countries in Latin America.

Mr. James H. Boren, an outstanding Texan and Director of the Partners of the Alliance program spoke on the subject of the Partners program at a convention of the American Advertising Federation in Houston, Tex., on June 12. I commend the attention of my colleagues to his remarks at that time:

REMARKS OF JAMES H. BOREN, DIRECTOR OF THE PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE PROGRAMS, AGENCY FOR THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION, EASTERN AND CENTRAL REGION OF THE AMERICAN ADVERTISING FEDERATION, SHAMROCK HILTON HOTEL, HOUSTON, TEX., JUNE 12, 1967

Last year, the Government of Brazil honored the Partners of the Alliance which is a private sector element of the Alliance for Progress by issuing a Partners of the Alliance postage stamp. This particular stamp gave recognition to citizen level participation in the Alliance for Progress and it was the stimulus for the establishment of the first philatelic museum in Brazil. Another significant first is attached to this Partners of the Alliance stamp because Astronauts Thomas P. Stafford and Eugene Cernan carried a block of the stamps with them in the historic flight of Gemini IX on June 3, 1966. Those stamps were the first to orbit the earth. On the occasion of the Second Inter-American Conference, held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, in which over 250 delegates from 15 nations participated, a letter bearing one of the orbited stamps and the signatures of Astronauts Stafford and Cernan was presented to Ambassador Pio Correa, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs in Brazil.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs issued a bronze medallion which bore a replica of the stamp on one side and on the reverse bore the statement honoring the Partners of the Alliance. Two additional medallions were specially struck for presentation to Astronauts Stafford and Cernan. At this time it is my honor to present to you the distinguished Consul General of Brazil, Minister Francisco Eulalio Nascimento e Silva.

PRESENTATION OF MEDALLIONS BY THE CONSUL GENERAL TO ASTRONAUTS STAFFORD AND CERNAN

Colonel Stafford serves as a member of the Board of Directors of the Texas Partners of the Alliance and as an advisor to the Oklahoma Partners of the Alliance. In recognition of the contribution which Astronauts Stafford and Cernan have made to the Alliance for Progress through the Partners program, it is my pleasure, in behalf of the Agency for International Development, to present to them this Partners of the Alliance Certificate of Appreciation "in recognition of leadership and significant contribution toward the attainment of the goals of the Alliance for Progress."

PRESENTATION OF CERTIFICATE

These gentlemen have done what men have dreamed about for centuries. They have flown through space as great explorers of the universe. Few men have the great skill, the raw courage, the physical and mental stamina and the driving motivation which combine to give them the opportunity to play a pioneering role in space exploration.

But there are other opportunities and other pioneering roles which are open to every American and it is of this that I wish to think together with you for the next five minutes.

My business is the business of selling opportunity—opportunity for every organization and private citizen in the three Americas to play a constructive role in the great revolution of development that is called the Alliance for Progress.

The Alliance for Progress is often considered to be a United States government program, but the U.S. government is only one Partner in the enterprise. The Alliance for Progress is an umbrella term for the total effort in Latin America through which free governments and free peoples are working in an economic and social development program which will move them into the sunlight of genuine progress.

A successful development program in Latin America require that governments work with governments in providing the environment, the incentives, and the means of building infrastructure and democratic institutions. Government-to-government programs are key elements in the building of roads, airports and seaports.

Governments are also important in the building of savings and loan institutions, private development banks, agricultural extension services, industrial promotion boards, practical programs of manpower development, educational institutions—in short, the building of Latin American institutions to resolve Latin American problems.

But governments alone cannot do the job. If the Alliance is to be successful, it must have the major involvement of the private section . . . not only in terms of investments, but also in terms of citizen involvement in development at the community level. This is the task and the challenge of the *Partners* of the Alliance, and, indeed, this is the challenge which you have already accepted through the outstanding Amigo Program. Walter Guild and Charles Collier in the best tradition of your profession, developed the idea and then put it into operation.

Today, the private citizens of 32 states in the United States are working through statewide Partners of the Alliance committees in a direct alliance with the peoples of 32 areas in 14 countries of Latin America. They are working in the fields of education, agriculture, public health, cultural affairs and business and industry.

Educational activities include scholarships, teacher and student exchanges, teacher training conferences. High school student bodies in the United States are providing the funds for the materials to put the roof, doors and windows on a school built by the self-help efforts of villagers in the Andes and in the lowlands of the Amazon Basin.

Agricultural activities include assistance with farm equipment, volunteer teams of agricultural specialists to assist in the development of cooperative programs directed toward increasing the production of food. 4-H Club students in the United States work directly with 4-H students in Latin America on a wide variety of projects. Assistance is provided to rural campesino federations in self-help projects.

Teams of doctors have responded to requests from Latin American medical authorities to assist in training activities. Drugs and supplies have been provided to the mobile rural health program in Central America and volunteers have assisted in the drilling and equipping of wells for village water supplies.

In the business and industry field, businessmen of the Americas have been brought together to explore, not the general environment for investments, but specific joint venture investments which not only make sense from the standpoint of financial return, but

which make a contribution to the development effort and create sources of employment.

But the Partners of the Alliance, as in any type of partnership, is not a one-way program. The people of Latin America have much to contribute to the United States from their great wealth of art, music, literature, and philosophy. Two weeks ago two young teachers of Spanish from Santa Cruz, Bolivia, returned to Bolivia after working with the school system in Little Rock, Arkansas, in a language improvement program. Next year 8 Bolivian teachers have been requested to assist Arkansas schools in elevating their Spanish instruction.

Three weeks ago a group of 12 ladies from a Latin American country completed a 4-week community development workshop sponsored by the Partners and the State League of Women Voters. They shared their working experiences in social action programs with their United States Partner. Collections of art and tours of performing artists have been made available to the United States Partners from Latin America.

The Partners of the Alliance is not an old clothes program nor is it one involving the collection of worn-out arithmetic books. It is a program through which the private community of the United States can work directly with the private community of Latin America on projects of mutual interest and of mutual concern.

Specific projects are not developed in my office in Washington but they are developed by representatives of the Partners committees.

Statewide Partners committees send program development teams to meet with counterpart Partners committees in Latin America. The United States teams visit the schools, hospitals, farms, businesses and unions during their program visit to their Latin American Partner area. During the last two days of the program development trip the participants identify those areas of activity through which they of the private sector will be able to assist through the involvement of their fellow citizens at home.

The Partners activity focuses upon the element of dignity and gives recognition to the principle that we, in the United States, can learn as well as teach and receive as well as assist.

The 32 state Partners organizations have formed the National Association of the Partners of the Alliance which is receiving outstanding leadership from its president, Edward Marcus of Dallas.

We are proud of the roll call of men and women of the three Americas who are answering the challenge of the Alliance for Progress through the Partners program. This includes such men as Edward Marcus, Astronauts Stafford and Cernan and Emory Williams, Chairman of the Illinois Partners of the Alliance and Vice President & Treasurer of Sears, Roebuck Company. Frank Prins, a manufacturer in Tennessee, who as Chairman of the Tennessee Partners arrives this morning in Manaus on the Amazon River as the head of a program development team. The roll call includes Robert Hansburger, President of Boise Cascade, and Sandy Morgan, a student leader. Dr. John Hannah, President of Michigan State University; Ed Smith, a California businessman and Dr. Glenn Dumke, Chancellor State College System of California; Edwin Brennan, a high school teacher in Wyoming; Marilyn Stafford, a teacher in Herndon, Virginia; Alvin Benley, business leader and philanthropist, of Michigan; Pearl Raupe, wife of a hog farm operator; Bill Sutle, President of the U.S. Jaycees; Al Acken, President of the Council of State Chambers of Commerce and Jimmy Jones of the U.S. Steelworkers in Pennsylvania.

High on the roll of business leaders who are working in the development spirit of the Alliance for Progress is the gentleman I am privileged to present to you at this time, Mr. Harding Lawrence, President of Braniff International.

NEW THINKING FOR FOREIGN ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. REES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, at times it would seem that our international obligations and responsibilities are virtually limitless. Our commitments stretch from the Nile to the Mekong, from the Amazon to the Ganges. No corner of the globe escapes our influence and no action is beyond our notice and concern.

In recent months, there has been an increasing murmur of resentment over our extensive international commitments. This neo-isolationalism sometimes expresses itself in terms of the need to direct our energies and resources to the solution of domestic problems. At other times, and by other groups, it is expressed as a desire to remain disengaged from people whose mores and institutions are different from our own. In either context the impact of this approach would be the same. Its results would be disaster, constituting a return to medieval relationships between nations where we would sit in our castle in xenophobic solitude, moats filled and drawbridges raised.

While I believe that such a retreat from our present position in the world is unlikely, attempts to impose wanton reductions in our foreign economic aid programs threaten those programs and inhibit our ability to take necessary forward steps. The need for such new action is skillfully and compellingly expressed in a recent article by Harrison Brown in the Saturday Review of Literature of June 24, 1967, entitled "The Combustibility of Humans." An honored and able scholar, Mr. Brown warns us anew that we face world famine and and population crises if present programs are not improved. Waging war against poverty, disease, and ignorance is not only less expensive than its military counterpart, but if successfully accomplished, eliminates the major breeding ground for such military action. We are forewarned that the cost of such programs will be great, but that our failure to take such action will result in even greater costs.

I commend Mr. Brown's article to my colleagues and include it in the RECORD at this point and urge its careful inspection and consideration:

THE COMBUSTIBILITY OF HUMANS

(By Harrison Brown)

The United States Government has now been in the business of providing technical and economic assistance to a number of the poorer nations of the world for about twenty years. It seems likely that had we not become involved with assistance programs, certain countries would be worse off economically than they actually are. And the Agency for International Development points with pride to Taiwan as an example of a country in which our efforts have been so successful that it is no longer necessary for us to continue them. Yet when we look at the plight of the poorer countries today we find that from certain points of view they are worse off today than they were twenty years ago. In particular during the last ten years the situation has been deteriorating at an alarming rate.

Although the economies of both the richer and poorer countries have grown at about the same rate during the past decade—about 4 per cent per year, the economic well-being of the average individual in the poorer countries has not improved very much. The reason for this is the relative rates of population growth. Although rates of population growth in the richer countries have dropped to an average of about 1.1 per cent per year, those in the poorer countries have risen to an average of about 2.5 per cent per year and are still growing. Indeed, in some regions rates of population growth are approaching 4 per cent annually. Thus, while on the average the economic well-being of persons in the richer countries is improving at the rate of nearly 3 per cent per year, that of persons in the poorer countries improves at a rate of but 1.5 per cent per year—a rate too small to raise the hope of the individual. The ratio of annual per capita incomes in the richer countries to those in the poorer ones, which stands at about 15 to 1 today, is increasing at the rate of about 1.5 per cent annually, giving rise to what Patrick Blackett, the president of the Royal Society, calls "the ever-widening gap."

Far more serious, however, is the situation with respect to food production. The economic growth in the poorer countries is in large part a reflection of the growth of the industrial sectors in those countries: increased production in the agricultural sector has failed to keep pace with population growth. Today the average person in a developing country has a little bit less to eat than he had ten years ago. Indeed, in Latin America, per capita food intake appears to have decreased continually during the past five years. When we combine this with the fact that even before this decline death from malnutrition was widespread in the world and that more people went to bed hungry than well-fed, we begin to appreciate the magnitude of the problem which confronts us.

By contrast, food production in the richer countries has increased more rapidly than population. Today the average person in these countries has about 10 per cent more food available to him than he had a decade ago. While the poorer nations are becoming hungrier, we are becoming fatter.

Careful examination of rates of population growth and the problems involved in increasing agricultural production indicate strongly that the situation may get worse before it gets better—that in another decade the people in the poorer countries may be even hungrier than they are today. At the same time, the actual situation is even worse than the bare statistics indicate. As the populations in these countries have grown, the pressures on the land have increased and the rural areas have become inundated with underemployed farmers. Many of them have moved to the cities where not enough jobs are available to accommodate the migrants. Away from the land—which at least provided a peasant with some food—unable to find a job, and consequently unable to obtain money to buy food, more often than not the migrant leads a life of abject misery. The plight of the unemployed, unemployable peasants living in the slum areas which threat to engulf most major cities in the poorer countries is so horrible as to be unimaginable to most Americans.

Hungry persons are combustible. In the last decade some 500 million hungry, combustible human beings have been added to the world population. On the basis of the evidence, it seems likely that the roster of combustible people will increase by at least another 600 million in the decade ahead.

Combustible people are, understandably, willing to take almost any action which they believe might mean more food for their families. Add to this the glimpses they get of the abundant life in the rich nations. Add to this the feeling of hopelessness concerning the rate of improvement of their personal situations. They see little change for the better from year to year (particularly with respect to food); they see changes for the worse. Given these ingredients, is it really surprising that we in the richer nations find ourselves confronted by fellow human beings whose social and political organizations are tumultuous, who search endlessly and usually to no avail for political panaceas, and who themselves view the affluent societies of the world with a hatred which becomes more intense with every passing year?

Cuba, the Congo, the Dominican Republic, Ghana, Indonesia, Nigeria, and Vietnam are examples of countries which have recently been torn by strife and bloodshed. That list is destined to become much longer unless something dramatically new is injected into the international picture. We must ask: If we double the number of combustible people and magnify their personal agonies, how many explosions will we experience in the next decade? Perhaps ten? Twenty? Thirty? We must ask further whether these new explosions can be policed. In particular, can an explosion be policed if another major power is nurturing it, with expectations of political and military advantage?

One of the wonders of the modern world is that we in the richer countries permitted ourselves to get into this predicament in the first place. The handwriting was on the wall in clear, bold strokes twenty years ago. Yet, aside from a brief burst of energy in the late Forties and early Fifties, we have managed in effect to do less and less about the problem each year. Seemingly we prefer to wait for the explosion, then to spend more money and effort attempting to achieve a resolution of the problem by force than would have been required had we attempted long ago to achieve on a substantial scale a peaceful economic, social, and political revolution. Our current annual military expenditures for Vietnam are now about ten times greater than the entire nonmilitary assistance program in the world.

