

the allowance. Many veterans entering the service have not finished high school. I feel that they should not receive less educational assistance simply because they answered the call to arms at an earlier stage of their educational careers.

Orphans of those killed in the military service, and children of severely disabled wartime veterans will receive educational benefits until the age of twenty-six, instead of age twenty-one. These benefits are provided to restore to the children the education opportunities otherwise lost by their parent's death or disability.

Besides increasing the allowance, the new legislation further expands the areas of education. The landmark 1966 Act which first provided educational assistance for Vietnam veterans did not include flight training and on-the-job training. However, the public response left no doubt but that our Nation needs more trained pilots. Flight training was eliminated from the Act last year because it was thought that such training had previously been used for recreational purposes. I believe, however, that regulations limiting flight training to vocational ends can be adequately formulated just as they have in other areas of training. I see no reason why one of our nation's most extensive educational acts should exclude preparation for an industry upon which our Nation is increasingly dependent.

The legislation of this Congress also remedies the conspicuous shortcoming of exclusion of assistance for on-the-job and apprenticeship training. Our government is heavily financing and calling upon the citizenry to support programs for increasing manpower skills. I think it only logical, therefore, that the veterans educational program include vocational training.

The Ninetieth Congress has also enacted provisions which liberalize veterans loans. The period for World War II veterans to apply for home and small business loans, rather than expiring now, is extended to July 25, 1970. Secondly, also by enactment of legislation which I sponsored, the Veterans Administration is empowered to make direct home loans up to \$30,000. Until last month, the limit was \$17,500.

Of course, there are still issues that are unresolved. The 90th Congress, for instance, has not decided the question of the effect of social security benefit increase on receipt of the veterans pension. An estimated 29,000 veterans and widows received reduced disability pensions, or none at all, as a result of the 1965 Social Security benefit increases. This is because, as you know, the disability pension is determined by income limitations. A social security cost of living adjustment may augment a veteran's income just enough so that he reaches a higher income bracket and the pension is therefore reduced. I believe that such reduction is unfair because

a social security increase should not result in a pension decrease—certainly not if the social security increase is only a cost of living adjustment and does not compensate for the loss of pension. I have urged my colleagues that all future social security increases be excluded from computation of veterans' income. It could not then decrease the veterans pension. I trust that I will be able to report to you successful passage of this proposition, just as I have today reported enactment of my proposal to extend to Vietnam veterans the benefits a grateful nation provides for all other veterans, and my proposal to increase the educational allowance of Vietnam veterans.

Finally, I should mention one further piece of pending legislation I have presented before the 90th Congress. The bill, H.R. 9808, reads:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America assembled, That the Catholic War Veterans are authorized to erect a statue of Saint Sebastian, the patron saint of the military, in the northwest quadrant of the District of Columbia. . . . And the National Capitol . . . and the United States . . . shall be put to no expense in the erection thereof."

With the erection of this statue of Saint Sebastian, a section of our capital city will be made more beautiful, and the public will be made more aware of the contribution and work of the Catholic War Veterans, just as Philadelphia is made aware of that good work by the presentation of the "Man of the Year" award tonight to Representative John Pezak.

CONGRESSMAN JOSHUA EILBERG'S TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 6916 AND H.R. 6920, TO PREVENT FUTURE SOCIAL SECURITY AND OTHER FEDERAL RETIREMENT BENEFIT INCREASES FROM AFFECTING THE AMOUNT OF OR ELIGIBILITY FOR VETERAN'S PENSION

Mr. Chairman, I speak in support of H.R. 6916 and H.R. 6920, introduced by me on March 9th during the present session. Both bills are efforts to prevent social security increases from reducing or eliminating a veteran's disability pension.

Strict income limitations of course determine entitlement to the veteran's pension in cases of non-service connected disabilities. For instance, no veteran whose income exceeds \$3,000 yearly, although he is completely and permanently disabled, receives pension benefits at all. A disabled veteran with dependents with less than \$2,000 annual income receives only \$84 monthly. If his income is pushed just over the \$2,000 mark by, for instance, increased social security, that eighty-four dollars is reduced to fifty.

The Administration has given special attention to this problem. In his special message on veterans affairs to Congress last January, President Johnson asked, among

five other principal requests, that we "make certain that no veteran's pension will be reduced as a result of increases in Federal retirement benefits, such as social security." With the exception of that one proposal, Congress has enacted all the requests into law. I see no reason why we should particularly exclude it, especially now that the House has passed H.R. 12080 which increases social security benefits.

H.R. 6920 provides that future increases in Federal retirement benefits may be waived wholly or in part. The amount rejected will not count as income in computing entitlement to veteran's pension. Under the present law, ten percent of amount of payments from public or private retirement or annuity programs may be deducted from income computation. My bill provides, of course, that the veteran may not include amounts which he waives among that excludable ten percent.

H.R. 6916 would allow exclusion of all future social security increases from income computation. The Senate passed a similar proposal which was not, however, accepted in the conference report to the Veterans Readjustment Act, signed by the President a few days ago.

In disallowing this proposal to exclude social security increases, the conferees stated that it was their intention to take action to assure that social security increases resulting from enactment of H.R. 12080 will not result in reduction of combined income from the veteran's pension, from veteran's indemnity compensation, and from social security benefits. Since that conference report, the House has passed H.R. 12080. Because the social security increases are therefore all the more imminent, surely it is time that the conferees' intent to prevent pension reduction be acted upon.

Under the present law (P.L. 89-730) pension reduction resulting from social security increases enacted during 1967 will not take effect until the last day of the year. This delay is expressly provided so that Congress will have time to enact legislation preventing pension reduction by the social security increase. Therefore, because of the foresight of the 89th Congress, time for this hearing has been particularly designated for deciding on the objectives which H.R. 6916 and 6920 are designed to achieve.

H.R. 6916 and H.R. 6920 would attain that objective by, to recapitulate, allowing waiver of Federal retirement benefits, and by excluding future social security increases from income computation. I believe that even the maximum income limitation \$3,000, is low enough. H.R. 12080 will result, in effect, in lowering the limitations still further. Yet, the increased social security income, which it will provide—being only a cost-of-living adjustment—will in no way compensate for the loss it occasions, of pension income.

SENATE

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 1967

(Legislative day of Monday, September 18, 1967)

The Senate met at 10:30 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty and ever-living God, as we bow in this quiet moment dedicated to the unseen and the eternal, make vivid

our abiding faith, we beseech Thee, in those deep and holy foundations which our fathers laid, lest in foolish futility in this desperate and dangerous day we attempt to build on sand instead of rock.

Renew our inner strength for these are troublous times and we stand in need of courage and fortitude and stability. The world is full of the clamor of the violent, the boasting of the proud, and the agony of the people, and we would be valiant in a day when the hearts of many turn to water in them.

Renew our valor, that, as undefeated souls, we may sustain the shocks of life, master its handicaps, and at last make even the wrath of men to serve Thee.

We ask it in the name of the Master of all good workmen. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, September 18, 1967, be approved.

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

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, with statements limited to 3 minutes.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of yesterday, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK].

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I yield, without losing my right to the floor, to the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

POSTAL POLICY ACT—ROLE OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT AS PUBLIC SERVICE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, for many years I have been privileged to serve both as a member and as chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. One of the principal achievements of that committee in 1958 and in 1962 was the writing of a Postal Policy Act which established in the law the concept of the Post Office Department as a public service.

The Post Office is indeed a public service, and the recognition of that fact by the Congress in 1958 was an important step forward. We now have a Postmaster General, Lawrence F. O'Brien, who recognizes clearly and fully the role of his Department as a contributor to the public welfare of the country.

One of the best examples of the public service contributions of the Post Office Department is in the field of rural mail delivery. The present Postal Policy Act defines the public service payment for rural delivery at 20 percent of its cost.

Postmaster General Larry O'Brien recently had occasion to publicly emphasize the role of the Post Office Department as a public service in a speech he delivered before the convention of the National Rural Letter Carriers Association in Cleveland, Ohio. Postmaster General O'Brien announced in that speech an immediate nationwide extension of rural delivery to less densely populated areas of the Nation. This is an excellent example of the type of public service performed in postal operations. If the Post Office were run as a profitmaking operation, not only would rural delivery not be extended but it would be extensively cut back, for there is no doubt that the Post Office loses money on rural delivery. But it does not withdraw and it does not decrease its service to rural America, because this service performs an important function in the Nation's interest—delivering the mail and communicating with all citizens of the country, no matter where they live.

In his speech announcing the extension of this service, General O'Brien established a new criteria. Heretofore, the national requirement for establishing an extension of rural routes was an average population density of two families a mile. His new program lessens the requirement to 1½ families per mile.

In his speech, the Postmaster General effectively rebuts those who argue that the Post Office is "losing money." General O'Brien says:

I am fully convinced that the postal service is already returning an enormous profit to the United States.

I could not agree with him more. For the benefit of all, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point the portions of Mr. O'Brien's speech dealing with the postal service.

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

This evening I have an announcement for you that expresses my view of your importance to effective postal operation. This announcement will not only be of interest to you, but also to American families throughout our land. For I have ordered immediate nationwide extension of rural delivery service to less densely populated areas of the country. Heretofore, the national requirement for establishment or extension of rural routes was an average population density of two families a mile. From now on, the requirement will be one and one-half families per mile. No longer will Americans living in areas where there are less than two families per mile be required to go to post offices to pick up their mail.

When I responded to President Johnson's request in 1965 and moved up Pennsylvania Avenue from the White House, I promised him that I would have one goal: superlative mail service. I think this announcement is another step in that direction.

The desire to advance mail service is also why I announced last April that a close study of the problems of the postal service had brought me to the conclusion that we should become a government corporation. Among other changes, this corporation would abolish my job.

In view of some of the comments I have heard since then, I want to assure every one of you that my job would be the *only* job abolished.

My proposal, along with other ideas, is now being studied by one of the finest commissions ever appointed by any President. No matter what conclusion the Commission may reach, I know that President Johnson is rock solid on one principle—that no postal employee will lose any rights, be deprived of any benefits, face any reduction in pay or allowances, as the result of any reorganization of the postal service.

In reviewing my proposal, some commentators have also overlooked the word "government" and have somehow analyzed it as advocating the turning over of the postal service to private enterprise.

I want to make it clear that I am *not* advocating breaking up a vital public service and turning it into a commercial enterprise.

I have nothing against profits.

In fact, I am fully convinced that the postal service is already returning an enormous profit to the people of the United States.

Your local police department or fire department certainly doesn't yield a profit at the end of the year—but it would be unbearably costly for a community to lack police and fire service. Hospitals are now known for being a profitable investment—except in the sense of saving human lives through treatment and extending lives through research.

My friend Orville Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, has a budget of some \$6 billion this year. At the end of the year there will be no profit from the operations of the Department of Agriculture—except the most productive agricultural system in the world, except tens of millions throughout the world saved from starvation.

Similarly, it is almost impossible to put a dollar figure on the benefit derived from the operation of a fast, efficient nation-wide postal service.

There is no dollar amount that can be placed on a mail system that guards the privacy of communication, and this ranks high on our list of American free institutions.

We secure all these benefits from our postal service and, at the same time, we return over \$5 billion to the U.S. Treasury.

That is a record we can be proud of.

A non-governmental postal service, interested only in short term private, and not social, profit, would be forced to examine some postal services very closely. Among such services would undoubtedly be our rural operations. They are invaluable to those millions of Americans who live in rural areas. They yield a profit to the nation as a whole. But a private postal service might dispense with them, or charge exorbitant rates. That is one basic reason why I have not, and will never, advocate turning over the great national resource of our Post Office Department to private hands. That is why my proposal clearly calls for continuing government management and ownership of the postal service.

U.S. MILITARY PROCUREMENT PRACTICES NEED INVESTIGATION

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, reports which have reached me concerning some recent military procurement practices indicate that there is a real cause for concern over the equity, inefficiency, and even perhaps the honesty of some of these practices. In one specific instance, I have asked the Senate Committee on Government Operations to conduct a preliminary investigation to determine whether the facts in that case warrant a full-scale investigation and public hearings on military procurement practices.

In this case, my constituent, Custom Packaging Co., a small business in Aurora, Colo., received less than equitable treatment, to say the least, in its efforts to do business with the Army. The facts in this case are as follows:

Working on its own initiative and expense over a considerable period of time, Custom Packaging Co. developed the concept of a lightweight, shoulder-borne flame weapon with a 2,000- to 3,000-yard range capability. In August 1965, they contacted Army officials at Edgewood Arsenal, Aberdeen, Md. The Army showed a great deal of interest and, after considerable discussion, a demonstration was arranged. The demonstration took place at Edgewood Arsenal on February 14, 1966.

Assurances were given to Custom Packaging Co. by the Army that the company's technological innovations would be fully protected against disclosures to or use by unauthorized persons. Two of the significant innovations introduced by the company were in the basic lightweight design and in the propellant that was used.

Following the demonstration at Edgewood Arsenal, the Army agreed that Custom Packaging Co. should prepare a color sound on film showing the weapon firing nine or 10 rounds. The Army also asked the company to prepare a proposal setting forth the company's capability to produce the weapon, estimates of time and cost factors, and statistics on how much time and money had already been spent by the company on the program.

Custom Packaging Co. submitted the

requested film and proposal to the Army on April 15, 1966.

During the summer of 1966, the Marine Corps displayed interest in a preliminary test program with this weapon. Subsequently, on October 16, 1966, Edgewood Arsenal circulated "Requests for Proposals" on a flame weapon system, soliciting quotations from several vendors, including Custom Packaging Co. The invitation called for proposals for research and development, production of 20 weapons and 2,000 units of ammunition. The language of the Edgewood Arsenal description of the weapon and requirements was virtually word for word identical with the "unsolicited" proposal submitted by Custom Packaging Co. on April 15, 1966, at the request of the Army.

On November 16, 1966, Custom Packaging Co. submitted its bid for a fixed price contract in the amount of \$167,608. Northrop Nortronics of Anaheim, Calif., a subsidiary of Northrop Aviation, submitted its bid on a cost-plus-incentive fee basis in the amount of \$387,000. Seven other bidders submitted quotations ranging from \$269,000 to a high bid of \$404,000, all on a cost-plus-fixed fee basis. A comparison of the bids of Custom Packaging and Northrop Nortronics shows that the engineering estimates were very nearly the same, but Custom Packaging's bid reflected lower labor rates and lower overhead costs, as well as lower subcomponent costs. Nortronics' bid proposed use of more expensive off-the-shelf, or subcontracted components. Subsequently, by telegram dated January 26, 1967, the Edgewood Arsenal Contracting Office advised Custom Packaging Co. that the award was expected to be made on Monday, February 6, 1967. Thereafter, in a peculiarly unusual procedure, Edgewood Arsenal announced the award of this contract, not on February 6, but on Friday, February 3, 1967, and designated Northrop Nortronics as the successful bidder in spite of the fact that the Northrop bid was more than double the amount bid by Custom Packaging.

Why was this award announced 3 days early? It appears to have been a deliberate attempt to justify an "urgent" classification for this procurement and thereby circumvent Armed Services Procurement Regulation 2-407.9 which generally prohibits an award being made if a timely protest has been filed, except where it has been determined that the award is urgently required.

Now, was there an overriding urgency to justify this award? In my opinion, there was not. In response to my question, Dr. Russell D. O'Neal, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Research and Development, told me that there was no planned production of this weapon system.

The Army then contended that Custom Packaging Co. had not filed a timely protest to the award. This too was disproven. Mr. Eugene Bates, the president of Custom Packaging Co. had the foresight to process his protest on February 3, 1967, through the Denver Regional Office of the Small Business Administration, who substantiated the fact that

both telephonic and telegraphic protests had been sent to the General Accounting Office on that date by Custom Packaging Co.

Mr. President, I interpolate to state that here is a classic example of a small business company trying to do something which will be of help to the whole country, and being cut out completely by giving the bid, at twice the cost, to another company which had never had any experience in the field whatsoever.

Mr. President, it now appears that this is not an isolated case. Other small business firms are having the same kind of difficulty in attempting to compete with the big business manufacturers doing business with the various military departments. Recently the Army Electronics Command, 225 South 18th Street, Philadelphia, Pa., awarded to the Radio Corp. of America a contract for \$10,087,431, despite the fact that the Army had on file a bid by a small business concern which was \$884,856 lower than RCA's award. This appears to be only the most recent of a long series of slaps at the taxpayers' pocketbook in Army dealings with RCA for this portable, walkie-talkie type radio transmitter-receiver. Let us look at the record from the beginning.

In May 1954, the Department of the Army, Fort Monmouth, N.J., initiated a contract with RCA, Camden, N.J., for the development of this portable radio set which was given the nomenclature AN/PRC-25. Under this contract the Army paid to RCA a total sum of \$2,214,857. In October 1961, this radio set was ordered into production when the Army awarded contract No. 89511 on a sole source noncompetitive basis to RCA for a total amount of \$20,482,143.68. This covered 8,248 units of this radio at a per unit price of \$2,156.91. Of this total \$20.5 million, \$17,790,000 covered the radio set. The balance of \$2,692,143.68 covered ancillary items. These items included manufacturing drawings.

On May 24, 1963, invitations to bid were issued on the second production requirement. This was actually the first competitive bidding allowed on this radio set. Mind you, this was almost a year and a half later. It covered 3,822 units of the AN/PRC-25 radio, plus 1,650 units of the major component, the RT-505 receiver-transmitter. The contract was awarded to the lowest bidder, RCA, at a unit price of \$843.37 for the AN/PRC-25. This was \$1,313.54 per unit less than the Army had paid for this same radio set to this same firm under the earlier noncompetitive negotiations in October 1961. On February 7, 1964, which was less than a year later the Army again invited bids for the AN/PRC-25 radio. RCA again reduced its unit price; this time to only \$736 per unit. Despite this latest reduction, however, on this occasion RCA was unsuccessful in obtaining the award. It went to a manufacturer in Huntington, Ind., who quoted a still lower price.

In March 1965, the Army decided to improve the AN/PRC-25 radio set. It negotiated noncompetitive, sole-source contract No. 01292 with RCA to cover this work. The total cost of this contract was \$694,593.

In April 1965, a third round of bidding took place. This was on the original version, not the improved one. RCA again reduced the price; this time quoting \$625 per unit for the AN/PRC-25 radio set in an unsuccessful attempt to acquire this award which was made at even lower prices to the Indiana manufacturer, with a set-aside quantity being awarded to a Massachusetts firm.

Four months later, on August 13, 1965, the Army awarded a noncompetitive contract to RCA for 4,158 units of this same AN/PRC-25 radio set at an average price of \$951 per unit. This was done despite the fact that the Army records of only 4 months earlier showed RCA's competitive bid as having been only \$625 per unit for the identical equipment.

The improved version of the AN/PRC-25 radio was assigned a new nomenclature. It became the AN/PRC-77. Customarily, the first production contract for any such item is negotiated with the company which did the research and development work. Therefore, in accordance with custom, on June 26, 1966, the Army awarded contract No. 10410 on a noncompetitive, sole-source basis to RCA. It covered 5,737 units of the newly designated AN/PRC-77 at a unit price of \$1,222.34.

This contract was for the total amount of \$7,619,000. It included \$54,834 for production drawings of this AN/PRC-77 radio set.

This contract stipulated delivery of these production drawings by March 31, 1967. Bear this in mind, because this is an important provision in this contract. March 31, 1967, was when the drawings had to be furnished to the Army and the Government as a whole.

Back on June 22, 1966, prior to the June 26 contract award, the Army justified the noncompetitive award of contract No. 10410 on the basis that:

Drawings, mechanical gauges, and electrical test fixtures are being procured to preclude sole-source on subsequent procurements.

This same statement was repeated on the Army's determination and findings dated December 2, 1966, to justify a subsequent increase in the number of units under this contract. The statement was signed by Maj. Clyde V. Craighead, contracting officer.

In February 1967, the plot seemed to thicken. On February 27, the U.S. Army Electronics Command, Philadelphia, Pa., issued negotiation DAABO5-67-R-1176. This was issued—in secret—as a sole-source, noncompetitive action with RCA. It had a closing date of March 9, 1967. This negotiation proposed a multi-year procurement of radio set AN/PRC-77 and RT-841. The latter item was the major component of the radio transmitter-receiver.

Under date of March 7, 1967, a small manufacturer, Decitron Electronics Corp., 841 Essex Street, Brooklyn, N.Y., submitted a letter-bid to the U.S. Army Electronics Command in Philadelphia. The bid made reference to negotiation DAABO5-67-R-1176, to which I have just referred. It quoted a price of \$893.75 per unit for the AN/PRC-77 and a price of \$793.75 per unit for the RT-841.

The bid stated that the unit prices quoted actually included all ancillary items of provisions documentation, selection worksheets, initial tool and test equipment lists, and so forth. The Decitron bid even went so far as to suggest to the Army Electronics Command that if the Army doubted Decitron's ability to fulfill the contract, the matter could be referred to the Small Business Administration for a certificate of competency.

Under date of April 5, 1967, the Army Electronics Command, of Philadelphia, in a letter signed by Maj. Clyde B. Craighead, rejected Decitron's bid on the basis of "urgency of delivery and lack of manufacturing drawings." The drawings referred to were the self-same drawings required for delivery by March 31, 1967, under RCA's contract No. 10410. That was 5 days earlier than the date of this letter.

This was the same RCA contract that was previously justified on a sole-source basis for the purpose of obtaining the specific drawings required to avoid the necessity for subsequent sole-source procurement.

On April 23, 1967, the Army awarded contract No. DAABO5-67-C-170 to RCA covering 10,500 units of the AN/PRC-77 at a price of \$937.16 per unit. The total amount of this RCA contract, which included ancillary items, was \$10,087,431. This was \$884,856 higher than the bid submitted by Decitron.

On June 7, 1967, the Army announced this contract in the Department of Commerce Business Daily—PSA 4326, page 15, column 4. Curiously enough, the Army's announcement stated that the award was only for 3,300 units of the AN/PRC-77 and for 900 units of the RT-841 for a total price of only \$4,094,745. The fact of the matter was that this contract was actually in excess of \$10 million. On May 31, 1967, this contract—DAABO5-67-C-0170—was increased by modification No. 1, to cover an additional 1,298 units of the AN/PRC-77 for an additional cost of \$1,234,684. Further, the Department of Commerce Business Daily later announced another modification, dated August 16, 1967. This one added another \$5,992,686 to the total amount of this contract.

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

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, we had hoped to have a little time remaining for the transaction of routine morning business. We have at least one Senator in the Chamber who wishes to take advantage of that time.

I wonder if the Senator might finish his speech in 3 minutes.

Mr. DOMINICK. I will do my best.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Colorado is recognized for an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, it is absolutely inconceivable that this last modification could possibly be justified

on the basis of urgency of delivery. The delivery of these units is for a multiyear requirement with options that could allow delivery to span 4 years. Nor could it be justified on the basis of lack of production drawings. After all, the Army, for the American taxpayers, had already given RCA \$54,834 to purchase these drawings in the original production contract of June 26, 1966.

Mr. President, the inequities, inefficiencies, and apparent mismanagement in this case, seemed so glaring to me that I sought additional information as to the capability of the Decitron Co. I secured a listing of 36 contracts under which this company had performed for the Department of Defense. Since the majority of these contracts for radio equipment had been awarded by the Navy, I asked the Navy to review its files and advise me whether there had been any history of failure by this company to perform, or any instance in which this company might have been suspected of underbidding and of subsequently applying for extraordinary financial relief under Public Law 85-804. The Navy reported to me that this company had not failed in the performance of any of its contracts for the Navy, and that there was no evidence that the company had sought extraordinary financial relief under Public Law 85-804.

Mr. President, what has made this case even more highly suspect has been the apparent attempts to keep information concerning it from the public. For example: On April 29, 1967, Mr. Robert R. Siegrist, a fully accredited, Washington-based, reporter-commentator with the Mutual Broadcasting System, and a highly respected member of the broadcast community, presented his credentials to the Army and asked some pertinent questions about the transactions of contract DA-36-039-AMC-10410(E), together with all amendments, and a copy of the determination and findings used to justify this award, and also advice as to what disposition was made of the drawings furnished under that contract.

Three and a half weeks later, on May 24, he received a simple acknowledgment from the Department of the Army advising that replies were being prepared to each of his questions. Under date of July 10, 1967, more than 2 months after his initial request, he received a further response from the Army. It advised him that the information he had requested could only be provided if he prepaid a cost of \$120.75. That advice was given to a reporter.

Numerous telephone calls in the ensuing 10 days failed to produce results. Finally, after a telephone call to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, the Honorable Phil G. Goulding, a letter dated July 21 was forthcoming from Gen. Lloyd D. Ramsey, Acting Chief of Public Information, advising that the material would be furnished without cost.

Thus, fully 3 months after this material should have been public information, it was finally made available to the newsmen. But, lo and behold, in response to the question concerning other bidders under this contract, the Army

contended that RCA was the only bidder, completely concealing the bid of March 7, 1967, by Decitron.

Mr. President, the factors in this case seem to raise very serious questions as to the relationship existing between the Department of the Army procurement officials and the Radio Corp. of America. I think we should ask the question as to whether any specific benefits have been derived by any one in the Army or elsewhere as a consequence of this peculiar procedure. Why was the significantly lower bid by Decitron, the small electronics firm, rejected under the claim that drawings did not exist when in fact they not only did exist, but the original production contract of June 26, 1966, had specifically required RCA to deliver such drawings for competitive bidding on subsequent procurement? Bear in mind that this was the original contract under which RCA was paid \$54,834 on a noncompetitive basis to produce these manufacturing drawings and deliver them by March 31, 1967. Therefore, these drawings were the property of the taxpayers of the United States.

There appears to be a similar pattern in both of the instances I have cited today, and I am certain there must be others. I suggest that Congress may be well advised at this time to begin an indepth investigation into our military procurement procedures. We owe it to our taxpayers that every step be taken by those spending the taxpayers' funds to insure highest efficiency at the lowest cost. And we owe it to the small businessman that he be treated equitably and fairly in his dealings with Federal procurement officials. There seems to be growing reason to question whether either is being done in many cases coming to light at present.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order previously entered, the Senate will proceed to the transaction of routine morning business.

EXECUTIVE REFORM

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, on January 11 of this year, I introduced a bill (S. 47), since cosponsored by 41 of my colleagues, to create a Hoover-type Commission on the Operation of the Executive Branch to study the organization and functioning of the Federal bureaucracy for a 2-year period and to make appropriate recommendations to Congress.

Twelve years have passed since the second Hoover Commission submitted its report. During this period many programs have been expanded and many new ones have been added, resulting in a rapid growth of the size of the executive branch and the scope of its responsibilities.

Thus, today we are faced with a bewildering variety of programs, many of which are attempting to treat the same problems. For example, more than 260 programs administered by 16 separate

departments and agencies are involved in the war on poverty. Over 30 Federal programs are concerned with teacher training.

In addition to the rapid expansion of existing programs, the past decade has witnessed an almost incredible proliferation of new projects and departments. It is this growth which is most indicative of the changing role of the Federal Government. Occasional attempts have been made to evaluate this change, but the reports have usually been quite scanty and disappointing.

As a result, Mr. President, I asked the Legislative Reference Service, in the person of Mrs. Helen Dalrymple, to prepare a comprehensive review of the number of new agencies, departments, and bureaus that have been created since the submission of the second Hoover report in 1955. The ensuing report indicates the name of each new office, the statutory authority for its organization, the size of its budget and staff at the time of its creation, and the size of its budget and staff today.

This review, the first integral investigation of the major new agencies created in the Federal Government in the past 12 years, has had to deal with a variety of problems peculiar to a study of this kind. For example, it is seldom that a new agency is created within an executive department with completely new functions. More often it is an expansion of existing activities or an amalgamation of widely scattered functions being

performed in different offices of the same agency. Thus, for the most part, agencies which are merely new names for old offices were not included in this investigation. In some instances, however, where the agency's responsibilities were significantly increased, the agency was included, with a note indicating the name of the office it superseded.

Moreover, the budgets for some Departments, notably Defense and State, are broken down by function rather than by line agency, so that it proved most difficult to determine how much has been spent by each agency.

In order to more fully understand the figures reported in this study, a further word of explanation is required. Except for specific dates, the years used in this review indicate fiscal years. In addition, figures for budget expenditures were used in every case where they were available. Otherwise, the figures for obligational authority or new obligational authority were used and are indicated by the initials OA and NOA. A dash indicates that the figures were not readily available from the budget.

Mr. President, partial as the figures in this study may be, they indicate a startling growth in the number and scope of completely new functions in the executive branch. For example, when the Office of Economic Opportunity was created it had a staff of 428 as of January 1, 1965. In 2 years this personnel figure had more than quintupled to 2,393. In the same period the budget figure rose

from approximately \$200 million to \$1.8 billion—a ninefold increase.

In addition, the Administration on Aging nearly doubled its personnel in the 2 years since its inauguration in 1965 from 47 to 86, while its budget increased over eight times from \$2.1 million to \$16.7 million.

These and other examples show that since 1955, a total of at least \$19.1 billion and 142,000 employees has been invested in new programs alone. The subsequent rate of increase of these new projects is even more surprising. As the study indicates, since the new programs were begun in many instances just 1, 2, or 3 years ago, 52,190 employees and \$12.5 billion have fueled their expansion. And the growth rate is increasing.

Mr. President, it is true this growth has, in large measure, been a response to public pressure for new and improved services. But, necessary as this expansion may have been, it is also true that to a considerable degree it has been uncontrolled. A thorough, objective, and far-reaching review of these changes is long overdue. Unless such a step is taken shortly, the value of these and other programs now just visible on the horizon will be significantly impaired.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the study by the Legislative Reference Service of executive growth be printed in the RECORD.

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

MAJOR INDEPENDENT AGENCIES AND DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES CREATED IN THE U.S. GOVERNMENT SINCE 1955

Agency	Statutory authority	At time of creation		Now	
		Budget (in thousands of dollars) (date)	Personnel (date)	1968 budget (in thousands of dollars)	Jan. 1, 1967, personnel
Executive Office of the President:					
National Aeronautics and Space Council.....	72 Stat. 426, July 29, 1958.....	203 (1962).....	14 (Jan. 1, 1962).....	505.....	24.
Office of Science and Technology.....	Reorganization Plan No. 2, 76 Stat. 1253, June 8, 1962.	464 (1963).....	48 (Jan. 1, 1964).....	1,752.....	105.
Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations.....	Executive order, Jan. 15, 1963.	400 (1964).....	30 (Jan. 1, 1964).....	566.....	30.
Office of Economic Opportunity.....	78 Stat. 508, Aug. 20, 1964.....	211,234 (1965).....	428 (Jan. 1, 1965).....	1,860,000.....	2,393.
Independent Offices and Commissions:					
Administrative Conference of the United States.....	Executive order, Apr. 13, 1961.	150 ((OA) 1962).....	1 (1962).....	240.....	6 (estimated, 1968).
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.....	73 Stat. 703, Sept. 24, 1959.....	35 (1960).....	5 (1960).....	481.....	43.
Appalachian Regional Commission.....	79 Stat. 5, Mar. 9, 1965.....	612 (1966).....	10 (Jan. 1, 1966).....	785.....	10.
Commission on Civil Rights.....	71 Stat. 634, Sept. 9, 1957.....	655 (1959).....	65 (1959).....	2,700.....	149.
Delaware River Basin Commission.....	75 Stat. 688, Sept. 27, 1961.....	20 ((OA) 1962).....	2 (1963).....	179.....	2.
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.....	78 Stat. 241, July 2, 1964 (operational July 2, 1965).	2,590 (1966).....	314 (1966).....	7,094.....	314 (estimated, 1967).
Federal Maritime Commission.....	Reorganization Plan No. 7, 75 Stat. 840, Aug. 12, 1961.	1,163 (1962).....	142 (Jan. 1, 1962).....	3,700.....	251.
Federal Radiation Council.....	Executive order, Aug. 14, 1959.	20 ((OA) 1961).....	125.....	9.
National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....	72 Stat. 426, July 29, 1958.....	145,491 (1959).....	9,286 (1959).....	5,300,000.....	34,706.
National Capital Transportation Agency.....	74 Stat. 537, July 14, 1960.....	135 (1961).....	16 (Jan. 1, 1961).....	7,155.....	40.
National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities.....	79 Stat. 845, Sept. 29, 1965.....	1,228 (1966).....	21 (Jan. 1, 1966).....	15,000.....	183.
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.....	75 Stat. 631, Sept. 26, 1961.....	1,033 (1962).....	89 (1962).....	9,400.....	251.
Water Resources Council.....	79 Stat. 244, July 22, 1965.....	275,238 (1966).....	14 (1966).....	1,320,020 (NOA).....	16.
Department of Agriculture:					
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service (successor to Agricultural Conservation Program Service and State ASC committees).....	Departmental order, June 5, 1961.	726,020 (1961).....	6,615 (Jan. 1, 1962).....	704,302.....	5,058.
Rural Community Development Service (superseded Office of Rural Areas Development).....	Departmental order, Feb. 4, 1965.	187 (1964).....	31 (Jan. 1, 1966).....	460.....	30.
International Agricultural Development Service.....	Departmental order, Aug. 5, 1963.	58 (Jan. 1, 1964).....	8,700 (funds come from AID).....	84.
Economic Research Service.....	Departmental order, Apr. 3, 1961.	8,190 (1962).....	957 (Jan. 1, 1962).....	13,306.....	1,149.
Area Redevelopment Administration.....	75 Stat. 47, May 1, 1961.....	7,339 (1962).....	201 (Jan. 1, 1962).....	See EDA.....	See EDA.
Economic Development Administration (successor to ARA).....	79 Stat. 552, Aug. 26, 1965.....	55,160 (1965).....	404 (Jan. 1, 1966).....	Total economic develop- ment assistance, 321,900.....	936.
Environmental Science Services Administration (con- solidated Weather Bureau, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Radio Propagation Laboratory).....	Reorganization Plan No. 2, July 13, 1965, 79 Stat. 1318.	139,863 (1965).....	10,231 (Jan. 1 1966).....	178,860.....	10,492.
Office of Foreign Commercial Services.....	Departmental Order 183, Feb. 1, 1963.	46 (Jan. 1, 1964).....	46.
Bureau of International Commerce.....	Departmental Order 182, Feb. 1, 1963.	Total international activ- ities, 10,026 (1963).....	769 (Jan. 1, 1964).....	Total international activ- ities, 17,950.....	792.
Office of State Technical Services.....	79 Stat. 679, Sept. 14, 1965.....	1,461 (1966).....	4 (Jan. 1, 1966).....	8,000.....	10.
U.S. Travel Service.....	75 Stat. 129, June 29, 1961.....	1,481 (1962).....	31 (Jan. 1, 1962).....	3,850.....	82.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

In the Department of Defense, four major agencies have been created since 1955: the Defense Communications Agency (May 12, 1960); the Defense Contract Audit Agency (July 1, 1965); the Defense Intelligence

Agency (August 1, 1961); and the Defense Supply Agency (January 1, 1962). In addition, the Armed Forces Special Weapons Project of 1947 was redesignated the Defense Atomic Support Agency in 1959. Comparative budgetary figures are not readily available for

these agencies, however, since the budget for the Defense Department and the military services is broken down by civilian and military functions rather than by line agency activities.

Agency	Statutory authority	At time of creation		Now	
		Budget (in thousands of dollars) (date)	Personnel (date)	1968 budget (in thousands of dollars)	Jan. 1, 1967, personnel
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:					
Bureau of Disease Prevention and Environmental Control (reorganization in Public Health Service).	Departmental order, Jan. 1, 1967.	179,486 (1966).....	-----	204,683 (includes funds proposed for separate transmittal).	-----
Bureau of Health Manpower (reorganization in Public Health Service).	...do.....	25,373 (1966).....	-----	189,647 (includes funds proposed for separate transmittal).	-----
Bureau of Health Services (reorganization in Public Health Service).	...do.....	388,066 (1966).....	-----	451,147.....	-----
Cuban refugee program.....	Presidential letter to the Secretary, Jan. 27, 1961.	52,902 (1963).....	101 (Jan. 1, 1964).....	51,276.....	173.
Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development (authority expired June 30, 1967; legislation pending in Congress).	75 Stat. 572, Sept. 22, 1961..	1,386 (1962).....	9 (1962).....	5,039.....	37.
Bureau of Family Services.....	Departmental order, January 1962.	3,708 (1963).....	377 (Jan. 1, 1962).....	8,489.....	615.
Administration on Aging.....	79 Stat. 218, July 14, 1965..	2,191 (1966).....	47 (Jan. 1, 1966).....	16,765.....	86.
Department of the Interior:					
Office of Minerals and Solid Fuels (successor to Office of Minerals Mobilization).	Departmental order, Nov. 2, 1962.	95 (1964) (estimated expenditures.)	15 (1964) (estimated)...	-----	8.
Oil Import Administration.....	Presidential proclamation, Mar. 10, 1959.	68 (OA) 1960.....	6 (Jan. 1, 1961).....	232 (NOA).....	11.
Oil Import Appeals Board.....	...do.....	9 (OA) 1960.....	2 (Jan. 1, 1961).....	15 (NOA).....	1.
Office of Coal Research.....	74 Stat. 336, July 7, 1960..	47 (1961).....	1 (Jan. 1, 1961).....	8,625.....	20.
Defense Electric Power Administration.....	Executive order of the Secretary, Feb. 16, 1962.	-----	-----	-----	5.
Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.....	70 Stat. 1119, Aug. 8, 1956 (operational Nov. 6, 1956).	16,420 (1958).....	1,389 (1957).....	46,000.....	2,212.
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.....	...do.....	40,864 (1958).....	2,124 (1957).....	90,000.....	4,550.
Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.....	Apr. 2, 1962.....	969 (1963).....	126 (1963).....	105,686.....	490.
Federal Water Pollution Control Administration.....	79 Stat. 903, Oct. 2, 1965 (operational May 10, 1966).	116,509 (1966).....	-----	229,000.....	1,948.
Department of Justice:					
Community Relations Service (established in Commerce Department by Civil Rights Act of 1964; transferred to Justice Department by Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966, effective Apr. 22, 1966).	78 Stat. 241, July 2, 1964....	493 (1965).....	33 (Jan. 1, 1965).....	2,500.....	84.
Civil Rights Division.....	71 Stat. 634, Sept. 9, 1957...	Civil rights matters, 483 (OA).	-----	Civil rights matters, 2,567 (NOA).	201.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

In the Department of Labor, both the Manpower Administration and the Labor-Management Services Administration, created

since 1955, represent major reorganizations within the Department. However, it is difficult to isolate either budgetary or employment figures for these two agencies, since

their activities have been transferred several times to different offices, and because both have absorbed older agencies within the Department.

Agency	Statutory authority	At time of creation		Now	
		Budget (in thousands of dollars) (date)	Personnel (date)	1968 budget (in thousands of dollars)	Jan. 1, 1967, personnel
Post Office Department:					
Bureau of Research and Engineering.....	80 Stat. 262, July 5, 1966....	(Research, development, and engineering activities), 11,592 (OA)	-----	(Research, development, and engineering activities), 20,161 ¹ (NOA)	309.
Postal data centers.....	Fiscal 1964.....	-----	1,414 (Jan. 1, 1965).....	-----	1,468.
Department of State:					
Agency for International Development.....	75 Stat. 445, Sept. 4, 1961 (operational Nov. 3, 1961).	1,836,000 (1962) (expenditures).	15,393 (Jan. 1, 1962)....	2,430,000.....	16,296.
Peace Corps.....	75 Stat. 612, Sept. 22, 1961..	11,409 (1962) (expenditures).	418 (Jan. 1, 1962).....	112,000.....	1,482.
New departments:					
Department of Housing and Urban Development.....	79 Stat. 667, Sept. 9, 1965 (effective Nov. 9, 1965).	767,080 (1966).....	13,472 (Jan. 1, 1966)....	3,178,891 (NOA).....	13,841.
Department of Transportation.....	80 Stat. 931, Oct. 15, 1966 (effective Apr. 1, 1967).	1,276,338 (1966) (reflects amounts spent on activities now in Department of Transportation which were formerly in other departments).	-----	1,374,660 (includes funds proposed for separate transmittal).	-----
National Highway Safety Bureau (under Federal Highway Administration in Department of Transportation).	80 Stat. 731, Sept. 9, 1966....	-----	159 (1966).....	123,000.....	1,059 (1968) (estimated).
Federal Aviation Administration (transferred to Department of Transportation; formerly independent agency).	72 Stat. 731, Aug. 23, 1958..	241,735 (OA) (1959)....	25,581 (1958).....	826,713.....	42,844.

¹ Estimate indefinite because it is based on anticipated revenues from postal rate increase legislation pending before Congress.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be excused from attendance of the sessions of the Senate from Thursday, September 21, to Tuesday, October 3.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, and by unanimous consent, the

Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

WITHDRAWAL OF CERTAIN TREATIES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the

Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Executive Resolution 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The executive resolution will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and is hereby, directed to return to the President of the United States, in accordance with his request, the following treaties:

1. Protocol dated at The Hague, September 28, 1955, to amend the Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules Relating to International Carriage by Air signed at Warsaw on October 12, 1929 (Executive H, 86th Congress, 1st session.)

2. Convention (No. 109) concerning wages, hours of work on board ship, and manning, adopted by the International Labor Conference at its 41st (maritime) session, Geneva, May 14, 1958 (Executive L, 86th Congress, 2d session).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Ex. Res. 1) was considered and agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified immediately of the adoption of the resolution.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on September 17, 1967, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 906. An act for the relief of Luis Tapia Davila; and

S. 1448. An act for the relief of Roy A. Parker.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 828. An act to amend section 5(b) of the act of March 18, 1966 (Public Law 89-372), so as to make the prohibition contained therein on the filling of certain vacancies in the office of district judge for the eastern

district of Pennsylvania inapplicable to the first vacancy occurring after the enactment of such act;

S. 1465. An act to provide for holding terms of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern Division of the Northern District of Mississippi in Ackerman, Miss.; and

S. 1657. An act to extend for 1 year the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make indemnity payments to dairy farmers who are directed to remove their milk from commercial markets because it contains residues of chemicals registered and approved for use by the Federal Government.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 814. An act to establish the National Park Foundation; and

S. 1933. An act to provide for the disposition of judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1788) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource developments, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2828. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Iowa Tribes of Kansas and Nebraska and of Oklahoma in Indian Claims Commission dockets numbered 138 and 79, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8338. An act to create a new division for the western district of Texas, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8580. An act to convey certain land to the Squaxin Island Tribe of Indians; and

H.J. Res. 516. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, to increase the number of electric typewriters which may be furnished to Members by the Clerk of the House.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 2828. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Iowa Tribes of Kansas and Nebraska and of Oklahoma in Indian Claims Commission dockets numbered 138 and 79, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 8580. An act to convey certain land to the Squaxin Island Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 8338. An act to create a new division for the western district of Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 516. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, to increase the number of electric typewriters which may be furnished to Members by the Clerk of the House; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD ARMORY, DURANT, OKLA.

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting, pursuant to law, notification of the location, nature, and estimated cost of an additional facility project proposed to be undertaken for the Army National Guard (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize an increase in the numbers of officers of the Navy designated for engineering duty, aeronautical engineering duty, and special duty (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS AND PROGRAMS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting pursuant to law, a report on review of voluntary agreements and programs under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as of August 9, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON WAGE PAYMENTS TO HANDICAPPED CLIENTS IN SHELTERED WORKSHOPS

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on wage payments to handicapped clients in sheltered workshops, dated September 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the City Council of Carpinteria, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for a Federal tax sharing program; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of South Gate, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation relating to a tax-sharing program; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Riverbank, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation relating to tax sharing; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution of the City Council of the City of Cypress, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation relating to tax sharing; to the Committee on Finance.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. HOLLINGS:

S. 2427. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in February 1968, to commemorate American Heart Month and the national fight against the cardiovascular diseases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 2428. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey to the State of Washington certain lands in the counties of Yakima and Kittitas, Wash., in exchange for certain

other lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 2429. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an income tax credit to employers for the expenses of providing training to their employees and prospective employees under approved programs; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. MONTTOYA:

S. 2430. A bill for the establishment of a board to review proposed procurements of automatic data-processing equipment; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MONTTOYA (for himself and Mr. TYDINGS):

S. 2431. A bill to provide more effectively for the regulation of the use of, and for the preservation of safety and order within, the Executive Mansion and Grounds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

S. 2432. A bill for the relief of To Tsz Cheung; and

S. 2433. A bill for the relief of Dr. Gangadhar S. Kori; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 2434. A bill for the relief of Chang Cheng Ming;

S. 2435. A bill for the relief of Vasilios Stavropoulos;

S. 2436. A bill for the relief of Diamantino Ferreira Pereira;

S. 2437. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Pacino Biancorosso; and

S. 2438. A bill for the relief of Hon Chun Eng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON:

S.J. Res. 111. Joint resolution expressing opposition to vesting title to the ocean floor in the United Nations at this time; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. COTTON when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

SPECIAL POSTAGE STAMP TO COMMEMORATE AMERICAN HEART MONTH AND THE NATIONAL FIGHT AGAINST CARDIOVASCULAR DISEASES

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the dedicated fight of the American people against the cardiovascular diseases, through the National Heart Institute and through their voluntary contributions to the research, education, and community service programs of the American Heart Association.

This association and their work is of particular concern to me because my State of South Carolina leads the Nation in the number of deaths from heart disease. However, I am proud to say that the medical profession in South Carolina has been very active in leading the fight against this tragic disease. It is their opinion and mine that the issuance of this stamp "would be another method of calling to the public's attention the need for continued effort on all of our part to reduce this needless waste of much needed manpower."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2427) to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in

February 1968, to commemorate American Heart Month and the national fight against the cardiovascular diseases, introduced by Mr. HOLLINGS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

TAX CREDIT FOR "HUMAN INVESTMENT"

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to allow an income tax credit to employers for the expenses of providing training to employees and prospective employees.

The problems of industrial production are twofold. One side of the problem is that of the productive machinery, the plant and equipment. We have encouraged expansion by a variety of means to induce capital investment, not least of which is the 7-percent investment credit which has now been restored. The other, and in some ways even more important, ingredient of industrial production is the worker. One is financial capital, the other human capital.

But for the latter we have not made equal provision. It is our lack of attention to the human element of the economy which has led to many of the dissatisfactions at the root of our ghetto problems. People who have no jobs have no stake in the society. When the unemployed among Negro youth comprise 1 out of every 4—a 25-percent unemployment rate, as compared with the overall 4-percent rate in the economy as a whole—we have failed in a most obvious way to integrate the human element into the economic order with the same attention and care as we have done for the plant and capital element.

Private industry is the basis for our economy. All that the Government does in that basis should be designed for the welfare of the Nation. This includes the principle of support for capital investment; the stimulus which it provides benefits the Nation as a whole. But we have never fully grasped and fully acknowledged the necessity for support and encouragement of private industry in the realm of human investment.

It is costly to develop people. We have seen that through the programs of the Federal Government which are directed toward manpower development and training. We have seen it in the Job Corps. We have seen it in all our efforts to set up Government programs, into which we try to draw industry, for the improvement and training of undereducated and underskilled people. The jobs are there, and the people are there. But too often the people cannot be matched with the jobs. Industry has itself neither the patience nor the willingness to invest its own resources in the training process on the scale necessary.

But there is no reason why we should not tackle the problem from the other direction as well as from that of government. Why should we not devise means and incentives that will bring the initiative from private industry to be the prime mover in developing people as well as capital resources?

The bill I introduce today is designed to induce the private sector to take the initiative. It is highly gratifying that the insurance industry has come forward with initiative for private investment in a way that will help solve the Nation's housing crisis. They are not doing this in a completely altruistic fashion—no business can afford to lose money for the sake of public benefit. There has to be at least a break-even prospect.

This prospect has not been present for small businesses in the area of training programs. Large industries have been able to wait for the beneficial longrun returns from training programs, and with their greater resources and complex organization they are willing to expand their internal operations to areas—public relations, morale-building employee activities, and others—beyond the direct production process. Smaller businesses generally cannot.

My bill will encourage particularly the smaller industry to move into programs of training both those who are presently unemployed and those who need upgrading.

It does so by providing a tax credit equal to 15 percent of the training expense, even if there is only one employee trained. Not only does it cover out-of-pocket expense, but wages and salaries paid to employees receiving training may be figured in as the base on which the tax credit may be taken. In addition, of course, these costs may be fully deducted as a normal cost of operation.

But the determination that training is being accomplished is not at the whim of the employer. His program must be approved by the Department of Labor, which is instructed to give first priority to those programs which will assist the unemployed, or those, in the words of the bill, "whose compensation from employment is insufficient to provide a decent standard of living." A second, and equally desirable, high priority is given to approving training in geographical areas with a proportionately high number of unemployed or marginally employed.

Further, approvable training programs exclude any which are directed toward development of management, supervisory, professional, or human relations skills—the aim is to develop those at the bottom of the economic structure, not those who are already up the management ladder.

Again, in order to induce the participation of the smaller business and industry, including the sole owner or partnership business, there is a limit—albeit a fairly generous one—on the amount of tax credit which may be taken. That limit is \$25,000. This means that the total training costs, including wages, which can be used as the basis for tax credit cannot be more than \$166,000. Any training expenses beyond that figure would lie outside the tax credit provision, but of course would be subject to present tax rules.

Again, as incentive for the involvement of smaller employers, there is provision for carryback and carryover of unused credit. Unused credit in one year could be carried back to the previous 3 years, or carried over to the succeeding 7 taxable years. Thus, it would be possible for

an employer to carry on a more extensive training program in a concentrated effort, one which exceeds the set limits for the taxable year, and still receive his credit. Theoretically, if a program should run even to 10 times the allowable costs—say, \$1,500,000 in a single year—if there is no training program for the three preceding or the 7 succeeding years, the employer could nevertheless recoup the allowable 15 percent for a total as high as \$250,000 in tax credits when fully spread out.

Here is a proposal by which I intend to promote a partnership between private industry and government in the job training area. By offering the tax incentive, including the cost of wages for those in an approved program, the initiative will come from private industry, not from government. The reverse process, I believe, does not work as well in many respects. Here, rather than the government seeking to enlist a reluctant industry or businessman in a program for which he finds small benefit to himself, the businessman will have sufficient incentive to take the initiative and enlist the government as it stands ready and willing.

We surely need not argue the need for aiding those who have no jobs to become paid workers. Full employment is our official and even statutory policy. Yet we have an unemployment rate which, even at its present level, is well above that recorded in most Western countries. The welfare rolls seem to shrink but little year by year. But there are other reasons for moving into such a program as this.

First, we need industrial and scientific skills which on-the-job training can help supply. Second, we must look forward to integrating our returning veterans into rewarding and productive employment. It is well known that the high reenlistment rate among certain groups is due to the fact that they cannot, or fear they cannot, find employment on the "outside"—they do not have marketable civilian skills. Third, we need to replace skills which are made obsolete by automation or economic change. Fourth, retraining will be needed for workers who may become displaced by defense industry closings when—or should I say if?—the war in Vietnam comes to a close.

We are committed in Federal policy to training and retraining, to making those unemployed employable, to doing all we can to remove individuals from the degradation of joblessness and welfare payments. The question is simple: How can it best be done?

We are already attacking the problem in other ways. But we have not yet made use of the carrot of tax incentive to bring in the voluntary initiative of the American businessman, and particularly the small businessman who would never normally consider that a government training program is anything for him. Yet it is the small business which is to a large extent the backbone of the economy.

Mr. President, I hope my bill will receive early consideration. I ask unanimous consent that its text may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately

referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2429) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an income tax credit to employers for the expenses of providing training to their employees and prospective employees under approved programs, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2429

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Employment Opportunity Tax Incentive Act of 1967".

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of the Congress in enacting this Act to provide an incentive to employers—

(1) to provide training for individuals, both employees and prospective employees, who lack basic skills to maintain or secure employment of a kind which provides compensation sufficient to maintain a fair and decent standard of living in the modern economy; and

(2) to provide retraining for individuals, both employees and prospective employees, whose skills have become obsolete or are no longer needed in the areas where they reside.

It is the purpose of the Congress, in particular, to stimulate and encourage the establishment or expansion by employers of training programs to provide skills to such individuals who reside in areas of proportionately high unemployment. It is also the purpose of the Congress to encourage employers to establish or expand programs to provide training in advanced skills for their employees who possess basic skills, thereby enabling such employees to attain higher standards of living and giving such employees increased pride in their employment.

SEC. 3. Subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits allowable) is amended by renumbering section 40 as section 41, and by inserting after section 39 the following new section:

"SEC. 40. EXPENSES OF EMPLOYEE TRAINING PROGRAMS.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—There shall be allowed, as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter, the amount determined under subpart C of this part.

"(b) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section and subpart C."

SEC. 4. Part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits against tax) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subpart:

"SUBPART C—RULES FOR COMPUTING CREDIT FOR EXPENSES OF EMPLOYEE TRAINING PROGRAMS

"Sec. 51. Amount of credit.

"Sec. 52. Definitions; special rules.

"SEC. 51. AMOUNT OF CREDIT.

"(a) DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT.—

"(1) GENERAL RULE.—The amount of the credit allowed by section 40 for the taxable year shall be equal to 15 percent of the employee training expenses (as defined in section 52(a)) paid or incurred by the taxpayer during the taxable year.

"(2) LIMITATION BASED ON AMOUNT OF TAX.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the credit allowed by section 40 for the taxable year shall not exceed—

"(A) so much of the liability for tax for the taxable year as does not exceed \$25,000, plus

"(B) 50 percent of so much of the liability for tax for the taxable year as exceeds \$25,000.

"(3) LIABILITY FOR TAX.—For purposes of paragraph (2), the liability for tax for the taxable year shall be the tax imposed by this chapter for such year, reduced by the sum of the credits allowable under—

"(A) section 33 (relating to foreign tax credit),

"(B) section 35 (relating to partially tax exempt interest),

"(C) section 37 (relating to retirement income), and

"(D) section 38 (relating to investment in certain depreciable property).

For purposes of this paragraph, any tax imposed for the taxable year by section 531 (relating to accumulated earnings tax), section 541 (relating to personal holding company tax), or section 1378 (relating to tax on certain capital gains of subchapter S corporations), and any additional tax imposed for the taxable year by section 1351(d)(1) (relating to recoveries of foreign expropriation losses), shall not be considered tax imposed by this chapter for such year.

"(4) MARRIED INDIVIDUALS.—In the case of a husband or wife who files a separate return, the amount specified under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (2) shall be \$12,500 in lieu of \$25,000. This paragraph shall not apply if the spouse of the taxpayer has no employee training expenses for, and no unused credit carryback or carryover to, the taxable year of such spouse which ends within or with the taxpayer's taxable year.

"(5) AFFILIATED GROUPS.—In the case of an affiliated group, the \$25,000 amount specified under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (2) shall be reduced for each member of the group by apportioning \$25,000 among the members of such group in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate shall by regulations prescribe. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term 'affiliated group' has the meaning assigned to such term by section 1504(a), except that all corporations shall be treated as includible corporations (without any exclusion under section 1504(b)).

"(b) CARRYBACK AND CARRYOVER OF UNUSED CREDIT.—

"(1) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—If the amount of the credit determined under subsection (a)(1) for any taxable year exceeds the limitation provided by subsection (a)(2) for such taxable year (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as 'unused credit year'), such excess shall be—

"(A) an employee training credit carryback to each of the 3 taxable years preceding the unused credit year, and

"(B) an employee training credit carryover to each of the 7 taxable years following the unused credit year,

and shall be added to the amount allowable as a credit by section 40 for such years, except that such excess may be a carryback only to a taxable year beginning after the date of the enactment of the Employment Opportunity Tax Incentive Act of 1967. The entire amount of the unused credit for an unused credit year shall be carried to the earliest of the 10 taxable years to which (by reason of subparagraphs (A) and (B)) such credit may be carried, and then to each of the other 9 taxable years to the extent that, because of the limitation contained in paragraph (2), such unused credit may not be added for a prior taxable year to which such unused credit may be carried.

"(2) LIMITATION.—The amount of the unused credit which may be added under paragraph (1) for any preceding or succeeding taxable year shall not exceed the amount by which the limitation provided by subsection (a)(2) for such taxable year exceeds the sum of—

"(A) the credit allowable under subsection (a)(1) for such taxable year, and

"(B) the amounts which, by reason of this subsection, are needed to the amount allowable for such taxable year and attributable to taxable years preceding the unused credit year.

"SEC. 52. DEFINITIONS; SPECIAL RULES.

"(a) EMPLOYEE TRAINING EXPENSES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subpart, the term 'employee training expenses' means—

"(A) expenses incurred by the taxpayer in providing one or more approved employee training programs for his employees or prospective employees,

"(B) expenses incurred by the taxpayer for training of his employees or prospective employees under an approved employee training program provided by another person, and

"(C) wages and salaries paid to employees, and allowances paid to prospective employees, receiving training under an approved employee training program described in clauses (i) and (ii) of subsection (b) (1) (A).

"(2) LIMITATION.—An expense shall not be treated as an employee training expense if such expense would have been incurred by the taxpayer in the conduct of his trade or business without regard to any approved employee training program provided by him.

"(b) APPROVED EMPLOYEE TRAINING PROGRAMS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subpart, the term 'approved employee training program' means a program—

"(A) which is designed—

"(i) to teach basic trade, business, or industrial skills to individuals who possess none of such skills,

"(ii) to teach new basic trade, business, or industrial skills to individuals whose skills have become obsolete because of advances in trade, business, or industrial procedures or techniques or have become unneeded because of a lack of demand for their skills, or

"(iii) to teach advanced trade, business, or industrial skills to individuals who possess basic or advanced skills in trade, business, or industry; and

"(B) which is approved by the Secretary of Labor as fulfilling the standards, requirements, and conditions prescribed by him for purposes of this subpart.

"(2) STANDARDS FOR APPROVAL.—The Secretary of Labor, after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, shall prescribe the standards, requirements, and conditions for approval of an employee training program for purposes of this subpart. Such standards, requirements, and conditions shall include—

"(A) the minimum and maximum periods for which training may be provided to individuals receiving training in the various trade, business, and industrial skills; and

"(B) the conditions under which an employer may be excused from offering employment to a prospective employee for whom he has provided training.

"(3) PROGRAMS DESIGNED TO REDUCE UNEMPLOYMENT, ETC.—In approving employee training programs for purposes of this subpart, the Secretary of Labor—

"(A) shall give priority in consideration to those employee training programs in which the prospective trainees (or a majority of the prospective trainees) are individuals—

"(i) who are unemployed, or whose compensation from employment is insufficient to provide a decent standard of living, and

"(ii) who reside in areas where a proportionately large number of individuals either are unemployed or are individuals whose compensation from employment is insufficient to provide a decent standard of living; and

"(B) may provide exceptions to the standards, requirements, and conditions prescribed by him for purposes of this subpart for employee training programs described in subparagraph (A), or may pre-

scribe different standards, requirements, and conditions for such employee training programs.

"(4) WITHDRAWAL OF APPROVAL.—The Secretary of Labor shall withdraw his approval of any employee training previously approved by him if he determines that such program—

"(A) no longer fulfills the standards, requirements, and conditions prescribed by him for purposes of this subpart, or

"(B) is not being conducted in compliance with such standards, requirements, and conditions.

"(c) LIMITATIONS.—

"(1) TRADE OR BUSINESS EXPENSES.—No item shall be taken into account under subsection (a) unless such item is allowable as a deduction under section 162 (relating to trade or business expenses). For purposes of applying the preceding sentence, expenses which are paid or incurred by the taxpayer with respect to an individual who is not his employee shall be treated as paid or incurred with respect to an individual who is his employee.

"(2) CERTAIN KINDS OF TRAINING EXCLUDED.—

"(A) No item shall be taken into account under subsection (a) with respect to any expense paid or incurred in providing training for any individual in—

"(i) management, supervisory, professional, or human relation skills; or

"(ii) subjects not contributing specifically and directly to such individual's employment or prospective employment.

"(3) REIMBURSED EXPENSES.—No item shall be taken into account under subsection (a) to the extent that the taxpayer is reimbursed for such item by any person (including reimbursement under any Federal, State, or local government program, grant, contract, or agreement).

"(4) GEOGRAPHICAL LIMITATION.—No item shall be taken into account under subsection (a) with respect to any expense paid or incurred by the taxpayer for training conducted on the territory of any foreign country.

"(d) SUBCHAPTER S CORPORATIONS.—In case of an electing small business corporation (as defined in section 1371)—

"(1) the employee training expenses for each taxable year shall be apportioned pro rata among the persons who are shareholders of such corporation on the last day of such taxable year, and

"(2) any person to whom any employee training expense has been apportioned under paragraph (1) shall be treated (for purposes of this subpart) as the taxpayer with respect to such expense.

"(e) ESTATES AND TRUSTS.—In the case of an estate or trust—

"(1) the employee training expenses for any taxable year shall be apportioned between the estate or trust and the beneficiaries on the basis of the income of the estate or trust allocable to each.

"(2) any beneficiary to whom any employee training expense has been apportioned under paragraph (1) shall be treated (for purposes of this subpart) as the taxpayer with respect to such expense, and

"(3) the \$25,000 amount specified under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 51 (a) (2) applicable to such estate or trust shall be reduced to an amount which bears the same ratio to \$25,000 as the amount of the employee training expenses allocated to the estate or trust under paragraph (1) bears to the entire amount of the employee training expenses.

"(f) LIMITATIONS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN PERSONS.—In the case of—

"(1) an organization to which section 593 applies,

"(2) a regulated investment company or a real estate investment trust subject to taxation under subchapter M (section 851 and following), and

"(3) a cooperative organization described in section 1381(a),

rules similar to the rules provided in section 46(d) shall apply under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(g) CROSS REFERENCE.—

"For application of this subpart to certain acquiring corporations, see section 381(c) (24)."

SEC. 5. (a) The table of subparts for part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"SUBPART C. RULES FOR COMPUTING CREDIT FOR EXPENSES OF EMPLOYEE TRAINING PROGRAMS."

(b) The table of sections of subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by striking out the last item and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 40. Expenses of employee training programs.

"Sec. 41. Overpayments of tax."

(c) Section 381(c) of such Code (relating to items taken into account in certain corporate acquisitions) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(24) Credit under section 40 for employee training expenses.—The acquiring corporation shall take into account (to the extent proper to carry out the purposes of this section and section 40, and under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) the items required to be taken into account for purposes of section 40 in respect of the distributor or transferor corporation."

SEC. 6. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

OPPOSITION TO VESTING TITLE TO THE OCEAN FLOOR IN THE UNITED NATIONS AT THIS TIME

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a Senate joint resolution expressing the opposition of the Congress to vesting title to the ocean floor in the United Nations at this time.

There is a move afoot in the United Nations to seek title to the ocean floor. Ultimately this may be the proper solution to many of the legal problems which will inevitably arise as we and other nations explore the "inner space" of the sea. But it seems to me that it would be both premature and ill advised for the United States to back such a move at this time when we are just in the process of evolving a national policy on oceanography.

It is encouraging to learn that spokesmen for the administration have indicated that such action is not presently approved, but I believe a resolution by the Congress would be a very desirable additional safeguard.

I ask unanimous consent that a recent statement on this subject which was issued by the National Oceanography Association be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the Record.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 111) expressing opposition to vesting title to the ocean floor in the United Nations at this time, introduced by Mr. COTTON, was received, read twice by its title, and re-

ferred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The statement presented by Mr. Cotton is as follows:

A move by an international organization of lawyers to have the United Nations take control of all deep sea mineral resources beyond the continental shelf drew vigorous opposition from the National Oceanography Association today.

The action, which was called "shocking to most Americans" by NOA, was taken by the World Peace Through Law Center. At a conference in Geneva, it passed a resolution calling upon the U.N. to take over the ocean resources by proclamation. Chairman of the World Peace Through Law Center is Charles S. Rhyne of Washington, D.C., a former President of the American Bar Association. It numbers among its members such prominent people as Chief Justice Earl Warren of the U.S. Supreme Court.

"This is a serious threat," said NOA President John H. Clotworthy. "Mr. Rhyne has told us that the international law organization is doing everything it can to bring the deep ocean mineral resources under control of the U.N. Furthermore, we have been reliably informed that the move has behind the scenes support within our own State Department."

Mr. Clotworthy, who is Chairman of the Division of Ocean Engineering of the University of Miami, said that NOA, a broad-based organization representing industry, the scientific and academic communities, and the general public, is working vigorously to head off the move to give the ocean resources to the U.N. He made specific reference to a resolution opposing the U.N. take-over at this time which is being introduced in Congress by U.S. Rep. Richard T. Hanna of California. It is expected that a number of other members of Congress will join in sponsoring this resolution.

The National Oceanography Association head said that "conferring title to mineral resources on the deep ocean floor on the United Nations or any other group at this time would be premature and ill-advised."

He pointed out that the action advocated by the international organization of lawyers is directly at odds with a resolution of the American Bar Association last year, urging the U.S. Government to thoroughly review the issues at stake "prior to framing any policy vis-a-vis other nations with respect to sea resources not covered by existing law."

"There are some competent authorities who believe that in the long run a general agreement on the allocation of these mineral resources may be necessary," the NOA statement said. "However, at present our knowledge is limited about the extent of the resources, the means of gaining access to them, the conditions for processing and marketing them, and how activities connected with their extraction will affect other uses of the sea."

Mr. Clotworthy pointed out that oil companies in the United States already have the technology to recover oil from the sea bed at a depth of 200 meters. The action urged by the World Peace Through Law Conference would not let them drill beyond this depth without going to the United Nations for permission.

"Placing industry in a position where it would be uncertain as to ownership and licensing arrangements for mineral rights beyond the continental shelf would most certainly stifle the technological development which is permitting us to go deeper and deeper into the ocean in search of its resources," the NOA statement said. "This would work to the detriment of all peoples everywhere."

Public attention was focused on the question of vesting title to deep ocean resources in the U.N. when it was suggested earlier

this year by Senator Frank Church, a U.S. Representative to the U.N.

INDEPENDENCE DAY—JULY 4TH—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 322

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I submit an amendment which would exempt Independence Day from the provisions of the Uniform Monday Holidays Act, S. 1217.

July Fourth is central to our political heritage, and holds a special meaning for most of our citizens. I believe it would be cavalier for us now, after so many years of adherence to this date, to manipulate its time of celebration. Surely this is one tradition we do not have to concede to convenience or economy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 322) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 323

Mr. TOWER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 9960) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 324

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators MORSE, BURDICK, NELSON, and PROXMIRE, I submit an amendment to S. 2388 and request that it be printed. My amendment is as follows:

Amend section 106 by the addition of a new subsection to read as follows:

"(e) Assignments of male enrollees shall be made so that, at any one time, at least 40 per centum of those enrollees are assigned to conservation centers, as described in section 107, or to other centers or projects where their work activity is primarily directed to the conservation, development, or management of public natural resources or recreational areas and is performed under the direction of personnel of agencies regularly responsible for those functions."

The purpose of this amendment is to continue the present policy in the administration of the Job Corps program under the Office of Economic Opportunity of insuring that at least 40 percent of male enrollees are assigned to conservation centers. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare when reporting the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 deleted this mandatory percentage ratio. This is regrettable to me and to all those who are interested in enhancing our Nation's conservation ef-

forts. The success of the conservation centers has been amply demonstrated. They have provided many training and other benefits for our youth assigned to these centers as well as assisted the Federal agencies responsible for resource management in accomplishing much needed work on our public lands.

There are three types of Job Corps centers: conservation centers, urban centers for men and women, and demonstration centers. Actually, a conservation center or an urban center may also be a demonstration center. Currently, two conservation centers are also serving as demonstration centers; one demonstrating training in heavy equipment operation, and one demonstrating training in general educational development.

Eighty-three conservation centers are currently being operated by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior, six by various States and one by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. On June 30, 1967, there were 16,046 enrollees in conservation centers, 16,177 in men's urban centers, and 275 in men's demonstration centers. About 50 percent of the male enrollees were in the conservation centers.

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 required that any any one time no less than 40 per centum of the enrollees within Job Corps be assigned in conservation centers. This was later amended to 40 percent of the male enrollees. The administration's proposal, introduced as S. 1545, would have continued the requirement of not less than 40 percent of the male enrollees in conservation centers. The committee's report on S. 2388 states:

The requirement that at least 40 percent of all male enrollees be assigned to Conservation Centers is dropped in order to permit more flexibility in establishing demonstration centers.

An analysis of the situation shows the reasoning behind this statement is without merit. The bill would limit total enrollment to 45,000 during fiscal year 1968. Of this, at least 25 percent must be women. This leaves 33,750 spaces available for the men. Forty percent of 33,750 would be 13,500 spaces. Based on the June 30 enrollment of more than 16,000 in conservation centers, a 13,500 minimum requirement would leave 2,500 spaces at conservation centers which could be converted to demonstration centers. An equal number from men's urban centers would generate 5,000 spaces for demonstration centers. It is inconceivable that this number would be allocated to the men's demonstration center program.

I am concerned that dropping this requirement could permit a reduction in the conservation center portion of the Job Corps program and in the closing of some conservation centers. It is the opinion of many and in which I concur that conservation centers have been the most successful part of the Job Corps program. As the Senate is aware, Job Corps is a total youth development and rehabilitation program. It involves social adjustment, motivation, remedial education, vocational training, and the teaching of good work habits. Conserva-

tion centers have been taking the most deprived youths entering the Job Corps program, providing a comprehensive program and operating it for 20 percent less cost per corpsman man-year than urban centers. As pointed out in the report of the committee, direct operating cost for men's urban centers averaged just under \$7,500 as compared with \$6,100 for conservation centers.

Conservation centers are particularly good in bringing about social adjustment and motivation. They are small in size, ranging from 112 to 256 corpsmen per center. This allows for close enrollee staff contacts, for more individualized training and counseling. It provides a stronger socializing influence. The less complex setting of a conservation center provides fewer stresses, thereby enabling corpsmen to devote their energies to learning. It removes disadvantaged youth from undesirable urban neighborhood environments and influences.

Firm discipline has been maintained in conservation centers since the start of the program. This discipline and the small size are reflected in the substantially fewer adverse incidents which have happened in conservation centers than urban centers.

Relationships with nearby communities have been excellent in almost all cases. Local communities have been involved in center activities through community relations councils, and have repeatedly assisted in overcoming any community difficulties which have arisen. In many cases, corpsmen have assisted local communities in times of disasters, such as tornados, fire, and flood.

Conservation centers have been taking the least educated youths entering Job Corps. Almost all enrollees who cannot read at the seventh-grade level have been assigned to conservation centers. About 35 percent of the corpsmen entering conservation centers cannot read or write. An additional 40 percent read and write below the fourth-grade level. The rate of mathematics gains in conservation centers has been 1.5 times better than the public school norm, and the rate of reading gain is 1.25 times better. These gains are a 250-percent improvement over the average rate these corpsmen experienced in public schools. The average stay per corpsman at the conservation centers has been 5.7 months as compared to an overall Job Corps tenure average of only 4.3 months. Approximately 10 percent of the corpsmen initially assigned to conservation centers go on to enroll in an urban center; this step generally being taken when the corpsman's reading level has improved to the point he can read the various technical training manuals. These educational gains are slightly less than at men's urban centers, but when you consider the selective assignment practice which has given conservation centers the lowest achievers, these education gains are remarkable. The educational gains at conservation centers are much greater than at women's centers.

Vocational training in conservation centers takes place primarily in an on-the-job situation. The result is that conservation center graduates are receiving practical training and are learning how

to work. They have been taught good work habits. In many vocations such as carpentry, welding, masonry, cooking, truck driving, heavy equipment operation and other outdoor activities, the centers are giving in-depth vocational training. The on-the-job training these young men are receiving cannot be duplicated in the large urban centers. Through construction of roads, trails, campground facilities, buildings, landscaping, and wildlife projects, Job Corpsmen have contributed \$32,000,000 in conservation work benefits through July this year. The several hundred conservation center corpsmen assigned to fighting forest fires in the recent fire disasters of the Northwest turned in top-notch performances.

As evidence of the success in vocational training in conservation centers, all 50 corpsmen recently completing training in heavy equipment operation at one center have been placed with an average wage of \$3.25 per hour. These are graduates from the heavy equipment operator training program at the Jacobs Creek Job Corps Conservation Center located on the Cherokee National Forest in eastern Tennessee. Here the International Union of Operating Engineers assisted the U.S. Forest Service and the Office of Economic Opportunity in conducting the training program. Training consisted of operation and maintenance of dozers, compressors, road graders, scrapers, and high lifts. Corpsmen carried out the field portion of their training by constructing roads on the Cherokee National Forest. This is the most outstanding placement success story of the entire Job Corps program to date.

In summary, the conservation center program is highly successful. We should be assured it will continue to represent a major part of the male Job Corps program. The amendment I propose will assure this and will not curtail the successful creation and operation of new demonstration centers. I urge the adoption of my amendment when the Senate considers this important legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENT: \$100 MINIMUM, 20-PERCENT INCREASE—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 325

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the basic purpose of benefits provided under social security is to give a modest minimum of income to recipients so that they will be able to maintain some semblance of life and dignity in their declining years. It is for this purpose that millions of people make their contributions to the system through tax withholding.

Today, as people have come to the end of their working life and become retired, there are millions receiving benefits toward which they have contributed. The first payments made under the law in 1937 came to only about a million dollars. By 1947, 10 years later, they stood at \$463 million, and by 1965 the total of payments was more than \$18 billion.

That is a lot of money. But it has all come from the contributions poured in as we have expanded the system to cover more and more people. The really significant thing is the per capita figure. Are people today receiving an adequate sum as compared with current wages and cost of living? Has the system provided benefits keeping up with the advance in the economy, in which gross national product has grown from \$90 billion in 1937 to \$740 billion in 1967?

The obvious answer is that on a comparative basis, as a proportion of lost income, or as a suitable share of the vastly increased affluence of America, the elderly beneficiaries are suffering wherever it is necessary to depend on their social security benefits as their source of income.

The facts are familiar. It is not necessary to labor the point that the largest single group of those in the "poverty" category, as a percentage of the total, are the elderly. According to a Census Bureau release of August 14, those in "poverty" comprise 15 percent of the population. But that figure is far below the percentage of elderly within the category. Of "unrelated individuals," the largest group of whom are the elderly living alone as widows or widowers, 37.4 percent are poverty stricken, as compared with 10.1 percent of those in families—white individuals and white families, that is. The comparable figures for nonwhites are 49.9 percent of those who are not in families and 40.8 percent of those who are. Although this is not my present point, it deserves note that these latest figures show poverty four times as prevalent in nonwhite as in white families.

But the point I make is that nearly four times as many among "unrelated" persons—and more than that among the elderly—are in a poverty-stricken situation. The increase in benefits recommended by the President, to a minimum of \$70 per month and a general 15-percent increase, was not enough. Now we have a House-passed bill which gives a minimum of only \$50 a month and a 12½-percent increase.

These sums are pitifully small to meet the need. Therefore, I am today submitting an amendment which would provide minimum payments of \$100 per month to the individual—\$150 per couple—and an across-the-board benefit increase of 20 percent.

I think no one can quarrel with the need and the desirability of such a provision. The question which will be raised is that of cost. I have dealt with that in a previous amendment, No. 313, presented on September 13 and discussed on page 25387 of the RECORD. There I called for holding the contribution schedule at present levels, with the Federal Treasury contributing as necessary to the trust funds, with the goal of eventual three-way financing between employee, employer, and the general fund.

But there are, in this proposal, some offsetting gains not only socially—they are more obvious—but economically. Title XIX of the social security law provides for matching payments devoted to old-age assistance as well as other categories of welfare. There are hundreds of

thousands, if not millions, of social security beneficiaries who are unable to make the grade economically on that low income—an income which the present bill would do so little to cure. They must, in order to maintain their existence, apply for additional old-age assistance payments and are thereby subject to all the indignities which our welfare investigation system involves.

My proposal for a 20-percent increase with \$100 minimum—and I have been furnished these figures by the Social Security Administration—would completely remove a half million elderly beneficiaries from the old-age assistance rolls. It would reduce payments, and, therefore, partially remove from the OAA rolls another 350,000 elderly for a total of 850,000 persons. Both of these results, of course, are predicated on the assumption that the added social security benefits will be passed along to the beneficiaries, not absorbed by the States as offsets to their own OAA payments. This I am attempting to deal with in a separate amendment.

The direct offset in OAA payments would amount to \$504,000,000, of which \$325 million would be the Federal share and \$179 million the State and local share. In addition there is the indirect offset of reduction in the numbers of persons in the program, hence of the numbers of caseworkers needed in the structure. This in itself would be a very sizable amount.

But above and beyond the financial question there stands the human question. Today we have millions of persons living in poverty in their old age, at the end of a long and useful life in which they have served society and paid their dues to it, so to speak. Now society lets them live not only in poverty but in the spiritual degradation which poverty enforces, \$100 a month for an individual is still only \$1,200 per year, and the Bureau of the Census sets the poverty level for a single individual over 65 at \$1,500 per year. For an elderly couple, the sum of \$1,800 per year is likewise below the very small minimum fixed as the poverty line for a couple over 65, which stands at \$1,900. They are still, when this is their sole income, below the poverty level.

Mr. President, we need this increased benefit. The House bill is not enough. The President's proposal is not enough. The Hartke amendment is not enough, but it comes closer to meeting the need. At least, we can and we should come closer to eliminating the poverty of old age with the means we have at hand in the existing social security system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 325) was referred to the Committee on Finance.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENT: HEALTH INSURANCE BENEFITS FOR THE DISABLED—AMEND- MENT

AMENDMENT NO. 326

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the social security law has long contained special benefits for those who, having

become qualified for benefits, become disabled and thereby unable to continue their worklife. The long official name is now Old-Age Security, Disability, and Health Insurance—OASDHI. The "H" was added when we provided the additional benefits of health insurance—medicare and medicaid.

Predictably, the disabled are apt to require more medical attention than the ordinary person. The same, of course, is true of the elderly, and that, coupled with the low income of the retired, was a principal compelling reason for the passage of the health insurance provisions.

The disabled, even though they may before disablement have acquired full social security coverage of 40 quarters in covered employment, are handicapped as a rule both by the physical disability and by the economic disability which has relegated them to being recipients of disability benefits. True, many disabled are in excellent health except for their impairment, and they require no greater medical service than the rest of us. But for those whose disability involves a chronic condition occasioning hospitalization from time to time, perhaps successive operations, or frequent X-ray, laboratory, or other attention, the cost can mount to sizable sums. These sums, given the income of a person who is subsisting on disability payments under OASDHI, can be a deplorable added handicap to that his physical condition imposes.

Therefore I am submitting today an amendment to H.R. 12080 which would provide health insurance for those who receive disability benefits, just as it is provided for those who receive old-age benefits. Their need is comparable, their income from the social security system is comparable, and the cost is minimal. Yet for those who need this additional aid the assistance it will provide can make a vast deal of difference.

Mr. President, we need this expansion of the law as a humane addition to the lives of some very unfortunate people in order to meet needs they are often hard pressed now to provide for.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 326) was referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT FOR STUDY OF DRUGS IN MEDICARE

AMENDMENT NO. 327

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I submit an amendment today that would authorize and direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct a study of the medical, social, and economic effects of S. 17 and S. 2299 of the 90th Congress.

The need for this study has been made clear by testimony before the Senate Finance Committee. Both Secretary Gardner of HEW, and Dr. Goddard of the Food and Drug Administration have made clear the need for taking a close look at the effects of these two bills.

The bill I introduce today is not aimed at preventing passage of these bills. It

may well be that I will support them after completion of a full study of their effects. However, as of now, I prefer to withhold judgment of these bills until after the completion of a study that both Administration and industry experts believe necessary.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this amendment may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

The amendment (No. 327) was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

On page 106, after line 23, insert the following new section:

"STUDY OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

"SEC. 169. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation to determine the effects which would result from the enactment of the bill entitled 'A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage, under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits established by part B thereof, of certain expenses incurred by an insured individual in obtaining certain drugs' (S. 17, 90th Cong., first sess.), and the effects which would result from the enactment of the bill entitled 'A bill to assure the orderly, efficient, proper, and economical provision of drugs to individuals entitled thereto under certain programs established by or pursuant to the Social Security Act' (S. 2299, 90th Cong., first sess.). In such study and investigation, the Secretary shall give consideration to (1) price savings which might accrue to the United States Government from the enactment of such legislation, (2) effects of the enactment thereof upon all segments of the health professions, (3) effects of the enactment thereof upon all elements of the pharmaceutical industry, including large and small manufacturers of drugs and retailers of drugs, and (4) such other economic and social factors as the Secretary shall determine to be material.

"(b) On or before July 1, 1968, the Secretary shall transmit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report which shall contain a full and complete statement of the findings of fact and conclusions made by the Secretary upon the basis of such study and investigation."

On page 3, in part 4 of title I of the table of contents, immediately after the item relating to section 168 of the bill, insert the following new item:

"Sec. 169. Study of proposed legislation."

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 1796, to impose quotas on the importation of certain textile articles, the names of the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], and the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] be added as cosponsors.

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

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague.

I appreciate the addition of my name as a cosponsor of S. 1796.

This bill is designed to prevent foreign countries from taking over an

unfair share of our increased domestic consumption, which has been the case in other areas, such as meat and dairy products. It represents the position of the United States with respect to our exports to the Common Market countries—namely, limiting us to a base period percentage of their domestic consumption and being content with such percentage of any of their increased domestic consumption. We believe that foreign exporters should take a similar approach to our market on meat, dairy products, and textile articles covered by this bill.

There is need for this legislation. In 1961, the ratio of wool textile imports to our domestic consumption was 13.3 percent. Last year it was up to 21.6 percent, and the trend is definitely up.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], be added as cosponsors to the bill, S. 2273, to promote interest and training in international agricultural assistance.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] be added as a cosponsor to my bill, S. 2348, to provide for a Great Prairie Lakes Parkway in the States of South Dakota and North Dakota.

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

NOTICE OF HEARING ON TAX COURT BILL (S. 2041)

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, I wish to announce a set of hearings for the consideration of S. 2041. This bill would remove the Tax Court from the executive branch and make it an article III court.

The hearings will be held at 10 a.m. on Tuesday, October 10 and Wednesday, October 11, 1967, in the District of Columbia hearing room, 6226 New Senate Office Building.

Any person who wishes to testify or submit a statement for inclusion in the record should communicate as soon as possible with the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, room 6306, New Senate Office Building.

POLLUTION OF THE GREAT LAKES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Chicago Tribune, in a series of articles based upon the investigative work of a team of reporters, has pointed up the peril to health and public safety involved in pollution of the Great Lakes. They found that one of them, Lake Erie, has already been sickened to the point of death by a massive invasion of polluted wastes and that the same conditions now menace Lake Michigan, a priceless asset to the future well-being of not only the Middle West but of the entire Nation, as well.

I invite the attention of Congress to a

problem which faces us all and on which herculean efforts must be made if we are to prevent the demise of a great water artery and a vehicle for the expansion of industry which has played a historic part in national development.

The threatened loss of our beaches and playgrounds is no less harmful. Senators will find these articles well documented, staggering in their revelations, and sickening in their detail of the lengths to which pollution has already reduced the lakes to a contaminated mass of bacteria-laden waters which foul once beautiful shores and threaten the water supply of great cities.

I ask unanimous consent that these articles, in gross, be made a part of my remarks and printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

[From the Chicago Tribune, Aug. 6, 1967]
CRISIS LOOMS AS NATION FINDS THAT WATER IS NOT EVERYWHERE

(NOTE.—There is a water crisis in America today. Voters in Illinois will soon come face-to-face with the problem. This first article of a series tells what is at stake.)

(By Casey Bukro)

If you drink water, bathe, sprinkle your lawn, wash dishes, water ski, own a boat, own a garden or a farm, hunt ducks, fish, or swim—the water crisis affects you.

Experts say Americans today are doing to their water supplies what they did several decades ago to grass lands, oil fields, and forests that eventually became wastelands through indiscriminate use.

Pollution is spoiling water so fast that there is some alarm now over whether future Americans will have water pure enough to be of any use.

CREATE GRAVE DANGER

Scientists and other experts for years have been warning Americans that they are polluting and wasting the same resource that gives them life and wealth. Some say that water use will be the most critical problem the next generation of Americans will face.

Because pollution and waste have been gradual, it has been only recently that Americans have begun to understand the seriousness of the scientists' warnings.

MANDATE FOR ACTION

Public officials now consider the public outcry against water pollution as a mandate to do something about it.

As a result, the Illinois General Assembly on July 1 authorized a referendum to be held in November next year on a 1-billion-dollar bond issue to finance a program to combat air and water pollution. Of that amount 840 million dollars will be devoted to fighting water pollution.

The proposal to hold the referendum was presented in March to the legislature by Democratic Gov. Otto Kerner and Republican legislative leaders, who apparently had heard the mandate quite clearly.

The bill authorizing the referendum is awaiting Gov. Kerner's signature.

Thus, the complex issue of water pollution may soon fall squarely into the lap of the voting public. The issue is complex because it involves areas of geology, geography, chemistry, politics, law, economics, government, sociology, and health and welfare.

COVERS 52 YEARS

The bond issue would finance a program to manage and develop Illinois water resources for the years 1968 to 2020. Gov. Kerner has said that a bond issue is the only way to create a capital fund large

enough to finance a comprehensive action program.

Water pollution and waste have become real to Americans who find dead fish floating in their favorite fishing streams, who can't draw water from taps on sweltering summer days, who smell the stench from bodies of water used for dumping industrial and city wastes, and who find "no swimming" signs at polluted beaches.

ENCOURAGED BY OUTRAGE

Growing public outrage at finding water fouled or exhausted is considered by some experts an encouraging sign. Ironically, earlier public apathy is partly to blame for the problem.

"People just can't understand why someone hasn't done something about this before," said H. W. Poston, Chicago director of the Federal Water Pollution Control administration.

"You see this over and over in talking to people; they really can't believe that some of the situations exist, are permitted, and developed."

"The answer is that there's been more pressure to obscure the information than pressure to inform the public. There haven't been any funds to look into these problems and inform the public. As the public becomes informed, they become adamant. They want changes."

PROPOSED SPENDING PLAN

The 1 billion dollars from the bond issue would form the Illinois Resource Development fund. The money would be spent to curb water problems in this way:

For water-related recreation—200 million dollars.

For pollution control [to match federal grants for sewage treatment projects]—300 million dollars.

For water management [land acquisition and development of multi-purpose reservoirs and a fund to finance local water supply works and sewer extensions]—300 million dollars.

A state water resources board would be created under the program. It would have powers to guide and coordinate all water resources programs of the state and administer the Illinois Resource Development fund.

Clarence W. Klassen, chief state sanitary engineer, one of the drafters of the bond issue proposal and of a report on state water supplies, said of the proposed bond issue:

"It is a program of financing, or financial incentives. It's not a give-away program. It is going to be particularly beneficial to cities because there is money for cities to borrow to build water mains and sewers."

WOULD AID TOWNS

"There is money to build sewage treatment plants, for municipalities to solve air pollution, for problems with dumps and incinerators, and to expand present water facilities."

Authorities say the program will concentrate on northeastern Illinois and the Chicago metropolitan area. The need for answers to water problems in the greater Chicago area is more urgent than in any other part of the state.

The goals of the water resources management program are to:

1. Insure adequate water supplies for all cities, industries, and rural areas of the state.
2. Control pollution to make the streams safe, useful, and attractive.
3. Meet the needs for water-related recreation.

END FLOOD DANGER

4. Alleviate the dangers and economic hardships of floods.

5. Complete the task of managing soil and water resources according to sound conservation practices.

6. Improve the water ways system for commercial and recreation navigation.

These goals, outlined in a report on state water resources, make a very important distinction: that water resources should be developed for human use, not just for private interests.

Experts believe that Illinois water programs of the future will demand new practices in use and conservation of waters. This will mean reusing water many times for various purposes, greatly improved treatment of sewage, transporting water from water-rich to water-poor areas, storing flood waters and using them for beneficial purposes, and finding and using new sources of water.

BARS LAKE USE

Further, Albert B. Maris, a special master of the United States Supreme court, has recommended that additional water for sanitary purposes should not be diverted to Chicago from Lake Michigan until the metropolitan area has shown "that it has employed all feasible and appropriate measures to manage and conserve its existing water resources."

Maris told the state to employ "the best modern scientific knowledge and engineering practice" to arrive at a water management program.

It is a time for reappraisal of water use policies and practices. The phrase, "spends it like it was water," reflects the public attitude toward this resource. Water is used and abused as though the supply is endless. It has become obvious our supply of water is not endless.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Aug. 7, 1967]

USE, ABUSE PERIL OUR WATERS

(NOTE.—The Chicago area's two sources of water, where they are, and how much water comes from them are discussed in this, the second article of a series on the water crisis.)

(By Casey Bukro)

In the Chicago metropolitan area, it is estimated that water is used at the rate of 250 gallons per person a day—and there are 6 million persons in the area.

Here are just a few reasons for this phenomenal use of water:

A shower takes 25 gallons of water, a tub bath 35, 3 to flush a toilet. Washing a car requires 10 gallons, and 1,000 are used to water an average lawn.

INDUSTRY USE UP

The greatest increase in water use in our era has been for industry. Modern industrial processes use tremendous quantities of water.

On the average, it takes more than 30,000 gallons to produce a ton of steel, 200 gallons to make a pound of synthetic rubber, 30 to manufacture a pound of paper, and 1 gallon to brew a pint of beer.

Where does all the water come from?

OUR "FRESHWATER SEA"

In the Chicago area, as elsewhere, it comes from one of two sources: Surface waters—such as lakes and streams—or from the ground.

Lake Michigan is the dominant body of surface water in northeastern Illinois. It has been called the "freshwater sea," having 22,400 square miles of surface area and depths ranging to 923 feet. The total volume of Lake Michigan is 1,116 cubic miles.

Ninety per cent of the population of Cook county and 76 per cent of the total population of northeastern Illinois gets its domestic water supply from Lake Michigan. Presently, only Cook and Lake county communities draw water from the lake.

Water for public municipal supplies is drawn from the lake by the city of Chicago and 14 other systems in this area. They are Evanston, Wilmette, Kenilworth, Winnetka, Northbrook, Glencoe, Highland Park, Fort Sheridan, Highwood, Lake Forest, Great Lakes Naval Training center, North Chicago, Waukegan, and the Lake county water district.

Chicago not only takes lake water for its own use but also provides all or part of the water supply of 66 surrounding suburbs.

The amount of lake water withdrawn from the lake for public water supplies, or domestic uses, is not limited by law.

NEED COURT OK

However, proposals to divert lake water for other reasons must be approved by courts or legislatures. Such diverted water sometimes is used for sewage disposal or raising waterway levels for navigation.

A 45-year-old legal battle over Illinois' right to divert water from Lake Michigan was ended June 12 with all parties to the dispute adopting the recommendations of Albert B. Maris, a special master of the United States Supreme court.

Maris recommended that the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago and other public agencies be enjoined from taking more than 3,200 cubic feet of water a second [about 2 billion gallons a day] from the lake by withdrawal and diversion.

Of the 3,200 cubic feet limit, 1,700 cubic feet a second [a little more than 1 billion gallons a day] was agreed upon as adequate for domestic uses in the six-county metropolitan Chicago area. The actual withdrawal of lake water for domestic purposes range from 900 million to more than 1 billion gallons a day, depending on seasonal needs.

The remainder, 1,500 cubic feet a second [969 million gallons a day], is used to dilute and carry away treated sewage in the Chicago sanitary and ship canal, which also is used for navigation.

WELLS SERVE MANY

The second source of water is the ground. Wells provide water supply for about 1,600,000 persons and many industries in the metropolitan area.

Water is held in the ground in pores, joints, cracks, fractures, and crevices in water-bearing rock or earth formations known as aquifers [literally, water-bringers].

There are three types of aquifers.

Two of them are common thruout the Chicago area, ranging in depths from a few inches to 400 feet below the surface. The two are glacial drift aquifers, consisting of sand and gravel deposits left by the receding glaciers, and shallow dolomite aquifers, composed of fractured crystalline rock lying just below sand and gravel deposits.

These two shallow aquifers account for about 15 per cent of the well water used in this region.

THIRD IS BEDROCK

The third, known as the bedrock aquifers, consists of layers of fractured sandstone 175 to 2,000 feet thick. They are found 700 feet below the surface and reach downward as much as 4,000 feet.

Bedrock sandstone aquifers yield the greatest amounts of water—amounts great enough to supply entire metropolitan areas. It has been estimated that deep sandstone wells account for 85 per cent of the ground water used in the Chicago area.

The three types of aquifers yield a total of 240 million gallons a day in the Chicago metropolitan area. All three aquifers are replenished by rain and melted snow. The moisture moves slowly from the surface, dropping as little as a foot a year.

A barrier of impervious shale, one to 250 feet thick, separates the shallow aquifers from the deep aquifers, so that water from shallow aquifers cannot seep downward into deep aquifers.

There are enormous amounts of water in the aquifers, but more than half of it is locked in place and will not flow. The estimated total volume of "free" water which will flow from the area's shallow aquifers is 4.72 billion gallons and 209.4 billion gallons from the deep aquifers.

Not all of this "free" water in storage is potable. Most of the water in the deep aquifers

below 2,000 feet is too salty or brackish. The water in the shallow aquifers is irregularly distributed, difficult to pump, and reliant on rain and snowfall for replenishment.

There is a lot of water under the ground but it will not be enough to meet future needs if water consumption continues at the present rate.

Illinois population is expected to grow from 1965's 10,650,000 to 13 million in 1980. Between 1980 and 2020, another increase of 5 million to 18 million is projected.

By 2000, the daily water requirement for the projected 10,961,000 residents of the Chicago metropolitan area will be about 2 billion gallons a day.

Of the 16 billion gallons of water withdrawn each day from all Illinois water sources, industry uses 14 billion gallons.

Present daily consumption of water in Illinois by major user categories is: 13 billion gallons for thermal power stations, 1.4 billion gallons for other industrial uses, 1.8 billion gallons a day for municipal uses, and smaller amounts for agriculture.

Competition for water soon will be fierce. Who will win?

[From the Chicago Tribune, Aug. 8, 1967]
REGION'S WATERWAYS ARE FLOODED WITH POLLUTION

(NOTE.—Water pollution in the Chicago metropolitan area is a fact of life which poses a permanent threat to our water supply. It is discussed in this, the third article of a series.)

(By Casey Bukro)

Debris, including rubbish and garbage, is floating on the surface of the Illinois river.

Huge oil slicks float on the murky, industrial waste-laden waters of southern Lake Michigan.

Water pollution in the Chicago metropolitan area is so severe and widespread that it is impossible to trace the history of the causes and to determine its final effect.

MOVES 200 MILES

A report released early this year by Illinois water experts said:

"Altho they are treated to a high degree by conventional methods, the massive waste loads discharged by the Chicago metropolitan area create both a primary degrading effect in local waters and secondary effects as far as 200 miles downstream.

"Altho highest concentrations [of pollution] are found near the cities, concentrations thruout most of the Illinois river system are so high that they are a danger to the health of people who use the streams for body contact sports such as swimming and water skiing."

A 1965 study of Lake Michigan water quality by the United States public health service concluded that, because of the heavy municipal and industrial waste discharge, water in the southern end of Lake Michigan and the Calumet river system is thoroughly polluted.

STOPPING IS NOT ENOUGH

Stopping the wastes now being dumped into these waters will not necessarily improve the quality of the water. The pollution is so serious, said the report, that it is practically irreversible.

Engineers have estimated that four feet of sewage solids have settled on the bottom of parts of the north branch of the Chicago river. The water bubbles and seems to be boiling because of the gases formed by decaying sewage.

For the second time in this century, the Chicago lake front has been spared from becoming a sea of sewage. The first time was in 1900, when engineers reversed the flow of the sewage-laden Chicago river away from the lake.

The second time was when recommendations, resulting from a 45-year Supreme

court battle, were adopted June 12 by six Great Lakes states that were suing to force Illinois and the metropolitan sanitary district to return water diverted for sanitary purposes back into the lake, as well as treated sewage. The six states argued that diversion had lowered the level of the Great Lakes.

Albert B. Maris, a Philadelphia federal District court judge acting as a special master of the United States Supreme court, said the lake diversion should continue.

Maris opposed the return of the waste-laden waters of Chicago to the lake, scientific plannings, he said, showed that there is little or no current in the southern tip of Lake Michigan.

Without current, sewage returned to the lake would not be diluted by the water. Instead, it would form a mass of sewage that eventually would float to the city's shores and contaminate the city's water system and public beaches, said Maris.

SET LATE 1968 DEADLINE

A second development in the fight against lake pollution came in 1965 when a federal conference ordered all Illinois-Indiana border area industries to stop polluting the lake by December, 1968.

In addition, the toughest water quality standards anywhere were established.

The standards' 200 points limit the amount of bacteria, viruses, chemicals, solids, and other materials dumped in the water. The timetable for meeting the standards is the tightest ever given to industries polluting bodies of water. It also is the first time a large number of industries have accepted water quality standards and moved aggressively to implement them.

JOB PARTIALLY DONE

Now, midway between adoption of the anti-pollution plan and the deadline, H. W. Poston, regional director of the federal Water Pollution Control administration in Chicago said:

"Municipalities have accomplished, for the most part, the job they have to do." He referred to cities that had been dumping untreated sewage into the lake, mainly in the industrial district bordering the Indiana lakeshore.

"The big industries are just in the process of eliminating pollution from the wastes now flowing into the lake," said Poston.

Each day, he said, industries in the Calumet area of Lake Michigan are dumping 100,000 pounds of oil, 300,000 pounds of cyanide, 37,000 pounds of ammonia, plus acid wastes into the lake. These and other industrial wastes are equivalent to the daily raw wastes of 600,000 persons.

The lake shore industries, many of them steel mills and petroleum refineries, have adopted schedules for ridding pollutants from their wastes thru a control program that could cost as much as 100 million dollars. Companies failing to comply with the federal program's requirements face legal action.

The most recent development in efforts to save our waterways was the adoption July 27 by the sanitary district of a billion-dollar program aimed at removing all pollution from Chicago waterways and tributaries by 1975. Vinton Bacon, general superintendent of the district, said the program will make the city's 71 miles of waterways usable for swimming, boating, and fishing.

WHAT PROGRAM INCLUDES

These developments are almost the total extent of progress made against pollution in the Chicago area.

More than 2 billion gallons of water carrying treated sewage is discharged each day from Chicago into a system of canals and branches of the Chicago river, which then flow into the Illinois river.

The suburban areas also use this canal system, or have a system of their own. Some

withdraw water haphazardly from wells and discharge the used water into the Illinois river via a network of small streams.

One of the users of that sewage disposal system is the sanitary district, which treats the sewage of 3.5 million city dwellers and 2 million suburbanites within an 858 square mile area. The district also treats industrial wastes equivalent to that created by another 3 million people.

Chicago has a very efficient sewage treatment system, which removes 90 percent of the impurities in sewage. But the remaining 10 percent discharged into the Illinois waterway is equal to the raw sewage of more than 1.5 million people.

Solid wastes sent down the Illinois river from Chicago to the Mississippi river each day amounts to 3,400 tons.

Industries with separate sewer systems discharge an additional load equivalent to 946,000 persons into the Illinois river system each day. Industrial wastes equal to the untreated wastes of 147,000 persons goes into the Illinois river each day from within the sanitary district.

DUMP UNTREATED SEWAGE

Some industries are known to be dumping untreated sewage directly into the Illinois river system.

What is the condition of ground water? Indiscriminate use of more than 162,000 septic tanks and cesspools in the metropolitan area has caused widespread pollution of both surface and ground water.

The extent and nature of ground water pollution is not known. However, ground water is easily polluted by waste, and it requires long periods of time to purify itself.

It would be unrealistic and shortsighted to consider water sources only in terms of domestic and industrial supplies.

For fish and other wildlife, pollution has turned many of our streams into rivers of death.

The public health service reported that polluted waters killed 18 million fish in 1964 and 11 million in 1965.

"For years, most of Chicago's streams and lower Lake Michigan have been too polluted to support adequate fish life," an Illinois report said.

To understand pollution, it is helpful to think of water as a living thing. It needs oxygen in dissolved form to be pure and fresh.

Overloads of organic wastes dumped into water uses up the oxygen and "suffocates" the water, destroying the natural capacity of a river to purify itself.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Aug. 9, 1967]

WASTING WATER: A GAME THAT EVERYBODY PLAYS

(NOTE.—Chicagoans waste almost as much water as they use. How it happens is told in this, the fourth in a series on the water crisis.)

(By Casey Bukro)

Wasting water has become a major national pastime.

Anyone can play. All you need is a leaky faucet, a broken water main, an over-watered lawn, or old-fashioned plumbing.

Those are just a few of the ways that more than 350 million gallons of water a day are wasted in Chicago.

WATER MAINS LEAK

Chicago is not alone. A 1961 survey of 36 public water distribution systems, including Chicago and 35 suburbs, showed that 20 percent of the water was lost thru leaks in the water mains.

That amounted to 40 gallons a person per day for all the systems, and 44 gallons per person a day in Cook county, where leakage is worse. The report said that 44 gallons a day was more than the normal use of water per person in two neighboring counties.

The national average of water use per person is 50 gallons.

This waste of water, taken nonchalantly by generations of Chicagoans, becomes important in light of the recommendations that settled a 45-year-old legal battle over diversion of Lake Michigan waters by the sanitary district.

LIMITS LAKE USE

Albert B. Maris, acting as a special master to the United States Supreme court, prescribed the amount of water he thought the Chicago area should be allowed to withdraw.

Then he warned that if Illinois expects to get more water from the lake, it must earn it.

Maris' recommendations state that Illinois may ask for more water diversion only after it has shown that it has used "all feasible means" to conserve and manage the water resources of the region and that it uses the water "in accordance with the best modern knowledge and engineering practice."

In short, he told Illinois to use its waters wisely, or it won't get any more from the lake.

WARNING FOR CHICAGO

Maris told Chicago to conserve and manage its water supply by eliminating leakage from its water mains and customer service pipes and fixtures.

Maris estimated that 192 million gallons a day are lost thru breaks in the 4,140 miles of water mains of the Chicago water distribution system. The rate of leakage now is estimated to be 45,000 gallons per mile of main a day.

That was "much higher than in any comparable city system," Maris asserted.

Maris said the city's program for locating and repairing leaks in water mains has not been effective. Until recently, he said, the city's leak detection and repair crews inspected the entire system on an average of once every 15 years.

Maris said the loss of water thru main leaks could be cut in half by inspecting the entire water main system each year.

James Jardine, Chicago commissioner of water and sewers, said that his department now has an aggressive water-leak detection program covering the entire distribution system in a span of two years.

"Universal metering would greatly reduce leakage and waste from consumer service pipes and fixtures," said Maris. "There is a relationship between the amount of leakage and waste in a water system and the degree to which the system's customer use is metered."

In 1964, 55.3 per cent of Chicago's total water production for city and suburbs [578 million gallons a day] was metered. Chicago meters all three-flat and larger buildings.

Maris said consumer waste and fixture leakage in 1960 amounted to 81 million gallons a day in Chicago.

URGE INSPECTION, REPAIR

A strict program of fixture inspection and repair would save half that amount, he said. A program of universal metering, including Chicago's 332,689 single-family and two-flat dwellings now exempt from water metering, coupled with a strict program of fixture inspection and repair, could save all 81 million gallons a day, Maris said.

Jardine told THE TRIBUNE that Chicago sells more metered water by volume than any city in the world. He said that Chicago now meters about 59 per cent of its water pumpage, but added that he questions whether it would be economically sound to meter water used in single-family homes and two-flats.

TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY GALLONS A PERSON

Jardine also noted that Chicagoans use about 250 gallons a day per person, compared with 288 gallons per person in 1930 when the population was 25 per cent less than now. Metering and elimination of slums

housing are among the reasons given for the decline in water use per person.

Maris said it would cost Chicago \$15,030,900 over a 30-year period for a universal metering program, or 1.65 million dollars a year for additional metering. He said this cost could be offset in part by savings in water treatment costs.

The Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning commission also has called for an effective program of underground leakage control.

Toilets, however, figured in one of its more unusual proposals for water conservation.

"On the average, household toilets installed prior to 1929 require 7.5 gallons per flush, whereas newer installations use 3 gallons per flush," said the commission.

HUGE SAVINGS POSSIBLE

Considering that 61 per cent of the housing units in northeastern Illinois were built before 1929, water use in this area could be reduced by as much as 50 million gallons a day by replacing older toilets.

Another planning commission proposal is to reduce the amount of water used in watering lawns.

It is estimated that home owners use 3 inches a year to water their lawns, although irrigation engineers recommend using $\frac{1}{2}$ -inch of water four times a year for a total of 2 inches.

Using less water on lawns could save 12 million gallons of drinking quality water a day. The savings is modest, but it would come during the summer when the demand for water is at peak.

COULD SAVE MUCH

Another 30 million gallons of water a day could be conserved if all industry reduced withdrawal of ground water by 82 per cent thru water conservation programs—programs now practiced by industries using public water supplies. Presently, industry in Illinois withdraws 88 per cent of its water from nondrinking sources.

The planning commission estimated that a practical four-part water conservation program—to stop underground leakage, to improve efficiency in industrial use of ground water, to install new plumbing fixtures, and to reduce the amount of water used on lawns—would result in a savings of 207 million gallons a day.

Both Maris and the commission emphasized that any savings on the amount of water normally wasted each day results in a corresponding savings in water needed to treat sewage and transport it from Chicago.

RESULT: DOUBLE SAVINGS

Presently, a gallon of fresh water is needed to dilute and carry away each gallon of treated sewage. Saving the wasted 207 million gallons of drinking water a day that is sent to sewage treatment plants saves the additional 207 million gallons a day that would have been used for sewage disposal.

The 414-million-gallon savings would reduce the demands for water now made upon Lake Michigan.

Illinois has no regulatory statutes protecting our ground water sources. There are no restrictions on locating or spacing of wells, on pumping from wells, and no law requiring the return of clean water to the ground.

Possibly this explains why deep aquifers in the Chicago area are being pumped at a rate that exceeds the natural rate of replenishment by 40 million gallons a day.

There are six major pumping centers, using deep sandstone wells, in the metropolitan area. They are in Chicago [near Summit], Joliet, Elmhurst, Des Plaines, Aurora, and Elgin. Together, they yielded 109 million gallons a day in 1964.

DROP 670 FEET

Over the last 100 years, declines in water levels have been 670 feet in the Chicago

pumping center and 650 feet in the Joliet pumping center. The decline averaged 11 feet during 1961 and 13 feet in 1960.

The fall in ground water tables has resulted in many wells throughout the Chicago area going dry. This means people must drill deeper into the ground to reach water.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Aug. 10, 1967]
BLUEPRINT FOR USES OF WATER IS SOLUTION TO WASTE, POLLUTION

(NOTE.—Water management is considered the answer to water problems. Here's how it works in the fifth article of a series.)

(By Casey Bukro)

Ever hear of a blueprint for using water? That's just another way to describe a "water management" program.

"Water management" is heard repeatedly as a solution to the problems of water pollution, waste, and greater future demands for water. Experts agree that it is the only effective way to deal with water problems.

PLAN FOR FUTURE

Water management means planning today on how water can be used for many purposes in many places in the future.

Chicago now has a water resource management program (if it can be called that) consisting of withdrawing water from Lake Michigan, using it once and dumping the treated sewage into the Illinois river by way of local canals and rivers. Chicago is a primary example of the "once thru" principle.

More than 2 billion gallons of water a day are used that way in Chicago. The suburbs also use a "once thru" strategy.

Experts say that thought should be given to the best ways to use the water and the land around it in the most efficient way thru cooperation by various users. That is water management.

Instead, we continue to build new homes, using 10,000 acres of farmland a year. Many of these homes are being built on flood plains, which still become flooded and cause millions of dollars in damage each year.

WATER LEVELS FALL

The spread of urban development outward from Chicago and away from Lake Michigan has created heavy local demands on ground water resources, resulting in falling water levels and reduced well yields.

Construction of thousands of sewage treatment plants and septic tanks has resulted in sewage being discharged at so many points that even small streams are polluted.

Recent developments have shown that public participation in major outdoor recreation has increased 51 per cent since 1961. A four-fold increase in outdoor recreation is expected between 1960 and the year 2000.

There also will be a need, and perhaps a greater one, for using our waterways for transporting waste, navigation, and irrigation.

WILL WATER BE FIT

These trends point to some urgent questions: Will Illinois waterways be fit and adequate to handle the load in the future? And how can we reconcile the different demands made upon the same waterways?

The answer is a water management program, taking into consideration that legitimate uses of streams change as the economy and affluence of the state change.

A beginning toward a water management program was made June 30, when all 50 states were required under the water quality act of 1965 to submit standards to the department of the interior for controlling pollution in inland and coastal waters.

UNITED STATES CAN ACT

If the states don't enforce their own standards, the federal government is empowered to force a state thru court action to comply with the standards. This plan insures that a river

flowing thru several states will be kept uniformly clean by all the states.

Under plans submitted to the department of the interior, the 71 miles of inland water in Cook county are classified in two main pollution categories.

Waterways classified for recreational uses would be cleaned within 10 years to permit maximum high standards for swimming, boating, and fishing.

WATERWAYS ARE "ZONED"

Industrial waterways would be used for barge shipping and industrial waste disposal.

In effect, this means that waterways are being "zoned" for various uses. It sounds simple, but in practice it takes much soul-searching and far-sighted thinking to determine how much pollution should be permitted in our waterways.

This was explained by Clarence W. Klassen, chief sanitary engineer for the United States department of public health in Chicago.

"In Illinois, our rivers have to serve multiple purpose uses. We must keep those uses in balance, including fishing, recreation, public and industrial water supply, irrigation, transportation, and a means of conveying waste for cities and industry.

"It is up to us to keep them in balance so they are not overused or underused for any single purpose.

"There are two sides of the coin. Should the Illinois river be put in condition so people can swim in it, or would it be more economical to build swimming pools. The United States public health service has estimated that it would cost 700 million dollars to make the Illinois river suitable for swimming."

COULD HURT INDUSTRY

Furthermore, if one section or area of the country imposes unrealistically high water standards, industry in that area will be at a competitive disadvantage. The cost of cleaning industrial wastes from their sewage discharge would be prohibitively high.

Klassen pointed out that the mechanical and technological methods for cleaning even the most polluted waters to drinking quality exist right now, if we want to pay the high cost of doing it.

"Economic feasibility is the only thing standing in the way," said Klassen. "That is the point that industry raises."

Gov. Kerner also has said that new water standards should be tailored to each individual waterway, considering both present use and future needs.

But that is just one facet of a water management program.

RESOURCES ARE INTERRELATED

Experts say that in nature, the resources of soil, water, forests, wildlife, and minerals are a closely interrelated whole. Harmonious use of all of these has been compared with a concert.

For that reason, a useful water management program must be thoughtfully planned.

The Senate select committee on national water resources has divided water management into six principal categories.

1. Regulating streamflows, which includes protecting the soil of our watersheds and constructing surface reservoirs. Water from surface reservoirs could be used to augment streams in times of drought or heavy pollution.

2. Improving water quality, which means purifying sewage and keeping all damaging wastes out of rivers and lakes.

WATER EFFICIENCY PLAN

3. Increasing water use efficiency, which means using water more than once and reducing wasteful practices.

4. Expanding the use of underground water. In the Chicago metropolitan area, about 424 million gallons a day or 84 per cent of the potential yield of the shallow aquifers are not used.

5. Expanding natural water yield which includes desalting, weather modification, and reduction of evaporation losses.

6. Redistribution—transporting water from river basins that have a surplus to areas of shortage.

QUALITY MANAGEMENT NEEDED

On a local level, both Albert B. Maris, special master to the United States Supreme court, and the Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning commission have said that the most urgent need of the Chicago area is an effective program of water quality management.

Maris made his own proposals for an "enlightened management and use of water resources" in Chicago by suggesting:

A strict leak detection and repair program; universal water metering; greater use of ground water supplies; elimination of untreated industrial wastes from the canals; complete discontinuance of construction of combined storm and sewer systems; artificial aeration of the canals.

Any consideration of a water management program must take into account that the obstacles to such a plan now are innumerable. One problem is that a water management program must be based on total cooperation.

BUREAUCRACY BID OBSTACLE

Sen. Frank E. Moss [D., Utah], an outspoken advocate of water management, said that bureaucracy is one of the big obstacles in the way of effective water management in this country.

"A question vital [to water management] is whether the programs necessary to restoration of America's waters can be carried out within the framework of existing governmental structures," the senator wrote in his book, "The Water Crisis," published recently.

"Are the federal, state, and local agencies of the 1960s capable of effective water management? Experience indicates that they are not, and that significant changes are essential."

Sen. Moss proposed the creation of a federal department of natural resources, with overriding authority to administer and enforce water projects and standards throughout the United States. He also proposed the creation of river-basin authorities with power to fix and enforce water quality standards regardless of state lines.

URGE BASIN METHOD

This river-basin method of operation is urgently proposed by many experts, who say it would be pointless to plan uses for a river which passes thru several states, with each state using widely different standards on the amount of pollution that may be dumped into the river.

Another problem is the number of individual state agencies involved in water problems. Illinois has 6,500 local governmental units [more than any other state] involved in water resource questions. Of that number, 1,200 of them are northeastern Illinois.

Presently, each state is responsible for its own waterways.

Sen. Moss has said:

"The states must replace the present anarchy in water use with river-basin authorities.

"Industry must recognize the maintenance of clean water as a cost of doing business.

"MUST RESTORE PRINCIPAL"

"The taxpayers must realize that we have been living off the capital of our water and this principal must now be restored."

Sen. Moss concluded:

"The future of every American depends on water regardless of his income, profession, or station in life. No society can build material prosperity or spiritual health on the ruin of its physical environment."

[From the Chicago Tribune, Aug. 11, 1967]
A PATTERN FOR THE FUTURE: USING WATER OVER AND OVER AGAIN

(NOTE.—Future demands for water mean we will need to learn to use it many times. Ways to do that are explained in the sixth article of a series.)

(By Casey Bukro)

Second hand water.

That is the next most important development in water conservation, and the experts say it will be part of our lives soon.

Call it water reclamation, recycling, or re-using water. It all means using water repeatedly in many ways. Experts say that water can be used again and again until it is tired.

"We've got to get away from the concept that we can use water once and throw it away," said Clarence W. Klassen, chief sanitary engineer for the United States department of public health.

DEPENDS ON REUSE

"This is the source of water [reused water] that we're going to depend on if we are to meet future demands," Klassen asserted.

Authorities say that the use of water in the United States has grown from 40 billion gallons a day in 1900 to 350 billion gallons a day today. By 1980, the interior department says, the need will be for 600 billion gallons a day, 85 billion more than is currently available.

Because of these immense demands, several areas of the nation are faced with the choice of finding new supplies or restricting population growth and economic development.

The alternative is an entirely new philosophy in the use of public water supplies. That philosophy was spelled out in 1964 by James M. Quigley, assistant secretary of health, education, and welfare in an address before a conference on industrial wastes. He said:

"We have got to take the water we have and use it, clean it up, use it again, clean it up, use it again.

"WON'T BE A CHEAP WAY

"This is not going to be inexpensive, but in many sections of the country, it is going to be inevitable. And it may become inevitable a lot sooner than you think.

"And when it does become inevitable, it will be the clear-cut duty of all water users, be they sportsmen, housewives, or industrialists, to use the water that they must, but then to clean it up and return it to the stream in as good condition as they possibly can.

"When that time comes, if you don't do that, your neighbor down the stream is going to have to do it for you. The neighborly thing, the fair thing is going to be to require everybody to do his fair share of cleaning up the water he dirties or contaminates or pollutes."

BACON IS OPTIMISTIC

Vinton Bacon, general superintendent of the Chicago sanitary district, described water as a "renewable resource"—one that can be cleaned thru natural river purification or thru sewage treatment plants.

"We can today take effluent [discharge] from sewage treatment plants, technically and economically, and convert it to completely pure and reusable water much cheaper than developing new supplies," Bacon explained.

Water treated for reuse could be sold for 5 to 10 cents per 1,000 gallons, Bacon said. Chicago now sells tap water for 22 cents per 1,000 gallons.

More than 2 billion gallons of water a day are drawn from Lake Michigan and discharged from Chicago without any attempt to reuse the water.

OTHER SUPPLIES AVAILABLE

"We don't reuse water because we have had other supplies so available. Aesthetically, we don't like the idea of using water directly from a sewage treatment plant.

"But there's no difference in the world in taking water from a treatment plant and piping it to a municipal water purification plant, or dumping treated sewage water into a river and letting it flow downstream to a municipal water purification plant."

People are comforted by the thought that their water comes from a natural stream, Bacon said.

Bacon emphasized, however, that there are no proposals to use water from sewage plants for drinking purposes. Instead, it is being proposed to reuse water to raise the level of rivers and streams, to replenish ground water supplies, for industrial processes and cooling, to form recreational lakes, to aid navigation, fresh water for fish and wildlife, washing, cleaning, irrigation, and waste disposal.

CITES CALIFORNIA CITY

Presently, fresh water is used for most of those purposes. Second hand water could be used without drawing on fresh water supplies.

One of the foremost examples in the country in reusing water is Santee, Cal., an unincorporated suburb outside of San Diego. It began reclaiming its used water in 1960.

By 1965, Santee had a recreation area complete with five small lakes. Water for the lakes had been distilled from sewage. Residents swim, boat, and fish in the formerly arid community and there is absolutely no health hazard, altho every drop of water in those lakes came from the local sewage treatment plant.

"It is only a matter of time before we have to reclaim water in the Chicago area," said Bacon.

"WE DON'T OWN THE LAKE"

"Altho Lake Michigan is at our doorstep, the Supreme court has said we don't own it and can't use it as we want to," Bacon asserted. He also described Chicago as the second greater water shortage area in the United States based on water supply available per person in the area.

Thus, water reclamation in the Chicago area is getting some very serious thought. Industry can take some credit for being in the forefront of water reclamation. It has been estimated that water used for industrial purposes is used on an average of four times before being discharged in the Chicago area.

The Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning commission has gone a step further in suggesting some ways to reuse water.

REFUSE AS SECONDARY SUPPLY

The commission has said there could be a savings of 31.3 million gallons a day of fresh water if treated sewage water was used for watering golf courses in the Chicago area; for industrial purposes; for air pollution abatement programs in which large quantities of water are used for washing; and in aeration tanks.

Another proposal by the commission is to collect all treated sewage water and use it as an auxiliary water supply for industry.

Another kind of water reclamation which few people know about has been proposed. Klassen told THE TRIBUNE that deep underground water supplies in Illinois are being protected until a way is found to desalt and demineralize water cheaply.

Geologists report that there are millions of gallons of water in the deep aquifers, but that most of it is too mineralized or salty for use at levels below 2,000 feet.

KEY WEST DESALTS SEA

However, some desalting programs have been highly successful. Key West, Fla., for

example, opened the nation's largest desalination plant July 20, becoming the first American city to get its fresh water from the sea. The plant is designed to produce 2.62 million gallons of fresh water daily from ocean water.

Klassen explained that there has been a trend toward disposal of industrial wastes by drilling wells a mile deep and putting wastes into what is now unusable waters below the ground.

"In view of the possibility of using water that is now unpotable, we've got to start protecting it," said Klassen.

Proposals for reusing water will depend on a high degree of sewage treatment. Presently, most sewage treatment plants clean a maximum of 90 per cent of the impurities from the sewage in two stages of treatment.

CAN BE 90 PERCENT PURE

A third stage of treatment, called tertiary treatment, can clean 99 per cent of the impurities. These third phase sewage treatment plants will play a vital part in future water reclamation and water management.

Bacon said Chicago is building a tertiary treatment plant in Hanover Park. It is scheduled to be completed in November or December at a cost of 1.1 million dollars.

"This will be the showpiece of the nation," said Bacon.

But Bacon said Chicago needs two more projects for total water quality, along with tertiary water treatment. One is a strict program against water pollution. The other is finding ways to separate sewage from flood waters.

ADOPTS 1-BILLION PROGRAM

"We are just kidding ourselves if we have one without the other," said Bacon.

The Chicago sanitary district guaranteed an effective fight against water pollution and floods July 27 by adopting a one billion dollar program to last 10 years.

One part of the program is aimed at eliminating pollution from the 71 miles of Chicago waterways by 1975 and making them all fit for swimming, boating, and fishing. This will be done by building more sewer lines, chlorination plants, and tertiary treatment plants.

A second part calls for building what is known as the deep tunnel plan for flood and pollution control, scheduled to begin by 1972 in the area near Lake Calumet.

"It is the most imaginative idea in years," said Bacon.

BYPASS SANITARY PLANTS

Most municipal sewer systems were built years ago and combine storm and sanitary drains. When large volumes of rain water rush into the drains during a storm, the volume of water is too great for sanitary plants to handle.

The flow is then sent thru bypass valves, which empty the mixture of storm water and raw sewage directly into lakes and streams.

The ideal solution to this problem is two systems—a sewer system to channel storm waters directly into streams, and a sanitary system that delivers sewage to treatment plants. It is estimated that it would cost 30 to 40 billion dollars to separate all combined sewer systems in the United States.

DISCUSSES TUNNEL PLAN

The deep tunnel plan proposes to excavate water storage tunnels in rock 700 to 800 feet below the ground. Vertical shafts would channel flood waters from the surface to the chambers below. The flood waters could be stored, then pumped to the surface after the storm and released slowly.

An additional advantage to the plan is that water, once pumped to surface reservoirs, could be drawn back into the ground again to activate turbine generators to produce electric power.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Aug. 11, 1967]

WATER POLLUTION LAB DEDICATED IN DULUTH

(By William Jones)

DULUTH, MINN., August 11.—Ceremonies were held here today dedicating the first federal facility built to study exclusively the problems of pollution in fresh bodies of water in the United States.

Construction work was completed last month on the National Water Quality laboratory, built at a cost of 2.2 million dollars on a 13.2-acre site overlooking Lake Superior. The laboratory eventually will employ 125 marine biologists who hope to find an answer to the growing problem of water pollution in the nation's lakes and streams.

WARNING FROM UDALL

The main speaker at the ceremonies was Stewart L. Udall, secretary of the interior, who said the time has come for definite action to be taken against water—and air—pollution.

"The time is coming—in many areas it is already here—when the dirty river and the belching smokestack are no longer the hallmarks of prosperity, but the hallmarks of a declining society," Udall said. "The time for hand wringing is over; the time for action has come."

Udall warned that the nation's lakes are "in clear and present danger" of being killed off altogether, of being prematurely turned into bogs and marshes.

FOUR FIELDS OF STUDY

Officials said the staff of the new laboratory will deal with four aspects of water pollution.

The staff will isolate and study a variety of marine organisms; it will conduct research to determine whether pollutants trigger rampant growth of algae; it will make a study to see which pollutants kill aquatic insects and worms which make up food for fish; and it will conduct research into toxic substances capable of killing entire fish populations.

The laboratory is the first to be built for the exclusive study of pollutants in fresh water. Laboratories already exist which conduct research into pollutants in salt water, the officials said.

The laboratory will be operated under the Federal Water Pollution Control administration, a part of the department of the interior.

BIOLOGIST NAMED DIRECTOR

Named as director of the new facility was Dr. Donald Mount, 36, an aquatic biologist specializing in the effects of water pollution on fish. He formerly was head of the federal fish toxicology laboratory in Newtown, O.

Chicagoans attending the ceremonies were Vinton Bacon, general superintendent of the metropolitan sanitary district; John Egan, president of the sanitary district board; and Jerome Stein, director of research and control for the district.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Aug. 12, 1967]

HOW YOU CAN HELP SAVE WATER SUPPLY

(NOTE.—Water conservation, even in the home, has far-reaching effects. Ways to save water in the home are told in the last article of a series.)

(By Casey Bukro)

A drip here, a splash there add up to a lot of wasted water. Water conservation at home could become the answer to demands for quality water.

Hints on how to reduce water use in individual households come from Gerald S. Batalle, president of Batalle, Kane & McKie, Inc., of Barrington, a consulting engineers firm. The firm specializes in industrial water conservation and pollution control.

STOP WATER WASTE

"We must think in terms of stopping waste, more than in trying to reuse water in the

home," said Batalle. "It's not just a matter of turning the faucets off tight. It means finding ways to conserve water."

Needless flow is the most frequent method of wasting water in a home, said Batalle.

Most men using safety razors will run hot tap water constantly, rather than filling the wash basin.

Housewives frequently wash vegetables in the kitchen sink under a constant flow of water, instead of filling the sink.

WAYS TO REUSE WATER

There are a few ways to reuse water in the home, altho this has been an industrial specialty until now.

Water used for water-cooled airconditioning units should be collected and reused for sprinkling the lawn, or washing the car.

Unless water in the outdoor swimming pool has some ingredients added that are harmful to grass, it also can be used for sprinkling and washing.

PLUG UP TUB

Leaky faucets should always be repaired. What seems like a small drip adds up to quite a volume of water over a 24-hour period, said Batalle.

In filling the tub for a bath, don't let the initial cold flow of water drain away. Plug the tub immediately. Even tho the water is cold at first, let it flow into the tub until the water becomes hot enough.

While taking a shower, notice if the nozzle is sending a spray so wide that little of it hits the body. It is better to buy a nozzle that can be adjusted to control the span of the spray, so that less water is used in taking the shower.

"Some people will tell you that they pay a fixed sum for their water, so no matter how much they use, it doesn't cost them anything extra," said Batalle.

Don't believe it, he asserted. Water consumption affects the entire community.

Batalle cited a specific example in Lincolnwood where an industrial firm was prevented from expanding its operations because it could not get permission to increase the amount of water it gets daily from the city.

NEED TO CONSERVE

Batalle pointed out that if every household in Lincolnwood conserved its water supply, that company and many more would receive additional water to expand and contribute to the economic welfare of the entire community.

"There are industrial firms in the Chicago area that are faced with the problem of expanding their production only thru water conservation. If we can reduce their water flow sufficiently, we can use that water for expansion. Otherwise, expansion is absolutely limited," said Batalle.

For that reason, industry has long been aware of the need to find ways to get more work out of water. With generally rising costs, water is one channel of possibly reducing expenses. The water treatment industries and its technology now are considered on the threshold of tremendous developments.

"Water conservation equipment in industry reduces original water consumption 75 to 80 per cent," said Batalle. "We've got some very big accounts to back that up."