Today the earth's inhabitants number some 3.3 billion and the rate of growth probably exceeds 2 per cent per year. Largely as the result of the rapid development of new techniques of public health and their widespread application, we can expect the average rate of growth in the poorer countries eventually to approach and perhaps even to exceed 3 per cent per year. It would be optimistic for us to expect a world population numbering fewer than 7.5 billion persons at the turn of the century. It is now difficult to believe that world population in the long run will be stabilized at much less than 15 billion persons—more than four times the present number.

This tremendous potential for increase in numbers of people is largely the result of our ability to apply science and technology intensively to the problem of postponing death. Our success has depended primarily upon the fact that as new techniques for combatting the major killers in these regions have been developed they have been applied on a vast scale. These applications have not, in the main, required the education of large numbers of people. The primary motivation has been direct and simple: living longer. Teaching full-time crews how to spray the walls of village huts with DDT once each week is a far cry from teaching hygienic habits to an entire population.

By contrast, it is much more difficult to decrease birth rates or to increase agricultural production. In both cases one requires the necessary technology—but equally important, if birth rates are to be lessened and agricultural yields increased, individual motivations must be strong and the knowledge of the techniques must be widespread. Death control is easier to apply than birth control. And both are relatively simple when compared with the problem of increasing agricultural production.

What, then, can be done about the situation? Here, it is tempting to look for the easy way out. Why not, for example, spray contraceptives around the countryside, much as we now spray DDT? Today, attempts are being made to do just that. The intrauterine device (IUD) has been looked upon as a large part of the answer because it is inexpensive, easily inserted, and effective. Overlooking for a moment the fact that some women can't tolerate foreign objects and expel them, and that the devices cause bleeding and pain in other women, IUD's nevertheless seem to work. They appear, for example, to have been a major contributing factor in the reduction of the growth rate of the Korean population from about 3 per cent to 1.9 per cent in the last few years.

We should also look at the worldwide prospects for the spectrum of steroid contraceptives, more widely known as "the pill." These have apparently already had profound effect upon the birth rates in the United States and other Western countries. The present cost of $2 to $4 per month (by prescription), however, is much too high to permit widespread use in developing countries. Nevertheless there is every indication that the cost as well as certain of the biological inconveniences can be greatly reduced, in which case "the pill" could in principle play a role in lessening some of humanity's current difficulties.

There are strong indications, however, that even with the "perfect contraceptive"—one which costs virtually nothing, is convenient to use, has no side effects, and is completely effective—it is by no means clear that it would be used in developing countries on a sufficient scale to reduce the rate of population growth to tolerable levels. There is a real doubt that the masses of people in the poorer countries would have the motivation to use the "perfect contraceptive" regularly on a continuing basis. Within most of the poorer countries, for example, children represent the only real form of social security. The man and wife who do not have children to support them in their old age face a horrible future. And most persons know empirically, from the experiences of countless generations, that if mother and father are going to have one or two male children who live long enough to support them in their old age, they must start with seven or eight children. Starting with only two or three would involve intolerable risks.

Statistics tell us, of course, that mother and father need no longer have seven or eight children to have a good chance for a male child to live long enough to support them. But what does the poor peasant care for statistics? He must be shown that such a change will benefit him rather than endanger him. "Habit," said William James, "is the enormous flywheel of society."

I suggest that a condition for securing truly widespread voluntary use of contraceptives in the poorer countries on a scale which is commensurate with the need is an improvement in the average family's lot at a rate sufficient to enable mother and father to see clearly that their children will live in a better world than that into which they were born. This means that infant mortality and death rates must go down still further, that food production must go up, that economic growth must take place at a more rapid rate than in the past.

The poorer countries must, of course, do everything they can to secure the use of contraceptives on as wide a scale as possible. We in the more technologically advanced countries should do everything we can to develop more effective, less expensive contraceptives which are easier to use. But we cannot look upon contraceptives as the "quick fix," the cheap and easy way out. There also must be enough overall economic and social improvement to enable the individual to see clearly that conditions are changing for the better.

What about food production? Is it not true, for example, that were India only to do what the Japanese have done it could double its yields of rice? This is true and it sounds simple. But let's examine the ingredients used by the Japanese.

The most important ingredient is time. Starting with the Meiji Restoration in 1868 about fifty years were required to double rice yields per acre. To this we must add the use of fertilizers and pesticides which must be produced in factories. Factories require steel, concrete, fuel, and technology. The fertilizers and pesticides must be transported. This requires trains, trucks, and roads. Add to this the scientists who must develop strains of rice which can accept the fertilizer and thrive in a particular ecological environment. Add to this an economic condition which permits the farmer to buy the fertilizers and pesticides and use them. Add to this an educational program which teaches the farmer the new agricultural technology and which convinces him that he can change his farming habits without undue risk. Add to this an economic situation which motivates him to *want* to use the new techniques.

We must conclude that just as there is no simple solution to the problem of population growth, there is no simple answer to the problem of food production. The two problems are related. For their solution both require economic and social development on a broad front.

Unfortunately, our knowledge of how to develop a poor country into a less-poor one is not very good. We can learn some basic lessons by examining the economic, social, and political histories of countries which have recently made the transition, such as the United States, the U.S.S.R., and Japan. We can learn more by examining success and failures in countries which are now attempting to transform themselves. From these experiences we know that large quantities of capital are required. There must be a resource base which can be utilized. There must be a transfer of technology enabling effective utilization of the resource base. There must be education, the development of technical and administrative skills, the evolution of technical, economic, and social "problem-solving capacities" (i.e., local research and development capabilities). And ever-present is the question of social organizations—old ones must be changed and new ones must be created.

No one today knows enough about the development process to say just what the most effective "mix" of these ingredients should be for a given country. But certain conclusions can be drawn.

First, a great deal of time is required for the transition. Thus far, at least, there is no such thing as "instant development." We must think in terms of many decades rather than of years.

Second, most of the poorer countries appear to have reached the point where they simply cannot, without help, extricate themselves from the vicious circle in which they now find themselves. Population growth rates have grown too high, per-capita food production has fallen too low, and the crushing problems of urbanization and industrialization have become too great. Certainly few, if

any, of the poorer countries are in a position to develop by themsevles at rates which are sufficiently rapid so that the economic and social well-being of the average individual improves visibly during his lifetime.

It seems clear that in the absence of truly substantial help from the outside, the poorer nations are headed squarely toward famine, pestilence, revolution, and bloodshed on a massive scale—with consequences for the rest of the world which are difficult to foresee. But in addition to being substantial the help must be sustained. And if it is to be effective it must be balanced. Thus far, development efforts in the world have not been large enough, nor have they been sustained, nor have they been adequately balanced.

Official help from the industrial countries of Western Europe, North America, and the western Pacific—which, with less than one-fifth of the world's population, produce and consume more than half the world's product—now amounts to about $6 billion a year. Our experience thus far suggests that this is woefully inadequate. Yet in proportion to the incomes of these nations aid contributions have actually decreased from 0.8 per cent to 0.6 per cent during the past five years.

In 1950 the nonmilitary economic aid given by the United States as grants and loans amounted to 1.3 per cent of our gross national product. Only about 4 per cent of the help was then in the form of loans. By 1955 our contribution had dropped to 0.5 per cent of our GNP; by 1960 it had dropped further to 0.4 per cent; by 1965 it had dropped to 0.3 percent of our GNP, and more than 50 per cent of the help was by then in the form of loans.

As to the quantity of economic assistance which the richer nations might make available, it seems clear that the poorer nations could almost immediately absorb effectively several billions of dollars worth of capital and technical assistance each year above the present level. I personally am sympathetic to a suggestion made by Barbara Ward that the industrialized nations ought to agree to provide each year 1 per cent of their GNP's for economic assistance. Using such a formula the United States' share of the burden would decrease with time.

Given some such formula for determining the quantity of economic assistance we would then be faced with the problem of maximizing its *quality*. What proportion of the available funds and effort should be channeled through international organizations? What proportion should be handled on a bilateral basis? What countries should receive the greater share of the support? What should be the proportion of outright grants relative to loans? What fraction of the total effort should be devoted to technical assistance?

Considering the poorness of our understanding of the development process these are extremely difficult questions to answer. Yet they are questions which the United States, by virtue of its vast economic power in today's world, must take the leadership in answering. We must help improve the effectiveness of economic assistance channeled through international organizations. We must above all improve the quality of our own bilateral efforts. We should make certain that as much thought, ingenuity, research, and planning go into the development of our own programs of economic assistance as now go into our defense effort.

These considerations raise a further critical question. Were the United States really to decide to embark upon a substantially increased nonmilitary program of economic assistance in collaboration with other countries—an effort which would be commensurate with world needs—would our existing governmental institutions be adequate for the task? Could the Agency for International Development together with the Department of State, to which the Agency is attached, cope effectively with a $7 billion budget which might exceed $10 billion in ten years and exceed $15 billion in twenty? Could they together develop the needed tactics and strategy?

I have been privileged during the past six years to travel widely in the developing countries. I have worked with AID in Washington and have spent a great deal of time with some of its missions overseas. I have come to know well many dedicated, selfless men and women in the organization who work night and day trying to keep essential programs going and trying to make sense of a situation the magnitude of which dulls the senses. But a man, no matter how dedicated he might be, can be little more effective than the organization within which he works.

AID, in its various structures and forms, has been so beaten upon and derided over the years, particularly by our Congress, that it simply is no longer an effective organization. It has built so many defense mechanisms within and around itself that it is a wonder that it functions at all. The political pressures force the Agency to think in short-range rather than long-range terms. Long-term planning becomes increasingly difficult with each passing year. Research is often looked upon as something nice to talk about but too far out to be of use.

I place much more responsibility upon Congressional attitudes (which reflect public indifference) than I do upon the Agency itself for this sad situation. At the same time, it seems to me that we have reached the point where another name change, another retrenchment, another reorganization will only compound the difficulties. Recently the Agency went through yet another reorganization, stimulated by a new slogan, "War on Hunger." I seriously doubt that this reorganization will result in any substantial increase of food production in the hungry regions of the world. But it already has resulted in the virtual destruction of AID's research program, which many of us have attempted to nurture during the past five years and which until this recent reorganization seemed to be a program of great potential effectiveness.

I believe we have now reached the point where we must profit from past experiences, both good and bad, and create something entirely new in the way of governmental institutions to guide our nation's efforts in economic assistance. Because the problems of economic development are fully as important to our long-run security as those now faced by full-fledged government departments, including the Department of Defense, we should consider the establishment of a completely new department, the head of which would be a member of the Cabinet. This should *not* be AID or any of its predecessors operating under a new name. It should be an entirely new organization concerned at first primarily with the problem of developing a strategy for effective assistance. The new organization should be connected to the Department of State only through the President. It must be in a position to decide questions concerning resource allocation, the levels of technical assistance, and the size and nature of research and development programs, and be divorced from daily shifts in international political winds.

Of most immediate concern, however, is the attitude within Congress toward economic assistance, and particularly the relationships between the Executive and Legislative branches of our government regarding this problem. It would be a tragedy were the Vietnam conflict to divert us from constructive actions which can help prevent new Vietnams.

The appropriate committees within the Senate and the House should make searching inquiry—in depth—into our nation's present and future roles in economic assistance. These committees should examine in detail assistance problems and expenditures in relation to military problems and expenditures. They should look at the international organizations. Above all, they should examine our handling of these problems within the framework of our government.

We in the United States often fail to recognize our real power in the world. It is not military power. It is the power of ideas, of invention, of getting old jobs done in new ways. I believe we have the power economically and technologically to play a major role in creating a world in which all persons can lead lives free of the threat of starvation. But our ability for creative leadership will not be with us much longer. We must use it while we can.

STEEL SURPLUS

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, one of this country's major industries is facing a serious crisis. Our great American steel industry is faced with a large and growing surplus of steel supply in the world market and world prices which are below full production costs. Just this week the Wall Street Journal, in a front page article, called attention to the serious problems of the industry and pointed out that the ultimate solution may well have to come from Washington.

In recent years, the total number of steel-producing nations has increased from 30 to 66. Some 20 years ago the United States produced approximately 70 percent of all steel in the world; today it is in the neighborhood of 26 percent. And there is no reason to believe that this trend is going to be reversed in the near future. As the Wall Street Journal pointed out, imports surged 20 percent above the year-earlier level during the first 4 months of this year.

Certainly the steel industry is making every effort to use all the resources available to them to increase research and development activity and to improve the efficiency of their plants. The capital outlay for such improvements has risen sharply over the last several years. In spite of this, however, the industry is still unable to match the distressed import prices.

Mr. Speaker, in just a few short weeks, the Senate Finance Committee is going to release the contents of a study on the problems affecting the steel industry. This study was authorized by the Senate last year after extensive hearings. I have not yet seen this study, but I am sure that it will spell out quite clearly what the industry problems are and what solutions should be considered.

It may be that a logical followup of this study should be a World Conference on Steel. If so, I urge that the U.S. Congress give such a meeting its strong endorsement. If it appears that tighter tariff controls on imported steel products

and pig iron are necessary, then I think that such a measure should be given full consideration by this Congress.

I certainly hope that when the study is released every Member of this Congress will give it his full review so that the necessary steps can be taken to maintain a strong and healthy steel industry in this country by creating a climate of equitable competition between domestic and foreign producers.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR EUGENE J. McCARTHY OF MINNESOTA, COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES, UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME, JUNE 4, 1967

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased to be able to call to the attention of my colleagues an address delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota, the Honorable EUGENE J. McCARTHY, at the commencement exercises at the University of Notre Dame on June 4, 1967.

Senator McCARTHY also received an honorary degree of doctor of laws at the ceremonies.

In his address, Senator McCARTHY called upon the more than 1,600 graduates to "reaffirm your belief in the dignity of every person, your trust in humanity, and your confidence in reason, sustained by faith and building upon it."

Senator McCARTHY was one of nine recipients of honorary degrees. The others were: Lawrence Cardinal Shehan of Baltimore; Archbishop John F. Dearden of Detroit; U.S. Commissioner of Education Harold Howe II; James E. Armstrong, retiring executive secretary of the Notre Dame Alumni Association; Oliver C. Carmichael, Jr., chairman of the board of Associates Investment Co., and a Notre Dame trustee; Charles S. Desmond, retiring judge of the New York Court of Appeals; Frank D. Murphy, chancellor of the University of California at Los Angeles; and Edmund A. Stephen, Chicago attorney and chairman of the Notre Dame Board of Trustees.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD, excerpts from Senator McCARTHY'S outstanding address:

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS OF SENATOR EUGENE J. McCARTHY, COMMENCEMENT, UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME, NOTRE DAME, IND., JUNE 4, 1967

Giving a commencement address would be, if not for the protection given by tradition and by its place in the ritual of graduation, a dangerous if not a desperate venture.

This might seem a good time for me to leave the platform, or if not, to proceed to give a kind of "music-minus-one" speech with the melody left out, or to use the anti-commencement approach of Bob Hope who has been advising graduates not to leave college and come out into the world, which he describes as a harsh and rough place. I could choose the easier way of speaking on a subject of limited scope and current application.

I shall not take this easy way out, however. This is a time of special challenge. A commencement speaker, if he plays the game fairly, is expected to present the meaning and significance of all a student has learned in four years of college, and make a projection of the bearing of that learning on the life of each graduate and, in a more generalized and comprehensive way, on the society of the future.

Assuming the responsibility of such depth and breadth is not as difficult for members of the Senate as it might be for other persons. We are not unaccustomed to making rash judgments. Every civilization has of necessity developed a formally functioning body to give ultimate rash judgments—in some cases the medicine men are used, in others the witch doctors, oracles, or high priests. The contest of America today, in politics at least, is between members of the Senate and the columnists, who currently have a slight lead on the Senate but who are without the support of the Constitution which quite clearly directs the Senate to advise the President and, of course, by implication the country.

IN RETROSPECT COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS SHOULD HAVE MEANING

A commencement address, although it may have little significance to graduates on commencement day, should, if recalled thirty years later, seem in retrospect to have been worthwhile.

Forty-six years ago, a speaker at a Notre Dame commencement sent the graduates off into the world with these reassuring words:

"The line of demarcation between right and wrong in every situation that can confront us, whether in professional or business life, or civic and social action, or in the multitudinous details of domestic experience has been clearly and infallibly drawn for us."

Thirty years later, the graduates of that class must have been somewhat unsure of the applicability of this text, and forty years later even less sure as they attempt to deal with the problems of the new morality and of situational ethics, to say nothing of the multitudinous details of domestic experience.

Thirty-four years ago, in 1932 in the midst of the depression, the members of the graduating class of Notre Dame were told, among other things, that the later appraisal of the men of the Thirties would result in their being criticized not for having done too little but for having tried to do too much, and they were warned that the threat to government budgets was due to increased charges for health, educational and social betterment.

These warnings in the context of today's expanded welfare programs, new levels of production, slightly different views on balanced budgets, deficit financing and inflation are not wholly relevant.

Much of the text of an address given here only twenty-five years ago on the dignity of womanhood and on the contribution of the church to the definition, preservation, and advancement of that dignity does not quite fit the sociological, psychological, and theological context in which the role of women is being considered today.

Thirty years from now, or perhaps twenty years from now, and possibly within ten years what I say may be wholly out of date or irrelevant. If so, I will have this defense: that we are today not at a threshold but beyond it in an age in which we have more power and competence—physical and intellectual—than we have ever had before; in an age differing from previous ones in that the mass of problems—not just in politics but in every aspect of life—is greater than it has ever been before. It seems to us quite suddenly all of these press in upon us; all of them say, "We are here," and they demand from us some attention and some judgment and, following that, some commitment.

SPEED OF CHANGE MORE RAPID THAN EVER BEFORE

And secondly, in that the speed of change is more rapid than it has ever been, we are called upon today to respond not on a timetable of our own making, but on a schedule or a timetable made for the most part by the very movement of history itself.

The greatest problem today is not that of the dead hand of the past holding us back, but of the violent or the threatening hand of the future which reaches back for all of us—politicians, educators, students, theologians—everyone.

Consider how much simpler it was, let us say, for Leonardo DaVinci. In dealing with the problems of aerodynamics, he did not have to keep in mind the question of how what he discovered might be used in the design or development of intercontinental ballistic missiles. Or Descartes dealing in abstract mathematics, not having to take into account the fact that his mathematics would be applied through modern technology in the development of nuclear weapons, and not having to take into account the way in which computers and chain reactions can take an abstract or pure idea and give it magnified and terrible application. Or someone like the monk Gregory Mendel dealing with heredity in the patch of peas, not having to take into account the problems which the nuclear biologists today must face.

Decisions in all of these areas must be made in broad social context and, to some extent, through social organizations and formal institutions.

Despite the fact of change, we must not dismiss institutions and other storehouses of values and meanings, or discount their influence too quickly or too easily. On the other hand, we must be ready to accept change and to bring about change and to discard that which is no longer useful. Father Gregory Baum has written wisely in *The Ecumenist*, March–April, 1967:

"Since institutions are made to promote man's life in society, they inevitably reflect the understanding of man that is current at the time they are created . . . What is happening today is that with a new self-understanding many Christians find that these institutions no longer adequately promote human life. . . . This does not mean that the men responsibile for the institution were lacking in generosity and kindness. . . .

"It is the people living the life that must give shape to the institutional patterns that serve them, and it is in this very process of finding the best institutional forms that men are drawn into participation and begin to experience themselves in a new way."

More than ever these decisions must be made by individuals, facing new situations without clear formulas and without the protection of accepted rules and traditional practices.

The general call is for the emergence of the human person, for the intensification and personalization of life whether this be reflected in the call for the emergence of the bishops or the emergence of the laity in religious life, or the emergence of the Senate and the emergence of the more fully responsible citizen in political life, or the acceptance of a greater measure of responsibility on the part of corporate directors and also for the intellectual and moral involvement of stockholders and of employees in the determination of corporate policy.

Education, educators, and the educated are always on trial, but they are on trial in a very special and clear way today.

THE EDUCATED PERSON MUST CONTRIBUTE TO SOCIETY

Forty years ago, Gilbert Chesterton wrote that every time problems arise someone gets up and says that what we need is a practical man to solve the problem. The difficulty, he said, was that there was usually one

around or perhaps more than one. But today, in the face of new and complex problems, while the role of the practical man or the experienced is not wholly rejected, it is more common to ask for an educated man, a student, for one who has given study to the problem.

The educated person no longer has the excuse that he is rejected or unappreciated: an excuse which had some validity in the last century. He no longer has the opportunity to run far ahead of decisions; history somehow has caught up. The advanced position of the philosopher, of the scientist, of the historian, and of other scholars has been overrun in many instances.

Every intellectual discipline today is called upon to make some contribution to society, as is every educated person.

Each important judgment must be made within the context of history and in relation to moral judgment as to right and wrong.

Politicians and those responsible for government decision have throughout the history of mankind been concerned about what historians might say about them. They have worked out various devices to help with the record. Many carried their own scribes; some still do. Julius Caesar—a kind of do-it-yourself historian—used, I suppose, the safest method. He wrote his own history. In any case, not only politicians but people generally look today to history and historians, accepting both the poet Santayana's view that to ignore history is to repeat all the mistakes of the past, and that of the politician-historian Churchill that to depend only upon the past is the best way to lose the future. We are asking historians today, and everyone is more or less an historian, to pass judgment upon the past and to help explain the present and to make projections into the future.

And more and more people today are seeking moral guidance and direction, turning to the philosophers and the moralists for help and for suggestions. This is the most serious test of the educated person. Those who preferred to think of themselves as pilgrims of the absolute, in a detached and unrelated world which was not to be challenged, are now called upon to become pilgrims of the relative; to, as Jacques Maritain has urged, enter into the fabric of their own time to perfect the means by which men are perfected in time and perfected for eternity.

The wisdom that comes 25 or 30 years after graduation—somewhere between the ages of 40 and 50—is not in new knowledge, but in the realization that one must pretty well make it with what he already knows and with the powers he has been given or has developed. In part, it is in the realization that it is too late for speed reading to help very much—if it ever does—or for the *Reader's Digest* or the *Catholic Digest*, or a crash course in the "Great Ideas," even directed by Mortimer Adler, to do much good.

FOUR POINTS OF ADVICE: DO NOT COMPROMISE METHODS

Whereas my positive advice to you has been limited and somewhat unclear, as you have noted, my negative counsel and suggestions are somewhat more certain.

Do not yield to the temptation to compromise methods in pursuit of acceptable purposes, to consider persons as expendable, or to what T. S. Eliot has described as the worst treason—to do the right thing for the wrong reason.

Many men have written and spoken on this point, but none better, at least in recent days, than Henry Steele Commager before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, when he said that certain government activities "in the various realms which have been called to our attention of late violate two of the great Kantian categorical imperatives: the first is never use any human being as a means but always as an end; and the second is so to conduct yourself that you might generalize your every action into a universal rule. The danger," as he saw it was in substituting "the immediate advantage for the longrun disadvantage; that it uses great things like scholarship, science, the community of learning, truth, for immediate purposes, which it doubtless thinks are worthy, but which, in the long run, are not to be compared with the larger purposes of learning, scholarship, literature, art, and truth. And the reason that they are not to be compared in the long run is that that is what the shortrun purposes are about."

AVOID THE TEMPTATION OF THE "INNER RING"

Second, avoid the temptation of the "inner ring." It is a very special temptation in the midst of complexity if not of chaos, in times of institutional failure and flux. The "inner ring" comes in many sizes and serves many purposes. On a national and international scale, we have seen it in its broadest form in fascism and communism, but almost every day we find it present and operative among our friends and associates. C. S. Lewis has spoken best on this in his essay entitled *The Inner Ring:* "I am not going to say," he wrote, "that the existence of the inner ring is an evil. . . . The desire which draws us into Inner Rings is another matter. A thing can be morally neutral and yet the desire for that thing may be dangerous. . . . This desire is one of the great permanent mainsprings of human action. . . . Of all passions the passion for the Inner Ring is most skillful in making a man who is not yet a very bad man do very bad things."

DO NOT CORRUPT LANGUAGE

Third, do not corrupt language and be attentive to protecting its integrity: first, as to the obvious obligation to speak the truth; and second, in the more subtle commitment to preserve and protect the meaning of words. As Allen Tate has written, man has an immediate responsibility, to other men no less than to himself, for the vitality of language. He must, said Tate, discriminate and defend the difference between mass communication, for the control of men, and the knowledge of man which must be offered us for human participation.

DEVELOP A KIND OF INDIFFERENCE TO WHAT YOUR BIOGRAPHERS MAY SAY OF YOU

And finally, this is a kind of ultimate test, be not overly concerned as to what the record may have to say about you if to make that record you must be false. Seek that high state of secular humility which leaves man to speak and act without fear and without concern for the judgment of his contemporaries or his biographers, or any judgment the world may pass upon him. I suggest two models: Harry Truman in politics, and Pope John XXIII in religion.

If one believes that man is the subject of history rather than simply the object, controlled by economics and by common will or by some other irrational force, if one acknowledges that the period of half-civilization and half-knowledge of the 19th century has been shattered, if one accepts that we must be prepared to face the judgment of our own person and of our nation and of our age, then the need is for a full response, accepting the commitment of Teilhard de Chardin in confidence and hope in the future.

You must reaffirm your belief in the dignity of every person, your trust in humanity, and your confidence in reason, sustained by faith and building on it, as the only defense against ignorance and false fear, as the instruments and power by which you can give some direction to life and to history.

TELEVISION X-RADIATION LEVELS REQUIRE IMMEDIATE ATTENTION

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, on May 18, 1967, Director James Terrill of the National Center for Radiological Health of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Public Health Service stated, in a prepared release on television X-radiation, that—

Studies made by the National Center for Radiological Health of several television sets during the past six months did not give rise to concern. All of the sets tested gave off radiation well below the limits (.5 mr/hour*) recommended by the National Council for Radiation Protection.

The full text of that statement follows:

STATEMENT BY JAMES G. TERRILL, JR., DIRECTOR, NATIONAL CENTER FOR RADIOLOGICAL HEALTH, OF MAY 18, 1967, CONCERNING X-RADIATION FROM CERTAIN GENERAL ELECTRIC COLOR TELEVISION RECEIVERS

The General Electric Company recently advised us that it had started a modification program involving rework of certain large-screen console and table model color television receivers. I understand that the problem was in the high voltage power supply and does not involve the picture tube.

General Electric representatives informed us that the modification program was started because the Company found higher than desirable levels of x-ray production were created during the operation of some models of these color television sets in tests by the Company. This emission is directed through the bottom of the set, toward the floor, and not toward the viewer.

Studies made by the National Center for Radiological Health of several television sets during the past six months did not give rise to concern. All of the sets tested gave off radiation well below the limits (.5 mR/hour) recommended by the National Council for Radiation Protection.

The General Electric Company stated black-and-white or small-screen "Porta-Color" sets are not involved. It identified the sets about which it is concerned as certain large-screen color TV receivers manufactured between June 1966 and February 1967, and purchased after September 1, 1966. The Company advised us that its entire distributor-dealer service organization has been mobilized to contact owners of such television sets to arrange for the modification, and that modification will be made without charge to the customer.

As of now there is no evidence in the hands of the NCRH to suggest that any television receivers manufactured by the General Electric Company, or television sets made by other companies, have excessively exposed viewers of television sets.

---

*Milliroentgens per hour. One milliroentgen equals one thousandth of a roentgen; a roentgen is the international unit of x-radiation or gamma radiation equal to the amount of radiation that produces in one cubic centimeter of dry air under standard conditions of temperature and pressure ionization of either sign equal to one electrostatic unit of charge.