ANSWER TO QUESTION

So, to those who say, "Why bother to save water?" Batalle answers:

"One home practicing water conservation doesn't make much difference. But millions of homes, all practicing water conservation, can save enough water to make a great deal of difference.

"Together with all other means of water conservation in industry and thru water pollution control, America will have the answer to its water shortage problems for a long period of years," said Batalle.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Aug. 13, 1967]

WATER PURITY TALKS CALLED HERE SEPTEMBER 11

Federal officials will meet here Sept. 11 to determine whether the Chicago area is moving fast enough to reduce pollution of Lake Michigan and the inland waterways.

"There has been a lot of talk, now we'd like to see some action," H. W. Poston, Chicago regional director of the federal water pollution control division, United States public health service, said yesterday.

Poston called the meeting "crucial," noting that the meetings have been at the conference stage since March of 1965.

"The next step is the hearing stage, at which we will require sworn testimony," he said. "After that, we go to court for action against those who refuse to comply."

TARGET DATE IS 1969

Poston noted that under the federal water pollution control act, treatment facilities are to be completed by 1969.

"We've been asked for time extensions twice already," he said, "and I think we'll be asked for more time at the next meeting."

Vinton W. Bacon, general superintendent of the metropolitan sanitary district, agreed that major industrial water polluters "may ask for a little more time."

He called "unrealistic" the federal requirement that treatment facilities be completed by Dec. 31, 1968, noting the district's one-billion-dollar cleanup plan will require 10 years to finish.

PROGRESS IS REPORTED

Bacon said most of the Chicago area's major industries are making progress toward controlling pollutants in the 3 billion gallons of wastes they discharge each day into Lake Michigan and the sanitary canal system.

United States Steel corporation officials are about to go to their board for approval of an extensive anti-pollution program, he said. The corporation's South works, 3226 E. 89th st., is listed as the area's largest industrial water polluter. It discharges 440 million gallons of wastes each day into Lake Michigan, and 17.8 million gallons a day into the Calumet river.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Aug. 14, 1967]

VIRUS SEEN AS PERIL TO WATER—MORE RESEARCH VITAL, ASSERTS U.S. JUDGE

(By Casey Bukro)

Science needs new ways to control and detect viruses if it expects to make progress against water pollution.

"Laboratory methods for isolation and identification of viruses are not practical for routine use in the testing of water," said Albert B. Maris, a Philadelphia federal District court judge. His recommendations to the United States Supreme court settled a 45-year-old legal battle over diversion of water from Lake Michigan last June.

LACK ADEQUATE TOOLS

"There is not known at this time any technique adaptable to field operating conditions which can insure the consistent removal of all viruses from a raw water supply subject to sewage pollution," said Maris in his report.

"Present chemical techniques do not provide adequate tools . . . for the inactivation of viruses in sewage."

Maris singled out the science of virology as one of the emerging weapons against water pollution, altho he described virology as "virtually in its infancy."

Virology is the branch of science that deals with viruses, submicroscopic infective agents that cause various diseases in man, plants, and animals.

MAY CAUSE OTHER ILLS

Infectious hepatitis is the only viral disease positively known to be transmitted by drinking water. But Maris added:

"The failure to identify other viral diseases as water-borne may be due to the general lack of information on the clinical illnesses that many of the viruses produce. . . . Public health statistics are commonly limited to a few diseases which are serious and epidemic, and will not indicate significant differences in the incidence of viral diseases as between communities which use polluted sources of water and those which do not."

ONE OF EIGHT CONTAMINANTS

Altho infectious agents are only one of eight classes of water pollution, they are becoming increasingly important.

"Sanitary engineering and public health authorities are expressing increased concern over the potential toxic effects of newly developed organic chemical contaminants present in public water supplies," said Maris.

Bacterial pollution up to 2½ miles offshore from Chicago often is dangerously high, said Maris. Chicago gets its water supply from the lake.

"Chicago's water treatment plants were not designed and cannot undertake to remove from the raw water all chemical contaminants which might be injurious to public health," Maris said.

NO METHOD OF TREATMENT

"There are no adequate procedures for identification of such substances under conditions of routine water production, there is no known treatment for removal of such substances if their presence were established, and there is not adequate information as to which chemicals are dangerous to human health, or in what quantities."

Maris said that until there is more scientific knowledge about viruses, it would be best for public health agencies to keep all pollution containing viruses out of Lake Michigan.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Aug. 15, 1967]

TOXIC ALGAE BLAMED FOR BIG ALEWIFE KILL (By William Jones)

A leading marine biologist said yesterday that Chicago's dead alewife problem was caused by an overproduction of toxic algae which thrive in polluted water.

Dr. Louis Williams, a research aquatic biologist who specializes in the study of algae at the national water control laboratory in Duluth, Minn., was called in by the federal Water Pollution Control administration [WPCA] in Chicago to study the city's alewife problem. He made his report to the administration on July 6, but its contents were not disclosed.

REPORT IS DISPUTED

Williams' report was disputed by Dr. Donald I. Mount, director of the water quality laboratory, who said there is no evidence as yet to conclude what is killing alewives. Mount, whose specialty is fish toxicology, said the algae were present in the water before the alewives started dying off. He called the Williams report "no more than a theory."

According to Williams, the alewives are killed by the toxic blue-green algae, which reproduce and thrive in warm, polluted water such as that found in the waters of southern Lake Michigan in May and June. He said the pollutants were probably from industrial waste.

The blue-green algae are so toxic, said Dr. Williams, that four dogs died of convulsions in Minnesota two weeks ago after drinking from a lake swarming with the tiny plant particles. In concentrated quantities, he added, the algae are capable of killing human beings. The algae have been blamed for a large number of deaths of fish and ducks in the Ohio river industrial regions.

BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS

Dr. Williams based his conclusions on water samples and a study of the stomach contents of dead alewives.

"All of the alewives I studied had consumed large amounts of the toxic algae," Williams said.

H. W. Poston, director of the Chicago office of the WPCA, said he had asked Dr. Williams to study the problem. Poston said he had not released Dr. Williams' report because a number of other reports have been submitted to his office by experts.

GROUP STUDYING PROBLEM

Poston said all reports have been turned over to a joint task force that is studying the problem in Washington. The group is headed by Stanley Cain, assistant secretary of the department of interior.

Poston termed the Williams report "a cursory review of data and not the result of research."

The report is the latest in a number of reasons given as the cause for the dead alewives. Other causes are listed as a thyroid condition in the fish, the after effects of spawning, simple old age, and the inability to adjust to the Great Lakes. The alewife, originally a salt water fish, migrated in huge numbers into the Great Lakes after the St. Lawrence seaway was opened.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Aug. 15, 1967]

INDUSTRIES COOPERATE ON POLLUTION: BACON

Vinton W. Bacon, superintendent of the sanitary district, said yesterday that nearly all industries in Cook county "are cooperating to the fullest extent possible" with state and federal guidelines for installation of industrial anti-pollution equipment along Chicago area waterways.

He denied a report that the district has singled out certain industries for failure to correct pollution problems, adding: "We don't make lists. We take court action against violators. Even in extreme cases co-operation by industry has been excellent."

Bacon labeled as "inaccurate, misleading, and distorted" a list published Saturday by a Chicago newspaper which described 15 major industries as major water polluters. The list, he said, was taken from a June 21 inventory of industries which discharge wastes, not necessarily pollutants, into Chicago area waterways.

He said only four of 95 industries listed in the inventory have failed to comply with guidelines and timetables for installation of new waste treatment facilities.

The industries are Trumbull Asphalt company, 95th street and Archer avenue, Summit; Electro Coating company, 9530 Ainslie st., Schiller Park; U. B. S. company, Lemont; and Hendrickson Manufacturing company, 8001 W. 47th st., Lyons.

In hearings set for 10 a.m. Aug. 26 the companies will be asked to explain reasons for the pollution and outline plans for corrective action. Failure to comply could result in action to shut down the plants or fines of up to \$100 a day for each day the violations continue.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Aug. 19, 1967]

LAKES WASTES MAY FORCE SEWER PLAN— INTERSTATE SYSTEM IS OUTLINED (By William Jones)

MILWAUKEE, August 18.—Pollution in Lake Michigan has reached such critical levels that an interstate sewage system may be necessary to prevent deterioration such as occurred in Lake Erie, a water expert warned today.

Dr. Alfred M. Beeton, a biology consultant and assistant director of the center for Great Lakes study, said marine biologists and other water experts believe Lake Michigan has reached the same stage as when rapid deterioration began in Lake Erie.

Erie, considered the most polluted of the five Great Lakes, "aged" 1,000 years in the past half century from industrial and municipal wastes, Beeton said.

LINK INDUSTRY, CITIES

Beeton, who also is a consultant to the army corps of engineers, said the concept of the massive tri-state sewer system would link industry and municipalities from Milwaukee to Michigan City, Ind. Waste would be treated at central points within the system before entering the Illinois river thru the Chicago Sanitary and Ship canal.

"This is by no means the only stretch of lake where drastic action is needed to halt pollution," Beeton said. "But in the future this area will be subjected to even greater demands from industries and municipalities along the shoreline."

Beeton said that, in the last year, tests also have indicated that the southern part of Green Bay, which flows into Lake Michigan's northwest corner, now is as polluted as the western part of Lake Erie.

DESIRABLE FISH DISAPPEAR

"In addition to the disappearance of desirable fish, we have found a marked increase in the number of organisms that thrive in heavily polluted waters," Beeton said. These studies include the disappearance of the May fly, Beeton said, considered a major turning point in the rapid deterioration of Lake Erie.

Beeton warned that communities on Lake Michigan should not be overconfident that the lake has thus far resisted pollution more effectively than has Lake Erie.

"Erie is a much smaller body of water and has a greater population demand along its shoreline," Beeton said. "However, those attempting to reverse Erie's pollution have an advantage in its location."

Erie is among the chain of four Great Lakes and receives a cleansing flow from Lake Superior and Huron, according to Beeton. This flow theoretically could cleanse Erie in three years, he said.

The long term outlook for Lake Michigan is not as encouraging, Beeton said. Lake Michigan is isolated from the chain and depends on its tributaries, which also are polluted, he said.

Beeton also noted that Lake Michigan's deep waters are relatively clear because the coastal and off-shore waters do not readily mix because of wave patterns.

"At the present time this is fortunate," Beeton said, "but if the lake ever becomes entirely polluted it will become a major deterrent to reversing deterioration."

[From the Chicago Tribune, Aug. 22, 1967]
BACON PLEDGES FULL REPORT ON POLLUTION
(By Casey Bukro)

Vinton Bacon, general superintendent of the sanitary district, said yesterday that he intends to testify next Tuesday that the district is the chief water polluter in the Chicago area.

Bacon said he has been told to "name names" at the hearing before the Illinois Water Pollution and Water Resources commission in the State of Illinois building, 160 N. La Salle St.

EIGHT ASKED TO TESTIFY

Bacon was one of eight top level experts named yesterday by Rep. Carl L. Klein [R., Chicago], chairman of the commission, to testify before the commission on water pollution problems.

Also named to testify were:

William C. Ackermann, chief of the Illinois water survey, on ground and surface water supplies.

Milton Fikarsky, Chicago commissioner of public works, on Chicago's plans for low level tunnels to store flood waters.

LAKE BASINS EYED

John Guillou, chief waterways engineer of the Illinois department of public works and buildings, on a plan in which three basins would be constructed a mile offshore at Chicago to collect industrial wastes and

flood runoff. The plan, first proposed in 1942, is designed to eliminate industrial pollution of the lake.

Col. John E. Bennett of the army corps of engineers, on the corps' present policy of dumping dredgings from the Calumet and Chicago rivers.

Clarence Klassen, chief sanitary engineer of the sanitary district, on industrial water use standards in Cook county.

W. H. Poston, supervisor of the federal water pollution control administration in the Chicago area, on pollution problems in Lake Michigan and the Chicago and Calumet rivers.

Frank DiLuzio, assistant secretary of the interior.

KERNER SOUNDS CALL TO BATTLE ON STATE'S POLLUTED AIR, WATER

(By Robert Howard)

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., August 21.—Gov. Kerner took the final step today to submit to a 1968 referendum a proposed billion dollar bond issue to finance programs to combat air and water pollution.

The governor signed a series of bipartisan bills in the presence of officials of conservation and sportsmen's organizations who are counted upon to help rally support for the anti-pollution program, the biggest in the state's history.

PRIMARY SOURCES OF LIVES

"Water and air are the primary sources of our lives, wealth, and enjoyment," Kerner said in a statement. "Protecting these life-giving measures is one of the most pressing challenges of modern society. Pollution is the cancer of our natural resources. Unlike the human disease for which no cause is known, we do know the causes of pollution. We have the motivation, the obligation, and a wealth of skills. Now we need the support of the people who hold the future of Illinois in their hands."

Both the bond issue and a constitutional convention proposal will be on the Nov. 5, 1968, ballots.

"The fund will generate more than three quarters of a billion dollars in federal matching grants which otherwise would not be available to the State and local governments," Kerner said.

Graves is planning a major campaign to get public support for the bond issues.

VEToes ONE BOND BILL

Kerner vetoed a million dollar bond bill introduced by Klein and signed a duplicate measure by Rep. William A. Redmond [D., Bensenville].

The governor approved another series of bills designed to encourage business firms to install pollution control facilities. In an effort to reduce taxes, the state revenue department is authorized to assess such equipment on a basis of productivity.

Sen. Arthur W. Gottschalk [R., Bloomer], the chief sponsor, said that expensive pollution control equipment adds little to the productivity of a factory and should not be taxed at the standard rates.

Recreational development is part of the billion dollar program worked out by Gene H. Graves, state director of business and economic development.

Rep. Carl Klein [R., Chicago], who made the final decisions in working out a legislative compromise, allocated 200 million dollars for recreational and conservation purposes. Of that total, 50 millions is to go to local governments as grants.

LOAN SYSTEM TOLD

Under the Klein financial plan, 410 million dollars will be loaned to local governments and private industry, and eventually will be recovered by the state.

This will allow local governments to get lower interest rates on guaranteed loans for construction of pure water plants, sewer

systems and sewage treatment plants. Thru the same system, industries will be aided in the purchase of equipment needed to control water and air pollution.

An additional 200 million dollars will be given to local governments as grants.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Aug. 24, 1967]
OFFICIALS HAIL SPENDING FOR POLLUTION WAR—BILLION-DOLLAR BOND TO BE SOUGHT

State, federal, and city officials yesterday hailed a proposed one billion dollar bond issue as a significant step forward in the accelerated battle against water and air pollution.

Gov. Kerner signed bills Monday to submit the question to the voters Nov. 5, 1968.

Afterward Rep. Carl L. Klein [R., Chicago], whose bill for the bond issue was vetoed by Gov. Kerner in favor of one introduced by Rep. William A. Redmond [D., Bensenville], questioned the validity of the proposition because the name of the administering agency was not exactly the same in companion bills.

WATER BOARD DISAGREE

Clarence W. Klassen, chief of the state sanitary water board, said he did not agree with Klein.

"From what I know about it, there is no question about the fact that we've established a pure water board that will have necessary authority to administer the bond issue. I'd be very much surprised if it were otherwise."

Klassen noted that more than half the money is to fight water and air pollution and to insure a public water supply.

"It is the most complete program for water resources of any of the states," Klassen said.

All Illinois cities will not take advantage of the bond issue, but it will be "the major step that is necessary as an incentive," Klassen stated.

PRAISED BY BACON

Vinton Bacon, general superintendent of the sanitary district, said the measure is especially significant for providing an integrated approach to water resources development, pollution, flood control, and recreation.

"This is a great step forward," Bacon said.

The issue would authorize loans and grants to municipalities for construction and would enable industry to secure guaranteed loans.

"We're certainly in accord with this step," said Robert Schneider, deputy regional director of the federal water pollution control administration. With state participation, Schneider pointed out, local governments which previously obtained a 30 per cent federal contribution for construction of waste treatment facilities could obtain as much as 55 per cent.

"There is no thought that this will solve all the problems of the state forever, but it will give a tremendous boost to make wonderful progress in the next 10 years," said John Guillou, chief waterways engineer of the Illinois department of public works.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Aug. 24, 1967]
REPORTS LAKE POLLUTION GAINS

(By James Yuenger)

WASHINGTON, August 23.—Federal officials are convinced that they are on the road to cleaning up pollution in Lake Michigan, but they don't expect any visible results for at least three years.

While the legislative machinery now exists to crack down on polluters, they say, the clean-up effort will be lengthened by the need for more research and for the tremendous sums of money to finance it.

Theodore Radja, an anti-pollution enforcement specialist for the department of the interior, said that the department is satisfied with the promises from steel and chemical companies along the Illinois-Indiana shore of the lake to install anti-pollution machinery.

KEEP TABS ON PROMISES

But the government is watching closely to see that the companies keep their word, Radja said.

"It will be hard for them to back down from their promises," he said. "But this stuff [in the lake] won't be cleaned up overnight. The program will take 3 to 7 years to complete, and we won't see any real progress until 1970."

The interior department estimates that it will take 250 million dollars from industry, cities, and the government for a program to remedy the pollution in the lake.

An estimate by the Senate public works subcommittee on air and water pollution goes much higher. As of last year, it said, 462 millions thru 1972 from all sources was needed to clean up the lake.

GETS U.S. FUNDS

This year the Federal Water Pollution Control administration, keystone of the government's anti-pollution campaign, provided 6.2 million dollars to Illinois as matching funds for sewage treatment facilities.

The portion that was allocated for Lake Michigan's cleanup was not available.

An administration spokesman characterized the agency's role as primarily a watchdog which is "only in the picture because of the faults of the states."

While the agency has embarked on a far-reaching program of research and evaluation in the fight against pollution, it emphasizes that it expects the states to take the major role.

LACK OF FUNDS

The spokesman, noting that Supt. Vinton Bacon of the metropolitan sanitary district has complained of a lack of available federal funds for fighting pollution, said that the F.W.P.C.A. can't get all the money it wants.

For instance, the clean water restoration act of 1966 authorized 450 million dollars in fiscal 1968 for grants to localities across the nation to help build sewage treatment plants. Administration budget-cutters reduced this to 203 millions.

Richard Grundy, a professional assistant to the Senate subcommittee on air and water pollution, laid the blame squarely on the states for the pollution problem that exists.

NOTHING FOR 20 YEARS

"Nobody did anything for 20 years," Grundy said. "The treatment plants that were built were geared only to current needs, with no thought of the future."

Grundy said that because Lake Michigan is used as a dumping ground, it and the other Great Lakes have been subject of many surveys, but he added that only in the last 5 years or so has the point been reached where scientists can make long-range recommendations for cleaning up the lakes.

The F.W.P.C.A. is depending on two basic legislative tools as backbones for its anti-pollution campaign.

GOVERNMENT TO ACT

One is the clean water restoration act passed last year, which authorized appropriation of 3.9 billion dollars in grants to help build sewage treatment plants, perform research, and help states establish water pollution control programs.

The other one was the water quality act of 1965, which demands the establishment of water quality standards. If the states don't set standards for interstate waters within their borders—and come up with a plan to meet them—the government is to do it.

[Illinois has submitted its standards. They're now being reviewed by the F.W.P.C.A. and a decision is expected soon.]

One of the difficulties in the anti-pollution program on the federal level has been the fragmentation of authority. One legislative assistant on Capitol Hill has been trying for six months to find out who is doing what,

and he estimated that the job will take two more months.

Grundy said that while pollution in Lake Michigan is bad, it is nowhere near the point that has been reached in Lake Erie and is still capable of control if the government, the states, and municipalities can, in the next few years, get the public to support an all-out fight against it.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Aug. 25, 1967]
POLLUTION SIPHONING OFF LAKE ERIE LIFE
(By Casey Bukro and William Jones)

CLEVELAND, August 24.—A polluted lake dies violently.

It suffocates fish, tosses unpleasant vegetable growths onto its beaches and fills the air along its shorelines with the stench of untreated wastes.

Lake Erie is in the final throes of a premature death, slowly choking on its heavily polluted tributaries and shoreline. There is little relief in sight, water experts warn, and Erie now is dying so fast that it may become America's Dead sea.

All lakes eventually die thru a normal process called eutrophication.

MAN SPEEDS UP PROCESS

But Erie would have lived for thousands of years and perhaps even survived the human race if man had not settled on its shores and began his methodic execution. By speeding up the aging process with industrial and municipal wastes, man has polluted Erie to the point where today it is like a child with progeria—that rare disease that accelerates the life cycle so the victim may die of old age at 10.

Erie is not alone. Experts now are warning that Lake Michigan and Lake Ontario may be next.

What has happened—and is happening—can be studied in two categories. They are Erie's tributaries and its open waters.

Nearly all the lake's major tributaries are so heavily polluted that in many areas they support no biological life. The Detroit river flows into Erie at its western end carrying phenols, acids, iron and oil wastes from industry.

POOR SEWAGE SYSTEM

Combined with the outpour from this great industrial complex is the flow of municipal wastes from 3 million persons that is treated in a horse and buggy sewage system. Detroit gives its sewage only "primary" treatment, which means only certain solids are removed.

On the southern shore of the lake, in and around Cleveland, a series of polluted tributaries carry the same wastes plus polluted runoffs from Ohio farmlands into Erie.

The Cuyahoga river, which enters Erie here, is a huge gutter for industry and the city.

Similar conditions are repeated in Toledo, Erie, and Buffalo and no one knows how much pollution is pouring into the lake.

As these nutrients enter the water, they overenrich the lake to the point where microscopic plant growths called algae proliferate. Some wash ashore to rot and ruin swimming areas. The rest settles to the bottom to provide food for plant life which in turn robs the water of oxygen.

Aquatic life becomes more and more the anaerobic [nonoxygen] type such as blood worms. They are the primeval forms of life that will continue to inhabit a lake after weed growth has reduced it to a swamp.

A mass of algae measuring 800 square miles and 2 feet deep now lies in the western basin of Erie. It represents a tragic preview of what may lie ahead.

Erie, in some ways, is more susceptible to a premature death from pollution. It is only the fourth largest of the five Great Lakes and is a puddle when its depths are compared to the gulfs that form Lakes Michigan, Superior, Huron, and Ontario.

POLLUTION BY DETROIT

This same shallowness, however, could help the lake recover if pollution ever is halted, according to water experts. Erie receives a cleansing flow from both Superior and Huron, but the flow now is polluted by Detroit.

Lake Michigan, which now is showing some of the symptoms Erie displayed 15 years ago, would not be as fortunate. It is the isolated Great Lake and receives no assistance from the others in cleansing its waters.

"If Michigan goes, it's gone forever," predicted a federal water pollution expert here. "It's as simple as that."

Even with the potential of Erie's cleansing flow, federal officials here are not optimistic about its chances for recovery. Too much has happened in the last 50 years.

CARP ARE THRIVING

The blue pike and whitefish are gone. The flesh of other fish has an undesirable taste and such scavengers as carp are thriving.

Swimming and water skiing have been curtailed because of high bacterial counts and dead plants and fish on the beaches. Miles of sandy beaches on each side of Cleveland now are posted with signs reading "If you must swim here—please observe the following safety regulations;"

The word "must" is underlined, a reminder that Erie's filthy water may well result in an upset stomach, ear ache, or even worse if it is used for swimming. Cleveland residents drive 35 miles to find swimming areas where the bacterial count is low enough for safe swimming.

Boat owners refuse to take their crafts in certain areas because of the oily material that clings to the sides.

BEACH IS CLOSED

A beach in the pleasant middle class Cleveland suburb of Euclid has been closed for years because of high bacterial counts in the water. It is adjacent to a series of storm sewers that carry the untreated wastes of 21 industries directly into the lake.

The owner of a small fishing bait and boat rental business on the other side of the sewer pipes has been told the city-owned property he leases soon will be used for an addition to the community's sewage treatment plant.

"It's just as well," said Forest [Woody] Dadlow, who has operated the boat rental business since 1959. "Fishermen don't come here any more because the pike and whitefish are gone. I'm selling my boats one by one this summer."

Dadlow said he has watched dead fish float ashore moments after brackish yellow water gushes into the lake from the pipes.

LAKE IS DYING

In 1960, the federal government took action and ordered a comprehensive study of the lake. Some 200 experts took part in the investigation of Erie's problem and concluded that the lake was indeed dying.

Since then, more sewage plants have been planned and built and some industries are installing filters in an attempt to stop using Erie and its tributaries as a convenient waste disposal area.

The present program will not reverse the damage already done, water experts say. They merely hope it will slow down the present rate of deterioration. The nutrient cycle may be so well established, they point out, that nothing can be done to return Erie to its condition at the beginning of the century.

If this is the case, then Erie is as good as dead.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune,
Aug. 26, 1967]

CLEVELAND'S POLLUTED RIVER IS A POTENTIAL FIRE TRAIT

(By Casey Bukro and William Jones)

CLEVELAND, August 25.—The polluted Cuyahoga river running thru the heart of this city

is one of the few rivers in the world that is a fire hazard.

City officials here say there is always the chance that anyone careless with a match could set fire to huge oil slicks and massive formations of oil-soaked debris floating on the river.

The last Cuyahoga river fire, in November, 1952, destroyed three tugboats and three downtown buildings at a cost of one million dollars. A few precautions have since been taken.

SUBJECT OF JOKES

Altho the condition of the Cuyahoga river is of major concern to the people of Cleveland, they do tell jokes about it.

Some say that anyone who falls into the Cuyahoga does not drown—he decays.

Pollution experts here will say only that the Cuyahoga river is one of the most heavily polluted waterways in the country today.

The Cuyahoga is one of three rivers spewing filth into Lake Erie in the Cleveland area. Authorities agree that the Cuyahoga is the worst. It is one of the major reasons that Lake Erie is polluted.

EXAMPLE OF POLLUTION

It also is an example of what becomes of a river that is used for a waste disposal over a long period by industries and communities.

The worst of the pollution is found in the last five miles of the river before it empties into Cleveland harbor and Lake Erie. Cleveland's major industries, including steel plants, oil refineries, paint and varnish plants, meat packers, chemical plants and a tar distillery, line the banks in downtown Cleveland.

SMELLS LIKE RUST

This stretch of river is "grossly polluted," said Glenn Pratt, a federal pollution control agent in Cleveland, while trying to find words to describe the lower Cuyahoga river. "You've got to see it to believe it."

Seeing pollution in this river does not make it any more believable.

At the mouth, the water is orange from dense concentrations of iron wastes. The water also smells like rusty iron.

Further upstream, the water bubbles with a brisk patter where several feet of industrial wastes lie on the bottom—rotting and forming a foul gas.

Put a match to the bubbles and a small blue flame will erupt.

"Methane gas is highly explosive in high enough concentrations," said Pratt as our boat slid over the bubbling waters. "It also is a very deadly gas."

Part of the fascination of this river is that a starkly different display of pollution usually lies just around the next bend in the river, whose name in Indian means "crooked." There are six bends in the first three miles.

DISCHARGE INTO RIVER

The boat entered a gulch formed by towering steel derricks, 21 bridges, smokestacks, and storage tanks belonging to Cleveland's big business.

Pipes from these companies discharge wastes directly into the river, which also is a major navigation line for shipping on the Great Lakes.

Still further, at a bend in the river, there was a black mass of floating debris covered with thick oil wastes. It smelled like a filling station.

A Tribune reporter dipped his hand into the river. When he withdrew his hand, it was covered with a thick coating resembling black molasses.

The river is heavily polluted with domestic sewage from many of the 60 sewage treatment plants in the Cleveland area.

SEWAGE PARTIALLY TREATED

They discharge the sewage equivalent of 510,000 persons a day into streams leading to the Cuyahoga river, including wastes from local industries. Of that amount, it is estimated that only 43.6 per cent of the sewage is effectively treated.

At least 155 tons of chemicals, metals, oils, and salts are dumped directly into the Cuyahoga river daily by Cleveland industries. This includes 34,000 pounds of iron, 525 gallons of oil, and 400 pounds of cyanide.

These figures are based on reports filed by the industrial firms with the state.

The latest deluge of pollution comes from a break in a 5-foot sewer main in suburban Brooklyn Heights, which is spewing 30 million gallons of raw sewage into the Cuyahoga river daily.

BREAK NOT REPAIRED

The break was reported early in April. City officials say they took "emergency action" seven weeks later to let a contract for repairing the break, which is eight miles from Lake Erie.

"We expect to have it repaired some time in September," said Walter E. Gerdel, commissioner of the Cleveland division of water pollution control.

These vast loads of pollution make the Cuyahoga river unique in many ways.

It doesn't freeze during the winter because of the high content of wastes and hot water dumped from cooling operations.

NO LIFE IN RIVER

It has absolutely no biological life or oxygen throughout the five miles of river floating through Cleveland. Even low forms of life, such as leeches and worms which usually thrive in wastes and sewage, have been polluted to death.

The usual color of the river is chocolate brown. The only resemblance the river has to ordinary water is that it is wet.

The stench in downtown Cleveland from the river usually is strong.

Debris causes thousands of dollars of damage annually to ships and small craft. An estimated 2 million pounds of junk has been hauled from the river and Lake Erie in the last two years.

Gerdel described the debris in the Cuyahoga as a "unique collection of material." He said most of it is there because people use the river as a dump all along the 100 miles from Akron to Cleveland.

By the time the flow reaches Cleveland, it has slowed to the point that it takes six to eight days to travel the last five miles through Cleveland. Sometimes the flow stops or oscillates back and forth.

It is commonly known that the captain of a Norwegian freighter a year ago ordered that the top of the mast of his ship be cut off in order to pass under a low bridge, rather than take Cuyahoga river water into his ballast tanks.

Pleasure boat owners will not enter the lower Cuyahoga because of the filth that sticks to the boats.

These are the sorrows and shame of a river that is used as a garbage dump.

Not only does it violate and contaminate everything that comes in contact with it, it also is offensive to the eye, the nose, and some say, to common sense.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Aug. 27, 1967]

CAN'T ENJOY WATCHING A LAKE DIE

(By William Jones and Casey Bukro)

CLEVELAND, August 26.—A retired lifelong resident here has given up his early morning walks along the shores of Lake Erie because he is sick of seeing clumps of raw sewage in the water.

The stench of rotting algae on the beaches also is revolting to him, and he prefers to take his walks away from the lake.

Lake Erie, one of the five Great Lakes, is dying. It is dying a geologically rapid death because of pollution by industry and municipalities along its shores.

FACE AQUATIC DESERT

What is worse, the more than 10 million persons who live along its shores soon may be denied every advantage that usually comes from living on one of the Great Lakes. They will live on the shores of an aquatic desert, water experts say, with a variety of floating and rotting wastes as a constant reminder that man can indeed kill a lake.

Already, those who enjoyed the lake and its wonders as children are mourning the fact that their children cannot do the same. Their concern is tragically late for Erie. Its real value lies in the warning to residents along the other Great Lakes, particularly Michigan and Ontario.

Both now are showing early signs of Erie's deterioration cycle which began less than 15 years ago, according to the experts.

COMES TO FISH

"I come down here to fish because my boys love to fish anywhere," said Wilbert Dillon, who works for a Cleveland trucking company. "But I don't enjoy it myself anymore."

A few yards away, one of his sons, Joey, 8, was fishing with a cane pole. The bobber periodically floated into a nearby oil slick. They were fishing for perch, the only desirable fish left in the lake.

"It makes you sick," Dillon said. "When I was his age I used to catch blue pike, wall-eyes, and white fish in this same spot with a cane pole. Now, you stand here for two hours and you have to move because the surface is covered with drifting slime."

The slime is dead algae and weeds mixed with oils and other petroleum wastes. In recent years the vegetable growths have thrived and multiplied on the phosphorous and nitrates contained in partially treated wastes from cities and industries. As they grow, they suck oxygen from the water, killing many desirable fish and plants.

The Dillon family has a boat, but they keep it at home in the garage now and only use it for fishing trips to Canada, more than 500 miles away. It just wasn't worth the effort, Dillon said to spend hours scrubbing off the black scum that formed on the bottom during a single day of boating in Erie's waters.

Swimming and water skiing also have been sharply curtailed. In addition to the heavily polluted waters, water skiers fear numerous floating logs and debris that flush into Erie from its lifeless tributaries.

SIGNS WARN SWIMMERS

Officially, the beaches are opened. But signs have been posted implying that swimmers take their health in their hands if they choose to enter the water. The signs begin: "If you want to swim."

Walter E. Gerdel, commissioner of the department of public works division of water pollution control in Cleveland, said he feels that reports of Erie's polluted beaches are frequently exaggerated. When asked if he would swim in the lake, Gerdel replied: "No, because I don't go swimming."

CHILDREN PREFER POOLS

Q. "Would you allow your children to swim in the lake?"

A. "Well, my children go to swimming pools when they want to swim."

Q. "Let me put it this way then. If a friend of your family came to Cleveland from another city and wanted to swim in the lake would you advise him against it?"

A. "Let me answer that by saying that we admittedly have problems with the bacterial count on our beaches. But I think a lot of the claims are exaggerated. We have good beaches at Cedar Point—but of course that's 50 miles away."

EXCEED HEALTH MINIMUM

Glenn Pratt, of the federal water pollution control administration here, said bacterial

counts where people now are permitted to swim exceed minimum health standards.

"It's a joke," Pratt said. "The bacterial counts are so high that the lifeguards employed by the city should be used to keep people out of the water."

"You read in the paper one day that some expert says the lake is dying and the next week another expert says such reports are exaggerated," said Fred Wittal. "I don't know who's kidding whom, but this lake is a goner."

Wittal wears a yellow rubber apron that smells of fish to cover his work clothes. He is not a water pollution control expert and he has no idea how much waste pours into Erie and its tributaries each day.

He does know only too well, however, that he is one of the last members of a once thriving commercial fishing industry in Cleveland that sent some 75 boats a day onto Erie in search of blue pike and white fish. When these fish disappeared in the mid-1950's the commercial fleet was out of business.

Wittal now must make a living of limited perch catches and such scavenger fish as carp and sheepshead. He frequently takes his boat more than 20 miles off shore to find them.

SLIME FILLS NETS

"Even that far out my nets are filled with weeds and slimy algae," Wittal said. His daily trips to these distant areas have revealed another startling fact of life in Erie's dying waters.

Wittals' boat is equipped with a sonar unit that blips when the craft passes over heavy movement of marine life.

"You can go for miles in the lake now and nothing is moving down there," he said. "It's damn eerie."

Wittal scoffed at claims that overfishing rather than pollution is responsible for the disappearance of blue pike and white fish. During the time when commercial fishermen were taking heavy catches of pike and white fish, he said, they also caught large numbers of burbot, a scavenger fish that they threw back into the lake.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Aug. 27, 1967]

HOUSE UNIT: DON'T FORGET LITTLE LAKES

(By James Yuenger)

WASHINGTON, August 26.—The growing furor over pollution in the Great Lakes should not obscure the fact that thousands of America's smaller lakes are being strangled by filth, a House committee warned this week.

In a report entitled "To Save America's Small Lakes," the House government operations committee called not only for more facilities to keep pollutants out of the small lakes but also for increased emphasis on removing the pollutants that are in them now.

"The small lakes of America are threatened by a shortening life span," the report said. "Their accelerated march toward extinction is caused primarily by man's activities."

IN DEATH THROES

"Some small lakes, both urban and rural, already are in the throes of death. They are virtually open cesspools, carpeted with green scum and formations of slime."

"Their waters are grossly turbid and unpleasant in taste and odor. These lakes, once blessed with the highest forms of aquatic life, have been thoughtlessly pillaged by man."

The Fox chain o'lakes was cited on the list of small lakes that are rapidly being killed by pollution.

The report, following intensive study of the problem by the committee's natural resources and power subcommittee, urges expansion and coordination of the federal anti-pollution effort.

Restoration of dying lakes should be accompanied by improvement of their shore-

lands and adjacent areas to promote full use of the lakes for recreational purposes, it said.

It called for legislation to make more government money available for pilot programs in cleaning lakes out, and for the federal housing and veterans' administrations to require the best feasible waste systems in housing they finance.

DEMONSTRATION IS SOUGHT

While citing the need for research, the committee made it clear that it thinks the scientists and other water experts ought to get moving with demonstration programs for clearing up pollution.

It recalled the 1963 testimony of John G. Morris, then director of environmental health in Lake county, Illinois [and now Du Page county public works superintendent] that "we are directing too much research money to the laboratory, and we are not going from the laboratory to the prototype which will show us how to remove nitrates and phosphates."

The soap and detergent industry came in for criticism in the report. While new detergents have cut down the amount of sudsy water flowing into the small lakes, it said, there is still a critical need to find substitutes for the phosphates in soap that build up pollution.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Aug. 28, 1967]

INDUSTRY GETS MUCH OF BLAME IN CUYAHOGA RIVER POLLUTION

(By Casey Bukro and William Jones)

CLEVELAND, August 27.—Industry in Cleveland has been accused of a public-be-damned attitude toward polluting the Cuyahoga river.

"That is an irresponsible statement," said George H. Watkins, when asked about this charge.

"In dealing with a big industrial complex—with new equipment and technological evolution—the time to make changes is related to the growth and development you have. In fairness to the companies, they have programmed these changes with other capital improvements."

Watkins is the executive director of the Lake Erie Watershed Conservation foundation in Cleveland. He is regarded as a spokesman for local industry.

LONG, SHARP BATTLE

Watkins is also one of the combatants in a battleground often found in communities where the public accuses local industry of polluting waterways.

This battle has been long and sharp in the Cleveland area.

Industries in the Cuyahoga river area, hold 44 separate state permits to dump waste waters into the river, including 10 in the Cleveland area. The Ohio public health service estimates that river industries pipe more than 550 million gallons of waste water into the Cuyahoga river daily.

Business spokesmen admit they are causing pollution in Lake Erie and the Cuyahoga river, but they say they are doing all they can to curtail or stop it.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FIVE TONS FROM CLEVELAND

It is also estimated that 155 tons of waste are dumped each day into the Cuyahoga river by Cleveland industries alone.

How much each of the Cuyahoga river industries contributes to the degradation of the river is a secret. So is the matter of what they dump.

The industrialists contend that such knowledge, delivered into the hands of competitors, would give away their innermost production secrets.

Most of the industrialists, however, want indisputable proof that new expenditures on pollution control are necessary and effective before they will make these payments freely.

Just because they are at the site of the

worst pollution does not mean all the pollution is caused by them, they assert.

BLAME DISPOSAL PLANTS

Watkins contends that a high proportion of the pollution comes from local sewage disposal plants, which also treat wastes from industrial plants. Not all of these plants are run efficiently, says industry.

Industry also objects to public demands for a federal crash program against water pollution.

"There is no emergency," Watkins insists. "There is no evidence at all of any danger to health. So far as we have been able to determine, the river is not toxic."

ALSO HAVE COMPLAINTS

Industry has complaints of its own. It says that once the Cuyahoga river reaches the industrial district, the water is almost too dirty to use. It also says that once river water is clarified and run thru cooling towers here, it is cleaner than when they took it from the river.

Many of the companies are recirculating and reusing water to overcome the problem of dirty water supplies from the Cuyahoga river.

This controversy of public versus industry involves some members of Cleveland's big business—Republic Steel corporation, Jones & Laughlin Steel corporation, United States Steel corporation, Standard Oil company (Ohio), E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. and Harshaw Chemical company.

SPEND 13 MILLIONS

One company especially stung by criticism is Jones & Laughlin, which has spent 4 million dollars in water pollution control equipment since 1957 as part of what is called a "good neighbor policy." Republic Steel said it has spent 9 million dollars on water pollution control in the last 10 years.

All told, industry here says it has spent 18 million dollars in the last 10 years on pollution control.

One of the greatest advances was made recently by United States Steel, which expects to eliminate the flow of pickle liquor into the river within a year. Pickle liquor is a sulphuric acid residue of the steel-making process. Some experts believe it is the harshest pollutant in the river and has eaten away many of the retaining walls in the river and changes the color of the river to a deep maroon.

OTHERS CONSIDER CHANGE

Other steel companies here reportedly are thinking about making a similar change to an acid that can be recovered and used again, and not dumped into the river.

Meanwhile, the steel industries have agreed to dump pickle liquor into the river a little at a time. They once dumped thousands of gallons of it at a time, making the Cuyahoga river virtually a waterway of sulphuric acid.

The cost to make these changes raises another problem, says industry. It is that the cost of steel and other products here will increase to compensate for the expenditures on pollution control.

"This added cost is a fact of life to the extent that it is a new production expenditure," Watkins said.

Does Cleveland industry believe it has done enough toward pollution control?

"That is a philosophical question," Watkins replied.

Watkins said that many of the industrialists in Cleveland are divided on this question. Some have moved voluntarily to curtail pollution. Others say they have complied with requests for improvement from the Ohio water pollution control board.

Does industry believe it has complied fully with requests by the pollution control board?

"I don't like to answer that question," Watkins said. "There are some industrial

people who will say there is room for improvement."

"We haven't solved the problem, but most observers say it is better than before," Watkins asserted. "Besides, industry takes the blame for everything that occurs on the river. They are the first to be blamed."

Watkins favored zoning the river so that it can be classified once and for all for industrial use, along with some standards and criteria on just how clean it should be.

"Industry will meet its responsibility, but somebody must tell industry what that responsibility is," Watkins said.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Aug. 29, 1967]
BELIEVES UNITED STATES RENEGED ON SAVING
ERIE—RECALLS L. B. J. TALK AT BUFFALO
(By Casey Bukro and William Jones)

CLEVELAND, August 28.—A city official here believes that the federal government has reneged on its promise to help with the cost of pollution control in Lake Erie.

Walter E. Gerdel, Cleveland commissioner of water pollution control, said, "There has been a lot of talk on the federal levels about doing this and doing that." But apparently there has been little else.

MUST SAVE LAKE ERIE

Still ringing in Gerdel's ears was a speech by President Johnson in Buffalo on Aug. 19, 1966.

"What happens to Lake Erie will alone affect the lives of more than 25 million people in the United States and Canada," Johnson said at that time. "Lake Erie must be saved. And if we work together—the federal government, the state governments, the towns and cities, and the local industries—we can save Lake Erie."

Gerdel's reaction:

"They led us on and then shut the door. You might say they reneged."

CITY WENT AHEAD

The commissioner explained that, under a schedule of the 1966 Clean Water Restoration Act, 450 million dollars was authorized for federal grants to pay for pollution control construction in 1968.

"We went ahead so we would have our share of the money to put up to qualify for federal aid authorized for next year," said Gerdel. A 22-million-dollar bond issue for a sewage treatment plant and sewer construction was proposed and adopted in a referendum in Cleveland earlier this year.

Subsequently, Congress offered a bill to appropriate only 203 million dollars in federal grants for pollution control construction next year.

"This means Cleveland will get no federal grants," Gerdel said. "It doesn't have priority among the eligible cities. There just isn't enough money for everybody, now that the appropriation has been cut so much. The smaller cities can show a greater need for federal aid."

"This grant thing is a sore point with me. It's a little unfair."

ANGER ELSEWHERE, TOO

Anger on this situation has been voiced by authorities thruout the country, including Vinton Bacon, general superintendent of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago.

Gerdel is not the only Cleveland city official who thinks the federal government should take a stronger role in paying for pollution abatement.

Mayor Ralph S. Locher has advocated since 1966 that the federal government pay 90 per cent of the cost of pollution control, much as it pays 90 per cent of the cost of interstate highway construction.

Under that formula, state and local governments would pay 5 per cent each.

COST \$90 MILLION

Locher said that the cost of restoring the waters of Lake Erie to acceptable water

quality levels has been estimated between 10 and 20 billion dollars.

Ten billion dollars, prorated over the present Lake Erie population, amounts to \$1,000 per person or about 1.8 billion from metropolitan Cleveland.

"Even the 5 per cent share for the local community in this case would be in the neighborhood of 90 million dollars," said Locher.

"If there is no federal help available, approximately 900 million dollars would be Cleveland's share of eliminating pollution."

"That is equivalent to nearly 15 years of our general fund budget of 62 million dollars."

"Think of it! For the next 15 years, we would have to devote as much to water pollution as we now spend for all city operations other than utilities."

"There is only one word to describe that—impossible," Locher added.

COST \$850 MILLION

Estimated costs for water pollution control usually are astounding. One Washington official said that the country might be facing a pollution abatement job which would cost more than 100 billion dollars during the next 35 years.

Gerdel said it would cost Cleveland about 850 million dollars to replace the combined sewer system, which regularly overflows and pours raw sewage into Lake Erie and the Cuyahoga River.

Altho the problem persists, Gerdel noted, Cleveland has spent 13.5 million dollars in the last four years for sewage treatment plant improvements to cut down the flow of sludge solids into the two bodies of water.

Cleveland now is in the act of developing a master plan for pollution abatement, which is expected to be completed by the end of this year.

"It will be a blueprint to see where to spend a dollar to do the most good," said Gerdel. Cleveland also is anxious to learn what federal water standards will evolve from the 1965 water quality act.

WHERE TO SPEND DOLLAR

"Some water conservation enthusiasts don't realize that a high price tag comes along when water quality is set extremely high. It's a matter of common sense. There has to be some compromise and acceptance of what you already have. What lies in the future depends on what the master plan proposes and how much people want to pay for it."

"A lot depends on what the public will pay for," said Gerdel, repeating a belief held thruout the country that water quality improvements will come only when the public demands them and is willing to pay the cost by approving bond issues and higher taxes.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Aug. 29, 1967]

STATE WATER HEARINGS TO BEGIN TODAY

Representatives of 20 Chicago area industries are expected to explain their programs to halt water pollution today before the Illinois Water Pollution and Water Resources Commission.

The commission, headed by State Rep. Carl L. Klein [R., Chicago], will meet at 9:45 a.m. in the State of Illinois Building, 160 N. La Salle st.

Also scheduled to testify before the commission are eight experts, including Vinton Bacon, general superintendent of the sanitary district. Bacon has indicated he will testify that the district is the chief water polluter in the Chicago area.

BACON TO OUTLINE PLAN

Bacon also will outline for the commission the district's 10-year, one-billion-dollar construction program designed to clean up Chicago area waterways.

Others scheduled to testify before the commission are:

William C. Ackermann, chief of the Illinois water survey, on ground and surface water supplies.

PIKARSKY TO APPEAR

Milton Pikarsky, Chicago commissioner of public works, on Chicago's plans for low level tunnels to store flood water.

John Guillou, chief waterways engineer of the Illinois department of public works and buildings, on a plan in which three basins would be constructed a mile offshore at Chicago to collect industrial wastes and flood runoff. The plan, first proposed in 1942, is designed to eliminate industrial pollution of the lake.

Col. John E. Bennett of the army corps of engineers, on the corps' present policy of dumping dredgings from the Calumet and Chicago rivers.

Clarence Klassen, chief sanitary engineer of the sanitary district, on industrial water use standards in Cook county.

W. H. Poston, supervisor of the federal water pollution control administration in the Chicago area, on pollution problems in Lake Michigan and the Chicago and Calumet rivers.

Frank DiLuzio, assistant secretary of the interior.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Aug. 30, 1967]
DALEY WARNS OF POLLUTION PERIL TO LAKE—
ASKS FOR HELP OF CITIZENS

(By William Jones)

An appeal to help save Lake Michigan from death by pollution was issued by Mayor Daley yesterday during appearances before two groups dealing with water pollution control.

"Despite all previous efforts in which billions of dollars have been spent we now find that Lake Michigan is faced with the same fate of many other lakes," Daley said. "This summer is the first time in the history of the lake that we've had algae on some of our shores."

TELLS OF PROPOSAL

And in an unscheduled appearance before a meeting of the Illinois Water Pollution and Water Resources commission, Daley termed water pollution the No. 1 problem faced by midwest communities.

During an appearance before 1,200 persons attending the International Water Quality symposium in the Hilton hotel, Daley disclosed that an ordinance will be introduced in the city council Sept. 7 making mandatory the use of retention or recirculation sanitary devices aboard all vessels operating in Chicago waters. He said the ordinance would become effective and be strictly enforced with the beginning of the 1968 boating season.

INDUSTRY ATTENDS MEETING

The proposed ordinance would apply to all pleasure craft more than 20 feet long and all commercial craft, Daley said. He also urged that an effective program be established to involve all states and communities on the lake.

"Water pollution prevention cannot be confined to any one single locality," Daley said. "No portion of Lake Michigan can be isolated from pollutants entering another portion. We must have uniform quality standards adopted by all the states and users of Lake Michigan."

More than 20 representatives of industry attended the meeting of the Illinois Commission in the State of Illinois building. The commission is headed by Illinois Rep. Carl L. Klein [R., Chicago], and is charged with the task of submitting a comprehensive water use program to the governor.

OUTLINE CONTROL PROGRAM

During the meeting, industry representatives outlined their pollution control programs and expressed concern over being labeled major water polluters in recent reports.

A spokesman for Commonwealth Edison company noted that the utility firm plans to spend \$275,000 for a recirculating system to halt the dumping of fine ash into the Chicago river.

Both Klein and Vinton Bacon, general superintendent of the sanitary district, said they believe that industry on the lake and Chicago area rivers generally is cooperating with efforts to halt pollution. Most industrial officials testifying yesterday noted that their firms are working closely with recommended procedures of the sanitary district.

TELL OF EXPENDITURES

In a statement issued during the meeting by the Chicago Association of Commerce, it was disclosed that a check of seven companies recently listed as polluters showed that the firms have spent more than 12 million dollars in the last five years to halt water pollution.

However, Klein also noted that during a recent check on Chicago's waterways, the commission found some examples of continued pollution by industry. One of these, he said, was the Rock Road Construction company, which was dumping raw wastes into the sanitary ship canal at Pulaski road.

During the water symposium, Sen. Gale McGee [D., Wyo.], warned the group that large urban centers were becoming water parasites by draining off water supplies of distant smaller communities.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Aug. 30, 1967]

INDUSTRIAL WASTES MAKE NIAGARA FALLS A SHRINE TO WATER POLLUTION—CANADIANS BLAME SMELLY MESS ON UNITED STATES

(By Casey Bukro)

NIAGARA FALLS, ONTARIO, August 29.—Water pollution has become an international incident here, where Canadians accuse the United States of spoiling the beauty of Niagara Falls.

"This is a terrible reflection on your country," said Joseph A. Montgomery, a Canadian whose complaints helped to trigger an investigation by the International Joint commission.

Most objectionable, he says, are the masses of oil-coated foam and the powerful chemical odors that plague Niagara Falls, which is visited by about 10 million persons a year from throughout the world.

"A lot of people consider Niagara Falls a shrine to natural beauty—it is one of the natural wonders of the world," said Montgomery. "It is becoming a shrine to water pollution."

Canadians are complaining that great amounts of oil and wastes dumped by United States industries into the Buffalo and upper Niagara rivers are swept over Niagara Falls to Canadian shores on the other side of the lower Niagara river.

Another complaint is that the city of Niagara Falls, N.Y., opposite the Ontario city of the same name, is dumping 40 million gallons of industrial wastes daily into the Niagara river from a huge tunnel about 500 yards north of American falls.

WASTES GUSH INTO RIVER

The wastes gush into the river near Rainbow bridge, about 100 yards downstream from the dock on the American side where thousands of visitors each year board Maid-of-the-Mist boats for a cruise in the gorge at the base of the falls.

Eddy currents surround the boarding area with wastes. There have been repeated complaints of strong odors that burn the eyes of tourists and of unsightly foam in the water.

American visitors here are bitter about it. Canadians, celebrating the 100th birthday of their country with a world fair attracting a surge of foreign visitors, are embarrassed.

CITES U.S. "PROPAGANDA"

"Canadians think all those statements about pollution abatement in the United States are just so much propaganda," said Montgomery, industrial department manager of the Greater Niagara Chamber of Commerce in Niagara Falls, Ont.

An investigation by the Tribune showed that the city of Niagara Falls, N.Y., permits four local industries to use the tunnel for industrial wastes.

"The tunnel is supposed to be handling cooling waters," said Vincent Loecey, acting director of the Niagara Falls, N.Y., department of sewage.

When asked about the obnoxious odors not usually found in cooling water, Loecey replied:

"What exactly is in that water—I don't know myself. It is known there are other things in that tunnel besides water. But I don't know what they are or how they get there."

This flow of wastes from Niagara Falls, N.Y., and from other American cities angered Montgomery. He protested to the general manager of the Ontario Water Resources commission July 28, saying:

"A POSITIVE SHAME"

"It is a positive shame that New York State and the International Joint commission would permit one of the seven natural wonders of the world to be spoiled so completely by the lack of pollution control in New York state."

Copies of the protest were sent to President Johnson, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York, Sen. Robert Kennedy, and others.

The issue was referred immediately to the I.J.C. which was formed by treaty in 1909 between Canada and the United States to safeguard boundary water quality. The commission consists of three representatives from each country.

BOARD WRITES REPORT

The advisory board of the I. J. C. met Aug. 9 and 10 in Ottawa and began writing a report on their findings, expected to be released this year. The board recommended at the meeting that the city of Niagara Falls, N.Y., be cited by the full commission for having inadequate sewage treatment facilities.

Niagara Falls, N. Y., with a population of 102,000, has only a fine-screening system built in 1939 to strain large particles from sewage and wastes.

Seventy million gallons of absolutely raw and untreated sewage spew daily into the lower Niagara river from Niagara Falls, N. Y. This discharge is 75 per cent industrial wastes and 25 per cent domestic sewage.

TUMBLES INTO RIVER

This discharge tumbles into the river about a mile downstream from Niagara Falls.

But Niagara Falls, N. Y., is just one American city contributing to Canada's problem with water pollution.

Federal pollution control agents here say that tons of industrial wastes flow each day from the Buffalo river in Buffalo and from the far eastern shores of Lake Erie, at Lackawanna, N. Y. This area in and near Buffalo is the site of a great industrial complex, including steel mills and oil refineries, where the waters are used for waste disposal.

These wastes flow into the upper Niagara river and finally plunge over the falls. Included in the wastes are 1.2 million pounds of solids, 75,000 pounds of oil and grease, and 1,000 pounds of cyanide daily.

Until this year, these wastes would collect in the Buffalo river for 60 or 70 days because of poor or no flow. A federal report described this river as "not even as good as a cesspool."

CANADIANS BUILD PARKWAY

Canadians admit they have some industrial waste problems of their own, but add

that a major part of the problem with industrial wastes comes from American shores.

Canadians have spent the last 60 years developing a riverside parkway on public land extending the entire 35 miles along the Niagara river from Lake Erie to Lake Ontario.

Across the river, on the American side, are the smokestacks of refineries and chemical plants, and the sewage and waste pipes emptying into the Niagara river.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Aug. 31, 1967]

POLLUTION PERILS NIAGARA; PLACE BLAME ON U.S. FIRMS

(By Casey Bukro)

NIAGARA FALLS, N.Y., August 30.—Niagara falls, the mecca of honeymooners, dazzles most of the 10 million visitors who see the cascade each year.

When the visitors take a closer look, and smell, some of the enthusiasm dies.

"We've seen passengers hold handkerchiefs over their noses because of the filth and smell coming over American falls," said Capt. Clifford Keech, skipper of the Maid-of-the-Mist II since 1949.

EXCURSIONS INTO GORGE

The boat is one of two which operate from the Canadian and American sides of the Niagara river, carrying thousands of passengers on excursions into the gorge below Niagara falls.

"Quite a few passengers complain," said Keech. "It tends to distract and disappoint people who came here to see an example of natural beauty."

An official of the boat operation said they candidly tell those who complain that the contamination in the falls and in the river is caused by pollution from United States industry.

KEEPS DAILY LOG

The company also keeps a day-by-day log of some of the nuisances detected. The log dates to 1961. Entries include:

June 30, 1964—"The foam and discharges remain much longer in the immediate area of both Canadian and American docks. The remarks and concern of most tourists who view the scum are far from flattering."

July 5, 1964—"Terribly strong, almost unbearable odor."

June 3, 1965—"Brown scum and foam."

Sept. 22, 1966—"Foul odor from tunnel—burns eyes [complaints from tourists]."

June 30, 1967—"Light green discharge from tunnel, discoloring water. Something in the water killing fish."

Federal pollution control agents have investigated and detected three distinct odors in the gorge at Niagara falls.

ROTTEN EGG ODOR

One is a sharp chlorine chemical odor coming from a tunnel at the American base of Rainbow bridge. This tunnel is used by four industries of Niagara Falls to discharge wastes.

The second is an odor at the Maid-of-the-Mist landing dock on the Canadian side and is believed caused by decomposed organic debris and algae collected in the foam.

The third is a rotten egg odor found at the base of American and Canadian falls, which might be caused by an inversion of polluted air.

Capt. Keech contends that the worst of the offending pollution drops over the American falls. Investigators agree.

The Niagara river branches around Goat Island. The east branch, carrying 10 per cent of the flow, rushes over the American falls. The west branch, carrying 90 per cent of the flow, drops over the Canadian falls, also known as Horseshoe Falls.

The Canadians have no industry in the falls area. Water tumbling over the Canadian falls, coming from the Canadian side of the river, tends to be much cleaner, they say.

Look at Niagara Falls with a critical eye and some of the enchantment fades. The blight is all on the American shores.

Start with the diversion tunnel used by the city of Niagara Falls, N.Y., for spewing industrial wastes into the river. It is 500 yards downstream from American falls and gushes 40 million gallons of industrial wastes daily.

A mile downstream is the Niagara Falls, N.Y., sewage treatment plant, which tosses 70 million gallons of raw sewage daily into the lower Niagara river.

SEEN FROM CANADA

Seen from Canadian shores, there is a cloudy like green band 100 yards wide in the river where the sewage is spewing from the plant. A thick tan-colored material also surrounds the plant.

Water outside this area is a clear deep green.

"You should hear the remarks of Canadian tourists riding in double-decker buses at this point," said Joseph A. Montgomery, industrial department manager of the Greater Niagara Chamber of Commerce in Niagara Falls, Ont.

"That plant is giving all of America a black eye—even with the Americans," said Montgomery.

A stark comparison of how the United States and Canada use or abuse their waters can be seen seven miles downstream from the falls, where both countries operate power generating plants on opposite sides of the shore.

POWERPLANT ABUSE

Water returning to the Niagara river from the Robert Moses power station at Lewiston, N.Y., looks dark and dirty. The water on the American side of the river, as a result, is much darker to the eye.

Now take a look at the Sir Adam Beck Niagara generating stations one and two at Queenston, Ont., across the river from the American plant.

The water discharged from this plant is light and clear. It is a stark contrast to the dark waters on the American side, which forms a distinct line of separation down the center of the river.

Farther downstream is Niagara-on-the-Lake, Ont., a small town where the Niagara river empties into Lake Ontario. This area, once a popular boating and swimming area, is deserted. It is infested with algae.

HELPLESS TO SOLVE

Montgomery said it is ironic that Canada and the United States in the past joined forces in monumental tasks including defense, economics, and trade.

But the countries appear to be helpless to solve the water pollution problem in boundary waters.

"The main obstacle appears to be that the six Great Lakes states can't seem to agree on what to do about it," said Montgomery. "There is no unity among those states on a course of action."

Since Ontario is the only Canadian province involved in this problem, it can speak with a unified voice for Canada, Montgomery said. But there is no unified voice in the United States on water pollution.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Aug. 31, 1967]

INDUSTRY TOLD: TAKE REINS ON POLLUTION
(By William Jones)

Industry must play a larger role in the control of water pollution or face the prospect of having its voice silenced in a wave of federal programs, an industry official warned yesterday.

Donald L. Porth, vice president of Culligan, Inc., manufacturer of water treatment equipment, with headquarters in Northbrook, proposed that industry and other groups within the private sector form a world water council to deal with water pollution problems.

Porth issued the warning to 1,200 industry officials and water experts attending the final day of the International Water Quality symposium in the Hilton hotel.

"WILL BE LEFT BEHIND"

"The government commitment on problems of water and its management has become total," Porth said. "If industry and the private sector don't match this commitment, they will be left behind, powerless, without a voice, swallowed up. The government has the money. We cannot compete there. But we can match their wealth in dollars with our wealth in ideas."

The proposed council is needed, Porth said, to maintain a favorable balance between government and private efforts and to fill an existing leadership vacuum.

COULD FORM COUNCIL

Porth said there now are 24 water-related associations in the private sector which could form the nucleus for a single council, and that informal discussions during the symposium brought enthusiastic response from many persons.

He said a meeting planned for October in Washington, D.C., further will explore the possibilities of the proposed council and he is hopeful that formal organization will follow in January.

Abel Wolman, professor emeritus of sanitary engineering at Johns Hopkins university and an engineering consultant, told the delegates that industry's image frequently suffers in regard to water pollution because of "the erroneous impression that industry will only move if you force it."

"HAS BEEN EXAGGERATED"

"I think this has frequently been exaggerated," said Wolman. "My own opinion is that it has an obligation that some have met and some have not met."

He also warned against looking to the federal government for all the remedies for proper management of water resources.

"Money doesn't grow on trees, not even on the cherry trees in Washington," said Wolman. "Money comes from people. And the real test is going to come when the people decide what kind of water they want."

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 1, 1967]

POLLUTION FOE'S CAUSE GETS EAR

(By Casey Bukro)

BUFFALO, August 31.—Some people say he is a troublemaker. Others say he is a rabid water conservationist.

Stanley P. Spisiak of Elma, N.Y., admits he is both.

New Yorkers once considered Spisiak a crank and a nuisance. Water conservation was an unpopular cause with little public support.

Today, 27 years later, Spisiak holds many honors, including the 1965 National Water Conservation award for water resources leadership and for promoting pollution abatement.

VINDICATES HIS EFFORTS

Spisiak is proud of "the manner in which I am received today and in the last five years. It completely vindicates my beliefs in water conservation over the last 27 years."

This recognition reached full magnitude in August, 1966, when Spisiak acted as official guide on President Johnson's boat tour of the polluted Buffalo river and harbor.

During this tour, Spisiak presented the President with a famed "bucket of slop" containing a sample of the 125,000 cubic yards of dredgings from the Buffalo river bottom that the army corps of engineers was dumping into Lake Erie each year.

"This can't be allowed to continue," the President said after peering into the bucket. He issued an executive order to halt the dumping. The army engineers now are build-

ing a dike at Buffalo to contain the dredgings.

RESPECTED IN STATE

Because of coups like this, Spisiak now is respected throughout the state of New York.

But it wasn't always that way. Spisiak said it is ironic that "I received honors for my efforts in water conservation from the Canadians 18 years before my American countrymen recognized I also was working for them. Some of my staunchest supporters now are people who thought I was persecuting them years ago."

In earlier years, Spisiak had been threatened with death and beatings for advocating a halt to water pollution in the state. His opponents have been giants of industry, legislators, governors, bureaucrats, and laborers.

BEGAN FIGHT IN 1939

Spisiak speaks of his past battles over pollution abatement with an excited edge in his voice, like a fighter ready to answer the bell.

Those battles began in 1939, when he was appointed to represent the Erie County Conservation society at public hearings of the Buffalo city common council because he had some spare time.

Spisiak was horrified by the abuse by New York waterways, and campaigned for laws and action to halt those abuses.

By 1953, he was testifying on pollution problems at hearings before congressional committees, the international joint commission, and a special Senate commission on water and air pollution.

WAS SCOFFED AT

He told hearing members then that Lake Erie was dying an early death from being over-burdened with wastes from cities and industries.

"They scoffed at me," said Spisiak. "Many thought I was being overly dramatic." He also testified about the fish killed in Lake Erie, where only perch and coarse fish now live.

In 1954, he fought and won an "initial A" classification of water quality in the Lake Erie portion of Buffalo harbor and the Niagara river. Industry and city officials asked for a "C" rating, which would make the waters unfit for bathing or drinking.

He has resorted to embarrassing bureaucrats by proving that governmental agencies were responsible for polluting water.

In 1960, Spisiak discovered that two key words were missing from specifications in a state contract permitting radioactive wastes to be dumped into salt caverns below the ground at Ashford Hollow, 40 miles from Buffalo. The key words, "suitably contained," were restored.

PUSH FOR BOND ISSUE

Spisiak also took part in a campaign in which New Yorkers voted by a 5 to 1 margin in 1965 to accept a 1.75 billion dollar bond issue for a pure water program.

By his own admission, Spisiak's presence at hearings on water pollution was usually, "just barely tolerated" by industrial and governmental officials. His squabbles with them are legendary, including the time his shirt was torn from his back during a hearing.

Today, he is in great demand as a speaker on water pollution, averaging two appearances a week for the last three years at clubs, civic groups, and panel discussions. He estimates that he has 3 million supporters in the United States and Canada.

STILL NOT CONTENT

Spisiak carried on this activity while operating a modest real estate brokerage and a jewelry store in Buffalo for the last 30 years.

Spisiak, 51, now stout and bald, is not content with his gains against water pollution.

He has complained to the international joint council that industrial wastes from American industry are ruining Niagara Falls. He has invited governmental officials to look at the scum and smell the odors of the falls.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 2, 1967]
DETROIT UNABLE TO PASS BUCK ON ERIE
POLLUTION

(By Casey Bukro)

DETROIT, September 1.—The buck for polluting Lake Erie stops here.

The headwaters of pollution are here, in the Detroit river. Most of the water flowing into Lake Erie is from the Detroit river, carrying doses of contamination that are killing Lake Erie and turning it into an algae-infested swamp.

The reason this is happening, and how it happens, can be converted into a simple formula: Big industry, with its big populations, equals big water pollution.

STAND IN BOLD RELIEF

These factors stand in bold relief in Detroit because their proportions are enormous.

More than 1.6 billion gallons of waste water flow into the Detroit river daily—1.1 billion gallons from industry and 540 million gallons from municipal sewage.

Twenty million pounds of wastes flow every day from the Detroit river into Lake Erie. More than 95 per cent of the wastes discharged into Lake Erie from the state of Michigan come from the Detroit river.

The Detroit sewage treatment plant is only 17 per cent effective in removing wastes from sewage. Treated water pumped into the Detroit river contains the raw sewage equivalent to the wastes of 2.5 million people each day.

DUMP RAW SEWAGE

Industry alone releases wastes which are equivalent to the raw sewage of one million persons a day.

Five billion gallons of raw sewage are flushed each year from Detroit storm sewers into the river.

Industry and communities dump 115,000 pounds of iron wastes, 19,000 gallons of oil, and more than 200,000 pounds of acid daily into the Detroit river.

"It would be accurate to say that Detroit is the principal source of pollution in Lake Erie," said Laurence B. O'Leary, director of the Detroit program office of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration.

"I would also say that more is being done in Detroit to correct the problem than elsewhere," O'Leary asserted.

He explained that studies begun in 1961 resulted in state and federal recommendations in 1965. The state of Michigan has agreed on stipulations with 35 municipal and industrial polluters to correct the abuses by 1970.

Still standing in bold relief in the Detroit area is the fact that industry was designed since the turn of the century to use waterways for waste disposal. The rivers show it.

"We now operate under the theory that the uses of water must be enhanced," O'Leary said. "The old theory of using water for waste disposal can't be accepted."

"In every case, industry has agreed to comply with pollution abatement recommendations without going thru court battles. This indicates industry here is progressive. Industry in other parts of the country has fought it."

SEWAGE PLANT LACKING

Not so progressive is the Detroit sewage treatment plant, using primary treatment. It is one of the major sources of pollution in the Detroit area.

"Primary treatment of sewage has loaded Lake Erie with nutrients and sludge," said O'Leary. Under agreements with the state, the city of Detroit is planning to build a secondary sewage treatment plant by 1970 to remove 90 percent of the wastes in its sewage.

Detroit now is engaged in a 114 million dollar program to provide better sewage treatment and to expand the system by 1970. Detroit now has a combined sewage treat-

ment system which collects wastes from the city and from 53 suburbs.

"People in Detroit are outspoken on pollution control measures," said O'Leary.

"The only time you meet resistance from the public is when a bond issue comes up and people are faced with paying higher taxes for pollution control."

BAROMETER OF PROGRESS

The barometer of any progress against pollution here will be the Detroit river, the "big daddy" of pollution.

"We must watch the river," O'Leary said. "There should be a dramatic difference in the Detroit river as enforcement of the improvements take effect. How long it will take Lake Erie to recover is a difficult thing to say. There is so much contamination there."

The final outcome is not known. Lake Erie might hold problems still unforeseen as concentrations of contamination build to levels where they can erupt as further symptoms of a dying lake.

Meanwhile, the Detroit river continues flowing like an intravenous injection of poison into Lake Erie.

REPORT TELLS DANGER

A federal report has classified Detroit river waters as "polluted bacteriologically, chemically, physically, and biologically." Water contact sports on the lower 26 miles of the 31-mile river are hazardous. This includes Michigan beaches on Lake Erie.

A federal report says that anyone swimming in Detroit river waters runs the risk of catching "gastrointestinal diseases; eye, ear, nose, and throat disorders, skin infections, and hepatitis."

The Ford Motor plant here, identified by the government as the source of 83 percent of the industrial wastes going into the Detroit river, dumps doses of iron and oil wastes into the Rouge river each day. The Rouge flows into the Detroit river.

"I'd like to see young Henry Ford moor his yacht in that river," said a Detroit resident. "Then he'd know what water pollution is all about."

Tonnage shipped thru the Detroit river during a recent eight-month season exceeded the entire combined tonnage shipped thru the Suez and Panama canals during an entire year.

The size of the river masks many of the signs of pollution. But the pollution is there, in the Detroit river. Ask anyone who lives on the shores of Lake Erie.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 3, 1967]
UAW RECRUITS CITIZEN HELP TO FIGHT
MICHIGAN POLLUTION

(By Casey Bukro)

DETROIT, September 2.—"If we get citizen involvement in combating air and water pollution—we've licked the problem."

The words came from Miss Olga M. Madar, architect of a program by the United Auto Workers union here to recruit citizen watchdogs in a campaign against air and water pollution in Michigan.

The program is called Pollution Action Line.

"This will be a program to train people to recognize and report pollution; to work within their community and to inform on pollution violations."

WILL TRAIN SPOTTERS

"Everyone who goes thru the training course will be a spotter," said Miss Madar, who is a member-at-large of the UAW executive board. She also is director of the UAW departments of conservation and resource development and recreation and leisure-time activities.

Miss Madar, a husky former physical education and history teacher in Flatrock, Mich., became a union member while working at the Ford bomber plant in Willow Run, Mich., during World War II.

She greets visitors with a hearty, "Hi there, how are you?" She is regarded as "the teacher" of the UAW staff.

"We want to get the citizen involved in this work, in addition to detecting pollution violations and effectively enforcing our laws," said Miss Madar.

WILL REPORT VIOLATIONS

The program works this way. Trained P.A.L. volunteers will file detailed reports with state and local enforcement agencies of pollution violations by companies, individuals, or municipal sewage treatment plants. Copies of the reports will be filed with the UAW for checks on follow-thru action.

The goal of the program is to get enough evidence to prosecute violators of existing air and water pollution control laws, and to get more adequate enforcement legislation where it is necessary.

"Pollution abatement can't be done by coaxing," said Miss Madar. "You must enforce the law."

Presently, 65 persons are being trained as spotters for the program in the Detroit area, with help from state experts on pollution. A goal is to have 200 spotters in Detroit. Staff members now are being selected for the program.

FIRST IN NATION

This attempt by an existing national organization to rally citizen support against pollution is the first in the country, said Miss Madar. It is hoped the program eventually will be expanded to include all the United States and Canada, with each of the 12 UAW service areas as headquarters for the campaign.

The training program is not open only to UAW members. Spotters will include members of labor groups, conservation clubs, garden clubs, civic committees, and sportsmen groups.

Why does UAW extend membership to other groups, running the risk of opposing viewpoints on goals?

"I don't think this should be a piecemeal job," said Miss Madar. "It should be coordinated."

PART OF COMMUNITY

"We also operate on the basis that a UAW member is a community member, and works in the framework of that community," said Miss Madar.

"The program is geared to getting people to know and have something to say about the public policies we have concerning our environment," she said. Miss Madar deplored the fact that the least amount of public involvement is in the development of recreational facilities, such as parks and beaches.

HAS AN OBLIGATION

People who are familiar with the problems of pollution also are more inclined to pay the cost thru taxes of cleaning up those problems, she said.

Why is the UAW getting involved in the fight against pollution?

"We're members of the nation and the world, just like everyone else," asserted Miss Madar.

"Besides, it doesn't make sense for us to fight for better working conditions, and then let those workers walk out into a world that is polluted and being destroyed by pollution."

OFFICIALS LACK COURAGE

Pollution becomes more important in light of predictions that workers will have more leisure time in the future. They will have few places of recreation to spend that leisure time, if water pollution continues its present destruction of recreational waterways.

"One of the revealing things I've found is that elected officials knew of these problems long ago. But they did not have the courage to speak up on how much it would cost to clean it up. They didn't have the courage

to resist the pressure of industry to keep them quiet.

"Now they wonder why the people, who didn't know of these things, were apathetic until now. The people are more than apathetic now. They are incensed.

"We've made improvements in the working place—now let's do it in the community," urged Miss Madar.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 3, 1967]
RIVER THAMES GIVEN CLEANUP; TAKES 10 YEARS, 56 MILLIONS

(By Mavis Cole)

LONDON, September 2.—Fish swim in the middle reaches of the old River Thames. Eels, timber borers, and small crustacea thrive to such extent that they are a pest. And it's all happening for the first time in 200 years.

Peer into the river as it flows thru London to the sea. The water still seems dark and murky. But according to Charles Townsend, river engineer, appearances are deceptive.

The River Thames has not been this clean since the 18th century, said Townsend, or, as the Poet Spenser would put it, "runs so sweetly." Spenser died in 1599, long before the wastes of industry and population turned the Thames black and stinking and drove the fish away.

FIFTY-SIX MILLION DOLLARS AND 10 YEARS

It has taken 56 million dollars and ten years to change the river water from ink black to gray. "Considering the size of the problem, this is progress," said Townsend.

For the last three summers not one area of the 200-mile long river has been deficient in oxygen. "Such has been the improvement in the river that fresh water fish are now thriving miles below their former limit of activity," comments Townsend. "In the salt water area the eels, small crustacea, and timber borers are becoming a nuisance in places where they had not been seen for many years."

The transformation is mainly due to new methods of treating the 270 million gallons of sewage which flows into the river each day. But sulphur compounds, present in all sewage, are still the worst offenders in the cleaner Thames.

Sulphur compounds become inoffensive in their six-week trip to the sea but if the oxygen content of the water falls to zero the sulfates react to form hydrogen sulphide—the rotten egg odor.

Crude sewage discharged from cargo ships, pleasure boats, and houseboats is another problem. The Greater London council estimates the discharge is equivalent to the waste of a small town of 7,500 to 9,000. Oil and detergents are not considered serious threats to a cleaner river now that some manufacturers have developed "soft" detergents.

PROPOSALS TOO COSTLY

Proposals to divert the capital's sewage to the Thames estuary or bubble liquid oxygen into the water with giant air pumps are regarded as too costly.

It has been four hundred years since salmon swam in the Thames but, down in the docks, the salmon's lesser relatives, sticklebacks and roach, now flourish. And water fleas have also reappeared after almost half a century.

The river, alas, is still considered unsuitable for swimming. Anyone who falls into the middle reaches is rushed straight to a hospital to have his stomach pumped.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 6, 1967]

POLLUTION PERILS LAKE MICHIGAN—FOUR STATES POUR FILTH INTO IT DAILY—DETERIORATION OF GREEN BAY CITED

(NOTE.—Tribune reporters have visited cities on the shores of Lake Erie to report

how pollution has brought death to one of the Great Lakes. Today one of them begins a report on their investigation of conditions that threaten Lake Michigan, a priceless asset to Chicagoland.)

(By William Jones)

GREEN BAY, WIS., September 5.—A polluted lake does not die alone.

As it becomes a vast green sump, recreation is destroyed, esthetic values dwindle, and entire communities are forced to look elsewhere for a water supply.

The tragic irony of living on the shores of a seemingly endless supply of water and having to obtain the precious fluid elsewhere is dramatically displayed here.

USES WATER FROM LAKE

The city of Green Bay, on the southern tip of Lake Michigan's largest appendage, obtains water directly from the lake for municipal use rather than using the polluted water of Green Bay.

Public bathing beaches in this area were closed more than 25 years ago. All types of fishing are virtually nonexistent. Pleasure boats are moored in water thick with raw sewage, oils, and dead algae.

MAN STACKS DECK

Water experts warn that the increase in bottom life tolerant to pollution in the main body of Lake Michigan at the Sturgeon bay outlet may be the result of pollution by Green bay waters. They warn that using the bay as a septic tank for five scum-covered tributaries now may affect the main body.

All lakes die. In terms of geological death, however, they could live for thousands of years. But man has stacked the deck in terms of evolution of the Great Lakes. He has rapidly accelerated the aging process by pouring huge amounts of nutrients and other oxygen killing wastes into these waters.

In effect, he is creating bogs out of the principal water source for one of the nation's largest concentrations of population and industry. The Great Lakes—with about 20 per cent of the fresh water on the face of the earth—constitute the largest reservoir in the world.

IS CONSIDERED SICK

The major sources of filth here, as elsewhere, are raw partially treated wastes from industry and municipalities. Last year, water studies revealed that the southern portion of Green bay now resembles the waters of Lake Erie, the worst of the five Great Lakes in terms of pollution.

Lake Michigan is not an Erie. Neither has its premature aging from the filth of pollution reached the deterioration of Lake Ontario. Lake Michigan is, however, next in line and considered sick when compared to Lakes Superior and Huron.

Already its pollution-choked shore lines are off limits in many places to swimmers in four states. Each day its tributaries in Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Wisconsin deliver more filth to its waters, hastening the day when man will have brought another of the Great Lakes to an early end.

DEFY REVERSAL ATTEMPTS

Chicago, with perhaps the biggest stake in the life of the lake, has spent the last half century and billions of dollars developing a good water system. The city draws a billion gallons of water a day from the lake and channels its treated sewage southward into tributaries of the Mississippi river to avoid lake dumping.

Ten miles past the Indiana line, however, the polluted sluggish streams that serve a dense industrial complex are defying efforts to reverse years of haphazard dumping of industrial waters. There is no dissolved oxygen in the Indiana Harbor canal and its waters and banks are covered with oil. The lake-ward reaches of Indiana Harbor are rust covered from wastes.

Less than 100 miles north of Chicago, a heavy rain in Milwaukee will flush raw sewage thru 150 overflow outlets and into the lake. The community has devised a program that systematically closes lake front beaches after a certain amount of rain has fallen. Health officials know that bacteria levels have reached the danger point after a heavy rain.

A single example in Milwaukee also helps to explain why little or no progress is being made in rescuing the lake from an early death.

ONLY PARTIALLY TREATED

Less than 2,000 feet from the site of a 10.6-million-dollar treatment plant constructed by the metropolitan Milwaukee sewerage district, partially treated sewage flows directly into the lake. It comes from South Milwaukee, a suburb that treats only 35 per cent of the decomposable organic matter in its wastes because its treatment facilities are outdated.

The suburb declined to join the district, which provides 65 per cent treatment and chlorinates adequately because it prefers to enlarge its own facilities. The plans, however, are still on the drawing board.

Time is running out, water experts warn.

CITES 1966 REPORT

In June, 1966, the federal pollution control administration in the Great Lakes region issued a report which concluded in part:

"The Calumet, Milwaukee, and Green Bay areas of Lake Michigan are already affected adversely by pollution. Should the lake as a whole reach critical levels of nutrients or other persistent contaminants, it would require many decades before remedial measures could result in restoration of satisfactory water quality."

"We are at the critical stage," said Albert Beeton, assistant director of the Great Lakes research center. "Unless drastic measures are taken to reverse the pollution trend in Lake Michigan the deterioration will occur too rapidly to be controlled."

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 8, 1967]

FOX IS THE FILTHIEST WISCONSIN STREAM

(NOTE.—Tribune reporters have visited cities on the shores of Lake Erie to report how pollution has brought death to one of the Great Lakes. Now the report focuses on conditions that threaten Lake Michigan, a priceless asset to Chicagoland.)

(By William Jones)

GREEN BAY, WIS., September 6.—The Fox river, largest stream in the Lake Michigan basin, is the filthiest waterway in Wisconsin.

The price tag for this murky distinction is high. It is dramatically high at Bay Beach park here, a short distance from where the Fox flows into Green bay.

The park is a beautiful facility with acres of tree-shaded lawn, picnic tables, and outdoor fireplaces. The shock comes when a visitor walks to the crest of a slight incline that once swept down onto a sandy beach. For the last 25 years, the beach has been a polluted swamp, consisting entirely of rotting logs and dense cattail growth.

POLLUTION ENDS SWIMMING

The pollution cycle that ruined the beach began when waterways like the Fox became so polluted that they flushed dangerously high bacteria levels into Green bay. Swimming was prohibited, and as the years passed authorities decided against the continued expense of keeping the dead waters free of weeds. Eventually the beach became the swamp it is today.

Many residents recall swimming in the water nearly three decades ago. Today their children use a wading pool less than a block from the bay when the family comes to the park. Here and elsewhere, the Fox continues to demand a high price for man's insistence

that the 200-mile river serve as an open sewer.

Boat owners at the Green Bay Yacht club, at the mouth of the river, steer their craft thru stagnant slime and oils that form on the slowly moving waters.

LOOKS LIKE BOILING MUD

"When the boat traffic begins running heavy in the spring, the whole river along here looks like boiling mud," explains a lock master at one of the 17 locks and dams along the Fox. The boiling mud consists of acids, phenols, and effluent that combine to form greasy sludge and smother the bottom of the river. At times, the few pollution-tolerant carp that still live in the river float and gasp on the surface of the oxygen-robbled water.

This entire pollution pattern that already has taken its toll in Green Bay waters, now constitutes a threat to the main body of Lake Michigan, water experts warn. Samples taken at Sturgeon Bay in recent years for example, show deterioration that may be originating in the bay before the water enters the lake.

PAPERMILLS A SOURCE

If pollution movements reach epidemic proportions, then Lake Michigan would be choking on pollution at both its northern and southern boundaries, water experts warn.

The most significant source of pollution of the Fox, according to water experts, are the paper mills along the shore of the river. Some experts estimate that 90 per cent of the river's pollution comes from the 27 mills that dump into the waterway. The river handles this pollution load for 20 miles.

Mill pollution consists of sugars in the watery residue that remains from pulp logs. Bacteria in the stream feed on these wastes and rob the water of oxygen necessary for desirable aquatic life.

Since 1927, the paper mill industry has spent 43 million dollars on anti-pollution equipment and research. The industry plans to spend another 10 million in the next few years.

The industrial hub of Neenah and Menasha dump effluent and industrial wastes into the Fox after only primary treatment at a sewage plant. Primary treatment removes only about 35 per cent of the organic material in effluent.

PROCESSED FOR DRINKING

Three miles away, the city of Appleton takes the water and processes it thru its filtration plant system for drinking. Menasha has begun to cope with the problem by constructing a new sewage plant that will treat most of the pollutional load.

What has and is being done, however, is obviously not enough. Clumps of raw sewage and dead algae still swirl thru the waters at all of the locks and dams along the river.

Water experts estimate that 5 million pounds of phosphate are dumped into Green Bay annually, the bulk of it from the Fox. Phosphates are found in enormous amounts in effluents and detergents. They are also the major contributor to runaway algae growth in the Great Lakes and their tributaries.

EXPERTS WARN OF DANGER

The danger of too much phosphate entering Lake Michigan cannot be emphasized enough, experts warn, because it creates a self-sustaining cycle whereby algae thrive on it, die, and return the material to the water. In addition, they say, Lake Michigan does not have the cleansing flow characteristic of a river which, over a period of time, can rid itself of such materials.

Some residents along the Fox and Green Bay are optimistic and say that measures already taken to halt the heavy pollution are showing some signs of success. If such observations are valid, the Fox may lose its reputation as the filthiest stream in the state. The tragedy is that there are others waiting to take its place.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 8, 1967]

TWO MICHIGAN RESORT CITIES POLLUTE LAKE

(NOTE.—Tribune reporters have visited cities on the shores of Lake Erie to report how pollution has brought death to one of the Great Lakes. Now the report focuses on conditions that threaten Lake Michigan, a priceless asset to Chicagoland.)

(By Casey Bukro)

HARBOR SPRINGS, MICH., September 7.—The waters of Lake Michigan meet their first onslaught of pollution here, just 35 miles from their birthplace.

Fresh waters flow thru the Mackinac straits, entering the mouth of Lake Michigan from Lake Huron 35 miles north of here. The fresh waters course down the eastern shores of the lake, then enter Little Traverse Bay.

Harbor Springs, the first sizable community in the path of the currents from the strait, disinfects its sewage and dumps it into the bay. The fresh water current is never the same again. Pollution worsens the farther south you go.

PETOSKEY DUMPS SEWAGE

The city of Petoskey, also nestled in Little Traverse Bay, is only 10 miles south of Harbor Springs. It dumps as much as a million gallons of treated sewage into the bay daily.

The communities are at the very top of 806 miles of recreational shore line in the state of Michigan. They are destined to be first in another way.

"Harbor Springs and Petoskey will be among the first to be ordered by the state to improve their sewage treatment plants," said Thomas Hoogerhyde, a sanitary engineer for the Michigan health department. "Both cities are discharging their wastes directly into Lake Michigan—an interstate body of water."

Harbor Springs and Petoskey are two of only three communities along the entire Michigan state shore line that are dumping wastes directly into the lake.

STATE STANDARDS STUDIED

Under Michigan water quality standards, now under consideration by the United States department of the interior, sewage must be treated more highly before it can go into Lake Michigan.

This means that Harbor Springs and Petoskey must improve their sewage treatment systems to prevent waste contamination of Lake Michigan. Ultimately, all Michigan communities will be asked to improve waste treatment and disposal to comply with the new standards.

Harbor Springs screens and chlorinates its sewage. Petoskey gives it primary treatment.

"Both of those plants are doing the job they were designed to do, but that is not enough in light of the new standards," said Hoogerhyde. "The term 'adequate' is changing fast."

PRIME RESORT AREA

Harbor Springs seems an unlikely place for pollution problems. It is a prime resort area. It is the summer home of millionaires from Chicago, Detroit, Dayton, Cincinnati, Toledo, and other midwestern cities.

The usual year round population of 1,433 more than doubles during the summer.

The problem at Harbor Springs is that since the 1930s, it has been concerned mainly with keeping its beach waters free of dangerous levels of bacteria.

With its faltering sewage treatment plant, that does not always work, the bacteria count sometimes soars over the critical stage.

Why hasn't such a wealthy community done more to conserve the waterway its residents come from afar to enjoy?

"Until now, no one has complained or demanded improvements," said Chester Harvey, Grand Rapids office district engineer for the Michigan Water Resources commission.

The city of Petoskey, year round population of 6,400, has some light industry and it also is a resort area, with population becoming double or triple during the summer months. It is a little stubborn about its water pollution problem, tho.

"It always takes a bit longer to convince Petoskey that they have an asset they should protect," said Harvey. "You always have to tell them they have a problem before they will admit it, then they're as slow as a tortoise to do something about it."

COMBINED SEWER SYSTEM

The origin of most of Petoskey's water problems is the combined sewage and storm water sewer system. A bad storm causes the system to overflow, dumping raw sewage from homes and industry into Lake Michigan along with storm waters. It is estimated that 25 per cent of the annual flow of the plant goes directly into Lake Michigan this way.

As a result, the public beach at Petoskey is closed after a bad storm until bacteria counts in the water drop to a safe level.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 8, 1967]

KERNER VETOES BILL TO FORBID DUMPING INTO LAKE MICHIGAN

(By Robert Howard)

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., September 7.—Legislation to curtail pollution of Lake Michigan was vetoed today by Gov. Kerner.

The bill was designed to stop dumping into the lake. Its veto brought an immediate protest from Rep. Carl L. Klein [R., Chicago], chairman of the legislature's Water Pollution and Water Resources commission.

Klein announced that he will ask the Republican leadership to support a move to override the veto when the legislature returns to Springfield Monday after a recess of 10 weeks.

ALSO VETOES REMAP

The governor also vetoed Republican bills to set up new congressional districts before the 1968 election. He adopted the contention, made by Democrats during the legislative session, that a reapportionment ordered by state and federal courts after a 1965 deadlock should remain in force until after the 1970 census.

The legislature passed three reapportionment bills. In varying form, they were designed to give Republican nominees a chance to carry two districts in Chicago and one in southern Illinois.

Klein's anti-pollution bill would make it illegal for the state department of public works after December, 1968, to issue permits for the dumping into the lake of dirt, sand, and other material dredged from harbors and rivers.

ENGINEERS STOP DUMPING

Klein introduced the bill because in the past the corps of engineers has deposited its waste material in the lake. As a result of his protest, the dumping has been stopped.

Kerner in the veto message said Klein's bill would increase the cost of river and harbor work by the corps of engineers, and added:

"To summarily deny the use of the bed of Lake Michigan for any purpose which does not jeopardize the interest of the people of the state of Illinois is not either beneficial or practical, even tho the avowed purpose of the legislation is to prevent dumping of the material into the lake which may tend to pollute the waters of Lake Michigan."

CALLS EXISTING LAWS ENOUGH

"Enforcement of existing legislation by the department of public works and buildings should be sufficient, at least for the present, to prevent further contamination of the waters of Lake Michigan. In addition, the corps of engineers and the Federal Water Pollution Control administration had in-

icated a joint effort to study and secure, if possible, a solution to the pollution problem sought to be cured by this legislation."

Also vetoed was a bill by Klein which would have required that residential subdivisions have separate storm and sanitary sewer systems. Kerner said the bill is not necessary, because the state sanitary water board has not approved a combined sewer system since 1929.

VETOES SCHOOL BUS BILL

Kerner vetoed a bill to require common school districts to provide free transportation for pupils living a mile and a half or more from schools in areas where adequate public transportation was not available.

Kerner noted that the requirement already was in effect for community consolidated high schools, and community unit districts, and said districts not now providing transportation could not finance such a burden on short notice.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 8, 1967]
CITY COUNCIL ASKED TO ACT ON POLLUTION

An ordinance and a resolution aimed at curtailing pollution of Lake Michigan were referred to committee by the city council yesterday.

The anti-pollution ordinance, proposed by Mayor Daley and referred to the council's port of Chicago committee, would require installation of retention tanks on all boats with sanitary facilities using Chicago harbors. The tanks would hold sewage for disposal on shore.

The measure would prohibit placing of pollutants in harbors or along banks of the lake and rivers within the city's jurisdiction, or within four miles of the city's water intake cribs.

The resolution, by Ald. Leon M. Depres [5th], asked that Daley and city department heads take immediate steps to halt pollution of the lake and rivers, report what they do to the council, and recommend further measures to the council to accomplish this end.

Depres, in his resolution, said policies of the city, state, and nation have brought Lake Michigan to a dangerous state of pollution. He charged polluted waters are drained into the lake from streets and highways, and that industrial and public sewers empty into the lake.

James W. Jardine, commissioner of waters and sewers, contended later that only storm water enters the lake from public sewers and the drainage from industry in Chicago is limited to air conditioning and other water used in cooling.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 9, 1967]
KERNER VETOES POLLUTION BILLS—CITES LIMITED FUNDS, PROPOSED BOND ISSUE—MASTER PROGRAM FOR 1968 GIVEN MORTAL BLOW

(By Robert Howard)

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., September 8.—Gov. Kerner vetoed today bills to appropriate 15.1 million dollars for an immediate start on anti-pollution programs to be financed later by a proposed billion-dollar bond issue.

Kerner said he vetoed the bills "because of coming demands on the limited funds available for unbudgeted appropriations such as these." He noted that a larger amount would be provided by the bond issue, which he commended.

Rep. Carl L. Klein [R., Chicago], chairman state water pollution and water resources commission, had introduced the bills.

APPROPRIATE 15 MILLION

One would appropriate 15 million dollars to be allocated by the state sanitary water board for construction of sewage treatment plants by sanitary districts and municipalities. Klein designed the bills so that the state appropriation would be matched both by federal grants and the local governments.

The other would appropriate 100,000 dollars to the state public health department for research on tertiary treatment in sewage disposal plants, provided that federal funds matched the amount. Cooperative programs were to have been authorized.

CHIEF DRAFTER OF PLAN

Klein was the chief legislative draftsman of a program, submitted to a 1968 referendum, for a billion dollar bond issue to finance clean air and clean water programs. Three other anti-pollution bills by Klein were vetoed earlier by Kerner.

Also vetoed was a bill to continue for two years the work of a legislative commission on air pollution. Under the chairmanship of Rep. W. Robert Blair [R., Park Forest], it was credited with major contributions to the 1967 anti-pollution program.

NO FURTHER WORK

The governor vetoed a bill which would have continued for two years the work of a legislative commission, headed by Sen. John A. Graham [R., Barrington] which has investigated the Chicago sanitary district and sponsored reform legislation.

He signed a \$20,000 appropriation for a new office of state sanitary district observer. It was introduced by Sen. Egbert B. Groen [R., Pekin], one of a group of downstate legislators who contended that the Illinois river has been polluted by the Chicago sanitary district.

Kerner completed work on bills passed by the legislature ten weeks ago by vetoing a majority of proposals that special commissions study governmental problems during the next 16 months.

VETOES ABORTION STUDY

He disapproved a bill for a special commission to study the possibility of a state abortion law. It passed both houses in June under the sponsorship of Rep. John Henry Kleine [R., Lake Forest].

In a final burst of work, he signed appropriations approximating 55 million dollars and vetoed bills aggregating twice that amount. Lack of funds to carry on the work was given as his reason for not approving expenditures.

CHERRY A CULPRIT IN PROBLEM AT TRAVERSE CITY

(NOTE.—Tribune reporters have visited cities on the shores of Lake Erie to report how pollution has brought death to one of the Great Lakes. Now the report focuses on conditions that threaten Lake Michigan, a priceless asset to Chicagoland.)

(By Casey Bukro)

TRAVERSE CITY, MICH., September 8.—Next time you drop a cherry into your Manhattan, think of the water pollution problems cherries cause here.

Let it be a reminder, too, that the water can be contaminated in a wide variety of ways that make it unfit for any further use. Oil, chemicals, and sewage are not the only villains of water pollution.

Traverse City has a serious water pollution problem every summer, when tourists swell the usual population of 20,000 to a peak of 40,000 to 50,000.

CANNING SEASON OBVIOUS

Also at its peak from July 17 to mid-August is the cherry canning season. Residents immediately become aware of it.

Waste waters from four canning plants, carrying whole cherries or parts, pits, stems, and leaves, have stained the waters of Grand Traverse bay a purple-black color every summer here for the last 50 years.

It has been a nuisance to swimmers, boaters, and fishermen who come here expecting clean water.

JUST A START

Those nuisances are just a start. Fruit sugars in the waste waters act as fertilizer,

stimulating massive growths of slime and algae in the Boardman river running thru town and into the bay.

These seasonal pollution problems in Grand Traverse bay caused by canning operations are unique on the Michigan shores of Lake Michigan. There are no other canneries located directly on the lake shores, although there are 70 canning companies in western Michigan.

Equally unique are the kinds of slime and algae growths found in the waters here.

SEES LONG STREAMERS

At first glance, the lower Boardman river seems to be full of long streamers of tissue paper waving in the water.

Actually, it is a long, tan feathery slime growth which coats the bottom of the river. It thrives on fruit sugars in the water. It is a nuisance and an unsightly mess.

When these growths break off, they float into the bay and are washed in great piles onto the shores of the west arm of the bay, where they decay and stink. The decaying slime also sends the bacteria counts at local beaches sky high.

CONSIDERS CLEANING BEACHES

"I seriously considered shutting the beaches here one summer," said Dr. John R. Spencer, former director of the Tri-County health department here.

High bacteria counts are not the only danger, Dr. Spencer said. He explained that the wastes from the cherry canners are a powerful form of water contamination that is adding a burden to the natural ability of Lake Michigan to survive as a clean body of water.

TELL WASTE FIGURES

"In terms of oxygen demand, cherry canning wastes are three or four times stronger than any raw human sewage," Dr. Spencer said.

Twelve thousand tons of cherries are produced here each year. Also produced here are four to five million gallons of waste water each day during the six to eight-week canning season.

"Half of the waste water goes directly into the Boardman river or into the bay without being treated," Dr. Spencer said. The bay flows into Lake Michigan.

The local sewage treatment plant treats some of the canning company wastes. But it removes only about 25 per cent of the waste at peak canning periods before dumping its daily load of three million gallons of treated sewage into the Boardman river.

Traverse City once drew its water supply from the polluted west arm of Grand Traverse bay. The city built a new water treatment plant at a cost of 3 million dollars so it could draw water from the east arm of the bay, which is not polluted.

RESIDENTS, TOURISTS COMPLAIN

Residents here who have paid several hundred dollars a foot for property fronting on the west arm of Grand Traverse bay, adjacent to the Traverse City area, have complained loudly of the nuisance in the water. So have tourists using public parks and beaches in the bay.

The result was a conference called here in 1965 by the Michigan Water Resources commission. It resulted in an agreement between the city and the canning company to cooperate in solving the problem.

One effect has been that one of the canning plants, Cherry Growers, Inc., closed its bay front plant in Traverse City this summer and moved inland to nearby Grawn.

PLANT TO MOVE

Two canning plants here have merged to form Morgan-McCool, Inc., which is located on the bay front in Traverse City. This company has announced plans to close its plant and move to another location when the city has enough money to buy the property for an

urban renewal project. It plans to move out in 1969.

City officials here say these plants are closing because there is no room to expand. Dr. Spencer says that is only part of the answer.

There has been intense public pressure on the companies and the city to stop the nuisances caused by canning wastes, Dr. Spencer said. The need to treat their wastes triggered the moves, he added.

DUMPS ONTO RIVER

A smaller canning operation, the Traverse City Canning Company, discharges its wastes to the city sewerage system and to the Boardman river.

What has been the result of any improvements stemming from the commission hearing?

"A very small part of the total problem has been solved," Loring F. Oeming, executive secretary of the commission told the Tribune.

Some headway was made this summer in keeping some of the nuisances, such as cherry parts, pits, and leaves, from reaching the shores of beaches and parks where people can see them. The companies have improved methods of screening waste waters to remove large objects.

The waters still flow black with cherry juice and oxidized fruit waste during canning season, tho.

"The hardest part and the most expensive part remains to be solved," said Oeming. "That is eliminating the organic material in canning wastes, such as fruit sugars and phosphates."

FERTILIZE PLANT LIFE

Those wastes continue to fertilize great blooms of plant life in the water here.

"We have treatment methods to remove organic solids from the water," Oeming said. "But we still do not have techniques to eliminate phosphates."

A pilot project has been started in Traverse City to find ways to remove phosphate from water by using biological and chemical processes. It is expected to be operating in December, 1970.

Traverse City also has offered a program to the M.W.R.C. to build a secondary sewage treatment plant, which could remove up to 90 per cent of wastes in sewage, by 1970. It is hoped that this plant will also treat wastes of any canning companies remaining in the city.

"The worst of the problem still remains, which causes the greatest injury to the public," was Oeming's verdict.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 10, 1967]
A LITTLE RIVER IMPERILS LAKE—ITS WASTES ARE GLUTTED WITH RAW GARBAGE

(NOTE.—Tribune reporters have visited cities on the shores of Lake Erie to report how pollution has brought death to one of the Great Lakes. Now the report focuses on conditions that threaten Lake Michigan, a priceless asset to Chicagoland.)

(By William Jones)

MANITOWOC, Wis., September 9.—When the Little Manistowoc river rises over its banks next spring and rushes to Lake Michigan, its waters will be glutted and soured with garbage.

This is the prediction of conservationists here who have clashed with the city over the creation of a raw garbage land fill on the banks of the river last January. Already, they warn, dangerous amounts of waste seepage already may be in the water.

DUMPING ORDERED HALTED

The Wisconsin state department of resource development agrees with the conservationists. Three times this year it has inspected the site and issued orders to the city to halt its dumping.

The dump is in a flood plain, according to the state, and substantial portions of its

greasy contents can be expected to flow into the lake when the river rises.

Three times the city has gone to court and argued successfully that such a move would create a hardship for the community because it has no other place to go with its garbage.

LEAGUE IS DISGUSTED

"We are a little disgusted to say the least," said Albert Mertens, president of the Manitowoc chapter of the Izaak Walton league. "It's rather frustrating because we have asked the state to inspect the site three times, and every time the city goes to court and its appeal is granted."

A constant procession of trucks and autos into the four-acre site has created a dust bowl of powdered earth. To reach the banks of the river at this point, a visitor must walk thru the dust, trash, and garbage. Rotting timber, discarded clothing, and milk cartons litter the steep banks.

The river now is little more than a creek with hardly any current to transport the soup and beer cans that roll down its banks. In the spring, however, when melting snow flows off the upstream farmlands, conservationists warn that the resulting torrent will cut into the piles of garbage and carry it into the lake.

In direct contrast to the city's apparent lack of concern over the Little Manistowoc and the spreading menace to the lake, is a far reaching community plan for improving the water and banks of the larger Manitowoc river, another lake tributary.

PLANS BEAUTIFICATION

Here, the community wants to beautify the river and lakefront, creating a focal point of recreational activity for residents. When the city embarked on this plan it called in the state resources department to evaluate such a program.

The state's report clearly outlines the dilemma faced even by a community of 34,000 when it decides to come to grips with its water problem. In addition to the deterioration of buildings and pilings along the Manitowoc river, the city was told that water pollution control greatly affects any decision to improve harbor and river recreation.

URGES GREATER FACILITIES

This conclusion was reached despite the fact that the city has had a separate storm and sewage system since the 1930s and secondary treatment of its municipal sewage since 1960. Such facilities are only in the planning stages in many communities on the lake and considered too expensive to even consider by others.

Nevertheless, the state recommended that greater treatment facilities be installed to reduce even further the amount of effluent entering the river and lake.

At the same time, upstream erosion along steep river banks will have to be halted by purchasing the land and planting vegetation, the report said. The erosion results in heavy silting in the river and the continued pollution problem where the river enters the lake.

The report also indicated that no community stands alone when it attempts to halt the pollution of a waterway. Manitowoc Rapids, a small settlement on the western fringe of Manitowoc, was annexed a few years ago and ordered to connect into the sewer system. Until then, the community had no sewers and the resulting outflow was a constant source of pollution.

LAKE IS LOSER

At the time the state report was compiled, the city had not yet created its present garbage dumping area on the banks of the Little Manistowoc. Now, as the city prepares to flush its garbage into one river and at the same time improve its other waterway, there seems to be little concern over the obvious conflict in water pollution control.

The loser, of course, is Lake Michigan. If the lake succumbs to such planning—and the list of experts who say it will be growing—a few clean waterways flowing into a dead Great Lake will be of little consolation.

STOP FOULING WATERWAYS, PLANTS TOLD—SANITARY DISTRICT SETS DEADLINES

(By Anne Getz)

Charged to enforce new state and federal standards for clean water, the sanitary district has established new 30-to-90-day deadlines for industries to correct their discharging of contaminants into Cook County waterways.

John Egan, district president, said failure to comply with the new schedule will bring fines and court action.

LONG TOO TOLERANT

"We have long been too tolerant of industrial pollution problems," he said. "It's now time for us to buckle down and fight back."

He said, that recent articles in THE TRIBUNE have brought the problem of pollution "into front page perspective—where it belongs."

In the first board order issued under new guidelines for operation of the district, five violators will receive fines and court action if they do not comply with district regulations.

John Vivoda, district coordinator of industrial waste, said the action follows a series of hearings in which the companies were given an opportunity to explain reasons for the violations. In most cases, he said, they were "vague and evasive" in outlining plans for corrective action.

YACHT CLUB WARNED

In the board order, Columbia Yacht club, Washington street and the lake, was told to discontinue by Sept. 30 its discharge of domestic sewage, garbage, and untreated waste water into Lake Michigan. Vivoda said the club has been under investigation by the district since 1965.

Enterprise Wire company, 2842 Vermont st., Blue Island, and Sterling Laboratories Inc., 4600 Ronald av., Chicago, were given until Oct. 1 to discontinue their discharge of oils, greases, and fats into sanitary district sewer lines.

A third company, Silver Skillet Food Products, 7450 St. Louis st., Skokie, was given until Dec. 1 to halt its practice of discharging contaminants into an interceptor line attached to the district's North Treatment works, Skokie. Vivoda said the discharge is clogging district treatment operations and preventing adequate treatment of wastes.

GETS DECEMBER 4 DEADLINE

Catalin corporation, a division of Ashland Oil and Refining company, 142d street and Paxton avenue, Calumet City, was ordered to discontinue its practice of dumping acids and bacterial loads into the Calumet river by Dec. 4. Vivoda said the company's record of violations dates from 1963.

Under board order, failure to correct pollution violations will lead to fines of \$100 a day for each day the violation continues or a court order to halt the discharges by injunction.

Since the stepped-up enforcement program started early this year, the district has cited 13 industries for illegal sewer discharges. Eight industries have been cited for discharging solids and oils into the sanitary and ship canal, the north branch of the Chicago river, and Lake Michigan.

NEW PROGRAMS SET

Under new water purity standards set by the state sanitary water board, industries must eliminate the discharge of oil, scum, grease, and floating solids from all rivers and streams by December of 1969. By 1972, new equipment for refined "second stage" waste treatment must be installed to remove

all but 6 per cent of contaminants from all plant discharges.

The time tables stipulate that industries provide for in-plant housekeeping, debris removal, spill control, sewer separation, neutralization of acid and alkaline wastes, monitoring, and other corrective measures to upgrade state waterways by 1975.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 10, 1967]
TAINTED FISH CAUSE WOE IN MANISTEE; RESIDENTS POINT TO INDUSTRY AS CAUSE

(NOTE.—Tribune reporters have visited cities on the shores of Lake Erie to report how pollution has brought death to one of the Great Lakes. Now the report focuses on conditions that threaten Lake Michigan, a priceless asset to Chicagoland.)

(By Casey Bukro)

MANISTEE, MICH., September 10.—Fish caught here sometimes taste like kerosene.

That is the major water pollution problem around Manistee, where thousands of fishermen are gathering now to catch transplanted coho salmon making their first spawning run.

Not all the fishermen are happy with their catches, even though each fish might weigh 16 pounds or more. Kenneth T. Turk, 28, a Manistee city policeman, is one of them.

Turk caught a rainbow trout weighing 16 pounds, 7 ounces last fall in the southern end of Manistee lake.

EXPECTED GOOD EATING

"Gee, I came home, thinking it would be good eating," said Turk. He cleaned the fish and gave it to his wife to fry.

"As soon as it started to fry, it started to smell," said Turk. "It seemed as if someone had poured kerosene into the pan. It stunk up the whole house."

Last year, Turk caught eight fish in Manistee lake, which flows via the Manistee river to Lake Michigan. He gave away three of the fish. Of the five he kept, three were not edible because of offensive taste or odor.

A story is told here of a minister from nearby Cadillac, Mich., who caught a large rainbow trout in Manistee lake. He brought it home and invited guests for a dinner of baked fish. It was tainted and they couldn't eat it.

ALL PRETTY UNHAPPY

On the following Sunday, the minister gave a powerful sermon on water pollution. The minister is one of many persons who have been duped by foul-tasting fish.

"We're all pretty unhappy about it," said Turk, who also is a part-time fishing guide. He knows of another guide who refuses to take fishermen to Manistee Lake because there is no guarantee they can eat what they catch.

What is causing this nuisance?

"I know industry is causing it. There is no doubt about it," said Turk.

The Michigan Water Resources commission, after a decade of investigating complaints of off-flavor fish, agreed with Turk's conclusion in a report issued Aug. 31.

RASH OF COMPLAINTS

There was a rash of new complaints in 1966 and early this year. Some anglers said the fish they caught tasted like oil or Scotch whisky.

The MWRC report said that tests begun last April show that live fish kept in boxes off shore from the Packaging Corporation of America—located at Filer City on the southern end of Manistee Lake—were found to have peculiar aroma and taste. A state official said the fish rated at the bottom of a seven-point scale.

Packaging Corporation of America operates two pulp and paper mills which make corrugated cardboard and food packaging cartons.

FOUR MILLION GALLONS

The mills dump four million gallons of waste into Manistee Lake daily. The commission told the company last July 12 to identify the substance causing the taint problem and to correct it. The company also was asked to investigate its disposal of kerosene, used to dissolve wood pitch that sticks to paper-making machinery. Kerosene used by paper mills has been a major water pollution problem for years.

Donald Voights, technical director of the company, told THE TRIBUNE that a substitute for kerosene was discovered a few days ago. Kerosene will be eliminated there, altho the substitute costs twice as much, said Voights.

There is another theory, Voights pointed out, that the tainting comes from thousands of gallons of oil released 15 years ago into the southern end of Manistee Lake by strikers who raided a nearby forge plant.

The cardboard company is testing the oily mud at the bottom of the lake in an effort to substantiate this theory. It also might prove that water contamination has far-reaching effects, which can strike again in the distant future.

A DELICATE BALANCE

This traumatic collision of man-made wastes and nature points up a delicate balance which conservation officials try to maintain in Manistee. The resort and fishing business is important here. But so is industry.

Frank C. Vining, a MWRC pollution investigator was driving past the Hardy Salt company here and a team of TRIBUNE pollution investigators when he said with a start, "I've never seen anything like that before!"

On the grounds of the company was a large well pipe gushing brine water at a rate of 300 to 400 gallons a minute. Wherever the water splashed, it dried into white crystals. The torrent of salt-saturated water was flowing into Manistee Lake.

FIFTY-YEAR HABIT

Investigation showed that the company has been flushing pipes used in pumping brine from natural underground deposits. Company officials told Vining they have been flushing pipes for 50 years.

"We'll see some correction here," said Vining. He set out to determine whether the brine flowing from the company property surpasses its authorized discharge into Manistee lake.

Geologists believe brine wastes should be returned to the ground for future use or at least safe disposal. A continued flow of brine could damage the lake, said Vining.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 12, 1967]
LAKE POLLUTION GROWING—DANGER IS DESCRIBED BY U.S. WATER EXPERT—DEMOCRATS BLOCK HOUSE BILL TO BAN DUMPING

(By Robert Howard)

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., September 11.—The Democratic House minority today blocked an attempt to override Gov. Kerner's veto of a bill designed to stop one source of Lake Michigan pollution.

"Do you want Lake Michigan to die?" asked Rep. Carl L. Klein [R., Chicago] while pleading for Democratic support. It was the first major roll call after the legislature, which recessed 10 weeks ago, resumed its regular session.

The vote was 95 to 46, but a two-thirds majority of 118 was needed to pass the bill over the governor's disapproval. From the minority side, only Rep. Leland H. Rayson [D., Tinley Park] voted for the bill, but 17 showed their embarrassment by voting "present."

OK'D 3 MONTHS AGO

Klein, chairman of the state's Water Pollution and Water Resources commission, three months ago won a 148 to 0 roll call on House passage of his bill to prohibit dumping

in that part of Lake Michigan which the state owns.

Gov. Kerner, who vetoed several of Klein's anti-pollution bills, said that the corps of engineers had stopped the deposit of harbor dredgings in the lake and contended that the problem could be controlled by having his department of public works refuse to issue permits.

BLAMES SANITARY DISTRICT

Klein disagreed on the latter point. He charged that some industries are being protected and said that dumping permits were issued until his investigation started last year. He contended that, unless his bill became law, the courts could not prohibit dumping if mandamus suits were brought in the future.

He accused the Howard street station of the Chicago sanitary district of responsibility for "slop and sludge" in river channels which tests show have been deposited in the lake.

"Do you want Lake Michigan to become worse than Lake Erie?" Klein asked. "Do you want pollution in our drinking water? Do you want to encourage Indiana, Wisconsin, and Michigan to allow dumping in the lake?"

"The time is now to let the polluters of the lakes and streams of Illinois know that we mean business."

NOTES DALEY APPROVAL

He said that Mayor Daley of Chicago, the Chicago City council, and Dr. Franklin Yoder, the governor's director of public health, favor the anti-dumping bill.

Gov. Kerner also vetoed Klein bills which would appropriate 15.1 million dollars for an immediate start on anti-pollution projects which would be financed later by a one billion dollar bond issue if it is approved at a 1968 referendum.

More roll calls on attempts to override bills are scheduled tomorrow and next week.

Democrats again indicated their intention to defend the governor when Robert G. Day [R., Peoria] asked the House to upset a veto of his bill to make 21 years the age of majority for women as well as men. The vote was 86 to 77.

MORE ROLL CALLS SET

House Speaker Ralph T. Smith [R., Alton] plans more veto roll calls tomorrow and the first three days of next week, when the legislature is expected to recess until January. The September session for consideration of veto messages was recommended by a special commission which studied legislative procedures for the past two years.

Sen. W. Russell Arrington [R., Evanston], the majority leader, put his stop-and-frisk bill, widely supported by law enforcement specialists, at the top of a list of vetoed bills on which Senate roll calls were scheduled Sept. 19.

Arrington also will attempt to override the veto of his bill which would permit reporters in precinct polling places for quicker reporting of election returns.

AIR PANEL ON LIST

Other Republican senators have asked roll calls on bills which would set up a grievance procedure for state employees, continue supplemental pensions for retired teachers, and regulate motorcycles.

Among vetoes being challenged in the House is one which ended an air pollution commission headed by Rep. W. Robert Blair [R., Park Forest].

INDUSTRY WASTE SHOWS INCREASE SINCE 1965
(By William Jones)

Pollution of southern Lake Michigan has drastically increased in recent years despite water purity standards adopted less than three years ago, water experts said yesterday.

"Industrial pollution in the Grand Calumet river and Indiana harbor canal system has become more severe since 1965," said

Robert J. Bowden of the Great Lakes regional office of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration.

REPORT ON COMPOUNDS

Bowden, who is in charge of the administration's pollution surveillance program in the Calumet area, said concentrations of iron, cyanide, and phenol [acid] compounds are all higher than in 1965. The Indiana canal connects the Grand Calumet river to Lake Michigan.

Bowden was one of a number of water experts who detailed the lake's increasing pollution sickness during an interstate progress meeting. Municipal and industrial representatives from Illinois and Indiana attended the meeting in the Federal building.

CALLED WORLD'S FILTHIEST

"The Grand Calumet river is the filthiest stream in the world," Bowden said. He said bacterial limits are being violated in 95 per cent of the cases in which his office took water samples and that rules requiring elimination of floating oil, solids, debris and odor are also being violated.

Mayor Daley, in his third appearance in recent weeks before groups attempting to deal with water pollution problems, told the meeting:

"Altho areas of Lakes Erie, Ontario, and Michigan have already deteriorated to the point that their use for water supply and recreation is severely threatened, there are still people who doubt that the situation we face is really a crisis. If we are to be guided by these persons, all of the Great Lakes would have to be destroyed before the public would be called upon to respond to the challenge."

WARNS AGAINST DELAY

Daley warned against piecemeal efforts to control the lake and said they will fail and cost more in the long run. Instead, he called for a cooperative effort from all communities with a stake in the future of the lake.

Murray Stein, assistant commissioner of enforcement for the FWPCA, warned that the pollution death of the Great Lakes could bring severe economic repercussions that might affect the United States as a world power.

James C. Vaughn, water purification engineer for the city of Chicago, reported a continuing decline in the quality of raw water in the lake.

"It was hoped that the activities of the FWPCA conference in 1965 would result in a definite and immediate improvement in raw water quality," said Vaughn. "On the contrary, there has been a steady deterioration."

AMMONIA CONTENT DOUBLES

Vaughn noted that since 1965 the average ammonia nitrogen content in the water at the south water filtration plant has more than doubled. Large slugs of pollution normally found only at the south plant, Vaughn noted, are now becoming common at the recently constructed water plant north of navy pier. He said that in the last 20 years, the city has increased its amount of chlorine needed to treat the same amount of water by 67 per cent.

Other grim statistics reported at the meeting:

The amount of activated carbon dosages used to remove objectionable odors and tastes from lake water has increased from 24 to 41 pounds per million gallons in the last 20 years.

The water quality at Chicago's Dunne crib and the Gary water intake does not meet the standards for chlorides, ammonia, phosphates, iron, and phenol.

INDIANA BEACHES POLLUTED

The water quality at Indiana beaches was not satisfactory because of wastes from Indiana Harbor and direct discharge into Lake Michigan.

Yesterday's meeting was one in a series which began in 1965 and resulted in water standards for the lake to be met by industry and cities that have been dumping sewage into the lake.

Vaughn was asked if federal legislation is necessary to end water pollution.

"There has to be federal legislation. There is no question about it, and I'm convinced that the cities, the state, and the federal government working together can find the answer," he replied.

DISCUSS STEEL DEADLINE

Much of yesterday's session involved a discussion between the five federal conferees as to whether the pollution control deadline of Dec. 31, 1968, should be extended for three steel companies.

The conferees are Stein, chairman of the group; H. W. Poston, regional director of the FWPCA; John E. Egan, president of the sanitary district; Blucher Poole, secretary of the Indiana stream pollution control board; and Clarence W. Klassen, secretary of the Illinois sanitary water board.

Since the conferees do not vote on such matters, Stein will submit a report to the department of the interior. Stewart Udall, secretary of the interior, then will decide whether the extension should be granted.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 12, 1967]

FISH OR JOBS? A PROBLEM FOR MUSKEGON—INDUSTRY POSES THREAT TO SPORT

(NOTE.—Tribune reporters have visited cities on the shores of Lake Erie to report how pollution has brought death to one of the Great Lakes. Now the report focuses on conditions that threaten Lake Michigan, a priceless asset to Chicagoland.)

(By Casey Bukro)

MUSKEGON, MICH., September 11.—Which is more important—fish or jobs?

That question can cause a knockdown, dragout fight here.

It shows that people are sensitive about the clash between the commerce that makes this a thriving port city and sport fishing.

This clash shows in another way. It shows in the oil slicks floating on Muskegon lake, the garbage dumped from ships at the shoreline, and the streams of industrial wastes flowing freely into the lake. Muskegon lake flows into Lake Michigan.

Muskegon, with a population of more than 100,000 in its metropolitan area, shows all the signs of severe water pollution problems created by a large population in an industrial city.

FIRST ENCOUNTER

Muskegon marks the first encounter with large-scale industrial pollution by a team of Tribune reporters on a southward sweep on the eastern shores of Lake Michigan, commonly thought to be a vast recreation area with clean water.

Human activities, on a large scale, cause this first great blight of pollution, said Chester Harvey, Grand Rapids district engineer for the Michigan Water Resources commission.

"The problem is people," stressed Harvey. "You can't have that many people performing their normal activities without creating water pollution problems."

Normal activities here include paper mills, shipping, metal working, foundries, manufacturing, refining, chemical works, and ferrying operations.

COEXISTENCE POSSIBLE

Harvey believes the industries can exist side-by-side with fish life. But he admits the fish are taking a beating in parts of Muskegon lake.

One example is the S. D. Warren Paper company, a division of Scott Paper company, located on the southern banks of Muskegon lake. It is a pulp and paper mill making wrapping paper and paper board.

"This is the largest single source of waste in Muskegon lake," said Harvey. The plant produces 500 tons of paper products a day, along with 15 million gallons of waste water carrying fibers and solids.

SHARP CONTRAST

This stream of buff-colored pollution hugs the southern shores of Muskegon lake and contrasts sharply with the blue lake water.

This waste accounts for 50 per cent of the suspended solid particles going into Muskegon lake each day, said Harvey.

The Michigan Water Resources commission has ordered the plant to reduce the waste load.

"They have not met those conditions," said Harvey.

The effect of this waste upon the lake is twofold:

1. Layers of sludge composed of the paper fibers and solids are coating the bottom of the lake. This sludge covers fish spawning and feeding grounds, driving the fish away.

2. The buff-colored wastes float to local marinas, yacht clubs, and boating clubs, spoiling the view and appreciation of the water.

SHIPS CAUSE PROBLEMS

Muskegon can take pride in being the only major Michigan port on the eastern shores of Lake Michigan. But this distinction also can be a pain in the lake.

Ships often dump bilge or ballast waters containing oil and grease into the lake. Clots of grease and oil floating in the lake mar the appearances of pleasure boats here. The ships also dump garbage into the lake or onto the shore.

"This is one area where we are lax," said Harvey. "We ought to have a better way to take care of garbage and wastes from ships here."

Furthermore, it is estimated that industry alone dumps 500 gallons of oil each day into Muskegon lake.

CITY ADDS POLLUTION

The city of Muskegon adds its measure of pollution to Muskegon lake.

The Muskegon sewage treatment plant discharges 7.5 million gallons of treated sewage each day into the Muskegon river, which flows into Muskegon lake.

The point where this waste enters the river can be seen easily.

This flow of sewage enters the river just about 100 feet from the field office of the Michigan conservation department here.

"If we could prove that the sewage was killing the fish, we would do something about it," said Harvey. However, Muskegon is planning to build an improved sewage treatment plant within five years.

Harvey noted that the most serious water pollution problems in Muskegon have occurred in the last two years, and the need to act against them is becoming urgent.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 13, 1967]
SHEBOYGAN: ONE CITY THAT ACTS TO PREVENT POLLUTION OF THE LAKE

(NOTE.—Tribune reporters have visited cities on the shores of Lake Erie to report how pollution has brought death to one of the Great Lakes. Now the report focuses on conditions that threaten Lake Michigan, a priceless asset to Chicagoland.)

(By Williams Jones)

SHEBOYGAN, Wis., September 12.—One of the few bright spots in the grim picture of Lake Michigan's pollution sickness can be found in this industrial community of 50,000.

Its pollution abatement programs—considered among the most progressive in the state—are a result of cooperative efforts by industry and local government.

Much of the credit for their success is given to Jacob Klein, who has been super-

intendent of the community's sewage department since its creation in 1935. Klein will retire in the spring after more than three decades of "friendly pressure" to save the waters of Lake Michigan and the Sheboygan river.

SEEK OWN SOLUTION

"Friendly pressure" is Klein's characterization of his dealings with industry. It consists, he says, of avoiding state and federal enforcement offices in favor of well-thought-out analysis of how industries cause pollution and what is required to correct the problems.

Klein recalled the case of a leather company which was flushing hair and flesh from animal hides into the sewage system. Both materials continued thru the treatment plant and into the river and lake.

Armed with the necessary data for correcting the pollution, Klein went to the company and suggested the installation of a waste diversion system with screens to remove the flesh and hair.

MORE PERSUASIVE DATA

The firm's engineers argued that a less costly program could achieve the same results. They yielded, however, when Klein and his staff returned with more details and demonstrated the need for the facilities.

"Industry here is always willing to listen to the man [Klein] because his approach is reasonable," one industrial official said. "He'd rather get the job done than go screaming all over the state about pollution control."

Another cooperative effort by Klein and officials of the Plastics Engineering company here has resulted in the installation of \$60,000 in pollution control equipment in the last two years. The equipment was installed, according to Klein, because the company was expanding and wanted proper equipment to keep its wastes from becoming a problem.

SEPARATE STORM LINES

The city itself has pursued a progressive pollution control program, separating its storm lines from its sewage lines to prevent overflow of sewage into the waterways during heavy rains.

Klein admits that the pollution in a community of 50,000 is more easily solved than that of a city of several million. He is convinced, however, that it is small communities—those of several hundred persons—which will pose the greatest threat of pollution in the future.

DIVERSE AND INEFFICIENT

Each has its own treatment facilities, Klein noted, and many are operated inefficiently. Six miles north of Sheboygan, for example, the town of Oostburg operates its own treatment plant for a population of 1,065 persons. Its effluent is pumped into a winding creek that flows into Lake Michigan after picking up effluent from Cedar Grove, three miles away.

"These communities should unite in a common sewage treatment system that could provide better waste removal," Klein said. "But they just never seem to get together."

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 14, 1967]

DALEY URGES UNITED STATES CRACKDOWN ON INDUSTRIAL POLLUTION OF LAKE—FILTH FILLED CREEK GROWS WORSE

(Tribune reporters have visited cities on the shores of Lake Erie to report how pollution has brought death to one of the Great Lakes. Now the report focuses on conditions that threaten Lake Michigan, a priceless asset to Chicagoland.)

(By Casey Bukro)

"This is how water pollution happens," Joseph L. Tite, sanitary engineer for the Indiana state board of health, said as he watched a white, milky liquid billow from a discharge pipe into an inlet of Trail creek in Michigan City.

"I caught a live one today," said Tite. "This is a new one to me."

The milky substance billowed in stark contrast to the black waters of the creek. It came from a pipe behind factory buildings of Blockson & Co., manufacturers of rubberized upholstery materials.

IDENTIFIED AS LATEX

Tite identified the contamination as liquid latex being flushed without authorization into the creek. He notified state and local officials to begin an immediate investigation.

"This is a typical day in my life," said Tite. "I go out on one call, then run into something like this. Then I spend the rest of the day trying to find what is causing it and how to stop it."

Tite is a soft-spoken man who has been a sanitary engineer for the state since 1960. He chain-smoked cigars.

FOUND ON PATROL

Tite had come to the area near 4th street on a routine check of water pollution trouble spots in Michigan City.

About 50 feet away from the new invasion of pollution was the contamination problem Tite had expected to see.

Large black clots of raw sewage were floating in the waters flowing from a storm sewer located just a half mile upstream from Lake Michigan.

"This is a classic example of problems with an old combined sewer system," said Tite. He explained that the Michigan City sewer system is 50 years old.

CITES OBVIOUS MALFUNCTION

"There is an obvious malfunction in the control gate of the storm water outfall," said Tite. This allows raw sewage to enter the storm water lines, which were designed to carry only storm waters to Trail creek.

Now, even in dry weather, all four storm sewers in the city discharge a steady flow of raw sewage mixed with industrial cooling water into Trail creek.

The problem is intensified because the flow of Trail creek is very slow, allowing contamination to concentrate in the creek. Trail creek flows into the Michigan City harbor, then directly into Lake Michigan.

Swimming in the harbor is forbidden as a health hazard.

Because Michigan City gets its water supply from the Lake just east of the harbor, this flow of raw sewage is a matter of concern to people who live there.

ORDERED TO CHLORINATE

To combat the high bacteria count in the waters of the harbor area, the state of Indiana issued a mandate in 1963, ordering Michigan City to chlorinate its treated sewage water.

The city now is building a chlorination plant at a cost of one million dollars.

This meant that Michigan City had to lay aside temporarily its plans to separate its system of storm and sanitary sewers.

"This is our greatest problem in Michigan City—separating the two systems," said James B. Gifford, manager of the Michigan City sanitary district.

WILL SELL BONDS

Gifford said that 1.8 million dollars in bonds will be sold Oct. 3 to finance a project to start separating the sanitary and storm flows. He said his office now inspects the entire sewer system once a week to detect breakdowns in the filtering system.