As can be expected, Mr. Speaker, on the basis of that reassurance many consumers of this Nation believed that although they quite possibly owned a defective television receiver there was no threat of actual physical harm. What could have resulted in a cry of citizens for protection became, instead, an utterance of dismay and discomfort over the inconvenience of receiver modification.

May 22, 1967, I told Mr. Terrill that—

I should welcome being informed of just what is the nature of the evidence in the hands of NCRH on which you make this final statement.

The full text of that inquiry follows:

MAY 22, 1967.

Mr. JAMES G. TERRILL, Jr.,
Director, National Center for Radiological Health, Bureau of Disease Prevention and Environmental Control, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TERRILL: The General Electric Company in circulating a press release of May 18 from Syracuse, New York, concerning its recently recalling 90,000 large-screen color television sets for modification because they emit x-radiation in excess of desirable levels, has accompanied it with a statement made by you under date of May 18 concerning x-radiation from certain General Electric color television receivers.

The last paragraph of your statement states: "As of now, there is no evidence in the hands of the NCRH to suggest that any television receivers manufactured by the General Electric Company, or television sets made by other companies, have excessively exposed viewers of television sets."

As you know, the Committee is interested in the subject of hazards in products which are sold to households and, accordingly, I should welcome being informed of just what is the nature of the evidence in the hands of NCRH on which you make this final statement as well as a description of the tests made by NCRH to determine that color television sets are below the safety limits recommended by the National Council for Radiation Protection.

In addition, I should welcome information as to how the standards were set by this Council, when they were set, and who are the members of the Council.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN E. MOSS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance.

Following the letter of May 22, for various reasons, my concern on the subject of the health and safety of individuals owning these television sets continued to grow. Finally, after considerable weighing of the reported situation, it became clear that the circumstances warranted full and complete investigation. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance considering legislation to create a National Commission on Product Safety, I spoke to the Honorable HARLEY O. STAGGERS, chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee who immediately authorized committee staff to visit various laboratories across the Nation and the Public Health Service Laboratory in Rockville, Md.

Mr. Terrill replied to my letter of May 22, on June 8, 1967. At the very minimum the reply can be described as startling. It follows:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
Rockville, Md., June 8, 1967.

Hon. JOHN E. MOSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MOSS: In reply to your letter of May 22, 1967, we are pleased to provide the following information regarding X-radiation from color television receivers.

Our statement of May 18, 1967, was based on exposure information reported to us by the General Electric Company, the nature of the principal source of exposure, and data from our own limited measurements of X-radiation levels in the vicinity of color television sets in home use.

We have recently assembled at our X-ray Exposure Control Laboratory in Rockville, Maryland, a system for simulating the conditions of operation of the defective shunt regulator tube in a color television receiver. Our purpose has been to verify the character and level of X-radiation leakage which may expose individuals and to test the efficacy of the tube replacement and modification procedures being carried out by the General Electric Company. Our measurements have generally confirmed that the X-ray leakage beam is directed downward in crescent shape with levels ranging up to 8,000 mr/hr at a distance of 7 inches from the defective tube. Levels of radiation scattered from floors or set surfaces are substantially less than in the direct beam but may exceed the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurement limit of 0.5 mr/hr at distances up to two feet from the set.

There is no question that the levels observed in the sets with defective tubes and shielding are in excess of the limits recommended by the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurement. Fortunately, the character of the X-ray leakage should prevent excessive exposure of people under those conditions of normal viewing where personal access near or to areas beneath the set is limited.

Our measurements have generally confirmed the levels of X-radiation arising from the defective shunt regulator tube reported to us by the General Electric Company. Presently, as I discussed with you during my recent visit to your office, our efforts, and I believe those of the General Electric Company, are directed toward correcting these defects as rapidly as possible. We are also obtaining X-radiation measurements in the vicinity of defective television sets and corrected sets to determine how estimates of possible overexposure can best be made. Presently, an organized study has not been possible, because we have been emphasizing the correction program. However, it seems that there should be only a fraction of the sets that would overexpose people in the normal viewing position. The numbers of people exposed to excessive levels will depend heavily on their relationship to the direct beam, the time they are exposed. and the fraction of defective tubes associated with this group. Some situations reported to us since our statement was made on May 18, require further investigation before final conclusions can be drawn.

Based on information now available to the Public Health Service, our conclusions are as follows:

1. Operation of sets with the defective electronic tube produces X-radiation levels considerably in excess of the limit of 0.5 mr/hr recommended by the National Council for Radiation Protection and Measurement.

2. While we can confirm that the X-radiation beam is directed downward through the bottom of the receiver, we have determined that the height at which some television receivers are located in some homes or places of business is sufficient so that individuals can be exposed to excessive X-radiation.

3. We also believe that a person immediately in front of an offending set can be exposed to X-radiation in excess of the recommended 0.5 mr/hr level from the scattering effects of the downward directed beam.

4. In light of the foregoing, we believe that any color television receiver suspected of emitting excessive X-radiation which could expose individuals in other than a normal viewing situation should not be operated in that location until the offending shunt regulator tube has been replaced. The State health departments have been asked to inform their local offices of these recommendations.

In our evaluation of the X-ray leakage associated with color television, we have referred to the recommendation of the National Council for Radiation Protection and Measurement published in the July 1960 issue of *Radiology*. A copy of the recommendation is enclosed for your information. Dr. Lauriston Taylor is President of the Council whose membership is listed in the attached copy of a report it recently published.

We appreciate your interest in these matters. If there is additional information we can provide, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES G. TERRILL, Jr.,
Director.

Leakage ranged to a level of 8,000 milliroentgens per hour. The height at which some television receivers are located in some homes or places of business is sufficient so that individuals can be exposed to excessive X-radiation.

By what possible explanation can the statement of safety assurance of Mr. Terrill on May 18, be reconciled with the totally shocking contents of his letter of June 8.

And, I might add, that during these past 2 weeks, my staff and I have taken every step possible in discussions with representatives both in industry and Government to examine the contents of the June 8 letter. There is no longer any question in my mind about the validity of its contents.

Mr. Speaker, the facts gathered by the committee staff coupled with the dangers certified by the letter of Mr. Terrill on June 8 underline the need for hearings at the earliest possible on this subject.

The public is entitled to reassurance that their Government will not permit products of questionable safety to enter the marketplace.

COOPERATION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADIAN POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD an address made by the Honorable Jean-Pierre Cote, Postmaster General of Canada, at the first day cover ceremonies held at the U.S. pavilion at Expo 67.

Mr. Cote's remarks to a postal case in which the United States and Cana-

dian Postal Departments cooperated in a magnificent manner and which serves to manifest, as Mr. Cote states:

That one of the noblest tasks of the Postal Service is to make every endeavor to facilitate the transmission of communications between individuals and nations throughout the world, independently of all other considerations.

The address is also a fine testimonial to our highly esteemed Postmaster General, Mr. O'Brien, his able assistant, Mr. Desautels, and the entire U.S. Post Office Department. I commend it to all my colleagues.

REMARKS BY THE HONOURABLE JEAN-PIERRE COTE, POSTMASTER GENERAL, AT THE FIRST DAY COVER CEREMONIES, U.S. PAVILION, EXPO 67, MAY 25, 1967

Mr. O'Brien, Ladies and Gentlemen, the importance of this day is wrapped up in a postmark reading "U.S. Pavilion, Montreal, Canada."

At first glance to others than philatelists the postmark may appear to have little significance. How wrong that assumption could be. The postmark in question represents the cooperation of two postal administrations, of two friendly countries and of two neighbourly peoples.

It was conceived during a friendly, neighbourly visit when I was in Washington talking—of all things, Post Office—with Mr. O'Brien. It represents the departure from procedure that is witnessed once in a lifetime. The circumstances which created it may not be seen for another lifetime.

The postmark is unique in that it will cancel U.S. postage on United States mail processed on a Canadian island in the heart of Montreal. It will carry the story of cooperation between our two countries throughout the world. It will be treasured in philatelic collections from this day on and will be a lasting reminder of how Government Administrations can work together.

The stamp which the United States issued to honour Canada's Centennial is further proof of our neighbourliness. To Canadians—who according to writers of the day are trying to discover their own identity—this stamp is a reassuring gesture that our country is known and that our partner in North America is very aware of our forming history.

I have tried to sketch in what I consider to be the significance of this occasion. Of course there is another aspect which is of interest to the Expo authorities. This stamp and this postmark are a solid way to advertise to the world, Expo as the biggest show of Canada's Centennial celebrations.

In all I am happy to have had a part in the events that culminated in today's programme. I thank Larry O'Brien and the United States Post Office for this demonstrated consideration of Canada.

As I said, I am happy to be part of this ceremony today which demonstrates that large agencies of national Governments can cooperate on organizational and promotional matters. Recently, though I took part in an exercise which should demonstrate for all time that the oft-designated bureaucratic agencies of our respective Governments can rise to the occasion and serve the citizens of our countries when all other help is passed.

Again the affair was a matter of cooperation between the United States Postal Administration and the Canada Post Office. To be specific it concerned a set of X-Ray plates and physical records of a little girl in Calgary who was afflicted with cancer of the bone. The plates and records had been sent from Calgary wrongly addressed to a hospital in New York. Having failed at delivery they were in the mail stream somewhere being returned to Calgary. Chelley Lynn, the little girl in question, was not in condition to undergo further X-Ray diagnosis. It was imperative the plates and records be intercepted and delivered to the proper hospital in New York.

A phone call to my friend Lawrence O'Brien started the massive search machinery in motion. Between his officers and my Ottawa group, the package—believe it or not—was recovered in the Milwaukee area. It was taken from there personally by a United States Postal Inspector to New York.

With Mr. O'Brien's permission I would like to read the letter I sent him following the story I just related:

"It was not an easy task to attempt to locate a letter being returned to the sender, in the mail stream between New York and Calgary at 10:00 P.M. on a Saturday. This is one more reason why it was such a real gratification for me to learn, within two hours after I had phoned your office, that your efforts to intercept the X-Rays and other documents originally mailed on April 29th in Calgary, Alberta, to the address of the Pack Medical Clinic in New York had been fruitful. I was also deeply appreciative of the special arrangements made by your administration to have the registered item in question picked up in Milwaukee, conveyed to New York and delivered early Sunday to the Pack Medical Centre.

"The fate of thirteen year old Chelley Lynn Stanway, who is fighting for her life, had become a matter of national interest and the attached copy of a front page news item appropriately describes what was made possible through the splendid cooperation of your administration. I want you to know that I am most grateful to those concerned in your Department for the prompt and indeed very special attention that was given to my request. I should not dare attempt to describe the feelings of Mr. and Mrs. Ken Stanway when they learned that their plea for assistance had met with such response, because in such moments of deep apprehension and grief, feelings cannot be expressed, they are felt.

"I cannot think of a better example of international cooperation to illustrate that one of the noblest tasks of the Postal Service is to make every endeavour to facilitate the transmission of communications between individuals and nations throughout the world, independently of all other considerations.

"I should be most grateful if you would extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to your Mr. F. E. Batrus and Mr. Desautels for their valuable cooperation and their diligence in bringing this case to such a quick and satisfactory conclusion."

The reason I brought this case into the ceremony today is that I thought it, beyond anything else I could say, demonstrates fully the theme of Expo 67—Man and His World.

THE SST PROGRAM—A UNIQUE BLEND OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE EFFORT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FULTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in the true tradition of our contemporary subsonic jet fleets whose operations span the globe, the purpose of the SST program is to develop and produce an airplane that is safe, economical to operate, superior to competitive designs and which will result in a major step forward in commercial world air transportation.

Because the airplane is very large and will represent significant advancements in technology, the Government has estimated it will cost approximately $1.1 billion during phase III to build and flight test two SST prototypes. It is obvious that Boeing, General Electric, and American industry do not have the financial resources to invest this amount of money, with no hope of return for 10 to 15 years. It is also obvious that American industry is not in a position to compete with the financial resources of the British, French, and Russian Governments. These Governments are providing outright grants to their airplane industries to produce competitive commercial supersonic transports—airplanes that our U.S. airlines would have to purchase if the U.S. SST program did not move forward with Government assistance. The sheer size of the investment, the time required to recover the investment, and national and international business impact of an SST makes it mandatory that our Government provide major financial assistance and initial program leadership in concert with our airplane and airline industries in the development phases of the SST program. Ultimately, it is planned to turn the whole program to the private sector without any Government support as soon as it is feasible. Such studies are underway at this time.

Through contract negotiations, the Government and the manufacturers have reached agreement on the cost sharing and recovery provisions of the prototype contracts. The Government-industry cost share formula for the prototype construction is 90 percent for the U.S. Government and 10 percent for Boeing, General Electric, and their subcontractors. The $52 million invested by U.S. airlines in the prototype program will reduce Government investment by an equivalent amount. Should there be an overrun during the prototype construction, the manufacturers will pay in addition 25 percent of any such expense without limit. This year Congress will be asked to appropriate $198 million to the $200 million approved thus far. During each of the next 3 fiscal years Congress will be requested to approve additional development funds necessary to complete the prototype phase.

The Boeing investment in phase III contract costs and new facilities unique to the SST is expected to exceed $100 million. Similarly the General Electric investment in contract costs and new facilities is expected to exceed $50 million.

The Government's total investment in the SST will be recovered when approximately 300 airplanes have been sold. By the time approximately 500 SST's have been paid for, the original investment plus interest will have been received by the Government. A 500-airplane market will be adequate to provide a basis for developing a competitive airplane price—estimated to be $40 million—that will permit all participants—the Government, the airlines, Boeing, General Electric, and American industry—to recover their investment and make a profit.

The present financing arrangement makes the SST a venture in which the

manufacturers and the airlines representing the private sector, and the Government representing the public sector will share in the financial risks as well as the fruits of a successful program.

PROPER LIMITS ON LEGITIMATE PROTEST—ADDRESS OF JUDGE CECIL MORGAN

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, Justice Holmes once said, in a Memorial Day address:

> I think that, as life is action and passion, it is required of a man that he should share the passion and action of his time at peril of being judged not to have lived.