Michigan City is an example of how water pollution problems can befall even a community which has taken steps to control pollution in its sewage.

STILL NOT ENOUGH

The city has a sewage treatment plant using primary and secondary treatment which removes up to 94 per cent of the contamina-

tion in the 10 million gallons of treated sewage released every day into Trail creek.

But these efforts are not enough in the face of rising bacteria counts and unexpected influxes of contamination from local industry.

Chemical tests prove these efforts are not enough. But there is another way city officials know.

"Our boaters keep us well informed," said Gifford. "Any time anything happens to the water, they let us know right away." There have been complaints here of odors in the water and scum clinging to the boats.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 14, 1967]

DALEY URGES UNITED STATES CRACKDOWN ON INDUSTRIAL POLLUTION OF LAKE—WANTS DEADLINE ENFORCED NOW

Mayor Daley yesterday strongly opposed giving industries any further extensions of the Dec. 31, 1968 deadline for completion of water pollution controls called for by the federal water pollution control act. The deadline has been extended twice and some industries have asked for still more time.

In a telegram to Stewart Udall, secretary of the interior, Daley said:

"The imperative necessity of protecting our citizens from contaminated drinking water and to preserve recreational facilities provided by the great natural resource of Lake Michigan and other waters impels me in behalf of the people of Chicago to oppose strongly any weakening of measures designed to eliminate water pollution."

ASKS FOR ENFORCEMENT

"To that end, the requirement for industry to institute pollution control by Dec. 31, 1968, should not be extended. Instead, every possible effort should be made to achieve this vital objective."

Daley told reporters the Lake Michigan pollution situation is serious and that every-thing possible should be done in 1968.

MUST ACCELERATE PROGRAM

He said, "We can't let one day pass without striving to meet the problem."

He continued: "We need a more accelerated program. Perhaps, instead of working eight hours a day, industry should be working 16 to 24 hours a day on this the way the city does on vital public works."

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 14, 1967]

DRIVE TO PUSH POLLUTION BOND

(By Robert Howard)

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., September 13.—The Kerner administration plans to have a state-wide committee take charge of the 1968 campaign to get voters' support for a billion dollar anti-pollution bond issue.

A spokesman for Gov. Kerner said today the committee should be created within three weeks under the chairmanship of William Rutherford of Peoria, who is prominent in conservation circles.

The mammoth bond issue, which had bipartisan support in passing the legislature three months ago, was designed to spur local governments to take emergency steps against air and water pollution throughout Illinois.

HAS IMPORTANT ROLE

Part of the state grants would be matched by federal aid. Some of the money would be recovered by the state after helping business firms and local governments qualify for low-interest loans. Much of the anti-pollution work simultaneously would give Illinois better recreational facilities.

The billion dollar bond issue has an important role in the effort to save Lake Michigan.

Fear that the anti-pollution drive has made a stumbling start that also might jeopardize ratification of a constitutional convention at the Nov. 5, 1968, election was expressed by legislators who returned to Springfield for a recessed session this week.

Kerner also plans to create a state-wide committee to work simultaneously for "concom." Both propositions will require widespread and enthusiastic support such as that given in the successful drives in 1954 for a legislative reapportionment amendment, in 1960 for university and mental health bonds, and in 1962 for judicial reorganization.

The governor gave perfunctory support to amendment proposals for annual legislative sessions in 1964 and to revenue reform in 1968. Both lost.

SNUBBED BY KERNER

Republican legislative leaders privately expressed hope that the anti-pollution campaign will not be delayed and said they are determined to keep it on a bipartisan basis, despite hints that they were being snubbed by the Democratic governor.

Republican leaders who helped formulate the billion dollar program were not invited to a ceremony when Kerner signed the bill in the presence of Gene H. Graves, state director of business and economic development, and officials of conservation groups. Graves made the original survey on which the bond issue program was based.

VETOES FIVE BILLS

A Republican learned later that those who had been invited were asked not to tell him about the bill signing, performed in front of cameras. Only in one case this year was a Republican legislative leader invited to witness the signing of his bill.

The governor also made bipartisanship difficult by vetoing five anti-pollution bills sponsored by Rep. Carl L. Klein [R., Chicago], an attorney who is chairman of the state water pollution and water resources commission. Klein, one of the state's most active workers for clean waters, made the final June decisions about the financial provisions of the billion dollar bond issue bill.

Legislators from both parties expected that Kerner would sign a bond issue bill by Klein and four companion bills by Rep. William A. Redmond [D., Bensenville]. Instead, the governor vetoed the Klein bond bill and signed a fifth Redmond bill which lacked a technical amendment needed to put the program in final form. After Klein pointed out the error, Kerner aids told him a mistake had been made.

THREE JOIN GOP

Only three Democrats voted with the Republicans when Klein tried to get a two-thirds House vote to override Kerner's veto of a bill which would prohibit dumping in Lake Michigan of dredgings from the Chicago and Calumet rivers. The anti-dumping bill, Klein said, had the support of Chicago Mayor Daley and federal and state health officials.

Klein plans an effort Monday to override Kerner's veto of a bill which would give municipalities and sanitary districts 15 million dollars as state aid and permit them to qualify for increased federal aid. For improved facilities, they now get 30 per cent of the money from the federal government but must raise 70 per cent themselves.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 15, 1967]
GROWING PERIL TO CITY WATER SUPPLY IS TOLD—HIGHER CHLORINE DOSES NEEDED TO FIGHT FILTH

(By Edward Schreiber)

Chicago's water supply system will be in "extreme difficulty" in three years if the rate of increase in pollution of Lake Michigan continues, the city's water purification engineer, James C. Vaughn, said yesterday.

Meanwhile, some key public officials were joining Mayor Daley in his opposition to further extensions of the deadline of Dec. 31, 1968, for compliance by industry with provisions of the federal water pollution control act.

Vaughn said that three years ago 10 to 20 pounds of chlorine per million gallons of water were sufficient to purify it. By last April, he said, the average demand was 25 pounds, with a high of 34.7 pounds in April and 35 pounds in May.

DESCRIBES DANGER POINT

He declined to say when he thought present purification facilities no longer would be satisfactory. But he expressed the view that if the requirement reaches 80 pounds of chlorine per million gallons, then the water probably would have to be put thru a de-chlorination process after its original treatment. He said this would increase processing costs substantially.

Robert Waller, chief water engineer, and James W. Jardine, commissioner of water and sewers, said they thought more than 80 pounds per million gallons of water could be tolerated.

Daley wired Stewart Udall, secretary of the interior, Wednesday, opposing extension of the 1968 deadline for industry compliance with pollution control provisions.

DALEY GAINS SUPPORT

John E. Egan, sanitary district president, and H. W. Poston, Great Lakes director of the Federal Water Pollution Control administration, came to support of Daley's stand after indicating earlier they would go along with further extension of the deadline.

Both said they changed their minds after a tour Tuesday of steel plants around the southern portion of Lake Michigan.

Egan said he issued a directive to Vinton W. Bacon, district superintendent, to "take immediate steps to assure the board and outside agencies responsible for water quality in this area that programs have been developed and are implemented so as to achieve effective control of lake pollution by December 31, 1968."

BACON VOWS ACTION

Bacon said he agreed with Egan. "If he wants people held to the original schedule, then we'll do it," Bacon said. He denied published reports that he thought the 1968 deadline could be challenged in the courts as unworkable.

"What I advocate," he said, "is court-stipulated agreement with the industries on deadlines. Then, if they miss the deadlines—or if they refuse to stipulate to them—we'll go to court."

"I'm not for penalizing industry," Daley said. "But if they work 24 hours a day, they can accomplish what should be done."

Poston said he would urge legal action against United States Steel corporation for pollution of Lake Michigan from its South Works at 3426 E. 89th st.

ASKS FOR SUBPENAS

He said as much has been done as possible in this instance thru conferences, and the company still can't give a definite deadline for starting effective pollution curbs. He said he is asking Udall to subpoena U.S. Steel officials for testimony before a special water pollution hearing board.

Murray Stein, chief enforcement officer for the Federal Water Pollution Control administration, did not think hearings would be necessary. "When U.S. Steel says they will put in pollution control measures by a certain date, they'll do it. They have always cooperated in the past."

But he conceded meeting the 1968 deadline is remote in the case of U.S. Steel's South Works, which he said dumps 17 million gallons of industrial wastes into Lake Michigan each day.

Stein though the deadline might be extended in individual cases, according to circumstances, but he preferred that U.S. Steel embark on the kind of crash program Mayor Daley advocated. "They work round the clock

to make steel, so there's no reason why they can't also do it to abate pollution," he said.

U.S. Steel issued a statement pledging itself to abating pollution as soon as possible. "We have been making every effort in that direction," the statement said, and we will work diligently to complete this water quality program with all possible speed.

The firm said two-thirds of the waste being released into the lake will be brought under control "at or near the original target date," and the remaining third as soon as possible thereafter.

U.S. Steel's Gary works along with Inland Steel company and Youngstown Sheet and Tube company have submitted plans for pollution abatement by 1970.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 15, 1967]

GROWING PERIL TO CITY WATER SUPPLY IS TOLD—POLLUTANTS FOUL INDIANA DUNES SHORE

(Tribune reporters have visited cities on the shores of Lake Erie to report how pollution has brought death to one of the Great Lakes. Now the report focuses on conditions that threaten Lake Michigan, a priceless asset to Chicagoland.)

(By Casey Bukro)

Diana of the Dunes would shudder if she could see the Indiana dunes lakeshore today.

Oil slicks have been seen floating in the beach waters, along with globs of unknown substances. A sign posted this summer at Beverly Shores warned against swimming in the lake.

Algae and dead alewives this summer added a new burden of contamination. Bacteria counts in the water have reached critical levels.

Some say that unchecked water pollution will change the famed dunes playground into what Diana is—no more than a memory.

RECALL FEMALE HERMIT

Dunes dwellers, still recall stories of the woman hermit who, in 1915, went to live in an abandoned shack between Dunes park and Mineral Springs. She fled to the peace and quiet of the wilderness after graduating Phi Beta Kappa from the University of Chicago.

Fishermen sometimes caught a glimpse of the elusive woman on the beach among the dunes, and she became known as Diana. She died in 1925. Her real name was Alice Mabel Gray.

She brought notoriety to the dunes in her day. Now, another kind of notoriety has come to the dunes.

"We believe that the waters of the Dunes State park are being damaged by the pollution," said Thomas E. Dustin, chairman of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore advisory commission and national vice president of the Izaak Walton league. "We're fighting like hell to stop it."

"In recent years, water pollution has reached the point where some believe the beach should be closed to the public at times."

CITES POLLUTION INCREASE

He cited examples of grease, oil, bacteria, and oxygen-damaging wastes in the water.

An estimated one million persons visit the dunes park each year.

Herbert P. Read, chairman of the engineering committee of the Save the Dunes council, charges that state officials have closed the park beaches because of high bacteria counts, but always on another pretext.

"I know for a fact that the beach has been closed because of high bacteria counts," said Read. "But park officials never admit to the public that it is because of bacteria. They say it is because it is too cold, not enough lifeguards, or it is too wavy."

WON'T ADMIT POLLUTION

"I don't know why the state is hesitant to admit it. Maybe they're afraid to scare people from the park."

Read said the bacteria problem usually crops up in the spring, when high water levels cause septic tanks in the area to drain. It usually does not happen during the summer swimming season, he said.

Read said that the invasion of park waters by pollution is both direct and indirect.

Direct pollution comes from neighboring streams that carry domestic sewage and industrial wastes to Lake Michigan. Among those are Trill creek, flowing into the Michigan City harbor at the easternmost point of the 14-mile stretch of dunes shore.

The city of Gary, at the western end of the lakeshore, pours its own brand of powerful wastes from industries into the waters.

Between these two points lie three big industrial plants—Midwest and Bethlehem steel mills and the Northern Indiana Public Service plant—and the towns of Beverly Shores, Dune Acres, and Ogden Dunes, plus the Indiana Dunes State park and the national lakeshore.

Almost in the middle of the stretch of recreational shoreline is Burns ditch, a source of highly-polluted water.

Directly in the state park, about 150 feet away from the pavilion, is the outflow of Dunes creek. It carries drainage from a swampy area near the park, along with occasional contamination from malfunctioning septic tanks of homes in the area.

PLAY AREA FOR CHILDREN

The brown waters of Dunes creek are chlorinated to remove bacteria from leaking septic tanks just before flowing into the beach area. The stream is a favorite play area for children.

Signs warning of chlorine gas are posted in the area, but state officials said there is little danger from chlorine. The brown color is caused by sediment from the swamps, they said.

Add to this the indirect flow of pollution from cities all along the shores of Lake Michigan—Chicago, Milwaukee, the Green Bay area, and the Calumet region—said Read.

CURRENT WEAK AT TIP

"The southern tip of Lake Michigan receives every bit of pollution poured into the lake," he asserted.

He explained that lake currents moving north to south tend to deposit water-borne materials at the southern tip of the lake, where the current is the weakest.

"That's how the sand got there," said Read. He contends that the sands which created the dunes were carried by lake currents from the northern end of the lake and dropped at the southern end of the lake.

Likewise, pollution tends to gravitate at the point of the Dunes State park, said Read. Unless all residents of Lake Michigan take steps to halt pollution going into the lake, the southern tip of the lake is doomed, he said.

VANDALISM A PROBLEM

It would be a mistake to believe that the problems of water pollution at the Dunes State park all come from outside.

"One of the biggest problems here is deliberate vandalism," said Joseph L. Tite, sanitary engineer for the Indiana state board of health. "When the park is crowded, it's very frequent."

He cited cases where youngsters have broken six or seven toilets in park comfort stations, so that the water closets flow continuously, causing some flooding in the sandy area. The park must then close the area to the public until it drains and the facilities are restored.

FOLLOWING A PATTERN

Thus, Dunes State park, at Chicago's doorstep, is following a pattern in which prime

recreational areas are being spoiled by man-made pollution. This pattern was first noticed by a team of *TRIBUNE* pollution investigators as far away as Petoskey, Mich., and all along the eastern shores of Lake Michigan, commonly thought to be unspoiled stretches of natural waterways.

"If the southern tip of the lake dies, people and industry will leave the area. We will see the fish go first. But the jobs and people will go next," said Read.

The waters of Dunes State park will be a barometer. If they deteriorate, so will the entire southern basin of the lake, he predicted.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 16, 1967]
MILWAUKEE RIVER'S OPEN SEWER NOW CHOKING LAKE MICHIGAN

(Tribune reporters have visited cities on the shores of Lake Erie to report how pollution has brought death to one of the Great Lakes. Now the report focuses on conditions that threaten Lake Michigan, a priceless asset to Chicagoland.)

(By William Jones)

MILWAUKEE, September 15.—The Milwaukee river, Lake Michigan's major tributary here, is a slime-coated cauldron of filth.

The Milwaukee river is an open sewer so heavily polluted in sections that its odors cause the few boaters to feel nauseated.

The waterway, with assistance from the Menominee and Kinnickinnic rivers, is choking the lake with a steady flow of raw sewage, algae, oils, and sludge.

SWIMMERS RUN RISK

Anyone foolish enough to swim in these waters runs a health risk. Yet these waterways are part of nature's grand design to replenish Lake Michigan.

Coast guard patrol boat trips up the river were described as almost nauseating by a petty officer. During a trip of a few miles up the lower part of the river, two stops were required to clean algae out of the filters of the water-cooled powerboat.

Carpets of algae frequently stretched from bank to bank of the river and from a distance appeared to be vast expanses of lawn. The decaying vegetable life clusters around the thousands of pieces of lumber, old tires, and other trash discarded into the river each day.

FORM POLLUTION RAINBOW

Along the Menominee, black swaths of coal dust accumulations mix with white paint slicks and bright green algae to form a grotesque pollution rainbow.

A junk yard on the banks of the river stacks its scrapped auto transmissions and auto bodies near the water where oil runoff easily reaches the river.

Refuse from slaughterhouse animal pens is dumped into and near the water, less than a mile from a city-owned asphalt plant which pours its steaming dark-brown wastes into the river.

Adding to these immense amounts of filth is the largest polluter of all—the Milwaukee metropolitan sanitary district. With industry tied into its system, the district handles the waste equivalent of more than 2.5 million persons daily with its outmoded combined sewer system.

Normally, the 550 miles of combined storm and sewer lines carry their load directly to the treatment plant. But during wet weather, storm water combined with raw sewage can flush the raw wastes of 250,000 persons into the lake and river.

The contamination of Lake Michigan beaches is so predictable at these times that the city health department has devised a plan to automatically close beaches when a certain amount of rainfall is reached.

BUILDING NEW PLANT

"When this happens the quality of the water in the lower Milwaukee river essentially

is raw sewage," said Lawrence Wright, chief resource planner for the Southeast Wisconsin Regional Planning commission.

The cost of separating storm and sanitary sewers here has been estimated at 200 million dollars, a price tag considered so high that few believe the plan ever will be seriously considered.

A new 10.5 million dollar treatment plant now is being built to increase the efficiency of sewage treatment. But such facilities fall far short of being a cure-all.

STUDY PHOSPHOROUS REMOVAL

They do not remove the large amounts of phosphorus that remain in treated sewage waters and is released to the rivers and lake. Algae thrive on phosphorus and the city recently obtained a \$196,000 federal grant to study increased phosphorus removal at its treatment plants.

The removal of this nutrient from waste waters is a common dilemma faced by all sanitary treatment facilities. Sewage experts admit that until this problem is solved, little progress can be made in controlling one of the main food sources of the water crippling algae.

WANTS PRODUCT SWITCH

"The greatest amounts of phosphorus by far are sent into the system from the thousands of households in the Milwaukee area using detergents," said one sewage official.

"If all housewives would switch to laundry products that contain little or none of this material the problem would solve itself. It's not too likely to happen, however."

Significantly, the Milwaukee river also has proven that such waterways can be used for waste disposal if man will compromise on the amounts of filth he pours into a river.

In its upper reaches, 11 sewage plants dump effluent into the river. There is no continual buildup, however, because the dumping is spread out and the water can purge itself of pollution thru the use of sunlight, dilutions, and desirable bacteria.

BEGIN 3-YEAR STUDY

Standing between the river and Lake Michigan, however, is Milwaukee. Here, the river receives colossal amounts of filth just before it enters the lake.

Attempts to deal with such problems move slowly at best. At the present time, they come in the form of a three-year study of the Milwaukee river watershed by the Regional Planning Commission. The study is just beginning and is financed by local, state, and federal funds and seeks recommendations on water pollution and water management.

Meanwhile, the dangerous pollution cycle continues and Lake Michigan is expected to wait until all the reports are completed. The same reports may someday be used for another more disgraceful purpose. They will tell how man killed Lake Michigan.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept 16, 1967]
BACON MOVES INTO MIDDLE IN CONTROVERSY—
WON'T TAKE SIDES ON POLLUTION DEADLINES

Vinton W. Bacon, general superintendent of the sanitary district, last night took a middle position in the controversy over whether the federal deadline of Dec. 31, 1968 for installation of pollution abatement equipment should be extended for industries at the southern end of Lake Michigan.

Public officials began taking sides Monday when a panel of Illinois, Indiana, and federal officials voted to recommend to Stewart Udall, secretary of the interior, that the deadline be extended to June 30, 1970. On Tuesday, Mayor Daley wired Udall opposing the extension.

EGAN CHANGES SIDES

Then John E. Egan, sanitary district board president, and H. W. Poston, regional administrator of the Federal Water Pollution Control administration, both members of the

panel, announced Thursday that they had changed their minds and opposed extending the deadline.

Bacon has been quoted as favoring extension because the present deadline is "unrealistic," but he set the record straight last night.

"I have been saying since 1965 that all industries could not meet the 1968 deadline," he said. "I have also been saying—and I say again—that we should get specific timetables set up with each polluting industry, stipulated to in court if necessary, and then adhere to them."

OPPOSES BLANKET DELAY

"But I am unalterably opposed to granting blank-check extensions of the existing deadline. If we do that, then we'll never get the lake cleaned up."

Bacon said it was fine with him if the sanitary district trustees want to take United States Steel Corporation, whose South works is a major polluter of the lake, into court.

"That's for them to decide," he said, "and they'll have a chance to do just that at Thursday's board meeting."

CRITICIZE GOV. KERNER

Earlier in the day, Republican trustees criticized Gov. Kerner for "playing politics" with his veto of anti-pollution bills. They called upon members of the state legislature to join in overriding the vetoes.

One of them, Eugene Dibble, warned that failure to override the vetoes could cost district taxpayers 7.5 million dollars in the next two years and would hamper the clean-up of district waterways.

Another trustee, Gerald Marks, criticized Democrats in the legislature—and, by implication, Mayor Daley—for failing to join Republicans in opposing Kerner's action. He recalled they had been almost unanimous in their support of the anti-pollution legislation in the regular session of the General Assembly.

The trustees called for public support in getting the legislators to vote for the bills, sponsored by Rep. Carl L. Klein [R., Chicago].

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 16, 1967]

STATES URGED TO AID WATER CONSERVATION

MILWAUKEE, September 15.—Representatives of the eight states composing the Great Lakes Basin commission were urged today to join with the federal government in the preserving the nation's water resources.

Harry M. Steel, assistant director of the water resources council in Washington, said that the nation faces a serious problem involving water requirements, industrial uses and pollution.

The commission, formed last April by Presidential order, has representatives from Wisconsin, Illinois, Minnesota, Indiana, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Michigan and New York. The meeting today was to discuss proposed objectives.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 17, 1967]

BOARD ORDERS UNITED STATES STEEL TO SUBMIT PLAN

The sanitary district has ordered the United States Steel Corporation to submit detailed plans for a water pollution abatement program by Tuesday afternoon.

Vinton Bacon, sanitary district superintendent, said that the plan was requested so that it can be placed on the agenda for the Thursday board meeting of the sanitary district board of trustees.

REASON FOR ACTION

John E. Egan, sanitary district board president, said that the board is taking a more rigid stand against United States Steel because it is the only major contributor of water pollution to Lake Michigan on the Illinois side and also because of an uncooperative attitude shown when an inspection party

visited the corporation's South side facilities last Tuesday.

There is some confusion as to how much pressure can be put on the steel corporation before its December, 1968, deadline for a working pollution control program agreed upon by conferees of a federal water pollution control panel, Egan said.

"I am not sure that we can do anything if U.S. Steel does not submit its plan by Tuesday," Egan said.

A HOSTILE ATTITUDE

A sanitary district spokesman said that the "hostile" attitude of the corporation officials to last Tuesday's inspection party resulted in "United States Steel bringing the world down upon itself."

Officials refused to commit themselves to any date, even beyond the December, 1968 deadline, for an operational water pollution control program which would meet criteria agreed upon by the federal conferees, the spokesman said.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 17, 1967]

NEW GOP ANTIDUMPING BILL

(By Robert Howard)

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., September 16.—Two Republican legislators announced today that another attempt will be made to outlaw the pollution of Lake Michigan by the dumping of harbor and river dredgings.

Sen. Arthur R. Gottschalk [R., Flossmoor] prepared for Senate introduction Monday a revised version of an antidumping bill, which was vetoed by Gov. Kerner after it passed the legislature in June under the sponsorship of Rep. Carl L. Klein [R., Chicago].

"The Republican party must see to it that Lake Michigan does not die," said Gottschalk, chairman of the legislature's advisory commission on economic development.

"Pollution is an emergency problem, and while the legislature is in session, we should give the governor a chance to change his mind."

Democrats in the House of Representatives on Tuesday blocked Klein's attempt to override Gov. Kerner's veto of a bill, which had passed both Houses overwhelmingly. Only three Democrats voted with Klein. The others made it a political issue by voting to uphold the Democratic governor.

Klein, who is chairman of the state water pollution and water resources commission, said that "the failure of my bill to become law is a go-ahead for industry and other states to continue pollution of the lake."

"I am especially perturbed by the appearance of algae in great amounts along the Chicago lakefront," Klein said. "This indicates that sewage pollution from the north shore possibly as far as Milwaukee finally has reached Chicago and it will probably get worse before it gets better."

"I am greatly alarmed about the condition of the lake, and something must be done now."

Klein reported a heavy mail and telephone response after five of his anti-pollution bills were vetoed by the governor. One letter suggested that Lake Michigan be renamed Lake Kerner if the pollution situation becomes as bad as that in Lake Erie.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 17, 1967]

INDIANA HARBOR PLANTS TURNING LAKE INTO SEWER FOR INDUSTRY

(NOTE.—Tribune reporters have visited cities on the shores of Lake Erie to report how pollution has brought death to one of the Great Lakes. Now the report focuses on conditions that threaten Lake Michigan, a priceless asset to Chicagoland.)

(By Casey Bukro)

A stream of poison pours into Lake Michigan from the Indiana harbor—a contender as champion of polluted waterways.

"The main source of infection going into

the lake is the Indiana harbor," said Robert J. Bowden, chief of the Calumet area surveillance project of the Federal Water Pollution Control administration.

BIG DOSE OF POLLUTION

Indiana harbor receives staggering doses of industrial pollution from the Indiana harbor canal and the Grand Calumet river. The Indiana harbor empties into Lake Michigan.

These waters stand as an open indictment of Indiana Calumet area industry. The waters cry for help.

"These are the sewers for industry here. That's the way they use waterways," said Bowden.

BOWDEN PROVES HIS POINT

To prove his point, Bowden took a team of Tribune pollution investigators on a 20-mile sampling run by boat and by truck, starting with an inspection of Indiana harbor.

Our first encounter with gross pollution came in the Inland Steel company slip, just inside the harbor. Trapped in this inlet was a floating island of oil and grease.

"I've seen that kind of oil fill the end of this slip for a distance of 30 or 40 feet," said Bowden. When the winds shift, this mass contamination floats into Lake Michigan.

This reporter stuck his hand into that floating mess to make a comparison. It smelled like a tar pit and it felt like thick, greasy mud. There seemed to be no bottom to it.

TEST OF POLLUTION

This test of oil and grease coating a river had been made by a TRIBUNE reporter late last August in Cleveland's Cuyahoga river—considered by some to be the most polluted river in the nation.

The oil and grease found in Indiana harbor were worse.

A few facts will support that.

Indiana Stream Pollution control officials told THE TRIBUNE that 37,000 gallons of oil are discharged by Calumet area industries into the Indiana harbor every day. That is equivalent to three tank cars.

Add to that 32,000 pounds of iron wastes and 280 pounds of cyanide coming from the United States Steel plant in Gary alone each day. There are two other steel plants almost as large feeding their wastes into the harbor.

The Cuyahoga river in Ohio gets a daily dose from all its industries of 34,000 pounds of iron, 525 gallons of oil, and 400 pounds of cyanide. The Detroit river swallows 19,000 gallons of oil daily from Detroit industries.

Both the Cuyahoga river and the Detroit river have been named as sources of the pollution that is turning Lake Erie into a swamp.

The Indiana harbor and its tributaries are doing the same thing to Lake Michigan.

WATERS ARE SICK

The waters from the Calumet area are sick. Some people like to describe these waters as "an open sewer," a "gutter," or a "cess-pool." Altho accurate, these descriptions fail to show that the waters are diseased and dying.

The death they carry is spreading to Lake Michigan, which yields water that is drinkable only after more and more treatment to strain out the pollution.

A cruise up the Indiana harbor canal shows why and how this can happen.

The first 1½ miles of the canal are inhabited by two steel mills, the Inland Steel company on the east bank and the Youngstown Sheet & Tube company on the west.

"The bacteria counts in this stretch of water are fantastic," said Bowden. "They sometimes approach the range of raw sewage."

The Lake George branch of the canal is the home of some five major petroleum refiners in the Calumet region. They stand like cities of rods and tubes, pipes and chimneys.

DECAY FORMS GAS

The bottom of the Lake George branch is coated with petroleum sludge. It decays, forming bubbles of gas that pop to the surface among swirling oil slicks.

Bowden took a sample of the water of the canal at Dicky Road, in East Chicago. He poured a chemical into it. The water turned white.

"See that color? That means there is no dissolved oxygen in this water," he said.

It also means that only the lowest forms of life, such as worms and bacteria, can live in this waste-suffocated water.

The Indiana harbor canal stretches four miles to where it meets the Grand Calumet river, also the home of much heavy industry.

By truck, we went to the Gary sewage treatment plant. Dense, white detergent foam tumbled from the discharge pipe into the reddish-brown waters of the Grand Calumet River.

"I'm at a loss to explain this," said Bowden. "Much of the detergent foam problem has been solved. Something is wrong. This is not a common sight at a sewage treatment plant these days."

He said he would investigate.

THE WORST POLLUTER

The United States Steel company in Gary was next. We stood across from the plant, looking at a rushing flow of reddish-brown water going into the Grand Calumet River from a plant discharge pipe.

Bowden identifies the United States Steel company as the number one pollution violator in the Calumet region.

"They have dumped their wastes into the Grand Calumet River with abandon. They've been doing it as long as they have been here, and they're still doing it."

RIVER COLOR CHANGES

"They are putting a fantastic amount of pollution into the water," he said. He estimated there were five-feet of sludge coating the bottom of the river, making it a settling basin for industrial wastes. The river flowing past United States Steel into Gary becomes loaded with iron and oil wastes, changing its color at this point from green to dark chocolate.

United States Steel operates two mills in the Calumet region, one in Gary and another on the south side of Chicago.

Bowden identified the next two top pollution violators as Inland Steel company and Youngstown Sheet & Tube company, although these two have taken some steps to improve. Each of the three draws about 1 billion gallons of water from Lake Michigan every day and returns it loaded with wastes via the river and the harbor canal.

Bowden estimates that these three steel companies account for about 70 per cent of the wastes flowing into Lake Michigan. The rest comes from some 50 industries on the Indiana side of the Calumet region, and nearby Indiana towns and cities that were discharging untreated sewage into the waterways until 1965.

Industrial wastes on the Illinois side of the Calumet region are transported by the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago down the Illinois waterway, and do not affect Lake Michigan directly.

"But don't whitewash Illinois industry," said Bowden. "Their waste disposal practices are just as bad."

DEFENSIVE ACTION

The massive doses of pollution from Indiana industry and communities going into Lake Michigan alarmed the department of health, education, and welfare to the extent that it took direct action to call an enforcement conference in Chicago in March, 1965.

The major pollution areas were identified as East Chicago, Gary, Hammond, and Whiting in Indiana; and Calumet City, Chicago Heights, and a part of the south side of Chicago in Illinois.

This conference resulted in the first public awareness of the extent of the pollution problem in the Calumet area, and its effect on Lake Michigan.

The conference set Dec. 31, 1968, as a deadline for a cleanup program. What is the status of that deadline?

Small industries in the Calumet region say they can meet the deadline, said Bowden. All the municipalities are making progress toward eliminating the worst offenses, although storm water overflows still cause great quantities of raw sewage to flow into Lake Michigan.

STEEL FIRMS ASK EXTENSION

During a follow-up conference held Sept. 11 in Chicago, the three major steel companies asked for an extension of the deadline until 1972. They were given until 1970.

But what has happened since 1965, when the steel companies agreed to start a cleanup program?

"So far, our sampling has shown it has gotten worse than it was in 1965," said Bowden.

This was borne out, he said, by weekly sampling runs covering 15 sampling stations in the Indiana harbor, the harbor canal, and the Grand Calumet River.

"They are heavily infested with wastes," said Bowden.

"The steel plants are expanding and producing more. They must have sat on their duffs quite a while after the 1965 conference. Now, 30 months later, they're getting their first engineering plans completed.

"These companies are buying a false prosperity today at the expense of our future," Bowden asserted. "And they're almost guaranteeing that it's all going to collapse because prosperity will depend on clean water and there isn't going to be any clean water left."

"There is absolutely no reason for waste pollution problems today," said Bowden. "It is technically feasible to clean it up right now. We have the technology. We merely have to apply it. Industries are not doing it because it cuts into their profits."

Federal pollution control agents are now waiting for the steel industries to meet their 1970 deadline. If they don't?

"We now have new laws and techniques to encourage them to do their duty through court action," said Bowden. "We hope it won't come to that."

"This is the first comprehensive effort to make a large industrial area correct its waste problems. If they can tell us to go to hell now and get away with it, they always will."

"If we are successful here, we have a chance to be successful in other areas."

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 18, 1967]
FIGHTS EASING POLLUTION BAN—MANN WILL INTRODUCE ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION

State Rep. Robert E. Mann [D., Chicago] said that he will introduce today in the General Assembly a joint House-Senate resolution which opposes any extension of the Dec. 31, 1968 deadline for water pollution control in Lake Michigan.

United States Steel Corporation in South Chicago had requested an extension of the deadline because of problems in its treatment facilities.

TWO REVERSE THEMSELVES

John E. Egan, sanitary district board president, and H. W. Poston, regional administrator of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, each had agreed on the extension but reversed themselves Thursday, saying that the steel corporation must have its pollution control program working by the original deadline.

Mann commended THE TRIBUNE's current series of articles on water pollution in the Great Lakes for informing the public about a "critical" problem.

LAKE'S SURVIVAL NECESSARY

"The survival of Lake Michigan must take precedence over private interests," Mann said.

"The tremendous strides which have been made with regard to the scientific treatment of polluted water convince me that if an Herculean effort is made the deadline can be met."

"Lake Michigan is our state's greatest asset and while it may be true that Indiana and Wisconsin are the principal sources of pollutants affecting Lake Michigan, Illinois has the greatest stake in a healthy and viable lake."

EXPRESSION OF PEOPLE

"If the resolution passes, it will be a clear expression of the people of Illinois, thru their elected representatives, that private interests—as important and significant as they are to the economic health of the state—must be subordinated to the future well-being of Lake Michigan. It seems to me shortsighted for industry to plead economic factors as the reason for the suggested extension when the lake has been the vehicle by which commerce has facilitated and extended the growth of industry."

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 18, 1967]
LAKE MICHIGAN INHERITS POISON OF A DYING RIVER

(NOTE.—Tribune reporters have visited cities on the shores of Lake Erie to report how pollution has brought death to one of the Great Lakes. Now the report focuses on conditions that threaten Lake Michigan, a priceless asset to Chicagoland.)

(By William Jones)

RACINE, Wis., September 17.—Dismally large amounts of polluting wastes are being dumped in the tiny Root River on its journey to Lake Michigan.

For years, this 25-mile waterway, which meanders from Milwaukee County to enter the lake here, was of interest only to those who worked and lived along its shores. It is too shallow in many places for motorboats. And so narrow in others that it resembles a creek.

Yet the combined problem of spring floods and the stench of its waters finally forced man to take a look at his decades of destructive ignorance. What he found was another reason why Lake Michigan is sick and large sections of the Root River are dead.

WASTES DUMPED IN RIVER

"The river system is presently being used principally for the transportation and assimilation of treated and untreated domestic and industrial wastes," according to a study completed last year by the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission. While pointing out that in some sections the river still provides recreation areas, the study concludes that "these uses are not completely compatible."

Highly incompatible, an observer concludes, when a duck farm that processes hundreds of thousands of birds annually is ordered to provide greater treatment of its wash water before it enters the river. At one time, according to the commission, pollution from this source alone was equivalent to the raw sewage of 14,000 persons.

Farmers along the Root learned years ago that the river has turned against man. They fenced the river to prevent their cattle from drinking the water.

REACHES 100 PERCENT EFFLUENT

"During low-water months, the flow of parts of the river is 100 per cent effluent," said Lawrence Wright, chief resource planner for the commission. "Our study recommended the entire removal of several municipal sewage systems that are major pollutants. Our conclusions have not been very effective, however, and nothing has been done."

Another phase of the commission's study included the sampling of water less than two

miles from where the river enters Lake Michigan here. At this point, Wright pointed out, lake and river water begin to mix, which they should to dilute the concentrated pollutants in the river. Wright's conclusion:

"The condition of the water in every respect at this point is poor—there is no question about its dangerous and detrimental effect on Lake Michigan."

The commission's findings also serve to underline a recent statement by Wisconsin's Gov. Warren Knowles.

PROBLEM'S "COLOR": GREEN

"The color of the problem is green," said Knowles, who may have had the cost of cleaning up the route in mind. The commission has estimated that it will cost 15 million dollars to restore only a portion of the sick river. This amounts to \$600,000 for every mile of a relatively small waterway.

"Cleanup should be right now," says James Wren-Jarvis, regional director of the state department of natural resources. "But the enforcement procedures do not work that way. Our department must now go out and promote. It will be a question of time."

In stark contrast is the prospect of a deteriorating Lake Michigan. If it ever reaches the condition of the Root or hundreds of other polluted waterways the damage will be irreversible, according to water experts. No amount of money or public indignation, however large, will be able to restore it. There will be no question of time. It will be gone for all time.

POLLUTION A THREAT TO AMERICA'S LAKES

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I, too, am most interested in the recent series of articles published in the Chicago Tribune concerning the pollution of Lake Erie, articles just placed in the RECORD by the minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Lake Erie is suffering a plight that is increasingly afflicting the Nation's lakes, both large and small. For generations, our closed bodies of water have been used as dumping grounds for manmade refuse. Now we are confronting the consequences of indifference and carelessness.

Along with thousands of smaller lakes in my State, Lake Michigan has been undergoing similar threats to its economic and recreational value. Effective action at all levels of government, as well as action by private users, is required to protect what remains and to rehabilitate this scarred natural resource.

THE DECISION TO BUILD AN ANTIBALLISTIC MISSILE SYSTEM

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, yesterday the decision to build an antiballistic missile system was announced by Secretary of Defense McNamara. I indicated my support of this decision shortly after Secretary McNamara's announcement. Under present world circumstances, we have no choice but to go ahead with an antiballistic missile system.

Regretfully, we have been unsuccessful in reaching an agreement with the Soviet Union on the depolyment of antiballistic missile systems. This factor and the emerging nuclear threat of Red China make it necessary that we go ahead with

an antiballistic system for reasons of national security.

In his state of the Union message, President Johnson on January 1, 1967, stated:

We have the solemn duty to slow down the arms race between us, if that is at all possible, in both conventional and nuclear weapons and defenses . . . I realize that an additional race would impose on our people and on all mankind, for that matter, an additional waste of resources with no gain in security to either side.

I read those phrases as a strong affirmation of the President's decision to communicate to the Soviet Union that the United States desired to call a halt to the ABM race. I can only conclude from Mr. McNamara's announcement yesterday that the Soviet Union has refused to sit down as reasonable men and negotiate on a reduction of ABM systems. Such a step would have benefited the United States, the Soviet Union, and mankind.

The emergence of Red China as a nuclear threat also had to be considered in reaching the decision. As indicated in the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy July report, Red China is developing a nuclear and missile delivery capability which will shortly constitute a threat to our security.

I believe that the Soviet Union has proceeded to build and deploy one and probably two ABM systems—a decision that until yesterday the United States has refrained from making. I regret that we could not reach agreement, but under the circumstances, I applaud the decision to go ahead with the building of an ABM system.

In proceeding with this step, I fully appreciate the additional financial commitment we assume. The decision has been made that we need an antiballistic missile system. This Nation can afford to pay for all its needs whether they are in the field of national defense or other vital fields essential to the maintenance of our position of preeminence.

There are other needs vital to the maintenance of our position of leadership which to some are not as readily apparent as those immediately related to our national security. These needs, since they are not directly—or at least not obviously—connected with our national security, are at times overlooked. There have been and undoubtedly will be additional shortsighted moves to sacrifice the support of other national needs based upon our assumption of the burden of an ABM system. We must guard against such moves. One specific area I have in mind concerns our Nation's space program. Space is a new frontier which any nation of preeminence must pioneer. It is a technical challenge second to none, and the mantle of world leadership will be worn by the nation which is first in space. Man's security and freedom will depend on the nation which leads in space. Our Nation leads at the dawn of the space age. Our Nation can and must forge ahead to assure leadership in space for the future. As a nation with a gross national product of about \$750 billion a year, we can afford to assume the burden of all of our needs—in space, in Vietnam, in building an ABM

system, and other programs needed to preserve and maintain our Nation's primacy in a turbulent world.

We must insure that our progress in space is not inhibited nor deterred by any shift in budget allocations which may result from the decision on the development of an ABM system. I believe that our Nation's objectives must include and our economy can sustain a vigorous space program and at the same time provide for the cost of an ABM system. I strongly believe that we should tighten our belts and proceed with both our space and the ABM programs.

There should be no slackening of our programs in space. We should and must be the first to reach the moon. This phase of our space effort cannot be our ultimate objective. Reaching the moon can only be viewed as a step in a dynamic new world. Our objective must go beyond the initial exploration of the moon. Here is where vision is vitally needed. We cannot put off developing the technology and hardware we need for the ultimate leadership in space. One specific area in which there is no scientific disagreement is the need to develop the ability to use nuclear energy in space. For meaningful leadership in space there is no alternative to nuclear energy. One of our nuclear energy development efforts which is being considered by some for sacrifice is the nuclear propulsion rocket program. Here is a program our scientists have, over the past few years, been outstandingly successful in. We have already run rocket power reactor experiments on the ground which have met or exceeded our performance objectives. We cannot afford to cut back or delay our progress in this field. I am very concerned that if we even place the nuclear rocket program in a "hold" position for a short while we will never regain our position in this vital field. As I have said before, this takes vision. We must provide this vision by supporting our efforts in our nuclear rocket program.

The United States faces many difficult days. Our country is threatened from without and has growing pains from within. We must proceed in a logical and orderly way to insure that our Nation continues to maintain its primacy in the world. Our Nation's security will be strengthened by an effective ABM system. Supremacy in space, which will come about from the very important development programs which are underway, has every indication of increasing the strength of our Nation—and perhaps our efforts on the space frontier will lead us to the one goal that now seems so distant—peace.

In connection with Secretary McNamara's decision to proceed with development of a "thin antiballistic missile system" I would like to pay tribute to the foresight of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] on assuming the chairmanship of the Joint Committee for the 90th Congress. Last January, Senator PASTORE began holding hearings in executive session on the nuclear capability of Red China. These hearings resulted in a joint committee print published in July entitled "Impact of Chinese Communist Nuclear

Weapons Progress on U.S. National Security."

On September 9, in a major policy speech at the launching of the Navy's latest nuclear submarine the *Narwhal* in Groton, Conn., Senator PASTORE called for "full speed ahead" on building an antiballistic missile system. The full text of his incisive and lucid argument for the development of an antiballistic missile system deserves the attention of Congress and the American people. I congratulate Senator PASTORE on his statement and ask unanimous consent that his speech of September 9 be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF U.S. SENATOR JOHN O. PASTORE AT THE LAUNCHING OF THE NUCLEAR SUBMARINE "NARWHAL" IN GROTON, CONN., SEPTEMBER 9, 1967

I have come to this day and moment with pride—pride in the workers whose skills have made this splendid nuclear submarine possible.

Pride in the nobility of purpose of the crew—men of courage who will guide this ship through the silent depths of the ocean—alone and unafraid.

This ceremony which marks the launching of the *Narwhal*, the SSN671, is a milestone in the annals of our submarine history. Just thirteen short years ago the world's first nuclear submarine, the *Nautilus*, designated SSN571, was launched from this same shipyard. Here we are a hundred submarines later, and of these, ninety-two have been nuclear powered. Only men of great foresight would have envisioned this tremendous accomplishment.

I can think of no other important technological advancement which has progressed as rapidly as has the use of nuclear propulsion for naval vessels.

It was not too long ago from this shipyard that the forty-first and last Polaris missile firing submarine was launched, marking the completion of this program. There is little doubt that the Polaris submarine represents our most formidable deterrent to an all-out war.

I must say that these achievements would not have taken place except for the persistent and aggressive support of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—with the help of Admiral Rickover and his associates—and I would want you all to know further that if world conditions persist in the way they are today, the Joint Committee expects to see many more nuclear submarines launched from these and other ways throughout this great Nation.

Now, however, we have come to the crossroads in the development of nuclear-powered submarines. With the present authorized Polaris program completed, we must give serious consideration to a further expansion of this program and we must intensify our efforts to develop new and more advanced nuclear attack submarines to meet the expanding challenge of Soviet naval power and the new Chinese threat. I also believe that we should actively pursue the replacement of all our conventional submarines with nuclear submarines of advanced design.

We have developed an irreplaceable reservoir of highly skilled men, such as I see before me today, who have been largely responsible for the clear supremacy the United States holds over any nation in the world in the development of nuclear submarines. Many of you workers, I might add, are friends from Rhode Island who journey here each day to join in this great endeavor to strengthen our national security.

We should insure that the great skills and capabilities of the men who design and build our nuclear warships should not be dissipated.

But this is only one aspect of the continuing fight for American nuclear propulsion supremacy.

The nuclear-powered aircraft carrier *Enterprise* has just returned from its second deployment in action off Vietnam. The *Enterprise* has proven so effective in battle in Vietnam that the Secretary of Defense requested a new nuclear-powered carrier in last year's defense bill and has told Congress that he intends to ask for one more next year and another in a future year.

The nuclear-powered carrier approved by Congress last year has been named the *Nimitz* after the late Fleet Admiral Chester W. Nimitz. You might be interested to know that about fifty-five years ago Lieutenant Nimitz was Commanding Officer of the first United States submarine *Narwhal*, the predecessor of the nuclear submarine we are launching today.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is proud of the active role it has taken and is taking to bring into being a Nuclear Navy.

Our reward has been to see the Polaris nuclear submarine emerge as our first line of defense—and the *Enterprise* and its nuclear escort vessels perform admirably in support of our limited objectives in the Vietnam conflict.

The world into which the *Narwhal* will sail is a world of conflict and contradictions.

We are engaged in a military struggle against the forces of communism in Southeast Asia. At the same time we are working with communist nations at Geneva to produce a treaty banning the spread of nuclear weapons—a treaty which will lessen the possibility of a nuclear holocaust.

Our hopes and prayers are for a non-proliferation treaty and agreements—agreements to halt the arms race—and, indeed, agreements to eliminate all conflicts.

But we must understand military power and constantly be aware of the capabilities of our potential enemies. We must stay in tune with changing events.

A dramatic and upsetting event has recently taken place in the Far East. In less than three years Red China has become, not only a nuclear power—but a thermonuclear power.

I suggest that they have made amazing and astonishing progress in this brief span of time. Their accomplishments in the field of nuclear weaponry are all the more significant because the internal strife within China has apparently had little or no effect on their nuclear and missile programs. In light of these factors, it appears that Communist China presents a clear-cut threat to the free world.

At the beginning of the 90th Congress, as Chairman of the Joint Committee, I initiated hearings on Red China's nuclear capability. One of the most significant findings contained in the Joint Committee report that followed was the statement based on CIA and Defense Department testimony that "... The Chinese probably will achieve an operational ICBM capability before 1972. Conceivably, it could be ready as early as 1970-1971."

Add to this new threat the fact that the Soviet Union's offensive nuclear striking power is increasing in comparison to our own—while at the same time they are deploying one and probably two anti-ballistic missile systems to defend their country—which we are not doing—I repeat—which we are not doing.

While for the moment we can find comfort and a certain amount of security in the ideological schism that exists between Red China and the Soviet Union, we cannot discount the possibility that this breach could

be healed and thereby greatly affect the balance of nuclear power in the world.

Which brings me to the important point that I want to make here today, and that is this—that the time has come for us to give serious and urgent thought to a reappraisal of our defense posture.

We cannot live in a world of atomic energy and discount completely the possibility of "surprise attack" on our Nation.

The Senate has just recently approved a budget of over seventy billion dollars for defense, the largest single appropriations bill in our history—and yet we have no effective anti-ballistic missile system.

I realize the cost to do this is high—indeed staggering—however, if we can afford to spend twenty-four billion dollars a year in defense of a neighbor, and I mean Vietnam, we can certainly spend as much to insure the life and security of our American society.

Our offensive weapons are second to none—but it has been our announced and continuing policy for generations never to strike first.

Today—in effect—we are asking the American people to be prepared to accept near nuclear annihilation because our strategy calls for absorbing the first nuclear strike.

We are not an aggressive people. We do not covet other nations' territory. We only ask that those who desire to be free—stay free. I merely point out that we must be as strong in defense to preserve our society as we must be strong in offense to discourage and deter an attack.

With all our offensive power, our defense posture could be our Achilles' heel.

We cannot sit back and let ourselves be lulled into a sense of false security, relying only on the hope that fear of retaliation will deter potential aggressors.

Development of an ABM system is, I repeat, extremely expensive but, indeed, necessary. In this kind of a world, the alternatives are few.

The security of our country—the ultimate in its defense—deserves the highest national priority.

An affluent America—with so much to lose—must not face this mortal challenge cheaply.

We should move full speed ahead on building an anti-ballistic missile system. In this connection, I am happy to say that Senator Henry M. Jackson of Washington, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Application of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and one of the Senate's leading experts on military affairs, will soon hold hearings on the ABM question.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy will pursue the development of an ABM system with the same vigor that it pressed for the development of the H-Bomb and our first nuclear submarine, the *Nautilus*.

Both endeavors were successful and greatly increased the security of this great Nation.

This new submarine, the *Narwhal*, represents another link in the chain of undersea security so necessary in this turbulent world.

It is into this difficult and dangerous world that you—the officers and men of the *Narwhal*—will soon sail.

Your task is vital to our security.

Your mission will be difficult.

Your dedication is unsurpassed and our pride in you is unbounded.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. Mr. President, the United States is second to none as a nuclear power. We have a nuclear weapon stockpile and delivery systems, which guarantee that any Nation foolhardy enough to attempt a nuclear attack upon us, will be utterly and completely destroyed.

In both Republican and Democratic

administrations it has been the announced policy of the United States that our nuclear strategic weapons will not be used on a first strike. The United States has made it clear to the world—to friend and foe alike—that our ICBM's and strategic bombers are for the purposes of deterring war; that we are prepared to, and are capable of, absorbing a first strike and thereafter retaliating with a force sufficient to utterly destroy the attacking Nation.

Notwithstanding our capability to absorb a first strike and successfully counter with our own nuclear missiles, any nuclear attack on the United States will cause great destruction of property and, more important, the death of untold numbers of people. It is for this reason that many of us have believed it essential that an effective anti-ballistic-missile system should be developed and deployed within the United States. It is for this reason that many of us in the Congress have for a number of years supported the necessary research and development work to develop an anti-ballistic-missile system. President Johnson and the Defense Department for a number of years have recommended development of an antiballistic missile system.

Mr. President, I was pleased by the announcement yesterday of Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara of the decision to move ahead with deployment of the ABM. I was particularly pleased because, together with other members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I for some time have believed it essential that we move full speed ahead on building an anti-ballistic-missile system.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has held extensive hearings in executive session on the Chinese nuclear weapon capabilities. One of the most significant findings set forth in the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy report, issued July 19, 1967, was that:

The Chinese probably will achieve an operational ICBM capability before 1972. Conceivably, it could be ready as early as 1970-1971.

As I have previously pointed out, we cannot live in a world of atomic energy and discount completely the possibility of "surprise attack" on our Nation. We must be prepared during the 1970's to protect our citizens from an irrational nuclear attack from the Chinese Communists. We cannot—we should not—sit back and let ourselves be lulled into a feeling of false security. We should not—we cannot—rely on hope that the fear of retaliation will deter potential aggressors. We must be prepared for possible irrational action on the part of those nations who have already demonstrated their irrational conduct in dealings with not only other nations but even with their own people. As I have also pointed out in the past, if we can afford to spend \$24 billion a year to defend an ally—to protect South Vietnam from Communist aggression—we certainly can afford an effective anti-ballistic-missile system to protect the lives of our own people.

I applaud President Johnson and Secretary McNamara for supporting, during the past several years, the necessary

research and development efforts required to make possible the decision and for having decided in favor of an ABM deployment.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I commend President Johnson for his decision to move ahead immediately on a "thin" ABM defense system. The funds to initiate production and deployment are in the budget and have been approved by the Congress. Secretary McNamara's statement today assures release of the money.

The Atomic Military Applications Subcommittee, which I chair, will hold public and executive hearings in October on ABM defense and the problem of deterrence.

The President's decision points up the growing problem of strategic weapons and deterrence for the years ahead. Red China will have the capability to deploy ICBM's in the early 1970's. The Soviets have started deployment of an ABM defense and, according to published information, have increased by 50 percent in 1 year the number of their operational ICBM's. Despite the appealing notion that technology stands on a "plateau" and that the "scientific military revolution" has been "stabilized," in fact missile technology is advancing in almost all fields of offense and defense—payload, accuracy, guidance, maneuverability, and multiple warheads.

In matters affecting the East-West nuclear balance safety first should be the rule. Deterrence depends not only on forces in being; it also depends on the state of mind and will of the contestants. An ABM defense in Soviet hands lends itself superbly to bluffing and blackmail. Would an undefended United States maintain its resolve to act strongly if a defended U.S.S.R. appeared willing to risk a move against Berlin or any part of Western Europe? As the Soviet planners "war game" with the forces of the 1970's they are certainly asking themselves that type of question. It is the kind of question we need to ask ourselves.

GASOLINE PRICE INCREASES

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, the July-August 1967 issue of *The Drilling Contractor*, the magazine published by the American Association of Oilwell Drilling Contractors, contains an important statement by R. J. Moran, president of the American Association of Oilwell Drilling Contractors, with respect to gasoline price increases.

A constituent of mine, R. W. Stubbs, of Moorcroft, Wyo., has called the article to my attention, and I wish to share it with other Senators.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

For the second time within a scant period of just five months, Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, has admonished the U.S. petroleum industry to avoid gasoline price increases. In addressing the National Petroleum Council on July 13, Mr. Ackley urged oil companies to absorb the increased cost of supplying

Western Europe due to partial disruption of Middle East and North Africa shipments.

As usual in instances of this nature, the statement by a government official was widely published in the press. In his dissertation, Mr. Ackley asserted that the service station price for gasoline, exclusive of taxes, had risen 12%, or 2½ cents per gallon, since 1964.

It was not fair, or quite honest, of Mr. Ackley to single out 1964 as the basis for comparison. This gave the general public an erroneous picture of substantial gasoline price advances. It did not present a true picture because Mr. Ackley did not tell the public that gasoline prices in 1964 were abnormally depressed to the lowest level since 1948, or during the last 18 years.

Mr. Ackley also neglected to mention that, in contrast with 1964 service station price of 19.98 cents per gallon, over the last 18 years gasoline prices were in the 20-cent per gallon range during 9 years; were in the 21-cent per gallon range during 7 years; and in the 22-cent per gallon range in 1957 and so far in 1967. In addition to the foregoing facts, it would have been easy for Mr. Ackley to have mentioned that gasoline prices today are just 2¼ cents per gallon (about 10 percent) higher than in 1949, and only one-quarter of a cent above 1957 levels.

It would have been a whole lot fairer and more ethical for Mr. Ackley to have given the consuming public all the facts, than to have erroneously indicted an industry which is due so much credit for the way it has held its retail prices in line. Very few other industries can match petroleum's record.

RECORD OF THE FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION IN SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, few of us, I believe, realize how important the operation of the Farmers Home Administration is to the farmers of rural America. I have asked South Dakota's State director, Arlo Swanson, an exceptionally vigorous and able administrator, to prepare for me a compilation showing the recent activities of the administration in South Dakota, together with a composite score from the inception of the administration in 1946 through December 1966. Of particular concern to me is the fact that the interest earned and collected is 45.3 times greater than the losses or writeoffs. Put another way, the Government has collected in South Dakota since 1946 \$27,288,286, while suffering principal writeoffs and judgments in the amount of \$601,881. In many areas of FHA authority, there has never been a single dollar of writeoff in the loss column.

I feel that this impressive record should be of interest to other Senators and ask unanimous consent that the record of the South Dakota Farmers Home Administration program be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION,
Huron, S. Dak., September 14, 1967.

HON. GEORGE MCGOVERN,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GEORGE: Regarding your request for information of the loan activity of this agency in South Dakota pertaining to the dollars advanced and loans made in the

various loan programs, the attached chart will give you the activity from the inception of the program through December 31, 1966. The total interest earned and collected is 45.3 times greater than the writeoffs.

The following is a report on the activity in the State during the past fiscal year—July 1, 1966 through June 30, 1967:

	Number	Amount
Operating.....	2,418	\$11,996,269
Emergency.....	360	1,013,150
Economic opportunity, individual.....	215	485,530
Rural housing.....	522	4,120,610
Rural rental housing.....	7	127,950
Soil and water, individual.....	22	181,530
Farm ownership.....	655	15,557,680
Economic opportunity, cooperative.....	13	95,820
Association development grants.....	7	244,370
Soil and water, association.....	38	3,740,890
Sewer and water planning grants.....	2	26,190
Total.....	4,259	37,589,989

The total loans advanced during the 1967 fiscal year amounted to \$37,672,279, serving some 54,000 South Dakota farm and rural people. This compares with \$10,000,000 loaned through the Farmers Home Administration in South Dakota during 1966. A total of \$107,747,400 has been loaned out to South Dakota farmers and rural residents during the past six years.

The total applications on hand as of August 31 were as follows:

Operating and emergency.....	96
Farm ownership.....	471
Soil and water, individual.....	12
Rural housing.....	389
Senior citizen housing.....	7
Rural rental housing.....	10
Labor housing.....	1
Domestic water.....	71
Waste disposal.....	8
Combination of water and sewer.....	16
Grazing associations.....	23
Rural recreation.....	12
Domestic water development grants.....	11
Waste disposal grants.....	7
Comprehensive area sewer and water planning grants.....	6
Watershed and flood prevention.....	4
Economic opportunity, individual.....	59
Economic opportunity, cooperatives.....	6
Resource conservation and development.....	4

Total applications on hand as of Aug. 31, 1967..... 1,213

The outstanding caseload by types of loans as of June 30, 1967 showing our loan and technical assistance to farmers, ranchers and rural residents is as follows:

Operating loans.....	2,952
Farm ownership loans.....	2,819
Rural housing loans.....	1,873
Soil and water individual loans.....	111
Emergency loans.....	408
Economic opportunity loans.....	406
Grazing Association loans serving 380 farm and ranch families.....	63
Water and/or sewer facility loans and grants serving 2,263 rural families.....	19
Recreation facility loans with 2,786 rural members.....	18
Economic Opportunity Cooperative Association loans serving 147 farm, ranch and rural families.....	25
Resource Conservation and Development loans serving 25 farmers.....	3
Comprehensive planning grants—one to Turner County and one to Fall River-Shannon Counties.....	2
Senior Citizen or Rural Rental Housing loans with 67 rental units.....	11

Very sincerely,

ARLO G. SWANSON,
State Director.

(Attachment.)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION—FHA LOAN ACTIVITY FROM INCEPTION OF PROGRAM THROUGH DEC. 31, 1966, IN SOUTH DAKOTA

Type of loan	Total loaned	Principal collected	Interest collected	Outstanding balance	Percent repayment to matured principal	Principal writeoffs and judgments
Operating from November 1946.....	\$112,173,025	\$75,398,295	\$11,552,513	\$36,308,419	92	\$466,311
Direct farm ownership from July 1937.....	17,850,785	7,133,205	4,153,990	10,682,675	97	34,905
Insured farm ownership from July 1947.....	57,847,556	8,743,941	8,430,126	49,097,932	96	5,683
Direct rural housing from July 1949.....	12,536,174	3,218,154	2,072,984	9,318,020	95	0
Insured rural housing from October 1965.....	3,286,550	63,093	67,037	3,223,457	102	0
Rental housing from July 1962.....	388,390	399	2,244	387,991	100	0
Individual soil and water from July 1938.....	1,216,724	776,140	177,089	437,040	100	3,544
Association soil and water from September 1954.....	8,768,726	130,163	455,655	8,638,563	100	0
Individual economic opportunity from January 1965.....	716,640	85,553	15,646	630,843	99	244
Economic opportunity cooperatives from January 1965.....	90,000	8,922	2,296	81,078	100	0
Emergency and special livestock from April 1949.....	13,578,896	12,269,569	358,706	1,218,133	98	91,194
Total, all current programs.....	228,453,466	107,827,434	27,288,286	120,024,151	98	601,881

¹ Direct.

² Insured.

³ WF.

HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS COMPLETELY IN ACCORD WITH EXISTING U.S. LAW—CXXXIX

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President—

In the United States we have long since established much higher standards in the bills of rights to our federal and state constitutions than those sought to be drawn out of the domestic field into the international domain.

These are the words not of any of the dozens of spokesmen of religious, labor, civic, or professional organizations supporting U.S. ratification of the Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery. These words are a direct quotation from the prepared statement of Mr. Eberhard P. Deutsch, representing the American Bar Association, before the Committee on Foreign Relations last week.

I agree wholeheartedly with this excerpt from Mr. Deutsch's statement. Every one of the human rights established and guaranteed by these three conventions is already the birthright of every American.

These conventions merely establish minimum universal standards of human dignity and human rights. U.S. law—both State and Federal—establish and guarantee far, far more.

The ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], on February 23 of this year questioned the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Arthur J. Goldberg on this very point:

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Are there any human rights referred to or established or promoted or advocated in any of these conventions that are not already existent in the laws of the United States, Federal and State?

Ambassador GOLDBERG. No, there are none. Senator HICKENLOOPER. Therefore, the adoption of these conventions or any of them would neither impose on the United States nor compel the United States to the adoption of any laws which we do not already have on the books.

Ambassador GOLDBERG. That is correct, Senator Hickenlooper.

Mr. President, I think the words of Senator HICKENLOOPER and Ambassador

Goldberg are clear and unequivocal. There exists no legal obstacle to U.S. ratification of the Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery.

Once again I urge the Senate to give its advice and consent to these three conventions and move with dispatch to the long-overdue consideration of the Genocide Convention and the Convention on Freedom of Association.

THE IMPORTANCE OF INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, an excellent essay concerning the importance of individual freedom in this Nation was recently brought to my attention. It was written by a teenager, Miss Janet Hall, who lives in St. Charles, Mo.

So long as our young people recognize the challenges and opportunities of our free society, our Nation will continue to grow and prosper. We have our problems and our ills, but as Miss Hall so aptly states it:

We are living in the most wonderful country on earth.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the essay be printed in the RECORD.

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

WHY IS AMERICA THE RICHEST COUNTRY IN THE WORLD?

(By Miss Janet Hall, St. Charles, Mo.)

We are living in the most wonderful country on earth, and we often cannot appreciate what it is to be really hungry. It is easy for us to take for granted all our luxuries. Have you ever wondered why we are the richest nation on earth, with only 7 percent of the land area of the world, and 6 percent of the population? How did we manage in 200 years to become so incredibly wealthy while people for 6,000 years have lived in hunger and poverty, and still do?

The answer is individual freedom. We are free to choose our careers, change jobs, live, shop, and vacation where we choose. Free men can have dreams and ambitions, and can make them into realities. They labor

with a hope of reward and not a fear of punishment.

Free men will produce as much as they can, and this private enterprise is what has built our nation. Our freedoms are guaranteed by our Constitution; and as long as we guard our Constitution and what it stands for, we shall remain free.

PROFESSOR EISNER OPPOSES THE TAX INCREASE FOR THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the September 17 Outlook section of the Washington Post carried what I consider to be an unusually perceptive letter regarding the administration's call for a tax increase. The writer is Prof. Robert Eisner, chairman of the department of economics at Northwestern University. He is one of the Nation's most brilliant economists and a very perceptive observer of public affairs.

His argument against the tax increase is on the grounds that this increase is to be used entirely for another ill-advised escalation of the Vietnam war. There is no other economic justification for a tax increase now, he writes. In his words:

It is not even a matter of "supporting our boys over there." The tax increase is intended to finance sending more boys over there. It is to accompany further escalation of the war. Refusal to enact this tax increase would therefore constitute a striking repudiation of the policy of escalation of the war.

I ask unanimous consent that Professor Eisner's letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

AGAINST A TAX INCREASE

In rendering advice on matters of policy, economists should be careful to distinguish between the implications of their professional expertise and their own political preferences or obligations. The tax increase proposed by the Administration raises this issue in striking fashion.

While economists may differ in details of their evaluation and we, like everyone else, can well be wrong in forecasts, a widespread consensus could be found for the view that, given the growth of the economy and rates of government expenditures no greater than they have been in the past, no tax increase is warranted. If there were no increase in the stream of purchasing power pumped into the economy by Federal expenditures, and the proposed tax increase were enacted, there is good reason to believe that the economy would suffer serious deficiencies in demand, with all of the usual consequences of increased unemployment and declining profits.

The economic case for a tax increase must rest upon the prospect of increased Federal expenditures. This increase could be in one or both of two directions: 1—vitaly needed funds, on a major scale, to eliminate the slums and inadequate education in our urban ghettos which are threatening to tear the country apart; 2—increased billions to finance further escalation of the war in Vietnam and the dispatch of many thousands of additional troops to that apparently endless venture.

President Johnson has made it clear that he does not want the tax increase in order to meet our growing and critical needs at home. While calling again for enactment of some of the all too modest programs he has presented previously, he and his advisers emphasize their intent to keep down

domestic spending. Rather, President Johnson makes it perfectly clear that the essential purpose of the tax increase is to finance continued escalation of the war in Vietnam.

The tax increase is not necessary to finance existing domestic programs and it is not being recommended in order to finance a major expansion of domestic programs. The tax increase is not necessary to finance the hitherto existing rate of expenditures of some 25 or 30 billion dollars per year on the war in Vietnam. The only economic justification of the tax increase is hence to pay for a further escalation of the war in Vietnam and consequent further increase in spending for that war. This is the message that professional economists should give, loudly and clearly, to the Administration, the Congress, and the public. And now for the politics!

There has been much concern of late that Congress has abdicated its constitutional responsibilities in matters of war and peace. The proposed tax increase offers a great opportunity for the Congress to reassert its authority. It is not even a matter of "supporting our boys over there." The tax increase is intended to finance sending more boys over there. It is to accompany further escalation of the war. Refusal to enact this tax increase would therefore constitute a striking repudiation of the policy of escalation of the war.

ROBERT EISNER,

Chairman, Department of Economics,
Northwestern University.
EVANSTON, ILL.

GOVERNMENT GRANTS ARE UNDERCUTTING OUR PRIVATE RESEARCH COMPANIES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have been a little shocked to learn that Government grants to universities and nonprofit institutions are literally driving our private research firms out of business. The fact is that private companies are now transferring many of their research contracts to universities and nonprofit organizations which can perform the research more cheaply because of Government support. I think this raises a serious question of public policy, because not only are long established private research companies being pushed out of business, but in effect the Federal Government is indirectly subsidizing private companies which place their contracts with universities and nonprofit institutions. This result was certainly not the intent of the Federal grants.

In addition it appears that the Federal Government itself, in some instances, is not giving fair consideration to private firms in placing research contracts. Despite the fact that Government agencies advertise for research jobs, there seems to be a well-established policy in some agencies to favor universities and nonprofit organizations. I believe that such policies in the placement of contracts violate the intent of the competitive bidding provisions of the Federal Procurement Regulations.

I have always supported legitimate aid to our universities and nonprofit institutions, but I feel that some investigation is in order as to the misuse and adverse effects of these grants. Clearly, any violation of the Federal procurement regulations should be corrected.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter from a constituent of mine which documents these points quite vividly be printed in the RECORD.

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

AMERICAN BIO-SYNTHETICS CORP.,

Milwaukee, Wis., July 20, 1967.

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: Your efforts and great interest in economy in all branches of the government is well known.

You may therefore be interested to learn about a tremendous misuse of tax dollars and how it is driving a small essential industry out of business.

This industry which is now desperately fighting for its very existence is the Research and Development industry. The unfair competition which is driving us out of business with our own tax dollars is the University—bulging with federal grants.

Our firm has struggled along in this State for twenty three years.

And during this time we have listened to and read about how necessary and desirable research facilities are for the State industry.

In the intervening years we have made many contributions to the economy of this State among them being responsible for the conception and inception of complete new industries which now contribute many thousands of tax dollars and provide thousands of jobs. No, there was no great publicity—we just "did our job".

And we have contributed in a very tangible way to stem the "brain drain" doing this when this catchy phrase was not even invented.

Now we find that the clients which we have had for years tell us that they can go to UWM or the University at Madison and get the work done much "cheaper".

As an example, A Wisconsin chemical company which has been a long time customer explained that costs at the University were so much lower that they just could not continue with us, and besides the University had received very substantial grants for new instrumentation and it now must justify these purchases and get some industrial jobs. The implication is, we presume, that more federal grants will then be forthcoming.

Needless to say, we equipped our laboratories without government dollars at a very considerable personal sacrifice.

The latest insult however came about just a week ago.

In carefully examining the Commerce Business Daily in a desperate hunt for business opportunities, we came upon a request by National Institute of Health under the heading Research and Development Sources Sought.

The notice briefly described the requirement as a "large scale collection of rat pituitary glands and the performance of fractionation and purification of the hormones extracted therefrom".

A copy of this notice is attached to the letter.

Because of our previous specific experiences in this field we responded immediately briefly outlining these experiences.

As a follow up and to indicate our very vital interest in this project, we called the contracting officer at the Institute on the telephone and were referred to a Dr. Lieberman.

We asked Dr. Lieberman if the information furnished to him was sufficient to qualify us for consideration as a source to perform this exacting technical service.

Dr. Lieberman's reply was "what is your price for these hormones"? We replied that it was customary for a government agency to define the parameters of the requirements and to give us time to prepare a cost estimate.

Dr. Lieberman's casual reply was that he did not recommend that we waste time in preparing a cost estimate because to all in-

tents and purposes the contractor had already been selected. I argued that we should be given at least some consideration because of our past experience but Dr. Lieberman made some vague reference to other organizations having the same capability and that institutions like Johns Hopkins had received sizeable grants sometime ago to set up such preparations laboratories and he was sure that they could do this job.

He also added "as you know, we always favor the universities and the non-profits". We like to call these contracts training grants.

We could go on to quote other similar experiences but we do not want to bore you with too much detail. It would be a repetition of this same kind of unfair competition. We desperately need your help.

You helped giant American Motors which is now "small business" (so says the SBA). We are mini-micro by comparison but our employees are entitled to the same consideration.

They too, have mortgages to pay and children to educate.

And it would be good to keep at least one private research and development facility alive in Wisconsin.

Most of our people have been with us many, many years.

I refuse to believe that this is the end for them. Some are past 45 and could not get comparable jobs elsewhere.

Yes, we do have a desperate problem, Senator. We don't ask for any special favors but in this case I think that we are (as a highly competent technical group) entitled to some tangible help and support from our lavish Uncle. We just can't believe that our talents do not have application somewhere in this great Government maze.

Yes, we've filled out about every form and we are listed with about every government agency, but the computers seem to prefer the universities.

This is a special case. I think that you will agree that we have been treated shabbily.

May I have your comments?

At some of the dinners I attended in your honor, you called me "Ham" as if I was a friend of long standing. I will therefore sign this letter that way.

Sincerely,

AMERICAN BIO-SYNTHETICS CORP.
HAMILTON A. PINKALLA.

[From Commerce Business Daily, July 7, 1967]

A—Research & development sources sought for large scale collection of rat pituitary glands and hypothalamal perform fractionation and purification of rat anterior pituitary hormones (FSH GH LH and prolactin) purity and potency assays will be required evidence demonstrating competence and reliability in performing this work must be furnished not later than 10 days from date of this publication to Mr. W. A. Carr, Building 31, Rm 10A52, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Md. 20014. Telephone inquiries will not be honored. See Note 68 on last page of this issue.

A—The National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic diseases invites proposals for the publication of Arthritis and Rheumatic Diseases Volume IV.

THE ST. LOUIS BASEBALL CARDINALS HAVE DONE IT AGAIN

Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. President, this is a great day for Missourians. The St. Louis baseball Cardinals have done it again, and with a high degree of authority. There are still 11 games to play, but the Cards will represent the National League in the world's series.

The 1967 Cardinals are a formidable team, combining the combativeness of

the old Gas House Gang, the pitching craft of Dizzy and Paul Dean, and the Murderer's Row of the old Yankees.

Earlier in the year I had hoped we would have an all-Missouri Interstate 70 series between the Kansas City Athletics and the St. Louis Cardinals, but we will have to put that off to a future year.

Meantime, I share Cardinal Manager Red Schoendienst's hope that the best team wins that torrid American League race. The junior circuit will need to field its best.

The St. Louis leg of the series will be played in beautiful, new Busch Memorial Stadium. August A. Busch, Jr., owner of the Cardinals and a civic leader, is responsible for a great deal of the progress of that city in recent years.

All Missourians are proud of the Cardinals and, I am sure, join me in extending to my colleagues in the Senate an invitation to meet us in St. Louis.

THE WISDOM OF AN OWL

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the able Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern] has written a most perceptive, penetrating, and pertinent comment on the war in Vietnam. It appears in the current, September 25, issue of the New Republic.

Senator McGovern questions the symbolic ornithology which divides supporters and dissenters into hawks and doves. He would prefer to call them ostriches and owls. He then proceeds to illuminate how these birds may be distinguished. A more pithy summary of the basic differences between these two attitudes could not be penned.

I recommend its reading, clipping, and circulating widely. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

VIETNAM AND THE BIRDS

SIRS: For many months those who have spoken out on our Vietnam policy have been labeled either "hawks" or "doves." Those who have supported the escalation policy toward a steadily larger war have been called "hawks." Those who have questioned the wisdom of the war have been called "doves."

I have never felt comfortable with that distribution of labels because it seemed to imply that the "hawks" were tough and hard-headed whereas the "doves" were soft or perhaps nervous.

It has always seemed to me that the so-called "doves" who have spoken out against the drift of our policy in recent years were taking a more tough-minded, realistic view of our national interest than the "hawks" who have dreamed about exporting American freedom to the jungles in B-52's.

I suggest that a new division of bird labels may now be appropriate—the "ostrich" and the "owl."

As related to Vietnam, I would include among the ostriches those who believe the following:

(1) That it is practical and desirable to sacrifice American troops and tax dollars to assist one group of Vietnamese against another group of Vietnamese when the group we are supposedly assisting has all but quit the struggle.

(2) That it is practical and desirable to win support for an unrepresentative regime in South Vietnam (the recent elections notwithstanding) by bombing North Vietnam.

(3) That it is practical and desirable to sacrifice a \$2 million airplane, a \$10,000 bomb load, and a skilled pilot (and who can place a value on his life) trying to knock out a \$50 rope bridge that will be repaired by nightfall even if it is hit.

(4) That it is practical and desirable for America to police Asia even when the rest of the world thinks the so-called police action is foolish and self-defeating.

(5) That our bombers are spreading freedom in the jungles and raising American prestige by destroying the villages, the rice crops and countless innocent people—all in an effort to wipe out a band of guerrillas that seems to be recruiting more and more supporters as a result of our tactics.

(6) That we are advancing the cause of democracy by backing General Ky—our ally in South Vietnam who has said that Hitler is his only hero.

(7) That we are somehow weakening Red China by throwing our youth and \$30 billion a year into a tiny, obscure jungle country where not a single Chinese soldier is being sacrificed.

On the other hand, I would include among the owls those who believe:

(1) That American forces should not be committed to the jungles of Asia unless there is an unmistakable challenge to our national security and survival as was the case with the Japanese attack at Pearl Harbor.

(2) That America has no commitment and no obligation to sacrifice our blood and treasure trying to save a regime that does not have the support of its own people.

(3) That if outside intervention is needed to settle a family quarrel in Asia or elsewhere, such intervention should be under the auspices of the United Nations rather than a lone operation by the United States.

(4) That America has needs and opportunities at home and elsewhere in the world that should not be further jeopardized by an excessive preoccupation with Vietnam.

(5) That it is dangerously reckless to risk provoking World War III by sending our bombers within seconds of the Chinese frontier.

(6) That instead of bogging down deeper and deeper in the mire of Southeast Asia, we should stop sacrificing our marines, soldiers, pilots and planes and go into a consolidated holding action accompanied by a determined diplomatic effort to settle the war on the best terms possible.

GEORGE MCGOVERN,
U.S. Senate.

THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION'S EFFORTS TO CONTROL THE PRACTICE OF MEDICINE

Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. President, as Senators know, I have long opposed the Food and Drug Administration's continuing efforts to control the practice of medicine.

The FDA's latest step in this direction is a new set of sweeping regulations on the labeling and advertising of drugs.

Medical World News recently published an article written by Dr. Morris Fishbein, an individual who is well-known and respected for his more than 50 years of experience as a physician and editor.

Dr. Fishbein spells out the possible effects of the regulations, which he terms "infinitesimal absurdities." He concludes that the ultimate effect of the regulations is to cast doubt on the ability of physicians to make any individual judgments about drugs and to remove from the physician both the responsibility and the right to practice that his license confers upon him. Further, the new regula-

tions put on the advertiser an impossible demand to project every conceivable facet of information.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Fishbein's article be printed in the RECORD.

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

ARE THE NEW DRUG RULES AN "APOTHEOSIS OF ABSURDITY"?

(By Dr. Morris Fishbein)

Next week marks the Food and Drug Administration's deadline for comment on its new regulations for labeling and advertising drugs prescribed by physicians. The proposed regulations, which were first published in May, seem to go far beyond previous requirements.

When an advertisement suggests how the product shall be used or suggests a dosage or contains any claim as to safety or effectiveness, it must also provide a summary of side effects and contraindications. A reminder advertisement is permitted, which may contain only the name of the drug, dosage form and ingredients, and information relative to the manufacturer or distributor, but no recommendation or suggestion regarding use, dosage, safety, effectiveness, "or other quality" of the drug. Another section elaborates in detail what is meant by the terms "side effects," "contraindications," and "effectiveness." The limitations on these terms are emphasized, intensified, and deemphasized. Indeed, the detail reaches so far as to require that advertisements for a drug offered as an antibacterial must name the types of infections and microorganisms for which the drug is effective clinically.

"Fair balance" is demanded between claims for safety or effectiveness and information relating to limitations on safety or effectiveness. As proof of positive claims, there must be "substantial" evidence. The advertiser cannot claim advantages for a drug without simultaneously disclosing pertinent disadvantages. He must not "publish articles" if these articles fail to include reference to other articles citing side effects. The advertiser must not refer to articles that fail to disclose the extent to which the claimed results may be done to placebo effect or concomitant therapy.

The detail in which the judgment of the reader of an article is guided in deciding whether or not the article is authoritative and dependable or false and misleading or outside the limitations considered desirable by the FDA is unheard of in previous governmental regulations. In the section on "fair balance," the paragraphs on evaluation of statistical material seem to go far beyond the ability of any except the most profound statisticians. Clinical investigators may find themselves completely baffled.

ALL IMPLEMENTING FACTORS

Any advertisement or statement that proposes a variation in dosage greater than that authorized in the approved package labeling would be subject to challenge.

Advertisements are controlled with reference to the number of pages and the size of the page. The exact area and space of the summary are stipulated. One paragraph demands that information related to side effects and contraindications shall be presented with "a prominence and readability reasonably comparable with the presentation of information relating to effectiveness of the drug, taking into account all implementing factors such as typography, layout, contrast, headlines, paragraphing, white space, and any other techniques apt to achieve emphasis."

Even beyond this, the advertiser is instructed as to the use of borders, headlines, the relationships of facing pages, and explanatory directions as to where to look for

the side effects and contraindications. The regulations make clear that every type of advertising is covered by these stipulations. And in a still more comprehensive paragraph, even film strips, sound recordings, and scientific exhibits are covered.

Should a manufacturer wish to discuss a drug in a motion picture or a film strip with audio or visual labeling, and should this method of presentation make it difficult to satisfy the stipulation for lists of side effects and contraindications, the statement must be made that printed matter will be distributed covering what is not in the audiovisual material. Exhibits must include a panel on side effects and contraindications, and other panels will have to tell the viewer that the side-effects panel is on view.

As a medical editor with some 54 years of experience, the proposals included in these regulations appear, if I interpret them correctly, to be beyond any reasonable attempt to protect either the medical profession, the publishers, or the advertisers against the hazards associated with the use of prescribed pharmaceuticals. These regulations represent an invasion of medical practice and medical education that is wholly unwarranted in the present state of medical science.

Prescription drugs are limited in sale and purchase to those qualified and licensed. If physicians are competent to diagnose disease and to direct the patient as to his course of living for the protection of his health, they should be considered possessors of sufficient knowledge and judgment to be aware of the benefits and hazards associated with the pharmaceuticals they recommend.

LICENSE AND RESPONSIBILITY

When a physician is granted a medical degree and is licensed to practice, he assumes the responsibilities associated with such education and licensure. Apparently, the FDA is convinced that its obligation under the law is to spell out the limitations on his prescribing, in terms so positive, so blatant, so meticulous, and so inescapable that he will henceforth practice only within the exact borders that the FDA may determine.

Despite the painstaking detail of the stipulations, the FDA's wording is still frequently far from specific. In addition to "safety" and "effectiveness," there is a reference to "other quality" of a drug, which is a phrase so all-embracing as to defy definition. The FDA assumes the authority and ability to interpret any illustration as to its meaning. Obviously its officials think they can decide whether or not the face of a person shown in a picture indicates the severe pain of a headache or of menstruation, the anxiety associated with the fear of death or the loss of business.

The regulations demand a bibliographic service better than those of *Excerpta Medica* or Medlars. Apparently they insist that every reference in the total medical literature be found. The advertisers cannot quote a recognized authority without indicating that there are other recognized authorities that differ with him.

The previous animadversions on statistical studies, in the light of current debates among statisticians, make these paragraphs represent the apotheosis of absurdity. If I read it correctly, one of these paragraphs says, in highly complicated and abstruse language, that one cannot emphasize a medical opinion unsupported by statistics acceptable to the FDA. Even among experts in advertising typography, there is no unanimity of opinion on the effectiveness of borders, headlines, and other technicalities, which the proposed regulations seem to take for granted.

When the amended Food and Drug Act was under consideration, many doubted the ability of the FDA to pass on questions related to the effectiveness of drugs. Some

even hesitated on questions of dosage, toxicity, and side effects. I am not aware that anyone involved in medical editing, practice, or education imagined that the development and interpretation of the law and regulations would carry the bureaucracy into such infinitesimal absurdities. Even a slight awareness of the history of previous legislation and regulations would suggest that what is here attempted will simply breed more and more of the same, until the mountain of minuscule stipulations finally disintegrates by the very weight of its particles.

THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM IN INDIA

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in the New York Times of September 14, Ambassador Chester Bowles wrote from New Delhi, using India as an example, about our foreign aid program—what it is, what it can do, and what it cannot achieve. His statement that what American aid can do, and in many parts of the world is doing, is to enable the developing nations which are prepared to help themselves build their own solid foundations for independence and national growth is clear, concise, and very much to the point. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

TOPICS: WHAT FOREIGN AID CAN AND CANNOT DO

(By Chester Bowles)

NEW DELHI.—Why does the United States, in view of its many domestic burdens, provide loans, grants and technical assistance to promote economic development in Asia, Africa and Latin America? What can the United States reasonably expect in return for such assistance?

If our primary objective is to assure unquestioning support for our foreign policy objectives or servile gratitude toward a beneficent Uncle Sam, we should have abandoned the foreign-aid program long ago. We can no more purchase the loyalty or gratitude of sovereign nations than we can buy the loyalty and gratitude of individuals.

TO HELP THEMSELVES

What American aid can do and in many parts of the world is doing is to enable those developing nations which are prepared to help themselves build their own solid foundations for independence and national growth. Although we may be angered on occasion by criticism of American policies by the very nations we are striving to help, we should not allow our irritations to obscure this central objective.

In this framework the more relevant questions, it seems to me, are the following: Is the recipient nation using American aid efficiently? Is it making an honest effort to tax its people fairly? To encourage widespread land ownership? To grow more food? To expand its exports? To root out corruption? To reduce its rate of population increase? To stimulate individual initiative?

Such criteria, in my view, are essential to the development of a realistic and mutually advantageous relationship between the aid-giving and the aid-receiving nations.

ACHIEVEMENT IN INDIA

Against this background let us look at the record of our foreign-aid program in India, the population of which totals more than half of all the non-Communist developing nations combined.

Casual visitors to India are struck with the awesome poverty and squalor. Millions of

Indians are still inadequately fed, while millions more cannot read or write. There are large slum areas in most Indian cities. Consequently, it is not surprising that many observers have come to look at this Asian nation as a bottomless pit.

However, on the positive side of the Indian balance sheet are some impressive economic accomplishments which have recently been obscured by the impact of two serious droughts in succession. Since the early 1950's these accomplishments include:

India's steel production has been increased sevenfold.

India's electrical power capacity is now five times what it was in 1953 and it will double again in the next five years.

India's fertilizer industry is now growing steadily.

India's tax system is being revamped to provide greater incentives for foreign investment and for individual initiative.

Malaria has been reduced from 100 million cases annually to less than 50,000 in 1966.

Four times as many youngsters are now going to school.

More than 30 million acres have been added to the 50 million under irrigation.

TO PREVENT VIETNAMS

This year nearly sixteen million acres of farmland are being planted with new high yielding wheat and rice paddy seeds.

A vigorous nationwide program has been launched in an attempt to reduce India's annual population growth from the present 2.4 per cent to 1 per cent by 1971.

These basic achievements, made possible by American and other foreign assistance and by a generally able Indian administration, have created a solid base for further development; indeed, many American and Indian economists are persuaded that with normal rains and continuing foreign aid India may become self-sufficient in food grain by 1972 and able to do without foreign governmental assistance by 1977.

Although our minds and our national budgets are primarily focused on Vietnam, it is important that we strengthen our efforts to help prevent new and even more costly Vietnams from developing elsewhere. Well planned and sensitively administered American aid coupled with an effective effort by the recipient nations themselves can help harassed new governments create nations that their own people feel are worth defending.

To assist this evolutionary movement toward political independence and self-sustaining economic growth is the only valid purpose of American assistance to the developing nations—and it should be reason enough.

(Chester Bowles is Ambassador to India.)

INCENTIVES FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW OR EXPANDED JOB-PRODUCING INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL ESTABLISHMENTS IN RURAL AREAS—LET US PASS S. 2134 AND END THE ECONOMIC DRAIN IN RURAL AREAS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, as we continue to agonize over the events of this long hot summer in the cities and to seek constructive solutions for such events, I strongly feel that we should delve into one of the great sources of urban discontent. That source is the great drain from the rural into the urban areas of the Nation. I feel this drain has been a most significant factor in creating the deeply disturbing problem, the most promising approach which I have seen in some time is embodied in S. 2134 which I am cosponsoring.

The bill provides a series of tax in-

centives to encourage private investment with the aim of utilizing more fully and effectively the human and natural resources of rural America, slowing the migration from the rural areas, which is principally the result of a lack of economic opportunity, and reducing the population pressures on our metropolitan areas.

A summary of the provisions of the bill follows:

The bill proposes as tax incentives a 14-percent investment credit on machinery, and a 7-percent investment credit on the cost of buildings. Other tax incentives are an accelerated depreciation of two-thirds of normal, useful or class life for machinery, equipment and buildings, and 125 percent for salaries and wages paid to low-income persons hired for a period of 3 years. All credits and deductions can be carried backward 3 years or forward for up to 10 years.

To qualify, a county cannot have a city with a population of more than 50,000. The county must also either have at least 15 percent of its families with annual incomes under \$3,000 or have an annual employment rate decline of 5 percent during the last 5 years. A county in which the closing or curtailing of operations by a Department of Defense installation has caused a substantial out-migration could qualify, as could an Indian reservation.

In order to qualify, an industry must create at least 10 new jobs at the start of its operations and must show a reasonable ratio between capital and jobs created. In addition, at least half of the original working force must be area residents.

Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, has pointed out the extent of the problem in the rural to urban drain. He states:

I don't need to tell you that there is a glut of people piling into our already over-piled cities. But perhaps you did not know that, in addition to your natural population gains, people are coming to you from rural America at the rate of 500,000 to 600,000 a year, most of them displaced persons, displaced from the countryside by the very agricultural technology that has produced so much for so many.

Studies show that these migrants from rural America are over-concentrated in low-income jobs.

This troubling rural drain has led to 70 per cent of our people living on only 1 per cent of our land while 30 per cent live on all the rest.

A most unfortunate result of such concentration is that the cost of government increases even faster than population. For example, the capital outlay required of the city of New York to provide facilities for each commuter is \$21,000; in Washington, D.C., that outlay rises to \$23,000 per commuter car. Contrast this with the total street department budget for the entire year in Fargo, a North Dakota city of 50,000, which this year will spend less than \$10 per citizen on all its transportation facilities.

But even greater than the spiraling financial cost of the urban to rural drain is the spiraling human cost. It is a tragic sight to see the frustration and misery of so many rural people who are thrust by lack of economic opportunities at home into the hostile environment of the teeming urban area. Surely this frustration and misery is a great

factor in the tragic events erupting in our cities.

There is no inexorable law which dictates that the cities must ever grow and the rural areas diminish. There are other alternatives besides the populating of our small towns by only older people, boarded up shops and grass growing in the sidewalks.

Mr. President, S. 2134 can greatly aid in combating drain. The major reason for moving from the rural to the urban areas is the lack of employment opportunities in the rural areas. This proposal can greatly stimulate such employment.

Mr. President, the Secretary of Agriculture's proposal has stated the problem; the eruptions in many of our cities have violently underlined the problem; this proposal is a constructive approach to meeting the problem. I hope the Committee on Finance, of which I am a member, can schedule early hearings on this proposal so that we can see some quick action on it.

A COST ANALYSIS OF THE VIETNAM WAR

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, Editor J. R. Wiggins, in the Washington Post of September 17, offered us a cost analysis of the Vietnam war. He barely mentioned money; that was not the chief point in this particular cost analysis. Mr. Wiggins wrote:

The practical issue before the American people is simply whether the costs of preventing such a conquest or the costs of acquiescing in it are greater. That, for us, is the single, central issue of the conflict.

Mr. Wiggins concludes that the prospects for peace—at least for peace as mankind is apt to know it in the foreseeable future—will be greatly improved if there occurs in Vietnam a demonstration that wars of national liberation involve an unendurable risk and an unbearable cost for the aggressors. Hence, in the interest of peace, there can be little question, if, indeed, any at all, that the cost of putting down the Communists in Vietnam must be met to forestall further such guerrilla wars in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

A COST ANALYSIS OF THE VIETNAM WAR—WIN OR LOSE

(By J. R. Wiggins)

It is natural, logical and inevitable for a people to make periodic reexaminations of a struggle involving half a million fighting men, requiring \$27 billion a year and influencing domestic and foreign policy in every quarter.

Wars have their own dynamics and make and unmake issues as they go along, so we need to examine what now is the central issue of the war in South Vietnam, to study the consequences of having that issue settled one way or another and at least to enter conjectures whether the cost of influencing the settlement of that issue in accordance with our preferences is worth the pain and the burden.

In Vietnam, there is a host of subsidiary issues (by no means unimportant because subsidiary). But the central issue is now, as it has been for some time, quite clear.

A BEARABLE PRICE

The world is watching Vietnam to see if the rules of one country, state sovereignty or territory, at an endurable risk and a bearable price, can impose a government and system of their choice upon a neighboring people by inciting internal subversion, supporting indigenous insurrection, engaging in infiltration and intervening and invading as necessary. This is the formula of the Communists' celebrated "wars of liberation."

The North Vietnamese so far seem convinced that the risk is endurable and the price bearable. The United States has intervened to make the price unbearable and the risk not endurable. The practical issue before the American people is simply whether the costs of preventing such a conquest or the costs of acquiescing in it are greater. That, for us, is the single, central issue of the conflict.

Since the ascendancy of Mao Tse-tung it has been popular in the Communist world to call such conquests "wars of liberation"; in the diplomatic vernacular of any prior generation, they would have been identified as ordinary aggression.

American policy ought to proceed from decisions on what would be likely to happen if the conquest succeeded and what would be likely to happen if it failed. So what would happen if it succeeded?

PROOF OF A THEORY

To begin with the broadest philosophical consequences, it surely would give an impetus throughout the Communist world to the forces that are persuaded of the efficacy of "wars of national liberation." Such a practical demonstration of the minimal risks and relatively low costs of this kind of conquest would play into the hands of every doctrinal Communist hawk in every undecided Communist government, lending great force to the proponents of adventurous imperialistic policy in every arena offering any plausible opportunity for such conquest. It would greatly strengthen the Chinese Communists against the Soviet Communists and it would immeasurably fortify the hardliners in the Soviet regime.

What this would mean for the United States and other non-Communist states, no one can say in any specific way, but it is safe to say that it would not mean a period of peaceful coexistence. On the contrary, it would probably usher in decades of political tumult and conflict, particularly in Asia, Africa and South America, and might even propel us into a worldwide thermonuclear holocaust set off by wars in even more dangerous areas than Southeast Asia.

The effects in Southeast Asia of North Vietnam's success in South Vietnam are more foreseeable. It is clear that the military predicament of Laos would be totally untenable. It is plain that Cambodia could not long support an independent role. Thailand certainly would have to re-examine its position and might have to exercise its genius for accommodation with neighboring aggressors.

The failure of United States policy in South Vietnam would certainly prompt the reasonable conclusion in every government in Asia that the United States was unable or unwilling to defend countries threatened with this kind of aggression. It would be logical for many of them to make appropriate diplomatic changes.

It is quite clear that American power and influence would be at an end in South Asia. This adverse consequence might be diminished, of course, by a demonstration elsewhere (say in Thailand) that the United States retained its willingness and ability to defend Asian friends.

But to lay down the gauge in South Vietnam and pick it up elsewhere would be illogical and politically impossible. And the lesson of failure in South Vietnam might fatally prejudice any subsequent endeavor if it

were made. It would be wise to write off South Asia for the time being.

NATIONALISM A FACTOR

Would this be fatal to American interests? Probably it would not be fatal, however damaging in the immediate future. It is possible to make a tenable argument that the removal of American power from the region would not permanently put all of the area into the control of forces hostile to American interests.

In the fullness of time, forces of nationalism and regionalism would undoubtedly assert themselves in Asia and produce states with differing degrees of independent sovereignty. There is no reason to suppose that the system which has failed to produce progress and peace in China would find it easier to impose peace and achieve progress in an even larger and less homogeneous environment involving the whole of non-Soviet Asia.

Whatever degree of submission to communism might temporarily prevail over much of Asia, from India to Japan, in the final unrolling of history, reassertion of national impulse and local interests could be expected. India and Pakistan might surrender or compromise their independence but a residual passion for national recognition and identity would linger within the body politic, "murmuring in the shell and waiting for the tide to return and flood it again."

LESS THAN AN ECLIPSE

It is reasonable to suppose that a century very different from the one hitherto foreseen would emerge from the triumph of North Vietnam and the humiliation of the United States. But it would be unfair to suggest that even a United States of vastly curtailed international influence and power would be fatally impaired or permanently diminished.

If its affairs in this vastly altered world were conducted with skill and prudence; if its international policy were realistically realigned in conformity with its diminished capacity to influence events; if its leaders accepted their liabilities philosophically; if its people cheerfully acknowledged the limitations on their power—then the nation might go on, its world role greatly changed but not necessarily eclipsed permanently.

And if North Vietnam's war against South Vietnam fails and there emerges in the South a viable state with a government that is reasonably representative of its people, will that usher in the millennium? No, it must be said that in fairness that it will not do so.

The Philippines and Malaysia demonstrated that wars of liberation do not always succeed, but that did not prevent the war in Vietnam. The tragedy in Indonesia demonstrated that infiltration and subversion can fail with calamitous consequences, but no one supposes that that was the last of Communist China's efforts to subvert and overthrow regimes friendly to it.

But if this failure did not usher in the millennium, it might diminish the zeal of many Communist states for this kind of conflict. There would be fewer "wars of national liberation" than there would be if North Vietnam's attempt at conquest succeeded.

The scale of the Vietnam war already has demonstrated that the price tag on such wars is higher and the risk greater than the hawks of North Vietnam must have anticipated. If there occurs in Vietnam a demonstration that such wars involve an unendurable risk and an unbearable cost and are not likely to succeed, prospects for peace in the future will be increased.

Peace, however, in any sense that we have enjoyed it in the past, is not in our future, whatever happens or does not happen in South Vietnam. The world has yet to accomplish the accommodation between great historical forces that are at present anti-

pathetic to each other and that proceed on paths that preclude any peaceful reconciliation.

Statesmen in our generation, and in generations immediately ahead, will vindicate their stature and make bold their claims on the gratitude of posterity if they succeed in holding this irrepressible conflict within such bounds that history in its patient unfolding may subject the rigidities of doctrine to the ameliorating influences of time's subtle and insidious solvent.

In this long and perilous interval, the peoples who survive will be those who keep awake to the disagreeable fact of our time; that there are no easy alternatives, no painless choices, no magic palliatives, no miracles that can spare us the anguish of struggle or guarantee us immunity to risk and danger.

ARCHIE MOORE SPEAKS OF RACIAL HYSTERIA

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, in this day and age when our newspapers are filled with statements of hate and vituperation made by certain people in this country, it is most refreshing to read a statement such as that recently made by Archie Moore. If America had more civil rights leaders like Archie Moore, Jackie Robinson, and Joe Louis, we could achieve greater strides in helping to solve the problems of our minority groups. Unfortunately, the rabble-rousers such as Stokely Carmichael and Rap Brown are more often quoted in the newspaper and their statements incite many of our minority groups to irresponsible actions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a column by John Mooney, published in the Salt Lake Tribune of August 25, 1967. I certainly subscribe to the views expressed by Mr. Moore when he said:

Granted, the Negro still has a long way to go to gain a fair shake with the white man of this country. But, believe me, if we resort to lawlessness, the only thing we can hope for is civil war, untold bloodshed, and the end of our dreams.

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

"OLD MONGOOSE" MAKES SENSE AMIDST RACIAL HYSTERIA

(By John Mooney)

Archie Moore, one of the great modern fighters in his prime, liked to call himself "the old Mongoose," an inference that he was a bit smarter than the average creature in the fistic jungle.

But since his retirement, the Mongoose has shown more native intelligence than he displayed in the ring, and that's quite an achievement.

Speaking of the racial situation recently, Archie was quoted in the San Diego Union as saying:

"The devil is at work in America and it is up to us to drive him out. Snipers and looters, white or black, deserve no mercy.

"Those who would profit from their brother's misfortunes deserve no mercy, and those who would set fellow Americans upon each other deserve no mercy.

"I'll fight the man who calls me an 'Uncle Tom.' I have broken bread with the heads of state, chatted with presidents and traveled all over the world.

"I was born in a ghetto, but I refused to stay there, I am a Negro, and proud to be one. I'm also an American, and proud of that.

"The young people of today think they have a hard lot. They should have been around in the 30's when I was coming up in St. Louis. We had no way to go, but a lot of us made it. I became lightweight champion of the world.

"A neighborhood kid, Clark Terry, became one of the most famous jazz musicians in the world. There were doctors, lawyers and chiefs who came out of that ghetto. One of the top policemen in St. Louis came from our neighborhood," Archie adds.

HAD A GOAL TO SEEK

The Old Mongoose continued. "We made it because we had a goal, and we were willing to work for it. Don't talk to me of your 'guaranteed income.' Any fool knows that this is insanity. Do we bring down those who have worked to get ahead, down to the level of those who never gave a damn?

"The world owes nobody—black or white—a living. God helps the man who helps himself!

"Now then, don't get the idea that I didn't grow up hating the injustices of this world. I am a staunch advocate of the Negro revolution for the good of mankind.

"I've seen almost unbelievable progress made in the last handful of years. Do we want to become wild beasts bent only on revenge, looting and killing and laying America bare?

"Hate is bait, bait for the simple-minded. Sure, I despise the whites who cheated me, but I used that feeling to make me push on. If you listen to the professional rabble-rousers, adhere to this idea of giving up everything you've gained in order to revenge yourself for the wrongs that were done you in the past—then you'd better watch your neighbor, because he'll be looting your house next.

"Law and order is the only edge we have. No man is an island."

LONG WAY FOR SHAKE

Archie concludes, "Granted the Negro still has a long way to go to gain a fair shake with the white man of this country. But, believe me, if we resort to lawlessness, the only thing we can hope for is civil war, untold bloodshed, and the end of our dreams.

"We have to have a meeting of qualified men of both races. Mind you, I said qualified men, not some punk kid, ranting the catch phrases put in his mouth by some paid hate-monger.

"There are forces in America today bent upon the destruction of America, your America and mine," Moore warns.

That is plain talk and sensible talk from a man who has been through the ropes many times.

It's the kind of thinking Willie Price and his neighbors in the northwest section of Salt Lake City evidenced a week ago when they decided to do something for themselves in the way of establishing neighborhood pride and achievement, instead of waiting for someone else to do the job.

No one ever gained acceptance by burning down the neighborhood or destroying buildings while looting, sniping and burning.

But few people of Archie's stature among the youngsters of all creeds and races have said it so well, and at such an opportune time.

THE STRONG PUBLIC INTEREST IN ALL ASPECTS OF THE PRESIDENT'S LIFE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, we live in a complex society and in trying times. Almost every day there is a flareup in some part of the world, or a serious domestic problem here in this Nation which needs attention. The man who must face up to these problems every day is the President of the United States. As leader

of the most powerful Nation on earth, he has awesome responsibilities and, of course, is judged principally by his decisions on these matters of national and world import. But we should remember also that the little things are often important, too—that the sum and total of many small decisions or routine activities may outweigh a single major action. That is why there is such strong public interest in all aspects of the President's life.

I believe the column by Hugh Sidey, entitled "The Presidency: Vignettes of Change Around the Mansion," published in the September 1, 1967, issue of Life magazine, gives us new insights into the life of President Johnson and helps us to understand better his job and his ability to do it. I therefore ask unanimous consent that Mr. Sidey's column be printed in the RECORD.

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

VIGNETTES OF CHANGE AROUND THE MANSION

Amid all the great events which march through the White House, there are also small happenings—things which give the place an inner life that goes on despite riots, war and taxes.

Lyndon Johnson turned 59 last Sunday and suddenly people remembered that he had lived there nearly four years and in that time his hair had silvered and he had become a grandfather, and he could admit with a wry smile, "I can't run as fast as when I was 40."

On a Monday morning some time ago, before the President was astir, workmen entered his Oval Office in the west wing, carrying a large portrait of Franklin D. Roosevelt. It was painted by Elizabeth Shoumatoff, the artist who was working for F.D.R. the day he was stricken and died in Warm Springs, Ga. She had offered the painting, one of four she did, to the White House collection and Lyndon Johnson had eagerly accepted it. Now from above the fireplace the workmen took down the rosy-cheeked Gilbert Stuart of George Washington which for more than three years had overlooked the work of the 36th President. The men gingerly rehung the Washington on the east wall across the room from the hawkish visage of Andrew Jackson. Then, with equal care, they hoisted Franklin Roosevelt up above the mantel. There he is now, greeting Johnson every morning—L.B.J.'s mentor, his friend and his only continuing hero. He looks out beyond the Rose Garden toward the Mall, where the great federal agencies are. It is a reminder to the President—and to anybody else who goes in—that F.D.R. put a more enduring stamp on this city than any other 20th Century man.

Another painting, this by Peter Hurd, still hangs only a dozen paces from the President's desk. Hurd was the artist who did the Johnson portrait that L.B.J. gave the back of his hand to—"It's the ugliest thing I ever saw," he grumped. The Hurd picture that hangs now in the President's office, *Eastbound Mail Stage*, was done in the 1930s under the WPA artists' project. At least once, when he passed it, the President thumped it admiringly and added, "Peter Hurd—hasn't been worth a damn since..."

In the past few months the personal living quarters of the White House have been subdued. Both the President's daughters are now living their own lives. Luci is a wife and mother in Austin. Lynda's journalistic career takes her away from the White House much of the time. Johnson feels the difference and, partly to take up some of the loneliness, there is a new dog kennel discreetly camouflaged with shrubs near the Oval

Office. In the cool of the evening the President comes out on his porch and claps and is answered at once by the joyful yelps of his dogs—five of them now. There is the old faithful white collie, Blanco. The famous pair of beagles—Him and Her, both deceased—have been replaced by four beagles: Freckles and her pup Dumpling; Edgar, named for the FBI director; and Little Chap. They noisily chase the tolerant White House squirrels while L.B.J. roars at them, "Go get 'em, boy." They never do "get 'em."

The President's continuing fondness for gadgetry has touched off some recent technological improvements. Observers have noted that the famous speaker's stand, called "Mother" by the resident White House types, has undergone some face-lifting, and is more impressive than ever. Not only does she still maternally encase the President, amplify his voice and provide the light and elevation he needs, she now also Tele-prompts without attracting attention. The old prompter screens that used to rise like periscopes before the awed audiences are now hidden behind Mother's new facade.

A few days ago, guests of the President noted that the black phone that used to hang from one end of the coffee table that sits near his rocking chair had disappeared. They were naturally intrigued when he decided to make a call. He reached down and pulled open a book-sized drawer in the table. Inside, cradled in the wood of the interior, was a compact phone, the buttons for the unit neatly inlaid in the mahogany.

For the first time in history, the White House press has been taken off its feet. At the twice-daily news briefings, reporters used to stand around the press secretary's desk, shifting from foot to foot. George Christian has improved both their craving for status and the condition of their arches by moving them into the elegant Fish Room, so dubbed because F.D.R. kept tropical fish there. The correspondents now get the news seated in cushioned White House chairs and surrounded by the works of such artists as Frederic Remington.

Without notice, a few weeks back, the President called his military aide into his small study, which is just down the hall from the Oval Office, and handed James Cross the papers which elevated him from lieutenant colonel to full colonel. Cross, who is also the pilot of Air Force One, put on his birds and went back to work so silently that not even some of his close friends immediately noticed that he was a notch higher.

Though the White House officially insists that L.B.J. keeps his weight steady, the close students of the presidential chins are certain he has lost a few pounds from a burst of religious dieting. His daytime drinks are iced tea and Fresca; and as a matter of fact, they are his nighttime drinks, too.

Not long ago Johnson noted a newspaper story about a small girl who had passed all the government physical fitness tests except the chin-ups; these she could not do because she had lost part of her arm in an accident. She could not get her certificate. The President picked up the phone and ordered the Physical Fitness Council to change the rules for handicapped people, and then he wrote a tender letter to a determined little heart. It took a moment and then the big events closed back in.

HOUSTON CHRONICLE CARRIES INTENSIVE STUDY OF POVERTY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, three young reporters on the Houston Chronicle, concerned about the poverty they see in their Nation, went out into the slum areas of their city a few weeks ago to learn firsthand what the poverty stricken had to say about their situation.

What these people had to say indicates a plight that those who have not known poverty cannot imagine, and would never have imagined to exist in America in this decade. Problems include rats in the house, holes in the roof that are never fixed, fruitless waits of weeks and months for improvements or extermination of pests, indifference to requests for medical aid or police protection—experiences which most Americans never encounter and do not imagine that others encounter.

Yet what reporters Carlton Carl, Jane Manning, and Susan Caudill found was not bitterness, not bland indifference, but determination and drive. They found that "with religious fervor they look to education as the answer," and that "most of them seek to retain one of their inalienable rights: Their dignity." They found people who worked, who tried to support themselves and their households, with age, disability, and inadequate education handicapping them.

This striking article, "Houston's Poor: Their Plights and Their Hopes," provides a view of the poverty stricken which few Americans, even those vitally concerned with the problems of poverty, ever encounter directly. I think that all of us as Americans could profit from the insights of these reporters, who set out to learn exactly what poverty is, and who found it an "uncomfortable and soul-depressing task." I commend them highly for their work, and for an excellent and needed report.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article published in the Sunday, September 10, Houston Chronicle, be printed in the RECORD.

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

HOUSTON'S POOR: THEIR PLIGHTS AND THEIR HOPES

(By Carlton Carl, Jane Manning and Susan Caudill)

A study of poverty is an uncomfortable and soul-depressing task.

The very word itself connotes want, deprivation and misery of body and spirit.

Any pretense at complete objectivity is folly. The mind's eye records too well the obvious ill-fed and ill-clothed child, the black roach crawling across a plaster-cracked ceiling, the rats squealing in an attic.

A team of Chronicle reporters recently visited four slum areas of the city and talked to 60 residents to determine who the people are and their plights and their hopes.

The Negro areas surveyed were parts of the Bottom, off Clinton in the Fifth Ward, and a block of shotgun houses bounded by Medina, Sycamore, Hockley and Fennell.

LATIN, WHITE POOR

Latin American and other white poor were interviewed at a one-story apartment in the 900 block of Medina off Broadway. Other Latin poor were interviewed at Canal Courts in the 700 block of Medina near Jensen and Navigation.

Nearly a third of the heads of households are unemployed. Age and physical disabilities account for most of the unemployment.

Only six receive any welfare assistance, but a dozen get Social Security, veteran's disability or retirement benefits.

The average income, from all sources, is \$48 a week, of which about \$10 a week goes for rent and \$20 for food.

The average is five children in each family.

Two household heads have high school diplomas. A fifth grade education is the norm.

MAJORITY DROPOUTS

The majority are dropouts, not from lack of interest or poor grades, but because they had to go to work to help support their families.

All 58 dropouts said they regret their lack of education. Their lot in life today would be better had they finished high school.

A majority came to Houston from small Texas and Louisiana towns in search of better opportunities. Twelve of the adults have lived here, generally in the same neighborhood all their lives.

Five own cars. The others ride the bus or walk to work, to stores and to the charity hospital.

Those employed hope for better jobs. The unemployed simply seek work.

The virtual futility is best expressed by Willie Spears, 41, of 1207 Schwartz. "I have seizures all the time. Nobody will hire me. But I'm looking."

Mrs. Emma Adams, 69, an unemployed cook of 3408 Melva, for five years, has been a welfare statistic because of her age and arthritis. "If I could work, I would," she said.

IF YOU ARE YOUNG

Listen to Lawrence Branch, 63 and one-legged: "It's no problem getting a job if you're young. But that doesn't do anything for me."

For the poor, their problems are not racial or class-based. They are their own immediate problems.

Many say they would prefer to help themselves rather than accept aid that might benefit those less fortunate.

Mrs. Jane Dixon, a mother of six, said, "It's not fair to bring all these children into the world and then ask for help. Others need it more."

Her husband drives an ice cream truck. He averages \$40 a week, of which more than \$30 goes for rent and groceries. This family of eight lives in two rooms and shares one bed.

O'Dell Edwards, 49, a factory worker, said, "I don't want to ask the government for money. I'm a disabled veteran but I can work. Besides, I like to pay my own bills."

Mrs. Willene Cantrell, who lives with her husband and five children in a two-room apartment in the 900 block of Medina, said: "We're down and out but we'll make it. I'll take charity from anybody, though, if it feeds the children."

Joyce Johnson, 48, a native of the Bottom, works as a maid.

"I've never taken any charity from anyone," she said, "and I hope I never have to. But if I have to steal to feed my children and send them to school, I will."

HOPE FOR RAINBOW

Most have resigned themselves to their lots in life but they hope for rainbows for their children.

With religious fervor they look to education as the answer.

Isaac Jones, 77, of 1146 Callas, a resident of the Bottom 56 years, has no intentions of moving from his environment.

Five of his 16 children slipped through a hole in the Fifth Ward poverty pocket. Those five attended college and earned master's degrees. Three are now teachers.

As for police protection, Alfred Block, 59, who lives in a little open-air shack at 100 Fennell and makes \$3 a week collecting bottles and junk, voices a common complaint:

"One night some boys were throwing rocks at me and my house. I called the police three times but they never showed up."

"The police just won't bother with any place that's a little out of the way. If some-

body with money and a nice house complains, they jump."

Mrs. Sandra Jones, a resident of the Bottom, recalls when one of her eight children became ill.

She arrived at Ben Taub with her child at 10 a.m.

"They didn't even look at my daughter till 10 p.m.—12 hours later," Mrs. Jones said.

"It wasn't that they didn't have enough personnel. Half the attendants were standing in a back room smoking cigarettes."

GRIEVANCES ENDLESS

Their grievances, in reality, are endless. The lot of the poor has been and always will be a want for the basic necessities. They don't expect the best of all possible worlds. Most of them seek to retain one of their inalienable rights: Their dignity.

Mrs. Zelma Freeman, 65, lives with her husband and son at 3108 Baron. "I'm too old to expect a change for myself," she said. "I just hope the young kids, my grandchildren and other people's children, will have a better life."

Mrs. Johnson looks for her children to escape the chains of poverty through education.

"I haven't made anything of my life and it's my fault," she said. "I didn't get an education. No matter what happens, if I can afford it, my children will finish school and go to college."

QUIT 11TH GRADE

Jene Gomez, 17, who helps support his mother and five brothers and sisters by working at Veterans' Administration Hospital, quit school in the 11th grade to go to work.

"I wish I had finished school and someday I may. But right now I'd just like to be anything better than I am," he said.

Two of Mrs. Effie Perkins' 10 children are the wage earners in the family.

Carla Evans, 21, said "The older generation is satisfied. But they've already lived out their lives. Whites and people with money still have the edge everywhere."

For all but a few the federal War on Poverty is no more than a slogan.

DISTANT IN EFFECT

It is as distant in effect as the Civil War is in time.

One Latin youth said: "Some poor people are being helped by the poverty program. But the very poor are not. They say they want to get jobs for unemployed kids, but they only give them to people with experience."

None of the 60 interviewed condones violence as a means of changing the lot of the poor or of minority groups in general.

However, they have their specific grievances: Indifferent landlords, rats and mosquitoes in weed-choked lots and stagnant pools.

The complaints don't end there. Polluted air from the Ship Channel industries, poor police protection, apathy of personnel at the county charity hospitals toward the poor, and lack of work for those who need it most.

Mrs. Perkins didn't get through the first grade.

"As soon as we were old enough, we went into the fields to work," she said.

"I wish now I had been able to go through school. But things are going to be different for my children. I am going to see to it that the ones still in school get good educations."

Pride is no stranger in the slums. Evidence of pride is seen in a clean house, a steady job, in children doing well in school, in a small flower garden.

All say discrimination still exists in Houston, both racial and economic.

Few of the young are angry or impatient, but most are concerned with their own situation.

A resident on Sycamore, two blocks from Buffalo Bayou, said:

"I called the Health Department four

times about the weeds and the rats and the godawful smells. Finally I went to City Hall four months later. They didn't even have my complaint on file."

A Latin American boy who lives in Canal Courts, near Navigation and Jensen, says of the pollution in his area:

"We wake up sick at our stomachs."

Canal Courts are surrounded on three sides by industrial plants. Buffalo Bayou is a block away.

"Rats?" asks Mrs. Rosa Wade, 67, of 205 Medina. "Why there were a couple of rats as big as rabbits wrestling under the TV last night just having a ball."

She said she has complained to her landlord and the city about the rats and mosquitoes. Nothing has been done, she said.

The homes of Houston's poor rent from \$6 to \$15 a week.

Landlords maintain they are doing all they can to improve living conditions for their tenants.

"Tenants never complain about not having hot water," said Mrs. Hannah Davis, owner of a row of houses on Baron St. in the Bottom.

ONE DOLLAR MORE RENT

"If anyone does complain, I will be glad to get it for them. Of course they will have to pay a dollar more rent each week."

"They have to do their own extermination work. I do all I can for them, but I have to make a living too."

Dr. Paulus Hofheinz, a dentist, owns Canal Courts on Middle St.

"I have gotten no complaints about rats in my courts," he said.

The courts are managed by Mrs. Henry Olivares. She says residents of the courts complain to her about rats, but she does not tell Dr. Hofheinz.

John L. Maida owns a row of houses on Medina St.

His tenants complain about holes in their floors and rats. They also say the houses need painting.

Maida says he sends maintenance men three times a week to make needed repairs.

A FREE ASIA

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the peoples of Asia have lived through a perilous period in recent years. Prior to World War II, colonialism kept Asians from exercising self-government. With the advent of World War II the area was in turmoil, and following that conflict Communists seized power in China, and attempted to do so in Korea, Malaya, Indonesia, and now in Vietnam.

Communist efforts in these countries, however, have failed. They have failed precisely because the people of Asia have come to understand that freedom and self-determination can only come when communism is defeated.

In Malaya, the British assisted in the defeat of communism. In Korea and Vietnam our own Armed Forces, together with those of such nations as Australia, New Zealand, Greece, and Turkey have assisted in repelling aggression. In Indonesia, the Indonesian people themselves rose up against the native Communists who attempted to subvert their government.

We are facing the dawn of a new day of freedom for Asia. At the first ministerial meeting for Asian and Pacific co-operation held in Seoul, Korea, on June 14, 1966, Thailand's Foreign Minister, Mr. Thanat Khoman, who is widely recognized as one of free Asia's foremost statesmen, spoke of the coming era of a free Asia. He said:

Ours will be a society where freedom shall prevail, a freedom that will be enjoyed not by one, not by a few, but by all, freedom for the individual, freedom within the family as well as within the national community. It will be a freedom from the dictatorial and tyrannical domination by a class composed of a privileged few who usurp the authority of the populace.

Mr. Khoman said that the countries of free Asia have nothing to hide, unlike Communist states. He noted that—

Only where terrestrial edens are claimed to exist, high walls have to be built and armed patrols accompanied by police dogs have to be used to prevent the people within from escaping their unwanted paradises.

He said that his desire "is to see those barriers and obstacles which divide and separate people of this world crumble down to make way for free exchange and contact between them for the sake of better understanding and good will."

Mr. Khoman is a voice of the new Asia, an Asia of freedom and independence, one which is unwilling to see its freedom invaded and trampled upon by others.

To share Mr. Khoman's speech with Senators, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

FOREIGN MINISTER'S STATEMENT AT THE FIRST MINISTERIAL MEETING FOR ASIAN AND PACIFIC CO-OPERATION

(Delivered in Seoul by Mr. Thanat Khoman, leader of the Thai delegation, on June 14, 1966)

We are gratified and grateful that the Government of the Republic of Korea has agreed to be host to this historic conference and has generously extended to us all a warm and cordial hospitality. For few places in Asia can be as symbolic as Seoul, the capital city of Korea, of the deep yearnings and desire of the Asian peoples to be free and to remain the master of their own destiny as of their willingness to lay down even their lives in fulfillment of their aspirations. The Republic of Korea also evokes the joint determination of many free peoples, near and far, to help those grievous sacrifices, to ensure that free men and women shall survive as decent human beings, capable of leading the life of their choice and engaging in the pursuit of their own happiness. This has been the meaning of the past. This still remains an inspiration for many of us whose free existence is overshadowed by lurking dangers and threatened by the insatiable appetites for power, for expansion and domination.

However, we do not come here today to save Korea from aggression. For the existence of the Korean nation, thanks to its dedicated leaders is now secure and, through the sacrifices and the hard work of its people, it is moving along toward progress and prosperity.

Neither do we come here to band ourselves against any people or nation. And whatever those who have ill design against our freedom and independence may say to cover up their nefarious intentions, we are not planning to set up any new military grouping or alliance. Our defense is already sufficiently secure and because of our inherent strength we need no new arrangements to strengthen that purpose. If, however, there were to be any alliance, it could only be an alliance against poverty and deprivation of freedom, or more positively an alliance for the advancement and prosperity of our peoples.

Rather we come here as free men and women, as people endowed with an immense fund of goodwill and friendly dispositions,

bearing malice to none, and willing to go more than half way to shake the hands of honest and sincere friendship which may be extended to us.

Such being the case, we do not contemplate to erect new barriers to surround our peoples and isolate them from the rest of the world. It has never been our habit to build walls and curtains to enclose and surround and separate people so as to prevent their contacts with the outside world. We do not therefore intend to adopt that deplorable human tendency which is being presently followed only by a few nations.

Our purpose in coming together may be difficult for some to understand, especially those who are bent upon suppressing their own people as well as others. But to us it is simple and natural. We seek only to fulfil our mission and our human urge. As human beings we have been created to be together, to work and live together rather than be enclosed and separated. What we aim therefore is to meet and work together for our common good, to help one another attain better living conditions and move along the path of peace and progress.

It is as simple as that and we make no secret of what we are doing and are going to do during the next few days or in the future. Our objective is therefore decidedly positive: we want to achieve a betterment in our present and future life and want to do it through mutual efforts and mutual co-operation. We are not necessarily anti-Communist, or, for that matter, anti-North Korea or anti-North Viet-Nam in the way of certain nations being anti-freedom. We do not have to be nor do we want to be. We find the negative approach utterly useless, purposeless and senseless. If we are against anything, we admittedly are opposed to aggression as well as totalitarianism. Indeed, even some of these people may have threatened Thailand with war and destruction, we know that they actually live in dire predicament, suffering from want and penury as well as from oppression. If anything, we would like to lighten their hardship and ordeal. If possible, we would even like them to join us in constructive efforts to build a more decent and a happier world to live in, free from ravages of war, from the sufferings from starvation and disease.

For all of us representing many scores of millions of people, our purpose in being here is primarily to join together in a common endeavour to examine the problems with which our nations individually and our region as whole are confronted, and to the greatest extent possible, to seek ways and means of resolving them to our mutual advantage and benefit. What then are these problems and how can we hope to find adequate solutions to them? Many may agree that the first and foremost unsatisfactory situation which they have been facing for a long time is the lack of purposeful contacts and co-operation. This may be due partly to a legacy of the past by the bygone western colonialism which compartmented Asia into secluded areas and channeled their overseas possessions exclusively to their metropolitan headquarters. Nowadays, although that kind of colonialism has practically receded, a new form of colonialism, the communist brand of it which has emerged, tried to step into the shoes of the earlier colonial regimes and to perpetuate to its advantage the isolation and seclusion of the past, hoping thereby to weaken the unconnecting elements and to impose its influence and control through a system of divide and rule. The protagonists of this system also shut in their own people within their national enclosures, not allowing them to have contacts with the outside for fear that the air of freedom and the light of truth will disintegrate their internal oppressive rule.

This represents, in our opinion, the most frightful and odious scourge of our time, the end of which we should hope to bring about

as shortly as possible. As far as we are concerned, we would like to see a world undivided by walls, curtain or barbed wire fences, a world in which all the peoples of this planet can freely move about, meet one another and get to know another as they wish. In our case, our nations have nothing to hide and our countries are open for all to come and see with their own eyes. Nor do we wish to contain our people and compel them to stay within our boundaries. We do not claim to have succeeded in building paradises on this earth, therefore our people are free to leave their land any time they want. Only when terrestrial edens are claimed to exist, high walls have to be built and armed patrol accompanied by police dogs have to be used to prevent the people within from escaping from their unwanted paradises. Our desire therefore is to see those barriers and obstacles which divide and separate people of this world crumble down to make way for free exchange and contact between them for the sake of better understanding and goodwill. Our objective therefore is to substitute mutual contacts and co-operation for the oppressive measures of separation and isolation. Once these barriers are removed and people can come into contact with one another more freely, it is our aim that the relationship between peoples and nations should be based, not on ideas of overlordship and domination as presently advocated and practised by certain countries and governments, but on partnership and co-operation which will bring more benefit to all concerned. The democratization of international relations will be more conducive to peace and harmony than other concepts based on inequality between nations. Furthermore, as most of the people in the world aspire to have peace, we should dedicate our efforts to eliminate the obstacles to world peace and threats and dangers thereto which at present stem from wars of conquest, of which the so-called wars of national liberation represent the most frequent applications. In our part of the world and particularly in South Viet-Nam certain predatory powers believe that by camouflaging their lust for power and domination under the cover of national liberation, they hope to delude world public opinion that they are performing meritorious acts rather than merely seeking the enslavement of others. But the reaction of both the actual and potential victims has been strong and unequivocal. They simply refuse to submit to these voracious attempts to devour them and many have put up a stiff resistance. Others realizing the imminence of similar dangers hastily reject the would-be aggressors out of their midst. As a consequence, the prospects of peace and stability in the South-East Asian region have significantly improved, while the expansionist forces have suffered serious setbacks.

This in brief is our sketch of a society of Asian and Pacific nations which we hope will spring into existence in the not too distant future. Ours will be a society where freedom shall prevail, a freedom that will be enjoyed not by one, not by a few, but by all, freedom for the individual, freedom within the family as well as within the national community. It will be a freedom from the dictatorial and tyrannical domination by a class composed of a privileged few who usurp the authority of the populace.

It will also be a society characterized by progressive evolution, not by stagnant immutability or by revolutionary jolts in which the lower passions of men are let loose. The adjustments which are brought about will represent the interests of the majority, not those of the ambitious few who seek to dominate and exploit others. Finally, it will be a society where abundance and plenty will reign, not an egalitarian society where poverty is equalized, where all stomachs are equally empty, where the pangs of hunger beat at the same rhythm and the walls of sufferings and misery rise from every corner.

Through mutual co-operation and concerted efforts, we know we can bring still greater happiness and well-being to all our peoples and provided we succeed in learning to work closely together, the future bears encouraging promise.

These are our objectives, our aims and our methods. Those who also share our belief in co-operation for the mutual good of all, for progress and plenty in freedom and in peace, for confident partnership rather than domination, have nothing to fear from us, in the same way as we are by no means awed by their professed aggressive militancy. For our strength lies in our dedication to peace with freedom and progress and we know that the peace and freedom loving peoples of the world stand with us.

To Korea we came with the determination to learn to live together and work together for our own good, to depend primarily on ourselves who belong to the same region rather than on others who are further away and to forge a newly born solidarity which is directed against no one but only at one objective—increasing the welfare of our nations in the Asian and Pacific area. It is our hope that after the few days we shall have spent in this beautiful and noble country, we shall succeed in laying down the basis for continuing further our joint efforts in many areas of human endeavour, particularly the economic, social, technical and cultural fields in which well concerted and co-ordinated actions will bring more beneficial results than we have ever been accustomed to expect in the past. Later on, as this historic conference draws to an end, new hopes may rise over the horizon for a more progressive and more beneficial Asian and Pacific Society where our peoples shall, through close and effective co-operation, live in peace, in freedom and prosperity.

SECOND WRIGHT BONER

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial titled "Second Wright Boner," which appeared in the Washington, D.C., Evening Star on September 18, 1967.

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

SECOND WRIGHT BONER

Earlier this month Judge J. Skelly Wright modified his original school decree to permit some 255 District youngsters to continue this fall in schools they had already been attending. This was done after Judge Wright had belatedly become aware that his original ruling would work an unconscionable and senseless hardship in the case of those children, most of whom are Negroes.

District school officials now are trying to decide what to do about a second unfortunate and probably unforeseen consequence of the Wright ruling.

Judge Wright, with some splendid rhetorical flourishes, ordered the abandonment of the track system on the ground that it discriminated against "lower class and Negro students." It turns out, however, that there were some 5,000 "educable retarded" children, most of them colored, in the "special academic" or basic track. With the track system judicially banned, some other arrangement for grouping these retarded children must be devised unless they are to become educational casualties of the Wright decree and of its interpretation by school officials.