This Holmesian charge to the young aptly sums up the spirit of many of the thousands of commencement addresses which now are being delivered to graduating students at colleges around the country. But Holmes' challenge to the young has received no better expression, in the commencement addresses which have come to my attention, than in Judge Cecil Morgan's talk of May 21 to the young ladies graduating from St. Mary's Dominican College in New Orleans.

Judge Morgan, who is well known to many of my colleagues in Congress, is dean of one of our country's most respected law schools, the Tulane University School of Law. We Louisianians are particularly proud of Dean Morgan, whose public career in our State included service as attorney, district judge, and U.S. commissioner. Prior to returning home to assume the deanship at Tulane, Judge Morgan served as executive assistant to the chairman of the board and as counselor of Standard Oil of New Jersey, in which positions his professional competence and unfailing kindness and good humor won him scores of friends and admirers here in Washington.

Judge Morgan's address at St. Mary's contains a particularly thoughtful discussion of the proper limits which should guide legitimate protest in our society and of the desirable role which citizens should play in the evolution of law. I was struck by its timeliness and wisdom and wish to bring it to the attention of my colleagues:

GRADUATION ADDRESS BY CECIL MORGAN, AT ST. MARY'S DOMINICAN COLLEGE, NEW ORLEANS, MAY 21, 1967

The most reverend archbishop, the reverend clergy, Sister Mary Louise, faculty of St. Mary's Dominican College, members of the graduating class, friends, our community can take pride in this day, this occasion—pride in these graduates stepping forth full blown into responsible citizenship—pride in the institution that sends them forth, educated, poised, disciplined and fortified for life's battles with religious training and with an assurance that comes from a background of stability as you move into this free and fast-moving society. It is a tribute to Dominican and to you that you have so successfully reached this important day. Surely the strain has been great, as have your labors.

You have listened to many speeches in recent months that remind us all of this era of accelerated change. We constantly read of it. Our public figures refer to it repeatedly. Educational institutions set up conferences on various subjects in which recent developments figure most prominently. We are reminded often of scientific breakthrough and its impact on everyday life; of new developments in transportation, communications, living conditions, food, drink and drugs. Above all, we are told of the unrest of nations, of new forms and patterns for government, of the movements of people from the farm to the city, and of decisions of the Supreme Court that change our way of life—new law and new attitudes toward law. There are new expressions of public officeholders toward law and society and there is the advent of The New Radical.

Change is disrupting. It shatters tradition; it destroys old values and suggests new and strange ones. It takes away our sense of security along with our complacency and comfort and peace of mind. From the confusion springs a new order of society.

What is your part in this process?

This is a day of protest. Protest seems to be associated with youth and a beard. Here at Dominican you have youth, but nature has not provided you with a beard. You can find some beards across the street. Possibly they are beginning to disappear again in this process of change, but they are with us still. The beard is a symbol of protest right now. Some beards are quite handsome. There were the fine cleft whiskers of Charles Evans Hughes, and there was Monty Woolley, known as "The Beard" for his handsome hirsute adornment, and there was the dapper Bernard Shaw and the virile brush of Ernest Hemingway. Even the Smith Brothers used their chin whiskers for advertising purposes. Some good things come of protest too. But not protest in a vacuum. Some beards today seem attached to a vacuum—they are just beards of protest, and this is their day. They must demonstrate, but what? If you don't have a beard, you do have a mini skirt, so you can demonstrate too. You can picket. Available to you today are sit-ins and stand-ins, sleep-ins and love-ins, and you can picket the store, the city hall, the school, the White House. You can laze on campus and riot at Fort Lauderdale. In effect you have protested the language. I am sure you at Dominican are "in" people, not "out" people. You are surely "hep" and maybe "mod." Do you know anyone here who is "way-out" or just "square"? Whatever your language, we shall attempt to communicate.

As I said, you are stepping into a strange world of protest, and some protest has brought forth good. Witness, for example, the origin of the Dominican sisters. They were organized by St. Dominic in the 13th century to care for converts from the albigensian heresy, and that heresy was a terrific protest. And you will also note that the Dominican Friars were established in the year 1215, the same year that one of the great protests in history took place at Runnymede where the barons wrested from King John the Magna Carta, which was a sort of prototype for all declarations asserting our rights since that time.

Speaking of beards and protests—the great protest that brought our own country into being, the Declaration of Independence, was signed by a wonderful group of clean-shaven men. Look at the reproduction of the great painting by John Trumbull on the walls of Yale's Art Gallery, a painting entitled "Declaration of Independence", and see the faces of the signers. From John Hancock to John Adams, from men as old as Benjamin Franklin down to the three twenty-six-year-old youths from South Carolina, there was not a single whisker! That great protest was not made in a vacuum—it was the basis for something very constructive, and it grew out of confusion.

With or without beards, let us protest. We will be glad for all the beards and miniskirts to join us. Also, all of you in dignified robes and any form of garb. Let us start our protest with a frank acknowledgment of confusion, and let us cut through all the brambles and beards of confusion and see if we can make some sense.

Permit me to be reminiscent and nostalgic. Do you recall that young men volunteered to join the army and suffered great chagrin when they were not called upon for overseas duty—instead of burning their draft cards? When lightheartedly they departed to the strains of Sousa's stirring martial music instead of the current folksinger's lament? When we snapped to attention and tears ran down our cheeks when the national anthem was played, instead of complacently permitting our flag to be burned? When we made speeches on occasions such as this or on the Fourth of July and made the eagle scream, instead of listening to a screaming mob? Or when it was proper and expected to quote Patrick Henry "Give me liberty or give me death!" instead of "Give me liberty though I have confessed I am guilty?" Or when Stephen Decatur said, "My country, may she ever be right, but right or wrong, my country," instead of "My country is wrong, I will not fight in Viet Nam." Oh! those were the swing years, as Sid Nowell says. I do not know what he means by the swing years, but they seem gone, and I am nostalgic for some good old patriotic platitudes. I protest, and you and I shall invoke another good old platitude: "This is a government of laws and not of men." Now, with this historic statement before us, we awaken from our nostalgic dreams and face the realities of today. We start with the acknowledgment that resistance, or for that matter protest without purpose, is futile, but that we have a great and urgent requirement that we direct the course of change for the betterment of our society.

Within the government of laws let us direct the affairs of men. Where the laws are wrong, we will reform them. Where men are intransigeant, we will do our utmost by education, by precept, by fair and efficient administration of justice to correct them. Where the needs of men are shown to us, we will meet those needs, even if we must surrender our prejudices we treasure and our compacency we enjoy. We do *not* surrender our basic governmental structure that sustains our ordered society.

In our country that ordered society rests upon a tripod of government and the separation of power among the three strong supports was the answer to tyranny. The statement that included the phrase "a government of laws and not of men" was that of John Adams incorporated in the Declaration of Rights, a part of the constitution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts of 1780. Article XXX of that document had to do with the separation of powers "to the end it may be a government of laws and not of men." This phrase can be misunderstood. Let us remember that our government, though of laws, is "for" men. Their needs cannot be overlooked. And while this phrase is not found in the Declaration of Independence or in the Constitution of the United States, its import runs throughout our entire system—that system which meets the needs of people in changing society within the body of laws that protects our liberties, insures stability of government, and challenges us to adaptation to new conditions, conditions that arise as a matter of course in the continuing American Revolution.

In this period that principle is put to a test. This test has been in progress ever since the adoption of the Constitution and is no new problem. Chief Justice John Marshall

dealt with it, in the same context of criticism as of this day.

Early concepts of constitutionalism, before constitutions were in written form, included the idea that there was a contract between the state and the individual citizens thereof, that the state provided certain liberties and protections in return for various obligations of taxes and military duty and obedience to the laws. A breach of this obligation called for penalties. In later years, and in the new forms growing out of the philosophical writings of the 18th century, the caprice of monarchs in the government of states led to the fragmentation of power in the state and the writing of the law even applying to the state itself. Anarchy results if this legal structure breaks down.

You remember the dialogue of Socrates and Crito, as reported by Plato, involved the question of whether Socrates should escape from prison and save his life. He was condemned under the laws. But Socrates persuades Crito that escape would be a defiance of the laws and suggests that it would be a move to overturn the laws and the whole state, and he asks the question: "Do you imagine that a state can subsist and not be overthrown in which the decisions of law have no power but are set aside and trampled upon by individuals?" He further ridicules the idea that if the state has injured us and given us an unjust sentence we should thereby be privileged to defy the laws. But the important part of this dialogue is his statement: ". . . whether in battle or in a court of law or in any other place he must do what his city and his country order him; or he must change their view of what is just . . . ." As their dialogue comes to a close, Crito is quoted as saying: "Now you depart in innocence, a sufferer and not a doer of evil; a victim not of the laws but of men. But if you go forth, returning evil for evil, and injury for injury, breaking the covenants and agreements which you have made with the laws and wronging those who you ought least to wrong . . . you are as an enemy." And as the dialogue ends and Socrates is determined to observe the laws and not break prison, he says: "Leave me then, Crito, to fulfill the will of God and to follow whither he leads."

While we condemn civil disobedience be it remembered that when officials and functionaries and police officers impose upon persons or discriminate against groups, they themselves are disobeying the laws that we purport to uphold and they place themselves in the same untenable position as those who engage in civil disobedience in pursuit of a cause. Governors of states, as well as marchers in a protest demonstration, can be equally culpable in the processes leading toward anarchy and the defiance of the rule of law.

The Greek philosophers understood the value of the ordered society while advocating reform. The Bible gives support to ordered society and provides the basis for reform. John Adams forcefully suggested the rule of law while he participated in the great reform that established our country. We may be impressed by the conscientious Thoreau and the spiritual Gandhi, but the great body of thought today supports our democratic process. As a people we fear the obvious dangers of civil disobedience and we relegate this procedure to the realm of abstract speculation and condemn its advocates for subjecting our ordered society to peril and to violence. It would seem a simple and uncomplicated doctrine to say that we do not subscribe to a program of civil disobedience on some shallow or irrelevant pretext. We support the ordered society and the rule of law; we abhor chaos. We render unto Casear the things that are Caesar's while we put forth our best efforts to bring about the reforms that our moral sense demands. Within the framework of law and by bringing about the necessary changes we meet the needs of people. In the words of Socrates—"We must change their view of what is just."

In our consideration today of protest and the reform of law, let us be fully aware of the responsibilities of lawyers, judges and officials on the one hand and the average citizen on the other. And let us keep in mind that neither can be successful in meeting his responsibility and in preserving the basic structure of our society without the other. Consequently, it is not outside of the concern of you young citizens, housewives to be, teachers, lay or religious, secretaries, for us to consider a few illustrations that may seem to be in the province of lawyers primarily.

We are all aware of our fundamental right to assemble peaceably, to express our views and to demonstrate as long as we do not impose upon the rights of others. When we trespass upon the freedoms of our neighbors, our rights cease and the rights of others predominate. This conflict of principles is forever before us in the cases that go to the Supreme Court. There have been three recent cases that illustrate the point. The *Edwards* case in South Carolina went to the Supreme Court of the United States in 1965, the *Cox* case in Louisiana in the fall of 1966, and the *Adderley* case in Florida is just now being reported. Let us forget the contributing issues in these cases because there is such a confusion of problems—like segregation, possession of property, use of public property, breach of the peace, freedom of expression. We are not deciding those issues today. We are considering the obedience to the law, and how the law is changed, and how it develops. These three cases all involve questions of constitutional rights. All of them are cases where people have legally exercised their rights to the questionable point. At that questionable point in the South Carolina case, by a divided court, the law was interpreted to be that the demonstrators had not overstepped. In the *Cox* case there was a similar ruling. But in the *Adderley* case in Florida the court began to delineate the limits of what could be done by demonstrators on public property and it was held that this group violated the trespass laws of Florida. The point here is that, whether we agreed with the first of these decisions or not, the court, given the opportunity with the right kind of a case, often dispels our fears that a trend will go too far.

In another recent case one of the four dissenting justices said: "The holding in this case today makes it more necessary than ever that we stop and look more closely at where we are going." These decisions on difficult and narrow questions, decided by 5–4 opinions with strong dissent, do indeed establish the law of the case and suggest a trend. But, you know, it is very difficult for us to be sure of what the court has said and has meant in a given case. Extensive opinions are written by the organ of the court, possibly supported with different reasoning by other members of the majority and then equally extensive dissents are added. Sifting through this mass reporters translate to the news media their interpretation of what the court has held. The public is likely to see in these opinions something that the court has not intended. Our reactions might be quite violent and we are prone then to criticize and to exercise that citizen's privilege, which I enjoy myself. However, to go so far as to berate a single member of the bench and blame him for all the ills we anticipate from such a decision is not quite justified. Let us remember that the judge writing the opinion may be only one of five judges who agree. There may be four who disagree. This dialogue between the two groups is part of our process for arriving at policy decisions, and the majority view prevails. Nor can we subscribe to the castigation of our courts as American institutions. Let us rather support our institutions and let us keep open the dialogue between the group who in one case may represent a majority and the other group a minority opinion. And let us bring before that court those cases which arise presenting similar points, in order that that court may fully develop the concept that may be at issue. Just as in these trespass cases the court has commenced to delineate the trend that was feared, so may it in other instances of our great concern, if given a chance, do the same.

We are all perturbed over the problem of crime in our own community. Almost all other communities throughout the land are equally apprehensive. We hear the names of landmark cases like *Gideon, Escobedo, Miranda,* and *Mapp*. Many point to the difficulties of law enforcement resulting from the holdings in these cases and some, without proof, believe the crime wave, which has increased, is related to these opinions. Maybe we should bring these cases into focus.

Gideon got his reversal, but suffered his punishment. Miranda was released and tried again on the same charge and convicted under the rules the Supreme Court laid down. Escobedo in Chicago under police surveillance is no menace to society. Mapp is no threat. The fear of the trends in these cases is a threat. The essence of these cases reduced to simplest terms is that accused persons must be warned of their constitutional rights and have counsel at an earlier stage in the proceeding than had been thought necessary heretofore, and the constitutional safeguards of these rights are applicable to state courts as well as federal courts; that confessions cannot be used if obtained under circumstances which violate these principles; and that evidence obtained from searches and seizures without a search warrant cannot be used against an accused. It is true that these holdings have made the problem of law enforcement more difficult for our state law enforcement officers. However, most of these rules have been applicable to federal enforcement, particularly by the FBI, and consequently enforcement should not be considered impossible. Properly obtained confessions can still be used and quicker procedures for obtaining search warrants are in the making. Re-training of police officers is in progress and new habits are being formed. We still, however, have some fear of the ultimate result of these decisions. But, if our trial courts will take the responsibility and do the extra work that is entailed in an analysis of the cases which come before them and if these courts will responsibly render judgments in accordance with their own values of justice, the Supreme Court will have an opportunity to limit the extension of the views expressed in these landmark cases. This is the process by which the court-made law can be properly molded, and, as much as we deplore legislation by courts, we must recognize that there has always been court-made law.

Many good things have come of these cases. There is a reassurance of the guarantee of our freedoms and our rights, and the validity of the Bill of Rights. There is a warning and a promise. What has been the perfectionism of the FBI must be injected into the state law enforcement officials. Diligence and fairness must prevail. Police abuses must cease, and be replaced by police efficiency. Citizens must pay more taxes and exact greater protection. The public should work with officials to the end that these processes are effective. The rules are tough and they put us on our mettle. There are movements in process in the direction of legislative correction of some portions of these holdings that public opinion and a segment of legal thought would condemn as going too far and not necessary to the protection of human rights. So either through a continuing judicial process or through a legislative process changes in the law are

being effected to bring about that balance between protection of the individual and protection of society.

The trespass cases we referred to a while ago and the cases involving criminal procedure that we have just discussed have reference only to two of the board issues of the day in the realm of law reform. Citizens like you have an interest, however, in a broader spread of subjects. You may be preoccupied with social change. The law must follow those changes when they are established. We are all concerned with the rise of crime and the difficulty of law enforcement. There are other and fully as important problems demanding solution. Solution means teamwork between those directly involved with the law and those citizens who live within it. One of the first requisites for proper participation by citizens is the requirement for information. We condemn the protest without a purpose; we see the shortcomings against which we protest. Now how shall we see the purpose to be effected? There is a wealth of knowledge available to us. The educated man or woman is the one who has the capacity for finding the facts, for objective analysis, and for communicating the facts and the analysis to others, which leads to sound and straight public thinking.

Only recently the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice has issued an extensive report with a wealth of statistical and factual information and a careful and painstaking evaluation thereof by the greatest experts throughout the country. Supplementing this report, just at the end of April has come the report of the task forces of that Commission on the police, another volume of extensive material forming a handbook for the organization and training of the police under our new guidelines. Amongst the comments made by this Commission I note the following: "Law enforcement cannot remain static and still serve the public adequately. Progress will require change in many of the time-honored ways in which numerous police officials have habitually functioned." And again I note many paragraphs having to do with citizens' involvement in policy making and the problem of intercommunication and leadership—all of this emphasizing the role to be played by the citizen in this evolution of the law. It should be noted that our police department and various civic groups in our own city are working together to bring about needed improvements, and the opportunities for service on the part of all citizens is tremendous.

Our law schools are concerned these days with substantive matters that have to do with the proper method of handling the psychotic violator of the law, alcoholism, and other illnesses. The question is being raised with respect to the justification for treating the sick as if they were criminals while still protecting the public from the dangers. The bar associations are confronted with momentous questions of judicial enforcement, particularly in large centers where thousands of accused persons are herded through the courts in assembly-line fashion. Are there not better methods of protecting the public and at the same time protecting the rights of the individual? Should the judicial process be encumbered with petty offenses such as traffic violations or should not the administrative process be sufficient?

Public bodies are faced with problems of housing, slum clearance, drainage, sewage disposal, and industrial growth and economic opportunity, and legal representation of the poor. All of these problems are multiplied and have become severe because of urbanization and growth of our mobile population. The structure of local government must change and must change rapidly to meet these urgent requirements because this disruption breeds an increase in social unrest. And our problems will not go away but will be multiplied. We cannot brush them under the rug. Innumerable studies are being made and have been made; many facts are available upon which judgments can be reached. The drag and delay at arriving at solutions are caused in various degrees by public apathy, political entrenchment, dedication to the status quo, and a dearth of vigorous nonpolitical leadership. If our leadership is that of the demonstrator and the one who protests without a purpose, the ills from which they and we are suffering will persist and grow worse. Our cry is for the leadership from those willing to protest and vigorously under the rule of law, with purpose and with affirmative determination, utilizing the tools at their command.

Our national goals may not have been articulated by you recently but they have been by some of our best minds, and I suggest that you read them. Our many institutions, public bodies, private organizations, and particularly professional groups, have important programs completely outlined in the realm of model constitutions, city charters, local governmental structures, codes of law on a multiplicity of subjects, uniformity of law, handling citizen complaints against bureaucratic abuses, the defense of the indigent, legal representation of the poor, and many other subjects of great importance. All these materials are at our command to fill that vacuum to which so much of the protest is attached. The opportunities for creative thinking, for blazing trails, for pioneering, for carrying torches are unlimited. Unleash your energies in these directions, and you will have no time for demonstrations in a vacuum—there is too much that is constructive for you to do.

Let us state our position directly:

The current mood of protest without a program, the new Radicalism with overtones of violence, are dangerous. Our institutions are valid, but our answer to this current mood is reform within these institutions and under the rule of law. There is no place in our philosophy or under our system for civil disobedience. The time for lamenting change is over. The natural effects of this evolution are to be dealt with. Mold them to the building of a nobler society. You may choose to be involved in political activity and this is all right; but if you choose to be involved through community service as a private citizen, there is no justification to resort to political expediency. The citizen must support sound programs. Whoever is in office should be influenced by the virtue of these programs. It is citizen action that makes worthy programs popular, and popular programs are most likely to be followed by the officeholder, whoever he may be.

You enter this new society having thrown off inhibitions, traditions and other similar shackles. You start afresh. Things are moving fast. You must think straight. Confusion resulting from these changes challenges you to avoid chaos, for your generation cannot restore order in that event. For your own sakes and for succeeding generations, that which is good must be saved—stability must be preserved. So plunge yourselves into this great protest against confusion. Think things through and do your part in your respective spheres of influence. Use your knowledge and apply your principles. See the alternatives. Stand fast upon the eternal rocks. Carry a banner instead of a placard. But move with the inevitable metamorphosis of life, guide it and make your own contribution to the attainment of your highest goals in a nobler society. You have a choice.

And as the poet William Arthur Dunkerley has said:

"To every man there openeth
A Way, and Ways, and a Way,
The High Soul climbs the High Way
The Low Soul gropes the Low,
And in between, on the misty flats,
The rest drift to and fro."

I believe you will choose the High Way, for you are graduates of St. Mary's Dominican College.

ALBERT EINSTEIN COLLEGE OF MEDICINE COMMENCEMENT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TENZER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, on June 2, 1967, commencement exercises were held at the Albert Einstein College of Medicine of Yeshiva University.

Yeshiva, founded 81 years ago in New York City as an advanced school, for the training of rabbis, became a university in 1945. Its record of growth and achievement in 20 years is a tribute to its distinguished president, its officers, members of the board of trustees and board of overseers.

In 1955 the Albert Einstein College of Medicine was established. The story of the medical school is one of vision, courage, and faith in our democratic way of life. The college was built through the generosity of men and women of all faiths throughout the country. It has advanced in a few years to the front ranks of American medical schools and is now embarked on a new program to meet the challenges of medical progress.

The oath to the students receiving medical degrees was administered by Dean Marcus D. Kogel, M.D., and the dean's remarks relate the background leading to the use of the Declaration of Geneva in lieu of the oath of Hippocrates at medical school exercises throughout the country. I place Dean Kogel's remarks in the RECORD at this point:

DEAN KOGEL. The physician bears an awesome responsibility. He confronts daily issues of life and death. For more than 2,000 years it has been the custom before admitting a student to the privilege of the medical degree, that he take a solemn oath that he will use his knowledge with wisdom and compassion for the benefit of his fellow man. The traditional oath bears the name of Hippocrates. The language in which our predecessors repeated this pledge is no longer spoken—the gods which they called to witness have been discarded—but few nobler thoughts have ever been voiced.

Within our living memory, a nation undertook a deliberate policy of extermination of a whole people and to the everlasting shame of the medical profession, physicians participated in this crime against humanity. It is therefore necessary to exact a pledge from each physician at the time of being admitted to the medical profession not to use his medical knowledge to further the crime of genocide.

The oath of Hippocrates does not contain this pledge—the oath that I will ask you to repeat after me is known as the declaration of Geneva, and it was adopted by the General Assembly of the World Medical Association in 1948.

I will now administer the oath. Will the candidates please rise to receive the oath.

THE OATH

I solemnly pledge myself to consecrate my life to the service of humanity.

I will give to my teachers the respect and gratitude which is their due;

I will practice my profession with conscience and dignity;

The health of my patient will be my first consideration;

I will respect the secrets which are confided in me;

I will maintain by all means in my power, the honor and the noble traditions of the medical profession;

My colleagues will be my brothers;

I will not permit considerations of religion, nationality, race, party politics or social standing to intervene between my duty and my patient;

I will maintain the utmost respect for human life, from the time of conception; even under threat, I will not use my medical knowledge contrary to the laws of humanity.

I make these promises solemnly, freely, and upon my honor.

Mr. Speaker, the commencement address was delivered by Dr. Sidney Farber, professor of pathology, Harvard Medical School at the Children's Hospital and director of research, the Children's Cancer Research Foundation in Boston.

As one of the five original House sponsors of the 1965 regional medical centers to combat heart disease, cancer, stroke, and other killing diseases, I was very pleased to read Dr. Farber's remarks and I urge my colleagues to do so.

The address follows:

CHALLENGES AND GOALS OF MEDICINE

(By Sidney Farber, M.D., presented at the commencement exercises at Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Yeshiva University, New York, June 2, 1967)

INTRODUCTION

It is a privilege to welcome the Class of 1967 as colleagues in Medicine. I shall cherish the memory of this occasion, all the more, because of a generous act of your university, a few months ago, I now have a relationship to your School, which has special meaning for me.

The fortunate members of this graduating class are not alone in marking this an important day in their lives. By your hard work and with your superior endowments, you have earned the right to be called Doctor of Medicine, and with this right, you have earned something more valuable, too. Yours is the distinction of bearing the doctor's degree from one of the truly fine medical schools of the world—a distinction all the more precious, because the high standing of your Alma Mater was achieved in such an incredibly short period of time. Graduating today with you is the man who, in the creation of this School, gave leadership to a Faculty of unsurpassed excellence—your mentors these past four years. No man in the future development of your School will be called upon again to display the unbelievable courage, strength of character and ability to meet problems and financial concerns of such immensity. His vision, clear understanding of the relationships of science and medicine, and of the role of the medical school in the world of both today and tomorrow, his insistence, and that of the faculty on the maintenance of the highest standards of excellence in a new school without firm financial support, his ability to fashion with his colleagues brilliant innovations in medical education, research and patient care, all mark him an outstanding—yes a unique—figure among contemporary medical educators.

You, of the Class of 1967, will possess always this precious memory of joining your Dean in the commencement of a new epoch in your lives—in the graduation from your responsibilities in the Medical School to the assumption of different and greater responsibilities that come naturally and deservedly to both the graduating class and to Dean Kogel. For him this marks the completion of four epochs in his life marked by distinguished achievement: in public health, in preventive medicine in the military, in a gigantic program for the modernization of the hospitals of this metropolis and in the creation of this great Medical School. It is my privilege to ask you to join with me in wishing this extraordinary man of noble purpose and great achievement all that is good in his private life and in the next phase of his activities in behalf of the Albert Einstein College of Medicine and of Yeshiva University of which the college is a part.

On this occasion, too, your class will take with you, the memory of the assumption of the Deanship by one of the most distinguished pediatricians in the world, an acknowledged authority in his chosen field, and a gentleman, deeply devoted to rapid progress in medical science and to the well being of his fellow man. With Dr. Harry Gordon as Dean, the Albert Einstein College of Medicine will continue under great leadership. I know that Dean Kogel has the peace of mind that comes from the knowledge that the enterprise to which he has given the prime of his life, will develop to ever greater heights under his successor.

I propose to consider with you today a few questions which will concern you the rest of your lives. You have dedicated yourselves to the care of the sick, to research, medical education and the prevention of disease. It matters not which of these avenues you will take—the opportunities will be rich in all.

The vast increase in federal support of medical research in the last 20 years has had a great impact on medical schools and teaching hospitals. This accomplishment must be attributed not to doctors alone, but more to the inspiration and devotion of lay leaders, the most prominent of whom are Mary Lasker, and such leaders in the Congress as Senator Lister Hill, and the recently deceased Representative John Fogarty. The expansion of the National Institutes of Health appropriation from 3 million dollars at the end of World War II to one billion and a quarter this past year, most of which was invested in the universities, medical schools, research institutions, and teaching hospitals throughout the country, gives one picture of what is available for those of you who will remain in either basic research or clinical investigation.

The extraordinary progress in the composite of several fields of science called by many molecular biology has inspired almost incessant repetition of emphasis on DNA and RNA in the several preclinical departments of medical school, and also in clinical fields referred to as molecular medicine. There is no question of the fundamental contributions which will revolutionize much of clinical medicine, as well as biological science, that have come from these developments in molecular biology in the last 20 years. Without diminishing one iota the propriety of this emphasis, it must be remembered that DNA and RNA use up only four letters of the alphabet. Happily there are 22 letters left for all the rest of medicine. Let us consider some problems in clinical medicine.