As a temporary measure the educable retarded children have been placed in regular classes, where they stand little if any chance of keeping up. An article by William Raspberry in The Washington Post told of the unhappy experience of one mother and child.

The child, a nine-year-old girl, had been making good progress in the basic track at Tyler Elementary School. "Now she's in a regular third grade class," said the mother, "and she comes home crying, telling me she can't understand the lessons. Her reading isn't as good as it was last year."

Well, this and other deplorable byproducts of the Wright decision doubtless will be straightened out in due course. But the essential conclusion remains: A Federal judge is no more qualified to undertake a whip-cracking approach to the dictation of educational policy than would a professional educator be qualified to serve on the United States Court of Appeals.

GEORGE B. GALLOWAY: A DEDICATED PUBLIC SERVANT

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on August 2, a memorial service was held at the Cosmos Club in honor of the late Dr. George B. Galloway. During this service, several distinguished speakers addressed a large assembly who had gathered to pay their respects to the memory of this fine gentleman and eminent scholar. The theme of these addresses was "Dr. George B. Galloway: His Contributions to Government at the Local, National, and International Levels."

The heartfelt words of admiration and praise for Dr. Galloway were among the finest tributes I have ever heard paid to the life and work of any man. They were altogether fitting, as Dr. Galloway was nationally and internationally recognized as one of this Nation's foremost political scientists and as one of its most preeminent authorities on the history and functioning of the U.S. Congress. He was also one of its most highly dedicated public servants. His primary goal in life was to make a profound and lasting contribution to the strengthening, improvement, and preservation of American democracy, in which he fervently believed, through the application of his knowledge and understanding of American political processes. In this he succeeded admirably, far beyond the measure of most men who try as individuals to influence the affairs and institutions of their times.

I am happy to record my personal indebtedness to George Galloway. He was my friend, and I was the beneficiary of his wisdom. His suggestions, his counsel, his analyses of current trends and of past and prospective events in the Congress, and his thoughts on pending legislation were always helpful. His life and career were intimately associated with the Congress. He was an integral part of its work. His death was untimely, and he will be sorely missed. I think I can say this in behalf of all Senators who had the benefit of association with him, and of still others who derived inspiration and enlightenment from his writings.

I ask unanimous consent that the eloquent tributes paid to Dr. Galloway at his memorial service be printed in the RECORD in order that his contribution to the legislative process and the work of Congress may become a matter of permanent public record.

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

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR DR. GEORGE B. GALLOWAY: HIS CONTRIBUTIONS TO GOVERNMENT AT THE LOCAL, NATIONAL, AND INTERNATIONAL LEVELS

(Speakers: Mr. Clarence Pierce (presiding), Inter-American Development Bank; the Honorable A. S. Mike Monroney, Senator from Oklahoma; the Honorable Emilio Q. Daddario, Member of Congress from Connecticut; Mr. Lester S. Jayson, Director, Legislative Reference Service, the Library of Congress; Dr. Ernest S. Griffith, former Director of the Legislative Reference Service, who was on vacation and sent his remarks from Glacier National Park, Montana.)

GEORGE B. GALLOWAY

Mr. PIERCE. Mrs. Galloway, David and Jonathan Galloway, Mrs. Price, friends and associates of George Galloway: we are assembled here today to mark the passing from our midst of this man who was to some of us a beloved husband and father and to others a valued friend and associate. We have come together to recall, and share with each other, the influence he had on our lives and affairs. It is fitting that we do this, even though we cannot convey adequately that special feeling we have when we remember this man and our association with him. We cannot identify accurately either the quality or extent of the influence which he had on us. All we can say with certainty is that it was enriching.

If a man is remembered because of the influence he had on the institutions of his times, then George Galloway will be remembered for his contributions to the improvement of the national legislature of this country. If a man is remembered because of his contribution to the sum of knowledge of his times, then George Galloway will be recalled when those are listed who insisted upon the need for national planning in the economic development of this country. If a man is remembered for his devotion to his family and for his encouragement to his friends and associates, surely George Galloway will be remembered by those present here and by many others who could not join us today.

We wish to pay our respects to this unique man and to share, to the extent that we can, the special place which he occupies in our minds and memories. In doing this, we assure each other and reassure ourselves that it is the quality of life that is important. We take special note of the unusual values in a life well-lived in the hope that we can do our best as well. We are met to record an epitaph and, in doing this, we wish to catalogue the special contributions of this man.

In a brief autobiography written in April, 1958, George listed three major aims in his career:

1. To understand the times in which one lives.
2. To make a contribution to the intelligent direction of political and economic change.
3. To promote democracy in American government.

In summing up his career to that point, George concluded that he had had some success in the first two of these aims, but had been unsuccessful with the third. He was unable to accept his assumed failure to promote democracy in American government even though he knew and expressed the reasons for it as being inherent in our political system. The failure to achieve substantial change in increasing democracy in American government became a personal failure to George. This was only so because he had not considered it beyond his capacity to try to influence such changes.

George believed that enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, was, for him, one of life's rare triumphs. It represented six years of sustained effort beginning as chairman of a committee of the American Political Science Association on the Congress and terminating as Staff Di-

rector of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress.

Senator A. S. Mike Monroney of Oklahoma, who was then a Representative, was vice chairman of that committee. He is here today to share with us his views on the contribution made by George to the work of that committee and George's continuing efforts for improvement in the operations of the Congress.

Senator MONRONEY. I speak today of a friend. My long association with George B. Galloway dates back for a quarter of a century. It spans an interesting, exciting, and trying period of our Government. From World War II, through the trying times of demobilization and reconversion, through the Korean War, and through the monumental struggle over the domestic issues of this period of transition to the world's greatest power.

George Galloway understood the impact of these trying issues and played an important role in trying to help solve them. Few men—and perhaps no man outside of the Congress itself—had as much to do as did George Galloway in inspiring and perfecting the various steps and stages in improving the Congress and its machinery to carry on the difficult tasks of the last half of this 20th Century.

I first met George Galloway when I was a very junior member of the House of Representatives. He was a man inspired by the challenge of the times to do something to correct the easy-going and loosely organized Congress of the United States.

He saw quite clearly—far better than many of us who were closer to the forest—the monumental post-war tasks and challenges that would fall upon the "people's branch" of our government. He wanted to strengthen it because he believed that the power had to be held close to the people. He knew the difficulties which would present themselves when the shooting stopped and the post-war period was upon us.

I had visited several times with George during my earlier years in the Congress. We had talked about the general disorganization of Congress. Because of his searching mind and his keen interest in the Congress as a great American institution, we would always concentrate on ways in which the freedom of a representative body could be maintained and yet have its efficiency increased. He well understood the dangers of sacrificing democratic action and public discussion in the interest of a straight-lined power structure stemming from a strong Executive and a weak Congress.

We used to meet for lunch. Sometimes it would be in the crowded House Restaurant—but more often in the Library of Congress. Here we went over in great detail the needs of the Congress for assistance to meet the ever-expanding tasks of government. Here we talked of streamlining the machinery of Congress. The possible-impossible task of realigning the overlapping and duplicating and inefficient committee system of both Houses.

Could Representatives and Senators ever be persuaded to give up some of the prestigious tokens of office such as chairmanships of such committees as "The Committee on the Disposal of Useless Executive Papers"? Or would they stand for the merger of the then existing three separate committees on veterans' affairs?

What were the chances of having a Committee on Armed Services instead of two committees—one on Naval Affairs and one on Military Affairs? While most Representatives and Senators were convinced such sweeping reorganization was impossible, George Galloway knew that it could be achieved—and a lot more along with it.

George Galloway carried on his John the Baptist role by convincing such Senate leaders as the late Senator Maloney of Connecti-

cut and the late Robert M. LaFollette, Jr., as well as leaders of the House, of the need for Congressional reform.

Together with compatriots and scholars from the Library of Congress, he kept the campaign rolling along with a quiet but determined Ph. D. pace.

Doctor Galloway was dedicated to the cause, and his missionary zeal spread throughout the wide circle of his friends, acquaintances and fellow political scientists. He was committed, dedicated and determined that the Congress had to reorganize if it was to maintain its historic function in an ever-expanding government.

This crusade took him on the lecture circuit, launched the work on his great book, "Congress at the Crossroads," and brought him into daily—yes hourly—contact with Members of Congress, staff members and political scientists from most of our states.

It was this pioneering work along with that of a very few Senators and House Members that finally brought about the passage of the Maloney-Monroney Resolution that created the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of the Congress. In the midst of the efforts to create the committee, with George Galloway ever in the vanguard, Senator Maloney died of a heart attack.

He was succeeded by Senator Bob LaFollette, and with George still as a chief advocate, the effort moved forward.

With the creation of the Joint Committee there was, of course, only one choice—Dr. Galloway, who had pioneered the move from the beginning, was chosen as Staff Director. George was the staff—together with a part-time stenographer.

The completeness and thoroughness of the hearings brought the cream of American political scientists to the committee for searching analysis of the system. It brought from abroad expert parliamentarians and from the domestic scene many outstanding American leaders of politics, government, and business.

In the hearings, these expert witnesses, all selected and scheduled by Dr. Galloway, wove into the record the need for strong reform, and the means of bringing it about. The carefully planned presentation of this type of evidence created one of the great textbook sources on the needs of the Congress for greater strength and clear-cut organization.

The clear need for Congressional research was demonstrated so that the Legislative Reference Service early became one of the important objectives of Congressional reform. The able help of many in the Library of Congress and of the experts in the field of public administration brought suggestions and advice to the committee.

With the overwhelming weight of the opinion of American political scientists behind the reform movement, with the outline of choice plans for a half-hundred needed improvements in Congressional machinery, public opinion was mobilized strongly behind the effort. But the apparent "instant support" was misleading. It was the result of the long and continued crusade waged by Dr. Galloway in the previous years.

Likewise was the expeditious completion of the hearings and the prompt preparation of the Joint Committee's report and recommendations. It was still George Galloway's plan for action. And he got it.

Had our Staff Director permitted the movement to sag or slow down—we still might be operating under Civil War rules and a committee structure that looked like it was designed by Rube Goldberg.

George Galloway's time-table was met by passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act by the Congress in 1946. Without his design, his missionary zeal with his fellow members of the American Political Science Association as Chairman of the Committee on Congress, and without his keen sense of

timing, the creaking, groaning, badly patched up organization of Congress would today be trying to do the impossible.

Ever a thorough man, Dr. Galloway refused to relax as the passage of the Reorganization Act was achieved. He knew, because he was a true expert on the Congress, that passage of legislation alone was not enough. The implementation of the act to carry out the real philosophy of a stronger Congress, George Galloway knew, would only come if the early days of its new life were carefully supervised.

As Senior Specialist in American Government and Public Administration, of the Legislative Reference Service, Dr. Galloway served as a one-man task force to see that the changes Congress had voted were carried out. And carried out too in the way that it was planned under the new rules of reorganization.

His devotion to this second phase of implementation led him into becoming an unofficial advisor to many of the new committees and the new staff members who were anxious to see the reforms properly installed. Dr. Galloway made one of his greatest contributions in carrying out this detail over the following two years.

He never lost his interest in creating and in perfecting a strong Congress. His books began with "Congress at the Crossroads" in 1946. There followed "The Legislative Process in Congress" in 1953, "Congress and Parliament" in 1955, and "History of the House of Representatives," in 1961.

Thus Dr. Galloway moved onward from the creator and director of reform to become an interpreter for the American people, and particularly their professors and students of political science. He was the #1 expert on the strengths and weaknesses of our form of democracy.

His love of and his service to Congress as an institution continued until his death.

George Galloway will be sorely missed. His counsel and advice through a quarter of a century have done much to create a stronger Congress and thus a stronger voice of our people. He believed in a working and workable democracy. He believed that strengthening our system at the representative level would bring justice and greatness to the Nation. To this end he dedicated his time, his mind and his life.

Mr. PIERCE. George's interest in political institutions was not confined to the national scene. From 1958 to 1966, he served as Executive Secretary of the U.S. Delegation to the Inter-Parliamentary Union. Congressman Emilio Q. Daddario of Connecticut is a U.S. Representative to the Inter-Parliamentary Union Council. He is here today to share with us his regard for George as he served the U.S. Delegation.

Congressman DADDARIO. At Wesleyan University—which is George Galloway's school and mine—a favorite song, "Tella Mystica", closes with these lines:

"So may we live, that when our lives shall end some memory of us, with that web may blend and so may we die."

George's gentle hand has now been stilled. Yet the pen it held has indelibly etched his thinking with emphatic permanence on our society. As an author his works are classical in proportion and they will continue to have an effect whenever an attempt is made to restructure our government, and especially the Congress, to the developing needs of our society. His interest was that the United States Congress be a vital force in shaping our destiny—both domestic and foreign—and he brought to that task a tempered, constructive, and scholarly attitude.

Brought up in the academic atmosphere of Middletown, Connecticut, which for many years was his home, as it was mine, he developed, because it was inherently in his nature to, a warm and penetrating intellect. How wisely he applied himself is attested

to—not only by what he has written, but also by the individual members of Congress, officials from other countries, students and civil groups—who came to him to savor of his vast knowledge and experience.

He was consumed by the idea that the Congress shall play an important part in the development of our foreign policy. As Secretary to the United States Delegation to the Interparliamentary Union, he served a unique purpose. His advice to his delegation was sound at the core and yet somehow sprinkled with the kind of imagination that made it palatable to others. His presence, however, served a greater than an advisory purpose. He was our traveling academician—the one to whom delegates from other countries came to learn of our political structure—and why he believed it worked as well as it did.

George Galloway has woven his thoughts into the fiber of our society.

We who are his friends will remember him because of his character and his goodness. Others will remember him because a touch of his genius remains behind him.

Mr. PIERCE. In his autobiography, George pays special tribute to Dr. Ernest S. Griffith, former Director of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. Dr. Griffith was one of the active members of the American Political Science Association who encouraged George to head the committee and to produce the significant report on Reorganization of Congress. The association of these two men was long and mutually productive. Dr. Griffith is in Montana and cannot be here with us today. Instead, he dictated an appreciation of George by telephone to Mrs. Galloway.

Mr. Lester S. Jayson, Director of the Legislative Reference Service, has consented to read Dr. Griffith's statement and to supplement that with his own evaluation of George's contributions in recent years.

Mr. Jayson. George Galloway was an example of a man who chose to educate himself for the public service, and having done that, he dedicated himself to service for the government.

George, as you may know, received his Ph. D. from the Brookings Graduate School of Economics and Government. That School was known for its pioneering emphasis on training for the public service. Its doctoral programs stressed the opportunities for ready access to the source materials of public-policy-research and personal contact and discussion with Washington officials. Its students worked on practical problems of government policy.

Robert S. Brookings who founded the School once explained its purpose in a letter to John D. Rockefeller, Jr.—I guess it was back in the early '20's: "Nearly every interest in the country is now organized," he wrote, "and has permanent representation in Washington, all striving to further their own interests. We are the only research activity in Washington which is just simply collecting evidence in the interest of truth, and making our findings known."

That's the kind of university that attracted George, and that is the kind of work he wanted to pursue. And the fact is that George Galloway spent most of his professional life engaged in research activity seeking understanding and truth, rather than the furtherance of particular interests. When he retired last December, he had completed almost 25 years of service in the Federal Government, more than 20 of them in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. He had achieved a magnificent record of accomplishment and effective public service. He had attained an international reputation for his contributions to the scholarly literature on the United States Congress. He had a knowledge of the Congress, of its organization and its procedures, that few men in our time could equal. He had the admiration and respect of the po-

litical and the academic communities. He also had the devotion and love of all who worked with him, and of all who knew him.

Anyone who met George was immediately impressed—and delighted—with his gift of clarity, with his dignity, with his courtesy and kindness, with his modesty and wit and his ready willingness to share his knowledge with those who sought his counsel.

And over the years there was a constant stream of people who called on him for that counsel—not only Members of Congress (and there were so many of them), not only political scientists and state legislators and journalists, not only parliamentarians from nations across the world and other foreign dignitaries, but also the people who worked with him on a day-to-day basis: his own colleagues. And I regard this as most significant, because if there is anyone who really is in a position to appraise a man's work—and his character—it's the man who works alongside of him.

One man who worked alongside of George for many, many years, and who knew him well, was Dr. Ernest S. Griffith, who was Director of the Legislative Reference Service for some 18 years. Dr. Griffith today is in the far west at a rather inaccessible spot in Glacier National Park. We contacted him by telephone, and over the telephone he dictated a tribute to George that I have been asked to read to you.

These are the words of Dr. Griffith:

The news of George Galloway's tragic death reached me this evening in the Montana mountains. As I write, these mountains in their strength and majesty speak of his strength of purpose and the grandeur of the concepts that governed his life. To him the Congress of the United States was central. He would have it responsible. He would have it worthy of the responsibility to which it is called. For these goals he labored in season and out; and with an effectiveness which he himself never fully realized. He was a perfectionist in these matters, and it troubled him when he sensed the shortcomings of those whom he would have rise to their full potentialities as leaders and members of the Congress.

I do not know when and how Dr. Galloway first acquired this interest. I do know that it came to its full flowering when the American Political Science Association made him chairman of its Committee on Congress. The story of this committee furnishes an interesting chapter in the annals of the Association. Its Washington group, under the prodding of the late Benjamin B. Wallace, had sent in a resolution to the Executive Council of the Association calling for the formation of such a committee. Hitherto the Association, as such, had rather consistently refused to attempt a role in political reform of any sort. There was, accordingly, a disposition in certain quarters to ignore the resolution or at least to treat it cavalierly. It was my privilege when the item was finally reached on the agenda, long past midnight I believe, to press for an affirmative decision calling attention to the probable reaction in the Washington Chapter of any curt dismissal. By a divided vote the committee idea won the day but with a directive to emphasize research.

Once the committee was formed, under Dr. Galloway's vigorous leadership it ploughed fresh terrain with what was, I believe, a new technique for the Association. First the Committee identified the Members of Congress of both parties who had expressed serious concern with its organization and functioning. Then in a series of off the record dinners, these Members were encouraged to discuss their ideas with the Committee. Ideas from the political science fraternity were solicited and tried out on the Members of Congress at the various dinner sessions. I scarcely need say that the Members invited were from both parties and the discussions were nonpartisan. Among the

participants were Democrats Maloney and Monroney, and Republicans Dirksen and Michener, Robert M. LaFollette, Jr., then an Independent and many, many others. The Committee report was a milestone. Its influence in aiding in the crystallization of Congress' own self study was clearly admitted by the sponsors of the Joint Resolution which, in 1944, set up the Committee on the Organization of Congress, known more familiarly as the LaFollette-Monroney Committee.

It was natural and perhaps inevitable that George Galloway was invited to become the Staff Director of this Committee, a post which he occupied with great tact and distinction during the two years or so of the Committee's life. Those familiar with Congressional ways know the importance of the role of the Committee Staff Director. Never was a Committee better served. The rapport between the dynamic and thoughtful co-chairmen and Dr. Galloway was virtually perfect. The Committee's first function was to encourage as many Members of Congress as possible to testify or at least send in memoranda. During this process it soon became clear what the trouble areas were. Under the guidance of Dr. Galloway's ever orderly mind, questioning and testimony and Committee deliberation more and more centered on these areas—especially committee structure, staffing, control of lobbying, and the lessening of the work-load of the individual member arising from relatively unimportant calls upon his time. The Committee Report drafted by Dr. Galloway was a marvel of its kind; as was also the bill introduced under the Committee's sponsorship.

Not all that the Committee desired found its way to the statute books, but most major proposals were passed. The number of standing committees was greatly reduced; their correspondence to the executive agencies and department much improved. Members were thus better enabled to specialize. Professional staffs were authorized for all standing committees. The Legislative Reference Service was enormously strengthened and its role clarified as a primary reliance for the individual Member and a supplementary facility for the Committee. If the lobbying provisions of the Act were not conspicuously successful, at least the issues were clarified and the difficulties exposed. Progress was made in lessening workloads, chiefly by the aforementioned staff service.

As a sequel, it was not surprising that bipartisan representations were made to the Director of the Legislative Reference Service that Dr. Galloway should be named as its first Senior Specialist in the legislative process and to give continuity in service to those Members and Committees of Congress interested in the ever better functioning of that body. So for more than 20 years, George Galloway carried on in this field, serving impartially those with whose ideas he agreed and disagreed. Always he strove to make the facts of the situation available; always when dealing with a problem he wrote clearly and forthrightly—listing each proposed solution and the pros and cons of each. There were many published studies by George Galloway and many public acknowledgments of his ideas.

I knew him well in these years, and know how at times he wondered whether what he was doing was worthwhile. Many things he felt very deeply—for example, the illogic which associated with the seniority rule, with the powers of committee chairmen, with the lack—as he saw it—of strict party responsibility. What he did not realize was the fashion in which Congress often chose to substitute modifications of usage and custom for the more formal type of reformation; thus at times retaining the advantages of the status quo by responding constructively to criticism of its disadvantages. While many

worthwhile formal changes were added by the reports he prepared for Members initiating them, his greatest influence during these years was in the analysis he gave Members in illuminating issues—a look more far-reaching in influence than he himself realized. It is not too much of an exaggeration to speak of him in this phase as "the conscience of the Congress."

No account of his service in strengthening our legislative process would be complete without mention of his published works, especially "Congress at the Crossroads", "The Legislative Process in Congress", and "The History of the House of Representatives". These have been read by, and have influenced, thousands and thousands of teachers, students, editors, and citizens in general. His ideas have entered the main stream of our nation's thought. Always they were informed in detail; always they were clear; often they were in the midst of realistic controversy at its best.

You will forgive me if in closing I add a more personal note—for I have lost a friend, one of the closest and best I have known. He and I both made the Congress our chosen field. Sometimes we agreed, sometimes we disagreed. Always I respected his criticisms, their penetrating quality and good temper and evident attempt to be fair. We shared the same objectives more deeply. We each knew we could count on the other for the candor that friendship could evoke as its more profound expression. If in my own way I may have served Congress in some fashion, much of this is due to my association with George Galloway. I feel sure that Ellene Galloway will say the same as regards her own notable services, and George would say this of her. Their two sons have a magnificent heritage.

I do not know George Galloway's thoughts as to immortality. This I do know—that one who has so dedicated his life to his fellowmen need not fear. You all, regardless of your particular beliefs in immortality as ordinarily understood, will grant at least this—that George Galloway set in motion and aided forces, constructive forces, at the very highest level in the democratic process, such that, if they come to know the truth of the matter, generations to come will rise up and call him blessed.

Mr. PIERCE. My association with George began exactly twenty years ago in the summer of 1947. I had just completed a study on the government of the District of Columbia under the auspices of the Library of Congress and at the request of the House District Committee. On submission of that report, a Subcommittee on Home Rule and Reorganization was appointed under the chairmanship of Congressman Auchincloss of New Jersey. George was appointed Staff Director and I was named as Assistant Staff Director. The chairman of the House Committee was Congressman and now Senator Everett Dirksen. As staff members, our assignments were to make proposals for improvement in the organization of D.C. government and to propose methods for enfranchising the residents of the District. As he states in his autobiography, George's long experience with the Municipal Research Bureau in Philadelphia served him in good stead for this assignment. As the work progressed, we discovered that our main responsibilities were to separate fact from fiction, truth from rumor and prejudice. Eventually, it was possible to make an orderly presentation of recommendations based upon fact and consistent with representative democratic government. After hearings on the main issues, legislation was drafted and introduced.

The record on home rule in the District of Columbia is too well known to most of you here today to dwell upon the reasons for its lack of success. It did not fail for lack of effort. Both George and I, convinced by the justice of the cause, devoted evenings and weekends to making hundreds of speeches

during the year when the Bill was under consideration, explaining the legislation and answering questions both pertinent—and impertinent. The support that was mobilized continues to this day. The opposition has been constant and untiring. The Bill passed the Senate three times, in substantially its original form, but could not get reported out of the House District Committee.

When George referred to his failures in attaining the third of his major aims, that of promoting democracy in American government, he listed Home Rule for the District of Columbia as the first of these. He went on to list other failures in this category: limitation of debate in the Senate, requirement for relevancy in Senate debate, a curb on the House Rules Committee and a code for fair play to prevent abuse of the investigative function. I leave it to you to judge whether these are indeed failures for which he has any personal responsibility. Perhaps nothing sums up the total of George's philosophy of life better than a phrase from Emerson which appears in his autobiography.

"What is a man born for but to be a Reformer, a Re-maker of what man has made; a renouncer of lies, a restorer of truth and good, imitating that great Nature which embosoms us all, and which sleeps no moment on an old past, but every hour repairs herself, yielding us every morning a new day, and with every pulsation a new life?"

What is a man born for, but to be a Reformer?

George Galloway was a Reformer.

Following the conclusion of these services, Mrs. Galloway and members of the family will be at the rear exit of this room for those who wish to pay their respects. After the services are concluded, please remain at your seats until she and members of the family have moved to that location.

We will now conclude the services by standing and observing a moment of silent meditation as a token of our respect and regard for our friend and associate, Dr. George B. Galloway.

NATIONAL ATTENTION FOCUSED ON DISAPPEARING SPECIES THROUGHOUT WORLD

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, it was with great pleasure that I noted in the Washington Post of Sunday, September 17, an excellent article on the dangers faced by the wild fur-bearing animals whose beautiful skins have become articles of such importance to fashion designers and fashionable. The article, written by Chairman Irston R. Barnes, of the Audubon Naturalist Society, inveighs against the unconscionable use of furs of the rapidly disappearing species of wild animals by both designer and consumer, and recommends that the consumer can provide the best means of stopping the slaughter, by rejecting these skins which are obtained at such cost to international wildlife.

I highly commend Mr. Barnes on his foresight and his concern with this increasing danger to whole species of animals. It is to provide for such public and international awareness and action against senseless killing of endangered species that I introduced in the Senate on August 28 of this year Senate Concurrent Resolution 41. This resolution provides for the setting up of an international conference on conservation of wildlife. As Mr. Barnes notes, this need is a great and growing one, and must be

acted on now, before more valuable and irreplaceable species altogether vanish from the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled, "Hard-Pressed Species Can Survive If Buyers Take Profit Out of Killing," be printed in the RECORD.

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

HARD-PRESSED SPECIES CAN SURVIVE IF BUYERS TAKE PROFIT OUT OF KILLING

(By Irston R. Barnes)

Some of the nicest people in the world are the ultimate economic force that is destroying some of our most beautiful and exciting wildlife. Today these people could be as effective as were their grandmothers and great-grandmothers 70 years ago when they rallied to save our most dramatic birds from extinction.

Fashions are still a threat to wildlife, just as hat fashions were in the 1890s, when gunners serving the millinery trade were slaughtering egrets and herons, gulls and terns, and many other birds to provide decorations for ladies' hats. The nuptial plumes of the egrets were so highly valued that at one time they were literally worth their weight in gold, and hunters followed these beautiful birds into the nesting colonies, wiping out entire colonies to satisfy the commercial demand.

When the Audubon Society of the District of Columbia was organized, its first action was not to raise money for sanctuaries and for wardens. Its first and most effective step was to mobilize the public opinion of the women of the country, to lead them to reject all hats decorated with the plumage of birds. Of course, the aroused public opinion was effective in securing protective legislation, in raising money for sanctuaries, but the most important accomplishment was to take the profit out of killing for the millinery trade.

The parallel problem today is clearly indicated in Philip K. Crowe's "The Empty Ark," recently reviewed in this column. In his investigation of the current status of rare wildlife species, Crowe repeatedly uses the market price for pelts as an index of the increasing rarity of endangered species. He reported that the Peruvian chinchilla, the so-called royal chinchilla, is probably extinct in the wild. The fate of the little animal is reflected in the market prices of its skins: \$6 a dozen in 1900; \$200 apiece by 1930; and wild chinchilla wraps in New York, if available, being priced in the \$50,000 range.

The ultimate responsibility for the disappearance of many rare species will lie with the women of fashion who provide the market for their furs, perhaps chiefly because these furs are expensive and hence are leading items of conspicuous expenditure, and the commercial interests which profit hugely by destroying these colorful animals.

Thus the New York fur trade features Somali leopards from Ethiopia, which exports 10,000 leopards a year although the hunting of leopards is supposedly fully controlled. Crowe reports the extent of the traffic at an estimated \$1.4 million a year. "The native hunter probably gets only about \$50 a skin, the smuggler gets about \$150 and in a New York fur store a fine leopard coat consisting of eight skins can bring \$10,000."

Although protected by law, the skins of the colobus monkey are readily available in stores in Addis Ababa.

Laws are important; international conventions to stop the trade in the skins of rare species would help; but most potent of all would be a termination of the styles and fashions in furs by the women who provide the ultimate economic incentives for this trade. The leopard is only one among many wild skins that have no place in commercial

markets if we are genuinely interested in protecting endangered species.

Alligator shoes, handbags and other items ought not to be items of commerce. The black alligators of the Amazon are victims of this trade. "Ten years ago two million skins came into the Manaus market and today fewer than 200,000 are sold."

Peru seeks to protect the vicuña, but their hides are regular items of commerce in Bolivia, where prices of \$100 a skin assure illegal killing of these animals.

Commercialism also threatens the tiny red siskin of Venezuela because canary fanciers—there are reportedly some two million of them—will pay up to \$60 for a red siskin canary cross, which is a superlative singer.

Leopards, chinchillas, jaguars, ocelots, vicuñas, alligators, red siskins! Wherever rare and endangered species are being exploited for profit, the most effective protection can come from the buyers and consumers. If the skins of these rare species could go completely out of fashion, the killing would end. So long as men and women purchase such items the slaughter will continue. The ultimate consumer must thus accept responsibility for the destruction of life carried out at his or her behest.

Today there is no need to start a new conservation organization as there was in the 1890s, when the plumages of birds were causing indiscriminate slaughter. If members of existing organizations with conservation goals made protection of endangered species from commercialism an active part of their programs, much could be accomplished.

LET US NOT BE FOOLED BY THE ARAB-SOVIET GAME

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, the Arab States of the Middle East have once again retreated from the harsh realities of a situation they were mainly responsible for.

Culminating their string of short-sighted moves, they precipitated a total military disaster. Compounding this is their utter refusal to face up to the realities of the present situation.

They have made themselves willing tools of the Soviet Union in the Middle East, allowing themselves to be used in the most casual and cynical manner.

Now these Arab States, oblivious to the advantages of direct negotiations with Israel, seek to enter by the back door of diplomacy after being rebuffed at the front door of military effort.

They seek to use American influence in the diplomatic field to win undeserved concessions from Israel. They hope to convince our Nation to use its influence to obtain a bargain at Israel's expense. I sincerely hope their effort is rejected by this country.

Let us not tread where those who spurned us yesterday ask us to do. It cannot and will not be to our benefit to do so. These very nations not only spurned us in the most unfair and undeserved manner, but have broken diplomatic relations with us.

These are the very same countries who subjected American nationals, American property, symbols of our Nation and our diplomats to the most appalling abuse and violence.

These are the nations who have used our country as an international whipping boy to excuse their own childish acts, diplomatic errors, and misguided policies.

We have been blamed by them for the sufferings of their own people. Yet now these very nations seek to use King Hussein as the key to the door they could not open by other means. Mr. President, we are not deceived. Nor are the brave and realistic Israelis.

To court or heed these insincere representatives of the Arab world is to reopen the doors to conflict once more. It would be working hand-in-glove with those very men who are so closely tied in with the Soviet Union and its cold-blooded attempt to step to Middle Eastern power over the bodies of innocents.

These are the same men who accepted Soviet arms with one hand and American aid with the other, hailing the former and damning the latter.

Were we to involve ourselves in their latest sub-rosa maneuver, our chances of being drawn into a confrontation with the Soviet Union would be increased substantially. Will we take this chance for the sake of governments who seek our harm?

The Israelis are standing firm in their own self-interest. They will not allow themselves to be euhed into a position of peril again.

Should we become a bumbling party to this effort and allow ourselves to be so used, we would cut a shameful figure indeed before the rest of the world.

America has made her foreign policy mistakes in the past. But by and large we have sought to perform on the world stage in an honorable manner.

I cannot believe we would ever relegate all our principles to the rubbish heap of history, and cynically play a role in the betrayal of a fiercely free people. Especially would it be a shameful thing if we did this in alliance with men and governments who are now bywords for dictatorship, attempted politicide, and international double dealing.

JAPAN'S GROWING ROLE IN DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, if the nations of the underdeveloped world are to be assisted in overcoming their problems of disease, hunger, and poverty, it is essential that those nations in a position to do so help them in their efforts.

Our own Government has been engaged in such a task ever since the end of World War II. Through the Marshall plan we have assisted Western Europe to rebuild after the devastation of World War II. Our aid since that time has assisted men and women in their desire for a better life in Asia, Latin America, and Africa.

But America cannot do this alone, and there is a need for other industrial nations to participate with us. One nation which was a recipient of American aid and is now dispensing aid of her own to the underdeveloped world is Japan.

Ever since the enactment of the Colombo plan in 1954, Japan has been steadily increasing its assistance to developing nations. In 1964 she formally joined the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, becoming an equal partner with the Western industrialized nations and sharing with

them the responsibility for providing aid to underdeveloped countries. Japan's aid is expected to reach the level of \$1 billion a year in the reasonably near future.

In an important and optimistic report, the United States-Japan Trade Council has issued a review entitled "Japan's Growing Role in Development Assistance." It points out that 1966 was a memorable year for Asian economic cooperation:

The countries of Asia took several concrete steps toward closer regional economic ties in order to deal cooperatively with problems of development. The establishment of the Asian Development Bank was indicative of the new trend. At the inaugural meeting of the Bank of Tokyo in November, 1966, 18 member nations pledged an initial capitalization of \$1 billion. Japan, the leading Asian subscriber, pledged \$200 million, equalling the contribution of the United States, one of the 12 nonregional members. This marked the first time in postwar history that any nation has equalled the contribution of the United States to an international organization.

The report also describes the aid given by Japanese private industry. In Thailand, for example, the development of modern industries by Japanese private enterprises has helped speed up that nation's industrialization. Japan is also playing a significant role in assistance to India, through programs designed to halt the drain on the foreign exchange reserves of that country, now plagued by a huge trade deficit.

Also discussed is the newly organized Japanese Corps for Overseas Cooperation, Japan's own version of the Peace Corps. By the end of 1966 there were about 100 volunteers in Laos, Cambodia, Malaysia, the Philippines, and India teaching rice cultivation, vegetable gardening, irrigation, and other skills.

To bring this important Japanese program to the attention of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that this significant report be printed in the RECORD.

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

JAPAN'S GROWING ROLE IN DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

The decade of the 1960's, designated by the United Nations as the Decade of Development, has seen a great expansion of the technical and economic assistance given by the highly industrialized countries to emerging countries, both multilaterally and bilaterally. Such expansion is desperately needed because of the wide disparity that now exists between the resources of industrial nations, which account for only 25 percent of the world's population but as much as 80 percent of total production, and those of newly developing nations, which represent 75 percent of the population but supply only 20 percent of total production.

There is now mounting recognition that Japan is destined to play an increasingly active role in assistance to underdeveloped nations. Last year saw Japan actively participating in several projects which marked a historic new departure in economic cooperation among Asian nations. Japan's total foreign aid, which has increased rapidly during the past few years, is expected to reach the level of \$1 billion a year in the reasonably near future.

LIMITATIONS ON JAPANESE AID

Ever since the enactment of the Colombo Plan in 1954, Japan has been steadily increas-

ing its assistance to developing nations. In 1964, she formally joined the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, becoming an equal partner with the western industrialized nations and sharing with them the responsibility for providing aid to underdeveloped countries. Even prior to her accession to the OECD, Japan joined the Development Assistance Committee, a subordinate body of that organization, and took part in its international program for development assistance.

In the past decade, however, Japan's efforts to aid emerging nations have been limited by several factors. Her income level remains low compared with other industrial nations. At present, Japan's per capita income is one-third that of the average member nation of OECD's Development Assistance Committee. Her foreign exchange reserves are usually at a level too low for comfort. Furthermore, Japan does not maintain the kind of close political relationship with a bloc of underdeveloped countries—such as France with her former colonies or Great Britain with the sterling bloc—which makes the giving of aid a natural development. Finally, Japan has found it necessary for a number of years to place primary emphasis on the reconstruction and strengthening of her own economy.

The Japanese economy has made great strides in the last decade. This has led not only to an increased ability to offer assistance, but an increased awareness of the responsibility to do so. During the past year, Japan has re-evaluated its basic position on foreign aid and has reached a decision to move steadily ahead in this area.

A NEW STAGE IN ASIAN ECONOMIC COOPERATION

1966 was a memorable year for Asian economic cooperation. The countries of Asia took several concrete steps toward closer regional economic ties in order to deal cooperatively with problems of development. The establishment of the Asian Development Bank was indicative of the new trend. At the inaugural meeting of the Bank of Tokyo in November, 1966, 18 member nations pledged an initial capitalization of \$1 billion. Japan, the leading Asian subscriber, pledged \$200 million, equalling the contribution of the United States, one of the 12 non-regional members. This marked the first time in postwar history that any nation has equalled the contribution of the United States to an international organization. The Bank is authorized to grant loans for a wide variety of development projects, both national and multinational, within the region. Among the multinational projects in which it will undoubtedly participate are the vast Mekong Valley development and the construction of highways, railroads and communications networks linking the countries of Asia.

The Ministerial Conference for Economic Development of Southeast Asia was held in Tokyo in April, 1966 to encourage voluntary efforts for economic development and to strengthen cooperation among participating countries. Japan pledged at the conference to raise the level of its foreign aid to one percent of its national income as soon as possible, and promised that a substantial share of its total aid would be channeled to the Southeast Asian region.

The April Conference led to a regional conference on agricultural development, also held in Tokyo, in December. Here the conferees agreed on the need to establish an agricultural development fund, possibly within the Asian Development Bank, and to provide capital on liberal terms for agricultural development projects in Southeast Asia. Japan was asked to provide a substantial part of the capital for the fund, with comparable amounts coming from the Southeast Asian region and from Western sources. The need was also recognized to proceed with studies for a new regional Marine Fisheries

Research and Development Center, proposed by Singapore and Thailand.

The government of Japan is keenly aware of its role as the most highly developed nation in Asia, and has been steadily expanding its financial and technological assistance to less developed countries. Of the members of the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD, Japan is the fifth largest supplier of official and private financial aid, after the United States, France, West Germany and the United Kingdom. Japan's efforts have multiplied significantly in the past few years. Japanese aid totaled \$486 million in 1965, a 67 percent increase over the previous year. The 1966 figure amounted to \$538 million, another 11 percent increase. In these years, foreign aid represented approximately 0.7 percent of the Japanese national income. The government is resolved to bring its assistance up to one percent of the national income as rapidly as its economic capabilities will permit.

JAPANESE AID IS WORLDWIDE, BUT CENTERS ON ASIA

Japan is active in development assistance all over the world. To Latin America and Africa, Japan's assistance is extended mostly in the form of private investment and export credit. In Brazil, for example, Japanese business ventures cover a wide range of activities in agriculture, forestry, fisheries, food, textiles, chemicals, ceramics, steel and electrical machinery. One of the largest ventures is the Usiminas steel mill, which is now capable of turning out 500 thousand tons of steel ingots a year. These ventures, along with financial aid and technical assistance supplied by Japan, are contributing in no small measure to the development of the Brazilian economy. Japan is also actively engaged in various development projects in Argentina, Peru, Mexico and other Latin American countries. In Africa, Japanese assistance through official sources is becoming increasingly active. A technical training center was set up by the Japanese government near Nairobi, Kenya in 1964. Here Japanese experts teach Africans the techniques of metalworking, machine sewing, machine assembly and repair. The Japanese government has recently supplied yen credits to a number of African countries for use in financing the development and processing of primary goods.

Japan's development assistance activities, however, naturally center chiefly on Asia. In 1965, 68.4 percent of Japan's economic assistance went to Asia, 16.2 percent to Latin America and 3.3 percent to Africa. Whereas in Latin America private investments dominate, the major portion of Japan's economic assistance in many parts of Asia is given in the form of governmental grants and credits, with private industry retaining a subordinate though important role.

REPARATIONS AGREEMENTS FOSTER AID

Under a reparations agreement with Burma, which was completed in 1965, Japan has provided assistance amounting to \$200 million, most of which was spent for the construction of an 84,000 kilowatt hydroelectric plant. Japan is now providing, under a new agreement signed in 1963, economic and technical assistance valued at \$140 million through 1977.

The 1956 reparations agreement with the Philippines called for \$550 million in goods and services over a 20 year period. By March, 1967, Japan had provided 43.7 percent of the total amount, which was spent for the construction of a cement factory, paper and lumber mills and other modern installations.

Japan began providing aid to Indonesia, amounting to \$223 million over a twelve year period, under a 1958 reparations agreement. By March 1967, 80 percent of the total amount was already provided for the construction of three dams, a paper mill and a cotton textile plant. Currently, Japan is one of the leaders in international efforts to help

the new Jakarta regime pull Indonesia out of its economic difficulties. In September, 1966, the first conference of Indonesia's creditor nations, which took place in Tokyo at Japan's initiative, agreed to reschedule that country's debt repayments.

Japan's economic aid to South Vietnam was provided under the provisions of a reparations agreement for \$39 million and a loan agreement for \$7.5 million which took effect in 1960. The major portion of the reparations has been used for the construction of the Da Nhim hydroelectric power plant. The plant, with a capacity of 160,000 KW, has already been completed and now sends power to Saigon. Reparations payments have also been used to build a number of factories for the manufacture of light industrial products. Yen credits extended under the loan agreement have been used for the installation of transmission lines and a transformer substation for the Da Nhim power plant. Japan has also sent medical missions to South Vietnam and is extending various types of technical aid.

PRIVATE INDUSTRY AUGMENTS GOVERNMENT AID

In Thailand, the development of modern industries by Japanese private enterprises has helped speed up the nation's industrialization. Japanese business ventures have been set up for a wide range of industries, including blankets, electric wire, fasteners, cotton spinning, weaving and dyeing, insecticides, steel piping, rolled steel and assembling of radios and television sets. Japan has also provided technical assistance in such fields as telecommunications techniques, road construction and fisheries. She had extended aid to Thailand amounting to \$13.9 million by March, 1967 under an agreement signed in 1962 which called for a total amount of \$26.7 million to be expended over 8 years. Chief items already supplied are a textile plant, fish research vessels and cargo boats.

Japan is playing a significant role in assistance to India, through programs designed to halt the drain on the foreign exchange reserves of that country, now plagued by a huge trade deficit. This has been done on both private and governmental levels. Government aid mostly comprises loans committed each year, plus such technical assistance as the establishment of model farms and a fishery training center. Private assistance concentrates primarily on the granting of deferred payments for various kinds of exports, including those for textile machinery, contributing to the development of the country's natural resources.

Japan began providing economic and technical assistance to Laos and Cambodia under agreements enacted in 1959, which are now completed. Under these arrangements Laos received \$4.7 million for the construction of a water pipeline and hydroelectric plant in the capital city of Vientiane, and Cambodia received \$4.1 million to extend water lines in the capital city of Phnom Penh, and to support medical and agricultural aid. Japan also joined the Agreement for the Foreign Exchange Fund for Laos, which aims at mitigating inflation in Laos and stabilizing exchange rates of the kip and which contributed \$0.5 million and \$1.7 million in 1965 and 1966, respectively.

These examples are illustrative of the depth and variety of Japan's commitment to development assistance in Asia. Other Japanese aid projects are found in South Korea, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Malaysia, Singapore, Pakistan and Ceylon. It should also be noted that, beside governmental assistance activities, Japan is extending assistance in the forms of private investment and export credit to Southeast Asia, particularly to Indonesia, the Philippines and Thailand, on a large scale.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND THE JAPANESE PEACE CORPS

Aid through the medium of investments, loans and grants, however substantial, can-

not be fully effective unless accompanied by technical cooperation and positive measures to encourage the exports of developing nations. Japan has become increasingly active in these fields of development assistance. Because the Japanese possess in great abundance the skills and experience needed throughout the less developed world, there is almost limitless scope for Japanese technical aid. The problem is to devise techniques for the effective transmission of this experience and knowledge across language and cultural barriers.

The principal methods of extending technical assistance are through the training and guidance of technicians and consultation on the planning and formulation of development projects. In the first area Japan accepts overseas trainees, dispatches its own technical experts and establishes and operates overseas technical centers, while the main form of cooperation in the second category is the provision of various consulting teams. Additional aid is given through supplying of machinery and equipment, the acceptance of foreign students and the sending abroad of members of the newly formed Japanese Youth Corps for Overseas Cooperation. Japan's own version of the Peace Corps is beginning to take shape. By the end of 1966 there were about 100 volunteers in Laos, Cambodia, Malaysia, the Philippines and India teaching rice cultivation, vegetable gardening, farm management, irrigation, road building, lumbering and ceramics.

ASSISTANCE FOR EXPORTS

Primary products account for an overwhelming 85 percent of the exports of the newly developing countries. One of the chief obstacles to an increase in the exportation of these products has been their relatively high prices. To overcome this difficulty, Japan has set up a so-called "compensation system" in her trade with a number of the developing countries, under which Japanese exporters contribute to a fund which is used to compensate importers for losses resulting from the purchase of expensive primary products. Japan has taken a series of additional measures to cope with other difficulties in the trade in primary products, such as relatively poor quality, erratic commercial practices and inadequate exporting capabilities in the exporting country.

As a close trading partner of developing nations Japan has a large stake in their continued economic advancement. In 1965, these countries accounted for forty-three percent of Japan's total exports and forty-two percent of her total imports. Japanese economic assistance programs aim at increasing the economic well being of the developing nations as a contribution to peace and to the advancement of the living standards of their people. At the same time, it is clear that the economic advancement of nearby underdeveloped countries will benefit Japan's own economy.

JAPAN'S KEY ROLE IN ASIAN DEVELOPMENT

Asia, with its rich natural resources, large working population, poverty, disease and political unrest, presents a serious challenge to the free world. Japan is the free world's best hope for leadership in Asia. Her increasing contributions to the welfare of the Asian region are a necessary part of the struggle for the establishment and maintenance of the basic principles of democracy on this crowded continent. As a country that has fully demonstrated the superior capacity for growth of a free economy; as the one Asian country that has developed a full and stable pattern of personal freedom and parliamentary democracy; as the only nation in Asia which has demonstrated that Asians too can enjoy an affluent society, Japan will exert increasing influence on the destinies of the peoples of this region and throughout the less developed world.

Although Japan is now recognized as a leading industrial nation, her per capita in-

come still falls short of the western democracies. While her economic growth rate in recent years has been remarkably high, the nation's economy is still struggling under the burdens of providing for the needed expansion of its social and economic structure. Consequently, to grant economic aid at the same level as the leading industrial nations of the West is to place a heavy burden on the Japanese people. What Japan is attempting to do is to seek remedies for her domestic difficulties while at the same time increasing as rapidly as possible her economic assistance programs to developing nations. Japan's capacity to perform both tasks successfully depends on her ability to expand her own economy.

Japan's economic dynamism rests to an unusual degree on the foundation of foreign trade. With a large and increasing population, few natural resources and a limited territory, Japan depends heavily on foreign commerce for economic survival. The expansion of foreign trade is therefore important on two counts to developing nations. It not only helps their economies directly, but it will enable at least one aid giving nation, Japan, to increase the scope and amount of the economic assistance which these countries so desperately need.

THE POSSIBILITY OF THERMONUCLEAR WAR

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on September 18, 1967, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara addressed the United Press International editors and publishers in San Francisco, Calif. In his speech, the Secretary discussed the planning, preparation, and policy governing the possibility of thermonuclear war.

I ask unanimous consent to insert Secretary McNamara's remarks in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ROBERT S. MCNAMARA BEFORE UNITED PRESS INTERNATIONAL EDITORS AND PUBLISHERS, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1967

Ladies and Gentlemen: I want to discuss with you this afternoon the gravest problem that an American Secretary of Defense must face: the planning, preparation, and policy governing the possibility of thermonuclear war.

It is a prospect most of mankind would prefer not to contemplate.

That is understandable. For technology has now circumscribed us all with a conceivable horizon of horror that could dwarf any catastrophe that has befallen man in his more than a million years on earth.

Man has lived now for more than twenty years in what we have come to call the Atomic Age.

What we sometimes overlook is that every future age of man will be an atomic age.

If, then, man is to have a future at all, it will have to be a future overshadowed with the permanent possibility of thermonuclear holocaust.

About that fact, we are no longer free.

Our freedom in this question consists rather in facing the matter rationally and realistically and discussing actions to minimize the danger.

No sane citizen; no sane political leader; no sane nation wants thermonuclear war.

But merely not wanting it is not enough.

We must understand the difference between actions which increase its risk, those which reduce it, and those which, while costly, have little influence one way or another.

Now this whole subject matter tends to be psychologically unpleasant. But there is an even greater difficulty standing in the way of constructive and profitable debate over the issues.

And that is that nuclear strategy is exceptionally complex in its technical aspects. Unless these complexities are well understood, rational discussion and decisionmaking are simply not possible.

What I want to do this afternoon is deal with these complexities and clarify them with as much precision and detail as time and security permit.

One must begin with precise definitions.

The cornerstone of our strategic policy continues to be to deter deliberate nuclear attack upon the United States, or its allies, by maintaining a highly reliable ability to inflict an unacceptable degree of damage upon any single aggressor, or combination of aggressors, at any time during the course of a strategic nuclear exchange—even after our absorbing a surprise first strike.

This can be defined as our "assured destruction capability."

Now it is imperative to understand that assured destruction is the very essence of the whole deterrence concept.

We must possess an actual assured destruction capability. And that actual assured destruction capability must also be credible. Conceivably, our assured destruction capability could be actual, without being credible—in which case, it might fail to deter an aggressor.

The point is that a potential aggressor must himself believe that our assured destruction capability is in fact actual, and that our will to use it in retaliation to an attack is in fact unwavering.

The conclusion, then, is clear: if the United States is to deter a nuclear attack on itself or on our allies, it must possess an actual, and a credible assured destruction capability.

When calculating the force we require, we must be "conservative" in all our estimates of both a potential aggressor's capabilities, and his intentions. Security depends upon taking a "worst plausible case"—and having the ability to cope with that eventuality.

In that eventuality, we must be able to absorb the total weight of nuclear attack on our country—on our strike-back forces; on our command and control apparatus; on our industrial capacity; on our cities; and on our population—and still, be fully capable of destroying the aggressor to the point that his society is simply no longer viable in any meaningful twentieth-century sense.

That is what deterrence to nuclear aggression means. It means the certainty of suicide to the aggressor—not merely to his military forces, but to his society as a whole.

Now let us consider another term: "first-strike capability." This, in itself, is an ambiguous term, since it could mean simply the ability of one nation to attack another nation with nuclear forces first. But as it is normally used, it connotes much more: the substantial elimination of the attacked nation's retaliatory second-strike forces.

This is the sense in which "first-strike capability" should be understood.

Now, clearly, such a first-strike capability is an important strategic concept. The United States cannot—and will not—ever permit itself to get into the position in which another nation, or combination of nations, would possess such a first-strike capability, which could be effectively used against it.

To get into such a position vis-a-vis any other nation or nations would not only constitute an intolerable threat to our security, but it would obviously remove our ability to deter nuclear aggression—both against ourselves and against our allies.

Now, we are not in that position today—and there is no foreseeable danger of our ever getting into that position.

Our strategic offensive forces are im-

mense: 1000 Minuteman missile launchers, carefully protected below ground; 41 Polaris submarines, carrying 656 missile launchers—with the majority of these hidden beneath the seas at all times; and about 600 long-range bombers, approximately forty percent of which are kept always in a high state of alert.

Our alert forces alone carry more than 2200 weapons, averaging more than one megaton each. A mere 400 one-megaton weapons, if delivered on the Soviet Union, would be sufficient to destroy over one-third of her population, and one-half of her industry.

And all of these flexible and highly reliable forces are equipped with devices that insure their penetration of Soviet defenses.

Now what about the Soviet Union?

Does it today possess a powerful nuclear arsenal?

The answer is that it does.

Does it possess a first-strike capability against the United States?

The answer is that it does not.

Can the Soviet Union, in the foreseeable future, acquire such a first-strike capability against the United States?

The answer is that it cannot.

It cannot because we are determined to remain fully alert, and we will never permit our own assured destruction capability to be at a point where a Soviet first-strike capability is even remotely feasible.

Is the Soviet Union seriously attempting to acquire a first-strike capability against the United States?

Although this is a question we cannot answer with absolute certainty, we believe the answer is no. In any event, the question itself is—in a sense—irrelevant. It is irrelevant since the United States will so continue to maintain—and where necessary strengthen—our retaliatory forces, that whatever the Soviet Union's intentions or actions, we will continue to have an assured destruction capability vis-a-vis their society in which we are completely confident.

But there is another question that is most relevant.

And that is, do we—the United States—possess a first-strike capability against the Soviet Union?

The answer is that we do not.

And we do not, not because we have neglected our nuclear strength. On the contrary, we have increased it to the point that we possess a clear superiority over the Soviet Union.

We do not possess first-strike capability against the Soviet Union for precisely the same reason that they do not possess it against us.

And that is that we have both built up our "second-strike capability" to the point that a first-strike capability on either side has become unattainable.

There is, of course, no way in which the United States could have prevented the Soviet Union from acquiring its present second-strike capability—short of a massive pre-emptive first strike on the Soviet Union in the 1950s.

The blunt fact is, then, that neither the Soviet Union nor the United States can attack the other without being destroyed in retaliation; nor can either of us attain a first-strike capability in the foreseeable future.

The further fact is that both the Soviet Union and the United States presently possess an actual and credible second-strike capability against one another—and it is precisely this mutual capability that provides us both with the strongest possible motive to avoid a nuclear war.

The more frequent question that arises in

¹A "second-strike capability" is the capability to absorb a surprise nuclear attack, and survive with sufficient power to inflict unacceptable damage on the aggressor.

this connection in whether or not the United States possesses nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union.

The answer is that we do.

But the answer is—like everything else in this matter—technically complex.

The complexity arises in part out of what measurement of superiority is most meaningful and realistic.

Many commentators on the matter tend to define nuclear superiority in terms of gross megatonnage, or in terms of the number of missile launchers available.

Now, by both these two standards of measurement, the United States does have a substantial superiority over the Soviet Union in the weapons targeted against each other.

But it is precisely these two standards of measurement that are themselves misleading.

For the most meaningful and realistic measurement of nuclear capability is neither gross megatonnage, nor the number of available missile launchers; but rather the number of separate warheads that are capable of being delivered with accuracy on individual high-priority targets with sufficient power to destroy them.

Gross megatonnage in itself is an inadequate indicator of assured destruction capability, since it is unrelated to survivability, accuracy, or penetrability, and poorly related to effective elimination of multiple high-priority targets. There is manifestly no advantage in over-destroying one target, at the expense of leaving undamaged other targets of equal importance.

Further, the number of missile launchers available is also an inadequate indicator of assured destruction capability, since the fact is that many of our launchers will carry multiple warheads.

But by using the realistic measurement of the number of warheads available, capable of being reliably delivered with accuracy and effectiveness on the appropriate targets in the United States or Soviet Union, I can tell you that the United States currently possesses a superiority over the Soviet Union of at least three or four to one.

Furthermore, we will maintain a superiority—by these same realistic criteria—over the Soviet Union for as far ahead in the future as we can realistically plan.

I want, however, to make one point patently clear: our current numerical superiority over the Soviet Union in reliable, accurate, and effective warheads is both greater than we had originally planned, and is in fact more than we require.

Moreover, in the larger equation of security, our "superiority" is of limited significance—since even with our current superiority, or indeed with any numerical superiority realistically attainable, the blunt, inescapable fact remains that the Soviet Union could still—with its present forces—effectively destroy the United States, even after absorbing the full weight of an American first strike.

I have noted that our present superiority is greater than we had planned. Let me explain to you how this came about, for I think it is a significant illustration of the intrinsic dynamics of the nuclear arms race.

In 1961, when I became Secretary of Defense, the Soviet Union possessed a very small operational arsenal of intercontinental missiles. However, they did possess the technological and industrial capacity to enlarge that arsenal very substantially over the succeeding several years.

Now, we had no evidence that the Soviets did in fact plan to fully use that capability.

But as I have pointed out, a strategic planner must be "conservative" in his calculations; that is, he must prepare for the worst plausible case and not be content to hope and prepare merely for the most probable.

Since we could not be certain of Soviet intentions—since we could not be sure that they would not undertake a massive build-

up—we had to insure against such an eventuality by undertaking ourselves a major build-up of the Minuteman and Polaris forces.

Thus, in the course of hedging against what was then only a theoretically possible Soviet build-up, we took decisions which have resulted in our current superiority in numbers of warheads and deliverable megatons.

But the blunt fact remains that if we had had more accurate information about planned Soviet strategic forces, we simply would not have needed to build as large a nuclear arsenal as we have today.

Now let me be absolutely clear. I am not saying that our decision in 1961 was unjustified. I am simply saying that it was necessitated by a lack of accurate information.

Furthermore, that decision in itself—as justified as it was—in the end, could not possibly have left unaffected the Soviet Union's future nuclear plans.

What is essential to understand here is that the Soviet Union and the United States mutually influence one another's strategic plans.

Whatever be their intentions, whatever be our intentions, actions—or even realistically potential actions—on either side relating to the build-up of nuclear forces, be they either offensive or defensive weapons, necessarily trigger reactions on the other side.

It is precisely this action-reaction phenomenon that fuels an arms race.

Now, in strategic nuclear weaponry, the arms race involves a particular irony. Unlike any other era in military history, today a substantial numerical superiority of weapons does not effectively translate into political control, or diplomatic leverage.

While thermonuclear power is almost inconceivably awesome, and represents virtually unlimited potential destructiveness, it has proven to be a limited diplomatic instrument. Its uniqueness lies in the fact that it is at one and the same time, an all powerful weapon—and a very inadequate weapon.

The fact that the Soviet Union and the United States can mutually destroy one another—regardless of who strikes first—narrows the range of Soviet aggression which our nuclear forces can effectively deter.

Even with our nuclear monopoly in the early postwar period, we were unable to deter the Soviet pressures against Berlin, or their support of aggression in Korea.

Today, our nuclear superiority does not deter all forms of Soviet support of communist insurgency in Southeast Asia.

What all of this has meant is that we, and our allies as well, require substantial non-nuclear forces in order to cope with levels of aggression that massive strategic forces do not in fact deter.

This has been a difficult lesson both for us and for our allies to accept, since there is a strong psychological tendency to regard superior nuclear forces as a simple and unfailing solution to security, and an assurance of victory under any set of circumstances.

What is important to understand is that our nuclear strategic forces play a vital and absolutely necessary role in our security and that of our allies, but it is an intrinsically limited role.

Thus, we and our allies must maintain substantial conventional forces, fully capable of dealing with a wide spectrum of lesser forms of political and military aggression—a level of aggression against which the use of strategic nuclear forces would not be to our advantage, and thus a level of aggression which these strategic nuclear forces by themselves cannot effectively deter. One cannot fashion a credible deterrent out of an incredible action. Therefore security for the United States and its allies can only arise from the possession of a whole range of graduated deterrents, each of them fully credible in its own context.

Now I have pointed out that in strategic

nuclear matters, the Soviet Union and the United States mutually influence one another's plans.

In recent years the Soviets have substantially increased their offensive forces. We have, of course, been watching and evaluating this very carefully.

Clearly, the Soviet build-up is in part a reaction to our own build-up since the beginning of this decade.

Soviet strategic planners undoubtedly reasoned that if our build-up were to continue at its accelerated pace, we might conceivably reach, in time, a credible first-strike capability against the Soviet Union.

That was not in fact our intention. Our intention was to assure that they—with their theoretical capacity to reach such a first-strike capability—would not in fact outdistance us.

But they could not read our intentions with any greater accuracy than we could read theirs. And thus the result has been that we have both built up our forces to a point that far exceeds a credible second-strike capability against the forces we each started with.

In doing so, neither of us has reached a first-strike capability. And the realities of the situation being what they are—whatever we believe their intentions to be, and whatever they believe our intentions to be—each of us can deny the other a first-strike capability in the foreseeable future.

Now, how can we be so confident that this is the case?

How can we be so certain that the Soviets cannot gradually outdistance us—either by some dramatic technological breakthrough, or simply through our imperceptibly lagging behind, for whatever reason: reluctance to spend the requisite funds; distraction with military problems elsewhere; faulty intelligence; or simple negligence and naivete?

All of these reasons—and others—have been suggested by some commentators in this country, who fear that we are in fact falling behind to a dangerous degree.

The answer to all of this is simple and straightforward.

We are not going to permit the Soviets to outdistance us, because to do so would be to jeopardize our very viability as a nation.

No President, no Secretary of Defense, no Congress of the United States—of whatever political party, and of whatever political persuasion—is going to permit this nation to take that risk.

We do not want a nuclear arms race with the Soviet Union—primarily because the action-reaction phenomenon makes it foolish and futile. But if the only way to prevent the Soviet Union from obtaining first-strike capability over us is to engage in such a race, the United States possesses in ample abundance the resources, the technology, and the will to run faster in that race for whatever distance is required.

But what we would prefer to do is to come to a realistic and reasonably riskless agreement with the Soviet Union, which would effectively prevent such an arms race. We both have strategic nuclear arsenals greatly in excess of a credible assured destruction capability. These arsenals have reached that point of excess in each case for precisely the same reason: we each have reacted to the other's build-up with very conservative calculations. We have, that is, each built a greater arsenal than either of us needed for a second-strike capability, simply because we each wanted to be able to cope with the "worst plausible case."

But since we now each possess a deterrent in excess of our individual needs, both of our nations would benefit from a properly safeguarded agreement first to limit, and later to reduce, both our offensive and defensive strategic nuclear forces.

We may, or we may not, be able to achieve such an agreement. We hope we can. And

we believe such an agreement is fully feasible, since it is clearly in both our nations' interests.

But reach the formal agreement or not, we can be sure that neither the Soviets nor we are going to risk the other obtaining a first-strike capability.

On the contrary, we can be sure that we are both going to maintain a maximum effort to preserve an assured destruction capability.

It would not be sensible for either side to launch a maximum effort to achieve a first-strike capability. It would not be sensible because the intelligence-gathering capability of each side being what it is, and the realities of lead-time from technological breakthrough to operational readiness being what they are, neither of us would be able to acquire a first-strike capability in secret.

Now, let me take a specific case in point. The Soviets are now deploying an antiballistic missile system. If we react to this deployment intelligently, we have no reason for alarm.

The system does not impose any threat to our ability to penetrate and inflict massive and unacceptable damage on the Soviet Union. In other words, it does not presently affect in any significant manner our assured destruction capability.

It does not impose such a threat because we have already taken the steps necessary to assure that our land-based Minuteman missiles, our nuclear submarine-launched new Poseidon missiles, and our strategic bomber forces have the requisite penetration aids—and in the sum, constitute a force of such magnitude, that they guarantee us a force strong enough to survive a Soviet attack and penetrate the Soviet ABM deployment.

Now let me come to the issue that has received so much attention recently: the question of whether or not we should deploy an ABM system against the Soviet nuclear threat.

To begin with, this is not in any sense a new issue. We have had both the technical possibility and the strategic desirability of an American ABM deployment under constant review since the late 1950s.