The medical profession grew up as a series of individual enterprises on the part of practicing physicians. The great developments in medical research, in medical school teaching, and in the tackling of problems too great to be solved by any one person, have led to the formation of Task Forces or interdisciplinary groups which cross the boundaries in all departments and fields of knowledge. Scientists and doctors, of many different kinds, all highly motivated to work toward the solution of problems in cancer, heart disease, or any of the other challenges before us, pool their knowledge and resources to make for far more rapid progress. The time has long since passed, if it ever existed, when, for example, any one man could treat completely any one patient with cancer. From such developments and considerations there has evolved the principle of what I have called for more than 25 years, the *total care of the patient.* This calls upon the resources of the community as well as the expert knowledge and techniques of those in medicine and science. May I define this for you?

Total care includes application of all the techniques of medicine, surgery and laboratory science for the comfort, well being, and prolongation of life of the patient—attention to the mental peace of the family and to their social and economic problems—and finally, as part of such total care the administration, primarily for the good of the patient, of the results of research as soon as possible after they have been studied carefully and completely in the laboratory.

MEDICINE AND SOCIETY

During your student years you have witnessed a bewildering series of events which have brought doctors into the main stream of social and economic problems. You will be called upon to take a stand on social issues, or you may, if you will, take refuge in the ivory tower, or even in the sanctity of your own practice. You will be confused, as I have been, by the fact that the needs of millions of medically deprived human beings in this, the most advanced country in the world, are just beginning to be cared for by Federal legislation. You will be disturbed by witnessing bitter attacks on such Federal programs by some leaders of organized medicine, whom I prefer to not accept as representative of the medical profession. These men raise the flag of medical ethics to cover what they regard as a threat to their economic security or "the American way of life". I do not have to remind you that rules of medical ethics were formulated primarily for the protection of the patient—not the doctor. The rule should be followed that what is good for the patient is best for the doctor. We must not forget that we are a select group, a truly chosen people, closer to the priests of old than to the rest of society. We are also members of our community and must understand that social and economic problems affecting the community as a whole must indeed affect the medical profession, too. In exhibiting an interest, or in taking leadership in the solution of these problems, let us act as members of the community, rather than representatives of groups seeking special privilege or favor. I still cringe when I recall the statement issued to every doctor some 20 years ago by an advertising firm retained by organized medicine. It went something like this:

"You must remember that the doctor is a business man—and as a business man he is entitled to a fair return on his investment." I have proper respect for the business men—in the world of business. I do not care to believe, however, that I have spent my life as a teacher of business men in the field of medicine. I have complete faith that if we act forthrightly with good heart and our best efforts in helping the rest of society to seek answers to the compelling problems of medical care, society will find honorable solutions for the economic needs of those who work in the health sciences and in medicine. Dr. Henry Segrist, the noted medical historian of Johns Hopkins Medical School, summarized this more than 30 years ago in these words:

"There is one lesson that can be derived from history . . . that the physician's position in society is never determined by the physician himself, but by the society he is serving."

A few months ago in a national meeting called by the segment of the National Institutes of Health concerned with Regional Medical Programs, I had occasion to discuss

the charge made by some leaders of organized medicine that these programs would lead to socialized medicine. I stated then that I would not try to define this commonly applied and badly abused term, but would assume what is means is federal control of the practice of medicine, or, in short, "Government medicine," and continued "We all realize the vast increase in demand for good medical care since the end of World War II alone. This is shown by eight thousand community hospitals built with the aid of the Hill-Burton Act, fathered in the Senate by that great champion of medical research and health, Senator Lister Hill. The demands for health services which have increased so rapidly in the last year alone, for reasons with which we are all familiar, cannot be met by the available manpower and facilities utilized and distributed in the manner presently employed. And now we proclaim the right of every man, woman and child to the most expert in diagnosis and treatment available in the medical world today. The needs of our people, for the best in medicine, let us not call them *demands*—must be met either by voluntary methods with Government support through programs of the kind we are discussing here, best suited to each particular region of the country, or some system of Federal health services will be invoked. May I express a personal reaction to the frequently expressed fear of what is called the 'threat of Government medicine'? We are talking not about some alien land, but about *our* Government—in *this* democracy. I do not share such fear, nor will I as long as there is a forum where I have the right to speak—as long as there are men and women to harken to my words."

Those of you who will be concerned with clinical investigation and patient care in academic institutions, and those who will enter the practice of medicine and serve in community hospitals, have before you the greatest opportunity in the history of medicine in this country, to bring to every doctor in behalf of his patients, and to those millions of patients who have no doctors, the finest in diagnosis and treatment to be found at the present time only in specialized medical centers. I am referring to the recommendations of the President's Commission on Heart, Cancer and Stroke. This program was restricted at the beginning to what the Congress calls these three dread diseases, which account for 71% of the deaths in this country. It was the recommendation of the President's Commission, however, that after a beginning of this kind, extension of the program to involve all diseases must come as rapidly as possible. The Bill called first for the creation of complexes or centers involving medical schools, and teaching hospitals which would, in addition to making available expert knowledge concerning diagnosis and treatment, generate new knowledge through clinical investigation and basic research. It called also for the creation of new methods of continuing education and communication with all community hospitals in a given region to make the most expert knowledge available, without delay, to every doctor in behalf of every man, woman and child in the country. Immediate acceptance of this remarkable opportunity was slowed by opposition of some leaders of organized medicine who feared interference with private practice, even though it was clear that quite the opposite would result. Much of this opposition appears to have disappeared with better understanding of what the programs really mean.

Unfortunately, there was weak acceptance and in some cases actual opposition from heads of some medical schools in the country who believed the medical school was ill-suited to take leadership in this vast enterprise. These complexes, presently diminished by political chicancery to the designation "Regional Medical Programs," have been perverted in some sections of the country to programs of continuing education, demographic studies and investigation of methods of delivery of medical care, with no reference to the immediate needs of the patient. These programs, however, *were* designed for patient care and research, and *were* defined by law as disease-oriented enterprises. It has been estimated by experts in the field of cancer, for example, that if all the knowledge presently available in the institutions of greatest knowledge and experience concerning diagnosis and treatment could be applied to every patient with cancer in the country today, there would be a saving of 100,000 lives of the 300,000 destined to die of cancer this year.

Apart from the direct consequences of implementation of this great program in the saving of lives, consider for a moment how much more satisfaction there will be in the practice of medicine in the community hospitals, and how a whole new dimension can be added by the community hospitals to the teaching and training of medical students, interns, and residents in the practice of medicine.

The world has foisted upon you not only problems of the delivery and quality of medical care, and economic considerations of great complexity, but has done this at a time of civil unrest and even grave uncertainty concerning survival. The year of your graduation is marked also by the largest gross national product in our history. Participation in decision-making is open to all of us. Each one of us will have to decide the kind and extent of participation for himself. I would say only, that leadership is expected from those who have been educated in a center of such excellence. Let us hope there will be opportunity, too, for the full utilization of your talents and energies in the field of your primary dedication.

I have no hesitancy in expressing the conviction, based upon critical analysis of the work of others and a study of some of these problems first hand, that cures for most, if not all of the many different kinds of cancer will be achieved during your lifetime by the use of chemical and physical agents which have come to us from the laboratory disciplines. An impressive start has been made. Nor do I hesitate to express a similar optimism based upon controlled and informed judgment concerning improvements significant in the therapy of heart disease, high blood pressure, neurological disorders, and even inborn errors of metabolism, to mention only a few. By the time you approach the end of your professional careers, your energies will be devoted more and more to the maintenance of the normal in body and mind of the individual, and indeed, of the community itself.

Your contribution to the society in which you live then, when peace becomes ours again, will become an increasingly important one. Your dedication to the care of the individual with problems concerning the *maintenance of the normal,* rather than the *cure of disease,* will require much more in knowledge, much more in the qualities of humanity, of humility, of equanimity, than ever before . . . and you will help prepare those who will follow you for the day when the great hospitals, laboratories, institutes of medical research, and the splendidly equipped wards in which you have worked, will be replaced by great Institutes of Health. When this day comes the emphasis will be not so much on the care of the patient—it will be more broadly on the total welfare of your fellow-man.

I would add a final word to my new colleagues in medicine who graduate today. A kind and wise teacher of biochemistry, the late Otto Folin, said with great simplicity to a graduating class some thirty years ago—"I hope that you will be reasonably happy." This, too, I wish for you. But I would add my hope that you will be somewhat unhappy, too—that your lives will be governed by what has been called a divine impatience—an eternal unrest—that as long as there are problems of disease and suffering, you will never find complete peace of mind. May I take out of context, as I did when I was very young in medicine, and use for my special purpose here, the words of Gretchen in Goethe's *Faust:* "My peace is gone. My heart is sore. I find it never, and never more."

When the day comes—when your problems are chiefly those of maintenance of the normal, in mind and in body, then let these borrowed words be sung no longer. Then may richly deserved happiness derived from your dedication be yours.

ELECTIONS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF], is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the United States has the unquestionable responsibility to support self-determination for the people of South Vietnam. Because of our dedication to freedom for all the people of Vietnam, American lives are being sacrificed and this Nation is spending billions of dollars to help the people of South Vietnam secure their freedom.

The drive for freedom in South Vietnam, a dedication to the very principles we in our Nation hold so dearly, is being tested in the South Vietnamese elections this fall. The people of South Vietnam, in an exercise of their democratic rights, will elect a President, a Vice President and a bicameral legislature.

Free elections, and I underline the word "free," were to have been guaranteed under the 1954 Geneva accords. Free national elections have never been held in North Vietnam, or for that matter in South Vietnam.

But now truly free elections are possible in South Vietnam. The freedom of these elections must not be violated; in a democracy freedom at the polls is sacred. The people of South Vietnam must be given the opportunity to work their will.

The important elections this fall will pave the way for a truly representative government for the people of South Vietnam.

Thus it is, Mr. Speaker, that I am disturbed by threats to the freedom of South Vietnam's elections. These threats, from the National Liberation Front—the Vietcong—and even from Premier Ky and some of his cohorts, cannot be allowed to deny the South Vietnamese their basic rights, if freedom is to prevail. The voting must be held openly and without fear of violence or intimidation of the electorate.

In order to insure that the elections are truly free, Premier Ky should be dissuaded from his position that dissent and public criticism be restricted during the campaign. Freedom will not be reality if basic rights are denied.

There is an even greater threat in warnings from the Vietcong that those people who exercise their voting rights risk bodily harm and terror. Freedom to participate in the voting without prohibition is the right of all, and here I

underline the word "all," all the people of South Vietnam. And this includes people of every political persuasion.

The importance of the fall elections for the future of Vietnam and the peace of the world is most significant.

I have, as you know Mr. Speaker, made four trips to Vietnam to study the situation there and meet the people of that embattled country. I can report from firsthand experience that a free and democratic order is earnestly desired by the people of South Vietnam. Political stability is vital to the success of the always present goal of building a strong and prosperous democracy in South Vietnam.

I had hoped that the United Nations or the International Control Commission or both would assume the responsibility of impartially supervising the elections in South Vietnam. However, since neither of these organizations has designed to perform this important function I believe strongly that it is incumbent upon the Congress of the United States to assume the role of observer during the elections, to insure the people their goal of self-determination.

The responsibility of such observers would be to protect the impartiality of the voting. Unless complete freedom is assured, the elections, which have the potential of greatly improving the government of South Vietnam, will be a sham. It is in the best interests of the United States and all freedom-loving people that the honest will of the people be served.

Therefore, I am today introducing a resolution providing that six Members of the House of Representatives, appointed by you, Mr. Speaker, and three Members of the Senate, appointed by the President of the Senate, go to Vietnam to observe the elections this fall. Upon their return the Members will report to their respective Houses and to the world on the conduct of the elections.

It is not my intention that these Representatives of the Congress act as poll watchers. Surely nine Members of Congress cannot by themselves police all the polls. Their presence, rather, will serve as a deterrent to challenges to the freedom of the electorate. Their presence will reaffirm, also, our responsibility to aid the people of South Vietnam in the protection of their right to self-determination.

For all of the above reasons, Mr. Speaker, I believe we have a responsibility to send Members of Congress to observe the elections in South Vietnam.

Because of the importance of these elections to the people of South Vietnam and because of the interest of the United States in the future of democracy in South Vietnam I urge rapid and favorable consideration of this resolution.

Thank you.

PRIDE IN OKLAHOMA ESSAY CONTEST

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Oklahoma State Chamber of Commerce initiated an annual Pride in Oklahoma Essay Contest. I am happy to announce that the first winner of this contest is a fine young man from Ada, Herschell Roberts. Herschell received $1,000 from the chamber of commerce for his prize-winning essay, entitled "Oklahoma Is the Place To Live"; I have just had the pleasure of reading it, and think it is worth every bit of that.

I would like to have the full text of this fine piece printed in the RECORD, so that all Members will have the opportunity to discover what we Oklahomans have known for a long time: Oklahoma is the place to live.

The essay follows:

OKLAHOMA IS THE PLACE TO LIVE

(NOTE.—The first annual Pride in Oklahoma Essay Contest was held in 1966. First place winner was Herschell Roberts, Ada, who received $1,000 from the State Chamber of Commerce, contest sponsor. The Hugo Daily News takes pride in running the essay verbatim which is titled "Oklahoma Is the Place To Live.")

Why am I convinced that Oklahoma is the place to live and that I am extremely fortunate to be an Oklahoman? To quote E. B. Browning, "let me count the ways."

First, of course, it's the one locale I'm most familiar with, and familiarity has bred love rather than adage-wise contempt. In the almost-18 years I've been an Oklahoma citizen, however, I've had a passing-through acquaintance with many other areas, and I've become convinced that our state is indeed "Another Eden" and our people a "happy breed of men."

OPPORTUNITY PLENTIFUL

Oklahoma is progressive and affords opportunity for everyone. With ambition and a will to work, anyone can gain success in this state. Nor is success limited only to the college graduate—it's for all takers who are strong enough to reach out and get it. It doesn't take a miracle, just ability and desire.

Perhaps because Oklahoma is a young and vigorous state, competition is keen. Gray matter is more important than blue blood. People are not so likely to ask who your ancestors were as they are to raise the question of what ability YOU have.

The competitiveness shows itself in many areas—in athletics, for example. Some of the finest athletes in the world have been Oklahomans. Jim Thorpe, labeled the greatest athlete that ever lived, was an Oklahoma Indian. To baseball, the state has contributed such greats as Mickey Mantle, Warren Spahn, Dizzy and Paul Dean. Too, Harry "The Cat" Brecheen, and Jerry Walker are from my hometown. Jerry, as well as two other promising young players of two years ago was signed by the major leagues immediately upon graduation from the rural high school I attend.

SUPERIOR WOMEN

I cheerfully admit being prejudiced when I say Oklahoma has the prettiest girls to be found anywhere, but again competitive results support my view. The current Miss America, Jayne Jayroe, has done much to change the "Okie" image throughout the nation as did Malinda Berry, former "America's Maid of Cotton" and Miss Sandra Sue Stout, a former "National Dairy Princess."

Nor are wholesome good looks and charming personalities the only qualities displayed by Oklahoma's outstanding women. Our list of "stars" includes such notables as Jerri Cobb, Aviation Woman of 1959; ballerinas of international fame, Maria Tallchief and Yvonne Choteau; and the "hostess with the mostest," Perle Mesta. Also, we have had two "National Teacher of the Year" awards within my memory. Miss Edna Donley and Mrs. Lawanna Trout were recipients of that honor.

If I were giving priorty to any one of Oklahoma's resources I'd list its educational system and its fine teachers as number one. The state ranks first in the nation in teacher preparation and it is near the top in making a college education available to every young person who wants it.

This year Oklahoma will celebrate its sixtieth birthday. It is our proud claim that within that time it has progressed from "Arrows to Atoms," from "Tepees to Towers."

EXCELLENT TOURIST ATTRACTIONS

We count our blessings in many areas. We point to our central location in the nation that makes us the convering point for national highways in the Interstate system which brings most coast-to-coast travelers through our state. We unblushingly admit Oklahoma's native beauty which often persuades those travelers to linger as they pass through.

As a matter of fact, Oklahoma is a bit like a teen-aged girl who, having been a bit of a tomboy all her life, has caught a glimpse of herself in a mirror and suddenly realizes she has the potential to be the belle of the ball.

If it is the tourist trade she is courting—and she has come to realize what a rich suitor he is—she is well endowed by nature to catch his eye. Oklahoma has rugged mountains, crystal-clear streams, broad plains, millions of acres of forests, more lake area than Minnesota and a longer shore line than the Atlantic coast. Fair and sunny of disposition with 339 days of favorable flying weather every year, she still maintains a bit of caprice in her changeability of weather and offers a variety and a vitality that accompanies definite seasonal change.

Though agrarian since her origin, perhaps because of a long growing season and fertile soil, and ranking high in the nation as a producer of food, Oklahoma has come to realize that she must do more than dangle her handkerchief before industry if she is to progress as she desires.

FAVORABLE FOR INDUSTRY

Since she began that organized courtship, Oklahoma has enjoyed industrial development at an accelerated rate. And why not? She has plenty of wide open space for location of industrial endeavors, a favorable location to important markets, an abundance of mineral resources, a water supply that seemingly is unlimited, an advantageous tax structure and a labor pool whose surface is unruffled by racial or political strife.

"Pioneering in Progress", a publication of Oklahoma Industrial and Park Development, points out that "a major factor in development of Oklahoma as an industrial state is the abundant supply of intelligent, adaptable labor, which surveys have shown to be significantly more productive than the national average."

Perhaps that last statement is more important than it sounds, for in the final analysis, Oklahoma IS people—all kinds of people—farmers, industrial workers, ranchers, educators, students.

We Oklahomans try—though we are not obsessed by it—to keep abreast of trends and styles in clothes, houses, and ways of thinking. We drive the best cars we can afford. We enjoy outings, sports and our work just like most other people in the U.S. In most respects, Oklahomans are just like everyone else.

However, I think there are a few characteristics that set us Oklahomans apart. We're unusually friendly and we expect friendliness

in return. We're talkative—not so much so as Texans perhaps, but compared to New Englanders we're downright garrulous—and we're proud.

A PROUD STATE

When I say proud, I don't mean the stiffnecked haughtiness that many associate with the word. Instead, I think it's a kind of fearlessness that is perhaps a part of our "Bible Belt" heritage—a "I can do all things" attitude that implies a sacred covenant between Man and Creator. I refer to the feeling that swells up in our throats when we hear the "Star Spangled Banner" or when we see the statue of the Pioneer Woman or the Will Rogers Memorial or anything that reminds us of the people who helped make Oklahoma what it is.

The pride we feel has a continuity about it. It reaches back to embrace yesterday; it envelopes the present, and it stretches eager hands toward tomorrow.

Yes, in many ways and in every way, I'm truly proud to be an Oklahoman.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. KEE (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, June 22, on account of official business.

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), beginning June 22 through June 29, on account of official business.

Mr. ROONEY of New York (at the request of Mr. CELLER), from June 22 through June 29, an account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WOLFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ADDABBO, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ABBITT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BIESTER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RAILSBACK in two instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.

Mr. LATTA.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. REES.

Mr. ZABLOCKI.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4717. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain lands owned by the United States to the State of Tennessee for the use of Memphis State University, Memphis, Tenn.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill and a Joint Resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5424. An act to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard; and

H.J. Res. 601. Joint resolution extending for 4 months the emergency provisions of the urban mass transportation program.

ADJOURMENT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 26, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

855. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956, to provide for a national program of flood insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

856. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enter into leases for the rental of, or to use or permit the use of, public space in, on, over, and under the streets and alleys under their jurisdictions, other than freeways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

857. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for a flat fee for services performed in connection with the arrival in, or departure from, the United States of a private aircraft or private vessel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 8582. A bill to amend chapter 7 of title 11 of the District of Columbia Code to increase the number of associate judges on the District of Columbia court of appeals from two to five, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 378). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 5799. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Uniform Gifts to Minors Act to provide that gifts to minors made under such act may be deposited in savings and loan associations and related institutions, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 379). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 763. An act to amend the act approved August 17, 1937, so as to facilitate the addition to the District of Columbia registration of a motor vehicle or trailer of the name of the spouse of the owner of any such motor vehicle or trailer (Rept. No. 380). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1226. An act to transfer from the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to the District of Columbia court of general sessions the authority to waive certain provisions relating to the issuance of a marriage license in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 381). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 10595. A bill to prohibit certain banks and savings and loan associations from fostering or participating in gambling activities; with amendment (Rept. No. 382). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 663. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 10918, a bill to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 383). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 664. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 10943, a bill to amend and extend title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (Rept. No. 384). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama:

H.R. 11086. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act in order to authorize quality grants for schools of veterinary medicine and scholarships for students of veterinary medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 11087. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of July 23, 1955 (ch. 375, 69 Stat. 368); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 11088. A bill to incorporate Pop Warner Little Scholars, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELS (for himself, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. NIX, Mr. POOL, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. WHITE, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. RUPPE, and Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia):

H.R. 11089. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide additional group life insurance and accidental death and dismemberment insurance for Federal employees, and to strengthen the financial condition of the employees' life insurance fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 11090. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to establish certain qualifica-

tions for persons appointed as judges or justices of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 11091. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the head of household benefits to all unremarried widows and widowers and to all individuals who have attained age 35 and who have never been married or who have been separated or divorced for 1 year or more; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 11092. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide certain employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration with the right of appeal to the U.S. Civil Service Commission from certain disciplinary actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 11093. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for hearing aids under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 11094. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to assist bilingual education programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.R. 11095. A bill to assure the purity and quality of all imported dairy products for the purpose of promoting the dairy industry and protecting the public health; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 11096. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to require that in the labeling and advertising of certain drugs sold by prescription the "established name" of such drugs must appear each time the proprietary name is used, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 11097. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Negro History Museum Commission; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 11098. A bill to amend title II of the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to the issuance of brokerage licenses to certain persons authorizing them to arrange for the transportation by motor vehicle of groups of passengers and their baggage; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 11099. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the moving expenses of agricultural workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 11100. A bill to establish fishing zones of the United States beyond its territorial seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD (for himself and Mr. FOUNTAIN):

H.R. 11101. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the protection of the public health from radiation emissions from electronic products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 11102. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to eliminate the requirement that extended care services follow hospitalization in order to qualify for payment thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 11103. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of July 23, 1955 (ch. 375, 69 Stat. 368); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 11104. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that construction workers and seasonal or migrant agricultural workers shall be allowed the deduction for moving expenses without regard to the length of time they are employed at their new principal place of work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 11105. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUSH:

H.R. 11106. A bill to provide that American foreign aid shall be suspended with respect to any country which has severed diplomatic relations with the United States on or after January 1, 1967, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 11107. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the protection of the public health from radiation emissions from electronic products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 11108. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act to extend its protection to workers employed in the demolition, dismantling, removal, and/or salvaging of public buildings; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 11109. A bill to promote health and safety in the buildings trades and construction industry in all Federal and federally financed or federally assisted construction projects; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 11110. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 11111. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 11112. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Negro History Museum Commission; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee:

H.R. 11113. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11114. A bill to amend the Highway Beautification Act of 1965 to remove the mandatory compensation feature; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 11115. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and national security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARDNER:

H.R. 11116. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 11117. A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, to provide grants to State and local governments for the development of comprehensive manpower development and utilization plans; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 11118. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSHER:

H.R. 11119. A bill to provide grants for assistance in the research and development of methods to abate pollution of the waters of Lake Erie and Lake Ontario; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 11120. A bill to provide for the disclosure of gifts and financial interests by Members of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 11121. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $3,600 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 11122. A bill to provide appropriations for sharing of Federal taxes with States and their political subdivisions out of funds derived from a cutback in projected new expansion of grant-in-aid programs and as a substitute for portions of existing grant-in-aid expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 11123. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 11124. A bill to amend the act of August 7, 1961, providing for the establishment of Cape Cod National Seashore; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 11125. A bill to reclassify certain key positions and increase salaries in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANDRUM:

H.R. 11126. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the stamp tax on conveyances shall not apply to property sold as the result of the exercise of the power of eminent domain; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.J. Res. 655. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. CAREY, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DOW, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. FARBSTEIN, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. GROVER, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. KUPFERMAN, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MULTER, Mr. PIRNIE, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. WYDLER):

H.J. Res. 656. Resolution to consent to and enter into the Mid-Atlantic States air pollution control compact, creating the Mid-Atlantic States Air Pollution Control Commission as an intergovernmental, Federal-State agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.J. Res. 657. Joint resolution creating a Joint Committee To Investigate Crime; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.J. Res. 658. Joint resolution to consent to and enter into the Mid-Atlantic States air pollution compact, creating the Mid-Atlantic States Air Pollution Control Commission as an intergovernmental, Federal-State agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.J. Res. 659. Joint resolution to consent to and enter into the Mid-Atlantic States air pollution control compact, creating the Mid-Atlantic States Air Pollution Control Commission as an intergovernmental, Federal-

State agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.J. Res. 660. Joint resolution to consent to and enter into the Mid-Atlantic States air pollution compact, creating the Mid-Atlantic States Air Pollution Control Commission as an intergovernmental, Federal-State agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.J. Res. 661. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate October 31 of each year as National UNICEF Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO (for himself, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. CAHILL, Mr. DANIELS, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. JOELSON, Mr. MINISH, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HUNT, and Mr. SANDMAN):

H.J. Res. 662. Resolution to consent to and enter into the Mid-Atlantic States air pollution control compact, creating the Mid-Atlantic States Air Pollution Control Commission as an intergovernmental, Federal-State agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 663. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 664. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the Volunteer Ambulance Corps and Fire Company Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.J. Res. 665. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 666. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.J. Res. 667. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the month of August of each year as National Gladiolus Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGEN (for himself, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. LAIRD, Mrs. MAY, Mr. PIRNIE, Mr. DOLE, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. KLEPPE, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. SCHWENGEL, Mr. DENNEY, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. BURTON of Utah, Mr. MACGREGOR, Mr. SCHADEBERG, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. MOSHER):

H.J. Res. 668. Resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.J. Res. 669. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.J. Res. 670. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WINN:

H.J. Res. 671. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.J. Res. 672. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MATHIAS of California:

H.J. Res. 673. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. Con. Res. 379. Concurrent resolution to advise the President of the sense of Congress with regard to obtaining a just and lasting peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H. Con. Res. 380. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in regard to the position the United States should maintain in support of circumstances that should prevail before withdrawal of Israeli military forces from territories they now occupy as a result of the Middle East conflict; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H. Con. Res. 381. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the establishment of peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H. Con. Res. 382. Concurrent resolution providing for the designation of nine Members of Congress to serve as observers for the Congress of the elections to be held in South Vietnam in September 1967; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee:

H. Con. Res. 383. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the establishment of peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BLACKBURN:

H. Res. 665. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 421; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H. Res. 666. Resolution providing for a thorough review of U.S. policy toward the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H. Res. 667. Resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the establishment of permanent peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER:

H. Res. 668. Resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the establishment of permanent peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 11127. A bill for the relief of Rogelio V. Lapuz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 11128. A bill for the relief of Angelo Giambalvo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 11129. A bill for the relief of Karl Brenke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 11130. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary E. O'Rourke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 11131. A bill to incorporate the Paralyzed Veterans of America; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 11132. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Gangemi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 22, 1967

(Legislative day of Monday, June 12, 1967)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in the heat and burden of days that drain our strength and demand our best, we would find the springs by the wayside—that living water which alone can refresh and restore our bodies and spirits.

Send us forth with serenity and calm to meet an agitated world with a quietness which is the inner strength of the soul. Keep us at tasks too hard for us, that we may be driven to Thee for strength.

Rising above all that is ignoble, teach us to work together in glad harmony for the honor, safety, and welfare of our Nation and of all peoples of this awakening earth who unite in mutual good will, determined to open the gates of life more abundant for all mankind.

We ask it in the name of that One who is able to keep us from falling and to lead us on from strength to strength. In His name, Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

REPORT OF OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 136)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was re-