While we have substantially improved our technology in the field, it is important to understand that none of the systems at the present or foreseeable state of the art would provide an impenetrable shield over the United States. Were such a shield possible, we would certainly want it—and we would certainly build it.

And at this point, let me dispose of an objection that its totality irrelevant to this issue.

It has been alleged that we are opposed to deploying a large-scale ABM system because it would carry the heavy price tag of \$40 billion.

Let me make it very clear that the \$40 billion is not the issue.

If we could build and deploy a genuinely impenetrable shield over the United States, we would be willing to spend not \$40 billion, but any reasonable multiple of that amount that was necessary.

The money in itself is not the problem: the penetrability of the proposed shield is the problem.

There is clearly no point, however, in spending \$40 billion if it is not going to buy us a significant improvement in our security. If it is not, then we should use the substantial resources it represents on something that will.

Every ABM system that is now feasible involves firing defensive missiles at incoming offensive warheads in an effort to destroy them.

But what many commentators on this issue overlook is that any such system can rather obviously be defeated by an enemy simply sending more offensive warheads, or

dummy warheads, than there are defensive missiles capable of disposing of them.

And this is the whole crux of the nuclear action-reaction phenomenon.

Were we to deploy a heavy ABM system throughout the United States, the Soviets would clearly be strongly motivated to so increase their offensive capability as to cancel out our defensive advantage.

It is futile for each of us to spend \$4 billion, \$40 billion, or \$400 billion—and at the end of all the spending, and at the end of all the deployment, and at the end of all the effort, to be relatively at the same point of balance on the security scale that we are now.

In point of fact, we have already initiated offensive weapons programs costing several billions in order to offset the small present Soviet ABM deployment, and the possibly more extensive future Soviet ABM deployments.

That is money well spent; and it is necessary.

But we should bear in mind that it is money spent because of the action-reaction phenomenon.

If we in turn opt for heavy ABM deployment—at whatever price—we can be certain that the Soviets will react to offset the advantage we would hope to gain.

It is precisely because of this certainty of a corresponding Soviet reaction that the four prominent scientists—men who have served with distinction as the Science Advisors to Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson, and the three outstanding men who have served as Directors of Research and Engineering to three Secretaries of Defense—have unanimously recommended against the deployment of an ABM system designed to protect our population against a Soviet attack.

These men are Doctors Killian, Kistiakowsky, Wiesner, Hornig, York, Brown, and Foster.

The plain fact of the matter is that we are now facing a situation analogous to the one we faced in 1961: we are uncertain of the Soviets' intentions.

At that time we were concerned about their potential offensive capabilities: now we are concerned about their potential defensive capabilities.

But the dynamics of the concern are the same.

We must continue to be cautious and conservative in our estimates—leaving no room in our calculations for unnecessary risk. And at the same time, we must measure our own response in such a manner that it does not trigger a senseless spiral upward of nuclear arms.

Now, as I have emphasized, we have already taken the necessary steps to guarantee that our offensive strategic weapons will be able to penetrate future, more advanced, Soviet defenses.

Keeping in mind the careful clockwork of lead-time, we will be forced to continue that effort over the next few years if the evidence is that the Soviets intend to turn what is now a light and modest ABM deployment into a massive one.

Should they elect to do so, we have both the lead-time and the technology available to so increase both the quality and quantity of our offensive strategic forces—with particular attention to highly reliable penetration aids—that their expensive defensive efforts will give them no edge in the nuclear balance whatever.

But we would prefer not to have to do that. For it is a profitless waste of resources, provided we and the Soviets can come to a realistic strategic arms-limitation agreement.

As you know, we have proposed U.S.-Soviet talks on this matter. Should these talks fail, we are fully prepared to take the appropriate measures that such a failure would make necessary.

The point for us to keep in mind is that should the talks fail—and the Soviets decide to expand their present modest ABM deployment into a massive one—our response must be realistic. There is no point whatever in our responding by going to a massive ABM deployment to protect our population, when such a system would be ineffective against a sophisticated Soviet offense.

Instead, realism dictates that if the Soviets elect to deploy a heavy ABM system, we must further expand our sophisticated offensive forces, and thus preserve our overwhelming assured destruction capability.

But the intractable fact is that should the talks fail, both the Soviets and ourselves would be forced to continue on a foolish and feckless course.

It would be foolish and feckless because—in the end—it would provide neither the Soviets, nor us, with any greater relative nuclear capability.

The time has come for us both to realize that, and to act reasonably. It is clearly in our own mutual interest to do so.

Having said that, it is important to distinguish between an ABM system designed to protect against a Soviet attack on our cities, and ABM systems which have other objectives.

One of the other uses of an ABM system which we should seriously consider is the greater protection of our strategic offensive forces.

Another is in relation to the emerging nuclear capability of Communist China.

There is evidence that the Chinese are devoting very substantial resources to the development of both nuclear warheads, and missile delivery systems. As I stated last January, indications are that they will have medium-range ballistic missiles within a year or so, an initial intercontinental ballistic missile capability in the early 1970s, and a modest force in the mid-70s.

Up to now, the lead-time factor has allowed us to postpone a decision on whether or not a light ABM deployment might be advantageous as a countermeasure to Communist China's nuclear development.

But the time will shortly be right for us to initiate production if we desire such a system.

China at the moment is caught up in internal strife, but it seems likely that her basic motivation in developing a strategic nuclear capability is an attempt to provide a basis for threatening her neighbors, and to clothe herself with the dubious prestige that the world pays to nuclear weaponry.

We deplore her development of these weapons, just as we deplore it in other countries. We oppose nuclear proliferation because we believe that in the end it only increases the risk of a common and cataclysmic holocaust.

President Johnson has made it clear that the United States will oppose any efforts of China to employ nuclear blackmail against her neighbors.

We possess now, and will continue to possess for as far ahead as we can foresee, an overwhelming first-strike capability with respect to China. And despite the shrill and raucous propaganda directed at her own people that "the atomic bomb is a paper tiger," there is ample evidence that China well appreciates the destructive power of nuclear weapons.

China has been cautious to avoid any action that might end in a nuclear clash with the United States—however wild her words—and understandably so. We have the power not only to destroy completely her entire nuclear offensive forces, but to devastate her society as well.

Is there any possibility, then, that by the mid-1970s China might become so incautious as to attempt a nuclear attack on the United States or our allies?

It would be insane and suicidal for her to

do so, but one can conceive conditions under which China might miscalculate. We wish to reduce such possibilities to a minimum.

And since, as I have noted, our strategic planning must always be conservative, and take into consideration even the possible irrational behavior of potential adversaries, there are marginal grounds for concluding that a light deployment of U.S. ABMs against this possibility is prudent.

The system would be relatively inexpensive—preliminary estimates place the cost at about \$5 billion—and would have a much higher degree of reliability against a Chinese attack, than the much more massive and complicated system that some have recommended against a possible Soviet attack.

Moreover, such an ABM deployment designed against a possible Chinese attack would have a number of other advantages. It would provide an additional indication to Asians that we intend to deter China from nuclear blackmail, and thus would contribute toward our goal of discouraging nuclear weapon proliferation among the present non-nuclear countries.

Further, the Chinese-oriented ABM deployment would enable us to add—as a concurrent benefit—a further defense of our Minuteman sites against Soviet attack, which means that at modest cost we would in fact be adding even greater effectiveness to our offensive missile force and avoiding a much more costly expansion of that force.

Finally, such a reasonably reliable ABM system would add protection of our population against the improbable but possible accidental launch of an intercontinental missile by any one of the nuclear powers.

After a detailed review of all these considerations, we have decided to go forward with this Chinese-oriented ABM deployment, and we will begin actual production of such a system at the end of this year.

In reaching this decision, I want to emphasize that it contains two possible dangers—and we should guard carefully against each.

The first danger is that we may psychologically lapse into the old oversimplification about the adequacy of nuclear power. The simple truth is that nuclear weapons can serve to deter only a narrow range of threats. This ABM deployment will strengthen our defensive posture—and will enhance the effectiveness of our land-based ICBM offensive forces. But the independent nations of Asia must realize that these benefits are no substitute for their maintaining, and where necessary strengthening, their own conventional forces in order to deal with the more likely threats to the security of the region.

The second danger is also psychological. There is a kind of mad momentum intrinsic to the development of all new nuclear weaponry. If a weapon system works—and works well—there is strong pressure from many directions to procure and deploy the weapon out of all proportion to the prudent level required.

The danger in deploying this relatively light and reliable Chinese-oriented ABM system is going to be that pressures will develop to expand it into a heavy Soviet-oriented ABM system.

We must resist that temptation firmly—not because we can for a moment afford to relax our vigilance against a possible Soviet first-strike—but precisely because our great deterrent against such a strike is not a massive, costly, but highly penetrable ABM shield, but rather a fully credible offensive assured destruction capability.

The so-called heavy ABM shield—at the present state of technology—would in effect be no adequate shield at all against a Soviet attack, but rather a strong inducement for the Soviets to vastly increase their own offensive forces. That, as I have pointed out, would make it necessary for us to respond

in turn—and so the arms race would rush hopelessly on to no sensible purpose on either side.

Let me emphasize—and I cannot do so too strongly—that our decision to go ahead with a limited ABM deployment in no way indicates that we feel an agreement with the Soviet Union on the limitation of strategic nuclear offensive and defensive forces is any the less urgent or desirable.

The road leading from the stone axe to the ICBM—though it may have been more than a million years in the building—seems to have run in a single direction.

If one is inclined to be cynical, one might conclude that man's history seems to be characterized not so much by consistent periods of peace, occasionally punctuated by warfare; but rather by persistent outbreaks of warfare, wearily put aside from time to time by periods of exhaustion and recovery—that parade under the name of peace.

I do not view man's history with that degree of cynicism, but I do believe that man's wisdom in avoiding war is often surpassed by his folly in promoting it.

However foolish unlimited war may have been in the past, it is now no longer merely foolish, but suicidal as well.

It is said that nothing can prevent a man from suicide, if he is sufficiently determined to commit it.

The question is what is our determination in an era when unlimited war will mean the death of hundreds of millions—and the possible genetic impairment of a million generations to follow?

Man is clearly a compound of folly and wisdom—and history is clearly a consequence of the admixture of those two contradictory traits.

History has placed our particular lives in an era when the consequences of human folly are waxing more and more catastrophic in the matters of war and peace.

In the end, the root of man's security does not lie in his weaponry.

In the end, the root of man's security lies in his mind.

What the world requires in its 22nd Year of the Atomic Age is not a new race towards armament.

What the world requires in its 22nd Year of the Atomic Age is a new race towards reasonableness.

We had better all run that race.

Not merely we the administrators. But we the people.

Thank you, and good afternoon.

TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EM- PLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, last night it was my privilege to be the congressional representative at the 20th anniversary celebration of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. More than 175 volunteers and Government officials attended to pay tribute to two persons who had performed outstanding service to the disabled over half a lifetime, Miss Mildred Scott and Mr. Millard Rice, and to honor the Secretary of Labor, the Honorable W. Willard Wirtz, for his own truly significant contribution and that of his Department in recent years. The award is a committee seal on a walnut shield with the citation bearing the facsimile signature of President Lyndon B. Johnson on a metal plate.

President's Committee Chairman Harold Russell made the presentations and Committee Executive Secretary Bill McCahill was toastmaster. John Clinton, of the Department of Housing and Urban

Development and the Federal Aviation Administration, received Chairmen's Commendations from Mr. Russell in the form of plaques.

The speaker was Marine Gen. Graves B. Erskine, retired, just returned from an around-the-world trip. He delivered an incisive summary of several countries he and his wife had visited on a special tour, his second in 6 months. General Erskine is the former Administrator of the Retraining and Reemployment Administration which established a citizen's cooperating committee in 1946 as the predecessor of the President's Committee which was formed a year later.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have included with my remarks the statement of President Johnson that day at the White House at noon in ceremonies recognizing the anniversary, letters from former Presidents Harry S. Truman, who established the committee, and Dwight D. Eisenhower, who continued it, and a statement from Senator Aiken, one of the sponsors of the committee's appropriation authorization in 1949.

Also, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the remarks of Chairman Russell in making the three presentations of the committee's highest award and the opening statement of General Erskine before speaking extemporaneously and off the record on the world situation as he sees it today. He is a former Director of Special Operations in the Office of the Secretary of Defense and one of the best informed retired military officers in Washington today.

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

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE EMPLOYER OF THE YEAR AWARDS PRESENTATION

Secretary Wirtz, Chairman Macy, Mr. Ochel, Mr. Payne, ladies and gentlemen:

Unlike Robert Merrill, I have never sung at the Metropolitan Opera. Unlike Frank Howard, I cannot play baseball with the Washington Senators.

As a matter of fact, there are a few other things I cannot do these days with the Senators. Unlike my Science Adviser, Dr. Hornig, I cannot do equations with three unknowns or even with two unknowns.

But with all that, I have never considered myself a handicapped person. I think that touches upon the main point of our gathering here in the Cabinet Room for this ceremony today.

Human beings have varying degrees of ability. Some can hit home runs. Some can sing in the opera. Some, like Thomas Edison, can produce great inventions—even though Edison was deaf. Some, like Sarah Bernhart, can be great actresses—even though Sarah Bernhart was an amputee.

What counts in life is not what people can't do. What really counts is what people can do.

We are finding out in America these days the so-called handicapped people can do far more than we ever dreamed before was possible. They can do their jobs as well or do them better than many so-called normal workers.

Two gentlemen, whom I have just met, are receiving awards today. They know that for sure. The companies they work for, the Wichita Division of Boeing Aircraft Company, and the International Optical Company, have shown great leadership in our country in employing the handicapped.

This has worked to the companies' benefit

as well as to the benefit and the dignity of their employees. I am very grateful to all who have made this policy possible.

They knew, as many in Government today are learning, that what we call health is a broad concept that goes far beyond mere survival to a stated number of years. In Government and out, our aim is not only to add years to life, but to add life to years.

The Committee on Employment of the Handicapped is doing that. Men like Mr. Ochel and Mr. Payne are doing that. On our country's behalf to the Chairman of the Committee, to the Cabinet officers concerned, to the companies involved—and particularly to the individuals who demonstrated that they are "can do" people—I express the gratitude of an interested Nation and the people who serve in it for the examples that you have set.

Thank you very much.

AUGUST 30, 1967.

Mr. HAROLD RUSSELL,
Chairman, the President's Committee on
Employment of the Handicapped, Wash-
ington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN RUSSELL: On the occasion of the celebration of twenty years of service to the handicapped by The President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, I send greetings and thanks to all who have given of themselves so freely and ably to this high calling.

Our concern for the handicapped is in the best tradition of this nation's permanent commitment to aid the deprived, help all the sick and restore to usefulness the handicapped among us. This is not only a matter of conscience, but a requirement of those among us who are more fortunate.

You have my hopeful best wishes for continued dedication to this cause.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

GETTYSBURG, Pa., August 25, 1967.

Mr. HAROLD RUSSELL,
Chairman, President's Committee on Em-
ployment of the Handicapped, Washing-
ton, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN RUSSELL: The President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped has made many contributions to our Nation and the world, but none more significant than blending government and the private sector in a partnership of mutual service over two decades.

You and your fellow volunteers have proved conclusively that it is both possible and necessary to join public and private groups for the benefit of all and—in the case of your Committee—developing under private citizen leadership effective cooperation between Cabinet and Agency heads and the leaders of our great private associations, organizations, unions and corporations.

Please accept my sincere congratulations.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT EISENHOWER.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND
FORESTRY,
Washington, D.C., September 14, 1967.

Mr. HAROLD RUSSELL,
Chairman, the President's Committee on
Employment of the Handicapped, Wash-
ington, D.C.

DEAR HAROLD: I am not able to be with you on September 18th for your 20th Anniversary, but I am enclosing a message for you to read.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE D. AIKEN.

MESSAGE FOR 20TH ANNIVERSARY, THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED

I am sorry that I cannot be with you tonight to help celebrate your 20th Anniversary.

As one of the original sponsors of the legislation that resulted in the creation of this committee, I have been proud of its work over the years.

It took a world war to make the people of this country aware of the needs of the handicapped. The demand for labor during the war encouraged employers to give handicapped workers a chance. After the war, the nation's conscience insisted that we do everything possible to rehabilitate our disabled veterans.

Before this committee was organized, we used to set aside one week of the year as "National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week." By 1948, however, there were nearly two million handicapped persons, many of them war veterans, who had registered in employment service offices across the nation. It was obvious that it would take more than the observance of an "Employ the Handicapped Week," once a year to solve the problem.

In the years since then, your committee has performed an important service for both handicapped workers and the country as a whole.

You have made employers aware of the great potential of handicapped workers. You have convinced them that—as the late Vice Admiral Ross T. McIntire, your first chairman, used to argue—"Refusing to employ the handicapped is both immoral and economically unsound." You have also helped those who are handicapped to prove that, with the necessary training, they can compete with other workers in the labor market.

Most important, you have helped restore hundreds of thousands of unfortunate people to usefulness and happiness.

You have every reason to be proud of the work you have accomplished over the past 20 years.

W. WILLARD WIRTZ

One of the things that intrigues me about our brilliant Secretary of Labor is his name, What do you suppose his parents had in mind in giving him three names that begin with W?

I did a little research into W. The letter W is a newcomer to our language. Some bright Norman scribe of the eleventh century took two U's and tied them together; and presto, a W. In those days, U's and V's were interchangeable. So that new W could just as soon have been a couple of V's.

Now if a W is really two V's tied together, then our man's initials, W W W, really add up to six V's. As everybody knows who remembers Winston Churchill and World War Two, V is the sign for Victory. The Secretary's initials, therefore, are really six signs for Victory.

The first V for Victory is the Labor Department's Employment Service—the Washington Headquarters and the local public employment offices around the country—strong right arms of the "Hire the Handicapped" movement for the past twenty years.

The second V belongs to the Manpower Administration for all its imaginative training programs and innovations, opening new doors for the handicapped . . . such as on-the-job training projects for the retarded in laundries and elsewhere.

The third V is for the Wages and Hour and Public Contracts Division, and all it's done to promote the interests of sheltered workshops in America.

The fourth V is for the entire Labor Department, top to bottom, which has always given such great support to the President's Committee in all its activities.

The fifth V is reserved for the Secretary's lady, Jane Wirtz, the guiding light of "Project Earning Power," a brilliant member of the Executive Committee of the President's Committee, a lovely friend of the handicapped.

And the sixth V we're saving for the man himself, W. Willard Wirtz, a gentleman, a scholar, a man of great heart and great mind.

Put them all together and they add up to three W's. They also add up to a man eminently deserving of the highest honor of the President's Committee, it's Distinguished Service Award. They add up to Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz.

MILDRED SCOTT

There is no greater champion of the handicapped than the person we are about to honor at this time. And I might say it is an honor that is long overdue.

Mildred Scott has not only devoted a "lifetime" on programs benefiting the handicapped, but she is a living example and constant reminder of the capabilities of the disabled. She is a teacher, career consultant, public relations expert, and many other things to many people—you name it and she can do it, despite her own affliction.

The word "can't" is not in her vocabulary. Even though she was paralyzed from the waist down from polio at the age of 22 months, Mildred set her sights high and inch by inch, achieved her goals in the face of overwhelming odds. After years of surgery and therapy, Mildred succeeded in learning to walk and worked her way through elementary, high school and college, and then on into the business world. When Webster defined "determination" and "courage", he must have had her in mind.

Mildred, however, is not one to dwell on her own problems. She is more concerned with others. Back in 1930, while in a sanitarium in St. Louis, Missouri, she became aware of the numerous problems encountered by people with disabilities. Later, while living in Dallas, Texas, she made a study and survey of all kinds of organizations and programs to determine why handicapped people were considered unemployable.

In 1944, Mildred came to Washington, D.C., and joined the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped which at one time had offices on this floor, for the express purpose of developing programs emphasizing the need of adequate training and to develop a climate of acceptance of men and women with disabilities. In 1945, while still with the federation, she registered as a lobbyist and testified before numerous Senate and House Committees on behalf of legislation benefiting the handicapped. She also testified before the House Judiciary Committee in connection with the resolution establishing the first week in October as the National Employ the Handicapped Week.

If Mildred had stopped there she would have accomplished as much as a lot of people could do in a lifetime. But she didn't. She has been talking and testifying ever since. She never misses an opportunity to promote employment for the handicapped, speaking before and working with civic, labor, business and professional groups on behalf of the disabled. She also took the minutes of the first meeting of the President's Committee 20 years ago last week.

Last year Mildred was chosen as the District of Columbia's Handicapped Citizen of the Year. In my opinion, she is everybody's handicapped citizen of the year, and it gives me great pleasure on behalf of President Johnson to present to her the Distinguished Service Award from the President's Committee.

MILLARD RICE

Millard Rice has given continuous leadership to the hire the handicapped movement for more than 20 years.

I would be partly correct if I said Millard Rice can dish it out but he can't take it. Not that Millard can't take his lumps but rather, as Chairman of the Awards Committee of the President's Committee he has approved—

with the other members of the committee—countless awards. But, when his committee tried to recommend him for an award, Millard would have no part of it. In fact, I understand he ruled such discussion out of order, using his prerogative as chairman.

Now I like chairmen who can control their committees and I do not condone committees which do things behind the backs of their chairmen. In this case, however, the Awards Committee was justified in calling the "rump" session and passing on this award because we would not have been able to pay tribute to Millard otherwise.

We are not honoring him for his long years of service alone. Millard Rice, as Executive Director of the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation, worked very closely with Paul Strachan and Mildred Scott to get Congress to pass a joint resolution establishing the first full week of October as National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week.

Well, Millard and his colleagues knew that calling attention to the employment problems of the handicapped once a year would not get them jobs. So they worked for a national year-round effort. In 1947 the late Secretary of Labor Lewis Schwellenbach received a letter from President Truman asking him to involve private citizens and this Committee was born.

One of the original Executive Committee members was Millard Rice. He has been faithful about attending committee meetings, of course, but more important he has given careful consideration to every question before the committee and has brought out many viewpoints, and ideas worthy of consideration. And as a result has made many contributions to the over-all program which have led to progress and growth.

A few minutes ago I mentioned his work in connection with the Awards Committee. Our Awards program is a very vital part of the hire the handicapped program. It is a way of giving thanks and recognition to those who have contributed to the national effort to promote jobs for the handicapped. In addition, Awards are legitimate news and therefore the Awards program is a strong promotional tool because it gets employment of the handicapped into the press and on the air.

Millard has constantly worked to keep our Awards program effective and meaningful. The proof of this is that employers continue to be most appreciative of President's Committee Awards although not too many are actually presented at the White House as were our Employer of the Year Awards today.

It is now my pleasure on behalf of President Johnson to present this Distinguished Service Award—the highest honor the President's Committee can bestow—to Millard Rice—for services over a long lifetime—services frequently above and beyond the call of duty.

REMARKS OF GEN. GRAVES B. ERSKINE, USMC, RETIRED

As has been indicated, I might be considered a grandfather of the President's Committee, due to the strategic position of the Retraining and Reemployment Administration in 1946, when Mr. Oliver Kincannon of the then Office of Vocational Rehabilitation suggested that RRA "coordinate" the activities of the second National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week.

When Bill McCahill received Mr. Kincannon's letter, I discussed the suggestion with a few people, including Dorothy Stratton, Bob Salyers, Shane MacCarthy, and the late Ed Chester. The end result was RRA Order No. 9 and a Cooperating Citizen's Committee on employment of the physically handicapped. This eventually became what is now the President's Committee after a brief transition period during which Virgil Smirnow,

the late Ross McIntire, and I worked on a private group along with Ed Kennan of the U.S. Employment Service. It is interesting how many of the early volunteers and staff people have remained active in the program through the chairmanship of Ross McIntire the first 7 years, Mel Maas the next 10 and now Harold Russell.

Having said this, I wonder how many of you may think you have heard it before. Well, in case you have any further doubts, these are almost the exact words I used at the Annual Meeting on April 30th, 1964 when I spoke on the opening morning. There isn't too much more that can be said about our early beginning. The recognition here tonight of Miss Scott and Mr. Rice certainly bridges the gap of the last 20 years. The award to Secretary Wirtz brings us right up to the future. The recognition given Paul Strachan at the Annual Meeting this year and Senator Hill's nostalgic remarks at the Old Timer's luncheon where Paul was honored certainly tell the story in more detail than anyone wants tonight.

This is a fun evening. We are happy to join in with the deserved honors tonight including the one to our former White House liaison officer and to the Federal Aviation Agency which were laid on after the program went to the printers. You've already heard from President Truman who helped us start this show on the road and from General Eisenhower who kept it going while triumphing over his own temporary disability.

Harold has told you about the most interesting and significant meeting at the White House this afternoon. And, if that weren't enough, we have been handed a kit which rather completely ties up almost all the remaining loose ends of our short history. So, what is a speaker supposed to do on a fun night when just about all that needs to be said or written has already been put before you?

Bill has suggested that I share with you some thoughts and impressions from my most recent visit to South East Asia. I've been out there twice in the last year and although I'm not getting any younger, I'm still interested in doing what I can to help make this a better world. It certainly wasn't curiosity that took Connie and me half a world away and back. So, rather than look back anymore tonight, I thought I'd share the present with you and some thoughts on the future.

When last I talked before the entire Committee we had a one-legged active duty member of the Marine Corps First Force Reconnaissance Company, Don Hamblen, on stage with us. At that time I mentioned the Navy's double amputee pilot, Lt. Frank Ellis and an Army amputee I had seen sworn in way back in 1946. Well, I am sorry to tell you what is certainly no news to anyone here, we have had a lot more Army, Navy and Marine Corps amputees since then, and Air Force amputees as well, as a result of the fighting in Vietnam. And, we are going to have a lot more. We are going to have a great many more casualties of all kinds before this business is over. But, there are casualties and there are casualties.

Bill was telling me that the Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Wallace M. Greene, Jr., spoke to another anniversary banquet Saturday night and mentioned that in one particular messy engagement where the Marines suffered a large number of casualties, only 10 per cent of the wounded left the West Pacific area for good. A large percentage of our casualties rejoin their units right from the aid stations. Most of the remaining walking wounded are back with their units within 60 to 90 days. So, although casualty figures are important, you must consider them in the context that our troops in the field continue their work in spite of physical handicaps.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order of yesterday, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 9960) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, inasmuch as we have agreed to vote at 11:15 a.m. on the amendments of the Senator from Ohio, the Senator from Colorado and I do not have much to add to the discussion on the two amendments, except that we believe the RECORD should be clear as to what the committee did.

The first amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio would decrease the appropriation of \$66.1 million for the Department of Defense, Office of Civil Defense, operation and maintenance, which the committee recommended. This was also the House allowance. Both these figures are \$7 million under the budget estimate for 1968, which was \$73.1 million.

We believe that the Senate committee and the House committee, as evidenced by the hearings, have made a substantial reduction in the estimates for civil defense. The same amount of money had been appropriated in fiscal year 1967.

This program, of course, has been subjected to much discussion and some controversy. Some people believe that civil defense has little or no value. Others believe it is not proceeding as fast as it should. However, in the past 4 years, the House and the Senate have attempted to achieve a substantial program in civil defense. We cannot do all we would like to do. In view of the fact that we are now going to be asked to spend \$5 billion for an antimissile system, which in a sense is part of civil defense, it seems to me that this is a reasonable amount for the protection of civilians in these areas, for civil defense education, and many of the things that go with it. Hospitalization and emergency supplies, instruction in what to do, particularly in the schools and in the urban areas. Therefore, our committee recommended \$66,100,000, which is the same amount as last year and is the same as the House figure. This is \$7 million below the budget.

The Senator from Ohio would cut \$10 million from "Research, Shelter Survey, and Marking." The amount in the budget for this item was \$37.9 million; the appropriation last year was \$35 million. The House recommended \$20 million, and the committee added \$5 million. We took \$2 million from the research and development program and added \$7 million to the shelter program, which made a net restoration of \$5 million.

This program has been going on for some time, and we have reached a point in the United States in which we are catching up with the marking and the provisions and the accommodations of the shelter survey throughout the United States. We do so much every year. The program is under the direction of the Army Engineers. We are reaching a point where we believe we will have marked and surveyed and have available for people, most of the places in the United States that can be adapted to this purpose. There is some controversy about that matter, also, and we realize that the problem exists. We have spent several million dollars already to reach the point at which we are presently. I believe the testimony will show that about 80 percent of the program has been completed.

Of course, the amounts may be smaller each year in the future, because there will only be a continuing program to mark and survey new buildings and things of that nature. We have proceeded in this matter with respect to construction in Federal buildings, and it seemed wrong, in our opinion, to provide these shelters only in Federal buildings and not to supply them in other buildings and places for other citizens.

So we believe that \$25 million is a reasonable and practical amount with which to continue the program, for which we have already spent a large amount of money. The amount is now \$12.9 million—approximately \$13 million—under the budget, and I wanted the RECORD to indicate this fact, in reply to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to make a few comments about the subject, and I should like, first, to talk for a moment about the excessive salaries that allegedly are paid in the Department of Civil Defense.

I have in my hand a document, which is used by the committee, showing the salaries that are paid in all the Government agencies that come under the pending bill. In looking down the first page of it, for example, I notice that the salaries paid in the National Science and Space Council are considerably above the average salaries in the bill. The salaries paid in the Office of Emergency Planning, the Office of Science and Technology, and even in the Appalachian Region Commission, are above the salaries paid in civil defense.

I procured a document this morning, and I believe the information should be made a part of the RECORD.

The average grade civil defense employee at the State and local level is only at grade 5, and the salary is \$5,500 a year. At the Federal level, the grade is 10.2,

or an average of \$12,300, which is about the average salary in the Defense Department.

The average grade of civil defense employees overall is grade 6, which is an average of \$6,200 a year.

The distinguished chairman of this committee and I have wrestled with this problem for many years, and each year the Senator from Ohio has offered an amendment to cut the appropriation for the civil defense program, and we have already explained exactly what we did in the pending bill. The \$101 million that was appropriated last year was increased by the Budget to \$111 million, so that the pending bill is \$19,900,000—almost \$20 million—under the budget as recommended by the President.

Mr. President, we questioned the civil defense people at great length to get them to justify the figures that we have. We did increase by the amount of \$7 million for shelter survey and marking, and reduce research funds by \$2 million.

It seems to me that we in this country have to face the facts of life as to our civil defense program. It has been stated that there is no civil defense program in Russia. Contrary to this position, I think that they do have a civil defense program. Recent translations of Russian documents indicate they do have a program and are placing great emphasis on it.

However, this is not the reason I would say we should have a civil defense program. We are in a situation in this world where we have two great countries facing each other, both with the potentiality at the present time of practically destroying each other. Is a civil defense program which could save a possible 80 million lives worthwhile or not, in case somebody does by accident or design push the panic button?

As a Senator and as a member of this particular committee, which has to deal with the actualities of the problem, I have to say that whether it may be Colorado, Ohio, Washington, D.C., California, Nevada, Washington, or wherever it may be, a program which can have and does have the potentiality of saving 80 million lives at the present time—and we can increase it in the event we ever get to that situation—is a program that is worthwhile. It is of just as much value as putting more money into missiles so that you can overdestroy the enemy abroad.

I do not think the Senate will shirk its obligations with respect to the civil defense program. We have cut and cut deeply into the budget which the President sent us, but as far as I am concerned, I cannot shirk my responsibilities embracing that somewhat ethereal dream that perhaps, after all, nothing will ever happen. I hope it does not happen, but if it should happen I do not want it ever said that the Senator from Colorado or the Senator from Washington walked away from their responsibilities to attempt to see that we were providing fallout shelters for as many people as we could in this great country of ours.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the facts are that of the 831 employees in the civil defense section of the De-

partment of Defense, 439 of those 831 persons receive salaries from \$10,927 per annum up to \$27,000 per annum. In other words, more than half receive an annual salary of from nearly \$11,000 to \$27,000. The remaining 392 employees receive salaries from \$9,221, down through those in the GS-3 grade who receive \$4,269 a year.

Mr. President, this is the most overpaid branch of the Department of Defense which is notoriously extravagant with taxpayers' money. Here is an opportunity to save \$20 million. Whether that is one-hundredth of the defense budget, or whatever percentage it is, \$20 million saved is a large sum of money.

Mr. President, I hope my amendment will be seriously considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 11:15 a.m. having arrived, under the order of yesterday, the Senate will proceed to vote on the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea" and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], is absent by leave of the Senate.

If present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 55, as follows:

[No. 252 Leg.]

YEAS—32

Bennett	Fulbright	McGovern
Bible	Gore	Morse
Burdick	Gruening	Moss
Byrd, Va.	Hansen	Mundt
Cannon	Hart	Nelson
Church	Hartke	Proxmire
Clark	Jordan, N.C.	Williams, N.J.
Cooper	Kennedy, Mass.	Williams, Del.
Eastland	Kennedy, N.Y.	Yarborough
Ervin	Lausche	Young, Ohio
Fannin	Long, Mo.	

NAYS—55

Aiken	Hayden	Montoya
Allott	Hickenlooper	Murphy
Anderson	Hill	Pastore
Baker	Holland	Pearson
Bartlett	Hollings	Prouty
Boggs	Hruska	Randolph
Brooke	Inouye	Ribicoff
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Scott
Carlson	Javits	Smith
Case	Jordan, Idaho	Sparkman
Cotton	Long, La.	Spong
Curtis	Magnuson	Stennis
Dirksen	Mansfield	Talmadge
Dodd	McClellan	Thurmond
Dominick	McIntyre	Tower
Ellender	Metcalf	Tydings
Fong	Miller	Young, N. Dak.
Griffin	Mondale	
Harris	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—13

Bayh	McGee	Russell
Brewster	Morton	Smathers
Hatfield	Muskie	Symington
Kuchel	Pell	
McCarthy	Percy	

So the amendment of Mr. YOUNG of Ohio was rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLINGS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

REVISION AND EXTENSION OF APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 602.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 602) to revise and extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, and to amend title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

TITLE I—APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1967

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the "Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 1967".

SEC. 102. Section 102 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (hereinafter in this title referred to as "the Act") is amended (1) by inserting "and" at the end of clause (7); (2) by striking out the semicolon and the word "and" at the end of clause (8) and inserting in lieu thereof a period; and (3) by striking out clause (9).

SEC. 103. Section 105 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

"Sec. 105. (a) For the period ending on June 30, 1967, the administrative expenses of the Commission shall be paid by the Federal Government. Thereafter, such expenses shall be paid 50 per centum by the Federal Government and 50 per centum by the States in the region, except that the expenses of the Federal Cochairman, his alternate, and his staff shall be paid solely by the Federal Government. The share to be paid by each State shall be determined by the Commission. The Federal Cochairman shall not participate or vote in such determination. No assistance authorized by this

Act shall be furnished to any State or to any political subdivision or any resident of any State, nor shall the State member of the Commission participate or vote in any determination by the Commission while such State is delinquent in payment of its share of such expenses.

"(b) To carry out this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commission, to be available until expended, not to exceed \$1,700,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1969. Not to exceed \$400,000 of such authorization shall be available for the expenses of the Federal Cochairman, his alternate, and his staff. Unexpended balances of appropriations under the authorization in this section prior to amendment by the Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 1967 shall remain available for the purposes of this section, as amended, until expended."

SEC. 104. Clause (7) of section 106 of the Act, entitled "ADMINISTRATIVE POWERS OF THE COMMISSION", is amended to read as follows:

"(7) enter into and perform such contracts, leases (including, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the lease of office space for any term expiring no later than July 30, 1971), cooperative agreements, or other transactions as may be necessary in carrying out its functions and on such terms as it may deem appropriate, with any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States (which is hereby so authorized to the extent not otherwise prohibited by law) or with any State, or any political subdivision, agency, or instrumentality thereof, or with any person, firm, association, or corporation."

SEC. 105. Title I of the Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"COMMISSION EMPLOYEE PROTECTIONS

"Sec. 109. Section 5334(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'For the purpose of this subsection, an individual employed by the Appalachian Regional Commission under section 106(a) of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, or by a regional commission established pursuant to section 502 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, under section 506(2) of such Act, who was a Federal employee immediately prior to such employment by a commission and within six months after separation from such employment is employed in a position to which this subchapter applies, shall be treated as if transferred from a position in the executive branch to which this subchapter does not apply.'"

SEC. 106. Section 201 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"APPALACHIAN DEVELOPMENT HIGHWAY SYSTEM

"Sec. 201. (a) In order to provide a highway system which, in conjunction with the Interstate System and other Federal-aid highways in the Appalachian region, will open up an area or areas with a developmental potential where commerce and communication have been inhibited by lack of adequate access, the Secretary of Transportation (hereafter in this section referred to as the 'Secretary') is authorized to assist in the construction of an Appalachian development highway system and local access roads serving the Appalachian region. The provisions of title 23, United States Code, that are applicable to the construction and maintenance of Federal-aid primary and secondary highways, and which the Secretary determines are not inconsistent with this Act, shall apply, respectively, to the development highway system and the local access roads. Construction on the development highway system shall not exceed two thousand seven hundred miles. Construction of local access roads shall not exceed one thousand two hundred miles that

will serve specific recreational, residential, educational, commercial, industrial, or other like facilities or will facilitate a school consolidation program.

"(b) The Commission shall transmit to the Secretary its designations of (1) the general corridor location and termini of the development highways, (2) local access roads to be constructed, (3) priorities for the construction of segments of the development highways, and (4) other criteria for the program authorized by this section. Before any State member participates in or votes on such designations, he shall have obtained the recommendations of the State highway department of the State which he represents.

"(c) In no event shall the Secretary assist in any construction (including right-of-way acquisition) which would require for its completion the expenditure of Federal funds (other than funds available under title 23, United States Code) in excess of the appropriations authorization in subsection (g). On its completion each development highway not already on the Federal-aid primary system shall be added to such system and each development highway and local access road shall be required to be maintained by the State as provided for Federal-aid highways in title 23, United States Code.

"(d) In the construction of highways and roads authorized under this section, the States may give special preference to the use of materials and products indigenous to the Appalachian region.

"(e) For the purposes of research and development in the use of coal and coal products in highway construction and maintenance, the Secretary is authorized to require each participating State, to the maximum extent possible, to use coal derivatives in the construction of not to exceed 10 per centum of the roads authorized under this Act.

"(f) Federal assistance to any construction project under this section shall not exceed 50 per centum of the costs of such project, unless the Commission determines that assistance in excess of such percentage is required in furtherance of the purposes of this Act, but in no event shall such Federal assistance exceed 70 per centum of such costs.

"(g) To carry out this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, to be available until expended, \$715,000,000 for the four-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1971.

"(h) (1) When a participating State proceeds to construct a segment of a development highway without the aid of Federal funds, in accordance with all procedures and requirements applicable to the construction of segments of Appalachian development highways with such funds, except insofar as such procedures and requirements limit a State to the construction of projects for which Federal funds have previously been appropriated, the Secretary, upon application by the State and with the approval of the Commission, is authorized to pay to the State the Federal share not to exceed 70 per centum of the costs of the construction of such segment, from any sums appropriated and allocated to such State to carry out this section.

"(2) This subsection shall not be construed as a commitment or obligation on the part of the United States to provide funds for segments of development highways constructed under this subsection, and shall not increase the limitation on construction in subsection (c)."

SEC. 107. Section 202 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"DEMONSTRATION HEALTH PROJECTS

"Sec. 202. (a) In order to demonstrate the value of adequate health facilities and services to the economic development of the region, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make grants for

the planning, construction, equipment, and operation of multicounty demonstration health projects, including hospitals, regional health diagnostic and treatment centers, and other facilities and services necessary to health. Grants for such construction (including the acquisition of privately owned facilities not operated for profit and initial equipment) shall be made in accordance with the applicable provisions of title VI of the Public Health Services Act (42 U.S.C. 291-291o), the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 (77 Stat. 282), and other laws authorizing grants for the construction of health-related facilities, without regard to any provisions therein relating to appropriation authorization ceilings or to allotments among the States. Grants under this section shall be made solely out of funds specifically appropriated for the purpose of carrying out this Act and shall not be taken into account in the computation of the allotments among the States made pursuant to any other provision of law.

"(b) No grant for the construction or equipment of any component of a demonstration health project shall exceed 80 per centum of such costs. The Federal contribution may be provided entirely from funds authorized under this section or in combination with funds provided under other Federal grant-in-aid programs for the construction or equipment of health-related facilities. Notwithstanding any provision of law limiting the Federal share in such other programs, funds authorized under this section may be used to increase Federal grants for component facilities of a demonstration health project to a maximum of 80 per centum of the costs of such facilities.

"(c) Not to exceed \$50,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 401 of this Act for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1969, shall be available to carry out this section."

SEC. 108. Subsection (1) of section 203 of the Act, entitled "LAND STABILIZATION, CONSERVATION, AND EROSION CONTROL", is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Not to exceed \$19,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 401 of this Act for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1969, shall be available to carry out this section."

SEC. 109. Subsection (b) of section 204 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Not to exceed \$1,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 401 of this Act for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1969, shall be available to carry out this section."

SEC. 110. (a) Clause (1) of subsection (a) of section 205 of the Act, entitled "MINING AREA RESTORATION", is amended to read as follows:

"(1) make financial contributions to States in the region to seal and fill voids in abandoned coal mines and abandoned oil and gas wells, and to reclaim and rehabilitate lands affected by the strip and surface mining and processing of coal and other minerals, including lands affected by waste piles, in accordance with provisions of the Act of July 15, 1955 (30 U.S.C. 571 et seq.), to the extent applicable, without regard to section 2(b) thereof (30 U.S.C. 572(b)) or to any provisions therein limiting assistance to anthracite coal formation, or to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Grants under this paragraph shall be made wholly out of funds specifically appropriated for the purposes of carrying out this Act."

(b) Strike out clause (3) of subsection (a) of section 205 of the Act.

(c) Subsection (b) of section 205 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) For the fiscal years 1966, 1967, 1968, and 1969, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Federal share of mining area restoration projects, including reasonable planning and engineering costs, carried out under subsection (a) of this section and conducted on lands other than federally

owned lands shall not exceed 75 per centum of the total cost thereof. The non-Federal share of the total cost of any project carried out under subsection (a) of this section may include reasonable land acquisition costs incurred in acquiring land necessary for the purposes of implementing such project, if such land is acquired after the date of enactment of the Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 1967."

(d) The first sentence of subsection (d) of section 205 of the Act is amended to read as follows: "Not to exceed \$30,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 401 of this Act for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1969, shall be available to carry out this section."

Sec. 111. Subsection (g) of section 206 of the Act, entitled "WATER RESOURCE SURVEY", is amended to read as follows:

"(g) Not to exceed \$2,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 401 of this Act for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1969, shall be available to carry out this section."

Sec. 112. Part A of title II of the Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"ASSISTANCE FOR PLANNING AND OTHER PRELIMINARY EXPENSES OF PROPOSED HOUSING PROJECTS UNDER SECTION 221 OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

"Sec. 207. (a) In order to encourage and facilitate the construction or rehabilitation of housing to meet the needs of low- and moderate-income families and individuals, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereafter in this section referred to as the 'Secretary') is authorized to make grants and loans from the Appalachian Housing Fund established by this section, under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, to nonprofit, limited dividend, or cooperative organizations, or to public bodies, for expenses of planning and of obtaining an insured mortgage for a housing construction or rehabilitation project, under section 221 of the National Housing Act (hereafter in this section referred to as 'section 221'), in any area of the Appalachian region determined by the Commission to have significant potential for future growth.

"(b) No grant under this section shall exceed 80 per centum of those administrative expenses, incident to planning a project and obtaining an insured mortgage under section 221, which the Secretary considers not to be recoverable from the proceeds of a mortgage insured under such section: *Provided*, That no grant shall be made to an organization established for profit.

"(c) No loan under this section shall exceed 80 per centum of the cost of planning a project and obtaining an insured mortgage under section 221, including, but not limited to, preliminary surveys and analyses of market needs, preliminary site engineering and architectural fees, site options, Federal Housing Administration and Federal National Mortgage Association fees, and construction loan fees and discounts. Loans may be made without interest, or at any market or below market interest rate authorized for a mortgage insured under section 221: *Provided*, That any loan made to an organization established for profit shall bear interest at the prevailing market rate authorized for a mortgage insured under such section. The Secretary may, except in the case of a loan to an organization established for profit, waive the repayment of all or any part of a loan made under this section, including interest, which he finds the borrower is unable to recover from the proceeds of a mortgage insured under section 221.

"(d) All funds allocated to the Secretary for the purposes of this section shall be deposited in a fund which shall be known as the Appalachian Housing Fund and shall be used as a revolving fund by the Secretary for carrying out such purposes. General expenses of administration of this section may be

charged to the fund. Moneys in the fund not needed for current operation may be invested in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States.

"(e) Not to exceed \$5,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 401 of this Act for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1969, shall be available to carry out this section."

Sec. 113. (a) Subsection (a) of section 211 of the Act, entitled "VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FACILITIES", is amended by inserting before the word "needed" in the first sentence, the following: "and for the equipment of such facilities and other school facilities".

(b) Subsection (b) of section 211 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Not to exceed \$26,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 401 of this Act for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1969, shall be available to carry out this section."

Sec. 114. Subsection (b) of section 212 of the Act, entitled "SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS", is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Not to exceed \$6,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 401 of this Act for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1969, shall be available to carry out this section."

Sec. 115 (a) Section 701(a) of the Housing Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 461(a)) is amended by striking out "and" at the end of clause (8) and all of clause (9) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(9) the Appalachian Regional Commission, for comprehensive planning for the Appalachian region as defined by section 403 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965; and

"(10) local development districts, certified under section 301 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, for comprehensive planning for their entire areas, or for metropolitan planning, urban planning, county planning, or small municipality planning, within such areas in the Appalachian region, and for planning for Appalachian regional programs."

(b) The proviso of the first sentence of section 701(b) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by inserting after "States" the words "and local development districts".

Sec. 116. Section 214 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"SUPPLEMENTS TO FEDERAL GRANT-IN-AID PROGRAMS

"Sec. 214. (a) In order to enable the people, States, and local communities of the region, including local development districts, to take maximum advantage of Federal grant-in-aid programs (as hereinafter defined) for which they are eligible but for which, because of their economic situation, they cannot supply the required matching share, the President is authorized to provide funds to the Federal Cochairman to be used for the sole purpose of increasing the Federal contribution to projects under Federal grant-in-aid programs, as hereafter defined, above the fixed maximum portion of the cost of such projects otherwise authorized by the applicable law. Funds shall be so provided for Federal grant-in-aid programs for which funds are available under the Acts authorizing such programs and shall be available without regard to any appropriation authorization ceilings in such Acts. Any finding, report, certification, or documentation required to be submitted to the head of the department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government responsible for the administration of any Federal grant-in-aid program shall be accepted by the Federal Cochairman with respect to a supplemental grant for any project under such program.

"(b) The Federal portion of such costs shall not be increased in excess of the percentages established by the Commission, and shall in no event exceed 80 per centum thereof.

"(c) The term 'Federal grant-in-aid programs' as used in this section means those

Federal grant-in-aid programs authorized by this Act for the construction or equipment of facilities, and all other Federal grant-in-aid programs authorized on or before August 1, 1967, by Acts other than this Act for the acquisition of land or the construction or equipment of facilities, including but not limited to grant-in-aid programs authorized by the following Acts: Federal Water Pollution Control Act; Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act; title VI of the Public Health Service Act; Vocational Education Act of 1963; Library Services Act; Federal Airport Act; part IV of title III of the Communications Act of 1934; Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963; Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965; National Defense Education Act of 1958. The term shall not include (A) the program for the construction of the development highway system authorized by section 201 of this Act or any other program relating to highway or road construction, or (B) any other program for which loans or other Federal financial assistance, except a grant-in-aid program, is authorized by this or any other Act.

"(d) Not to exceed \$71,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 401 of this Act for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1969, shall be available to carry out this section."

Sec. 117. (a) The first sentence of section 221 of the Act, entitled "MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT", is amended by striking out "exclusive of Federal funds," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "exclusive of expenditures for participation in the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and exclusive of local funds and Federal funds."

(b) The second sentence of such section is amended by inserting after "Highways" the following: "and expenditures of local funds and Federal funds".

Sec. 118. Section 223 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

"Sec. 223. No program or project authorized under any section of this title shall be implemented until (1) applications and plans relating to the program or project have been determined by the responsible Federal official to be compatible with the provisions and objectives of Federal laws which he administers that are not inconsistent with this Act, and (2) the Commission has approved such program or project and has determined that it meets the applicable criteria under section 224 and will contribute to the development of the region, which determination shall be controlling."

Sec. 119. (a) Subsection (a) of section 224 of the Act, entitled "PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA", is amended (1) by striking out "In developing recommendations on the" and inserting in lieu thereof: "In considering"; and (2) by striking out "within those recommendations".

(b) Subsection (b) of such section is amended by striking out clause (1) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(1) to assist establishments relocating from one area to another."

Sec. 120. Section 302 of the Act, entitled "GRANTS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF LOCAL DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS AND FOR RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS", is amended by (1) striking out subsections (a) through (c); (2) redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and (3) inserting the following new subsections (a) through (d):

"(a) The President is authorized—

"(1) to make grants to the Commission for administrative expenses, including technical services, of local development districts, but (A) the amount of any such grant shall not exceed 75 per centum of such expenses, (B) no grants for administrative expenses shall be made for a local development district for a period in excess of three years beginning on the date the initial grant is made

for such development district, and (C) the local development district contributions for administrative expenses may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to space, equipment, and services; and

"(2) to make grants to the Commission for investigation, research, studies, technical assistance, and demonstration projects, and for training programs, but not for construction purposes, which will further the purposes of this Act.

"(b) The Commission is authorized to make a survey and study of acid pollution in the region resulting from mining activities and the effects of such pollution, in full cooperation with the Secretary of the Interior and other appropriate Federal, State, and local departments and agencies, with the objective of developing a comprehensive action program for the appropriate control, reduction, or elimination of such pollution in the region or the effects of such pollution. The Commission shall submit to the President a report, including specific recommendations for such program and for the policies under which it should be conducted, and the President shall submit the report to the Congress, together with his recommendations, not later than March 31, 1969. The study shall, among other matters—

"(1) Identify sources of acid mine pollution in the region and their type, area, ownership, and other characteristics; the relative contribution of each source; and the impact of each source on water quality in the streams affected.

"(2) Identify present and potential water-using and other activities which are affected by acid mine pollution in the region, or originating in the region, and the economic and social costs and effects attributable to such pollution.

"(3) Identify known methods and costs for the control and abatement of acid mine pollution.

"(4) Estimate economic and social benefits, public and private, that are likely to result from reducing to various levels acid mine pollution in the streams of the region and identify the types of beneficiaries and the relative distribution of the benefits to such beneficiaries.

"(5) Consider the appropriate roles of Federal, State, and private interests in programs for the control, reduction, or elimination of acid mine pollution in the region and the relative costs which each should bear, including specifically (A) the extent, if any, to which private interests can bear the cost of such programs within the economics of mining activity, (B) the effectiveness of past action by Federal, State, and local units of government in remedying or controlling the adverse effects of acid mine pollution, (C) relationships which might be established among Federal, State, and local units of government, and with private interests, for implementing and funding such programs, and (D) the need for appropriate Federal and State legislation, including adequate enforcement provisions, for such programs.

"(6) Formulate a program for the appropriate control, reduction, or elimination of acid mine pollution in the region, including the identification of specific objectives and costs, with due consideration to: (A) the developmental effects of the program, (B) the economic benefits of the program in relation to costs, (C) the social effects of the program, (D) the avoidance of unwarranted financial gain to private interests, and (E) the types and sources of aid required to accomplish the program.

"(c) (1) The Commission shall, as required by the President, maintain accurate and complete records of transactions and activities financed with Federal funds and report thereon to the President. The records of the Commission shall be available for audit with respect to such grants by the

President and the Comptroller General or their duly authorized representatives.

"(2) Recipients of Federal assistance under the provisions of this section shall, as required by the Commission, maintain accurate and complete records of transactions and activities financed with Federal funds and report thereon to the Commission. Such records shall be available for audit by the President, the Comptroller General, and the Commission or their duly authorized representatives.

"(d) Not to exceed \$10,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 401 of this Act for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1969, shall be available to carry out this section. Not to exceed \$3,000,000 of such authorization shall be available for the purposes of subsection (b)."

Sec. 121. Section 303 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"PROJECT APPROVAL

"Sec. 303. An application for a grant or for any other assistance for a program or project under this Act shall be made through the State member of the Commission representing such applicant, and such State member shall evaluate the application for approval. Only applications for programs and projects which are approved by a State member as meeting the requirements for assistance under the Act shall be approved for assistance. No project shall be approved by the Commission unless the Commission is satisfied that the project will be properly administered, operated, and maintained."

Sec. 122. Section 401 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"Sec. 401. In addition to the appropriations authorized in section 105 and in section 201 for the Appalachian development highway system and local access roads, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, to be available until expended, not to exceed \$170,000,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1969, to carry out this Act."

Sec. 123. (a) Section 403 of the Act, entitled "DEFINITION OF APPALACHIAN REGION", is amended—

(1) by inserting in the clause relating to the counties in Alabama after "Jefferson," the following: "Lamar," and after "Morgan," the following: "Pickens,";

(2) by inserting after the clause relating to the counties in Maryland the following:

"In Mississippi, the counties of Alcorn, Benton, Chickasaw, Choctaw, Clay, Itawamba, Kemper, Lee, Lowndes, Marshall, Monroe, Noxubee, Oktibbeha, Pontotoc, Prentiss, Tippah, Tishomingo, Union, Webster, and Winston;

"In New York, the counties of Allegany, Broome, Cattaraugus, Chautauque, Chemung, Chenango, Cortland, Delaware, Otsego, Schoharie, Schuyler, Steuben, Tioga, and Tompkins,"; and

(3) by inserting in the clause relating to the counties in Tennessee after "Campbell" the following: "Cannon,".

(b) Such section is further amended by striking out the colon following "West Virginia" and inserting in lieu thereof a period, and by striking out all of the remainder of such section and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"No recommendation for any change in the definition of the Appalachian region as set forth in this section shall be proposed or considered by the Commission without a prior resolution by the Committee on Public Works of the Senate or of the House of Representatives, directing a study of such change."

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Sec. 201. Subsection (a) of section 503 of the Public Works and Economic Development

Act of 1965 is amended by striking the semicolon after clause (2), inserting a comma, and the following: "including the development of a comprehensive long-range economic plan approved by the Secretary;".

Sec. 202. Subsection (c) of section 505 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Not to exceed \$2,500,000 of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this subsection for each fiscal year shall be allocated by the Secretary to each regional commission to carry out the purposes of this section."

Sec. 203. Section 509 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended by redesignating such section as section 510 and by inserting after section 508 the following new section 509:

"SUPPLEMENTS TO FEDERAL GRANT-IN-AID PROGRAMS

"Sec. 509. (a) In order to enable the States and other entities within economic development regions established under this Act to take maximum advantage of Federal grant-in-aid programs (as hereinafter defined) for which they are eligible but for which, because of their economic situation, they cannot supply the required matching share, the Secretary is authorized, once a comprehensive long-range economic plan established pursuant to clause (2) of section 503(a) of this Act is in effect, and pursuant to specific recommendations, approved by him, of the regional commissions heretofore or hereafter established under this title and after consultation with appropriate Federal officials, to allocate funds appropriated to carry out this section to the heads of the departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government responsible for the administration of such Federal grant-in-aid programs, to be used for the sole purpose of increasing the Federal contribution to projects under such programs above the fixed maximum portion of the cost of such projects otherwise authorized by the applicable law. No program or project authorized under this section shall be implemented until (1) applications and plans relating to the program or project have been determined by the responsible Federal official to be compatible with the provisions and objectives of Federal laws which he administers that are not inconsistent with this Act, and (2) the Regional Commission involved has approved such program or project and has determined that it meets the applicable criteria under section 504 and will contribute to the development of the region, which determination shall be controlling. Funds may be provided only for Federal grant-in-aid programs for which funds are available under the Act authorizing such programs. Funds so provided shall be available without regard to any appropriation authorization ceilings in such Act.

"(b) The Federal portion of such costs shall not be increased in excess of the percentages established by each commission, and shall in no event exceed 80 per centum thereof.

"(c) The term 'Federal grant-in-aid programs' as used in this section means all Federal grant-in-aid programs in existence on or before August 1, 1967, assisting in the acquisition of land or the construction or equipment of facilities, including but not limited to grant-in-aid programs authorized by title I of this Act and by the following Acts: Federal Water Pollution Control Act; Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act; title VI of the Public Health Service Act; Vocational Education Act of 1963; Library Services Act; Federal Airport Act; part IV of title III of the Communications Act of 1934; Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963; Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965; and National Defense Education Act of 1958. The term shall not include any program in which loans or other Federal financial assistance, except a grant-in-aid program, is au-

thorized by this or any other Act. Grants under this section shall be made solely out of funds specifically appropriated for the purpose of carrying out this section, and shall not be taken into account in the computation of allocations among the States made pursuant to any other provision of law.

"(d) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for use in each of the regions for the purposes of this section the sum of \$5,000,000 for the period ending June 30, 1968, and the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

"(e) An application for a grant under this section shall be made through the State member of the Commission representing such applicant, and such State member shall evaluate the application for approval. Only applications for programs and projects which are approved by a State member as meeting the requirements for assistance under this section shall be approved for assistance."

Sec. 204. The Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended by adding at the end of title VI thereof the following new section:

**"ADMINISTRATION, OPERATION, AND
MAINTENANCE**

"Sec. 604. No Federal assistance shall be approved under this Act unless the responsible Federal official is satisfied that the project for which Federal assistance is granted will be properly and efficiently administered, operated, and maintained."

And, to amend the title so as to read: "An act to revise and extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, and to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the House amendment to Senate bill 602, the Appalachian Regional Development Act, and request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. SPONG, Mr. COOPER, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, and Mr. BAKER conferees on the part of the Senate.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9960) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the Senate committee amendment to H.R. 9960 on page 10, line 25, which deals with the construction of public buildings, in the amount of \$70,641,900.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read the committee amendment, as follows:

On page 10, line 25, after the word "buildings", to strike out "\$54,511,900" and insert "\$70,641,900".

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this item involves—and I wish Senators who are present would give us their attention—the whole GSA public building

construction program for these United States. I have been on this committee for many, many years. Over the years we have always expended what we thought was a modest amount to keep up with a growing population and the growing need of public buildings, providing amounts from approximately \$170 million to \$200 million, for the whole country, out of a budget that has run as high as \$75 billion to over \$100 billion, even in peacetime. We have provided from \$170 million to \$200 million for public buildings for the whole of the United States, and even with this we have not kept up. They are standing in line. There are priorities piled up at the General Services Administration for needed places, but we have held down the appropriations, for many, many reasons. In the meantime the General Services Administration has had to rent space in many places in the United States where the cost is almost prohibitive.

When we construct Federal buildings, we find we sometimes amortize them anywhere in from 11 to 15 years, just by the saying in rent and upkeep. We thought this year it was a time to hold down expenses. So we have provided \$70 million for the whole of the United States. Each of the buildings provided for has had a longstanding priority. The applications and approved prospectus for them have been standing in line. They are for construction in places where the rental cost is prohibitive. Very few of them would not be amortized by the saving in rent alone over a period of 15 years.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. As a matter of fact, it has become rather fashionable for people to construct these buildings even in the District of Columbia, hoping the Federal Government will rent them. Is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes, and they do that.

Mr. PASTORE. They are going up every day and we are paying for them at prices out of all proportion.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We had a building program, under the first years of the Eisenhower administration—it was not new with him, but it happened then—in which we thought we could get away from the problem by appropriating a modest sum of money. I think the amount for public buildings is modest in proportion to the whole budget. As a matter of fact, we appropriate less for public buildings, in relation to our budget, than does any other nation in the world, even with the \$170 million to \$200 million rule of thumb that we had for years.

Several years ago, in an effort to avoid appropriating money, we started a scheme called lease-purchase. A contractor would construct a building, lease it to the Government—I think it is still being done to some extent on smaller units by the Post Office Department—the Government would pay rent for 20 years, and then, after 20 years, it could take over the building. Of course, by then the cost was amortized, so the contractor

made a reasonable sum out of it with no risk. He had a 20-year rental contract with the Government.

After a few years of experience with that plan, we found—and I must say that the Senator from Delaware was with me on this—that it was costing us anywhere from 16 to, in one case, 45 percent more than if we had appropriated the money and built the building. We have been doing that, year after year, with a very modest appropriation in comparison with what was needed. It saved some money on maintenance, too.

Meanwhile, many of these needed buildings have been standing in line. Some of the amounts recommended in the bill are required because we have delayed so long after the bids came in that even the lowest were about 4 percent over the original funding, a conservative amount and an unavoidable increase.

Seven of those buildings are listed in the bill as amendments. Four were included in the budget estimate but three more were added by the House because of the time lag involved. Then three more proposed buildings have been standing in line, as to which I think I can prove, with cold, hard figures from the GSA, that we will be saving money by starting them now, because they must be started eventually, anyway.

One is a Federal office building in Mobile, Ala. This project has already been funded for site and expenses, and any delay in construction not only would affect the general economic well-being of the area, which is growing all the time at a great rate, growing faster than most sections of the country, but would in itself be pennywise and pound foolish.

Another one happens to be—and I am not embarrassed to talk about it—a Federal office building in Seattle. That has been standing in line, and was funded for site and expenses in 1965. It has been delayed for a long time. It is now ready to go. It has been ready for 6 months.

What has happened there is what has happened in Washington with respect to the Labor Department building and, last year, the FBI building. The city is putting a rapid transit system underneath and around the area. The amount of money provided in the bill is only for the foundations, so that the buildings can be built in conjunction with what is going on underneath and around it involving the rapid transit system. The building of the subway is not going to stop, so if we sought to fund the building next year, it would be necessary to tear up a lot of construction and spend more money. So I am not embarrassed to talk about this at all. The project has been lying dormant for a long time.

As I say, the same thing happened in Washington—and the Senator from Colorado and I wrestled with it—with respect to the Labor Department building. We finally agreed last year to allow money for the substructure, and it is good that we did, because even now a tunnel is being started right in front of this Capitol. If we let that go, and build the building later, even next year, the cost would be 15 to 20 percent more.

Another of the items is the U.S. Tax Court building in the District of Columbia. The Tax Court, as many people know,

has been located at the Internal Revenue Service. There has been some suggestion that it should be separated from the Internal Revenue Service because they are doing business too close together. I think in certain cases that might well be true. The Tax Court has needed a small building for a long time; and the Internal Revenue Service, of course, is bursting at the seams. We thought some money might be saved by providing a small amount to get going on that project—the amount involved is \$1.1 million, and it is estimated that the savings, through new construction, will amount to about \$22.6 million—to get the Tax Court out of there so that the Internal Revenue people, who have been paying rent elsewhere, could move back. The Tax Court building would be amortized, according to our best figures from all the people involved, in 13.8 years.

That is what we added. The Bureau of the Budget submitted to the Congress last January, increases in construction costs—so that we could save more money toward this end—

[In thousands of dollars]

Project	Prior construction appropriation	Addition
Bridgeport, Conn.: Courthouse and Federal office building	3,190	338
Evansville, Ind.: Courthouse, post office, and Federal office building	3,596	710
Dayton, Ohio: Post office	5,105	1,475
Baker, Oreg.: Post office and Federal office building	1,177	274

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. Just let me finish.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What table is the Senator reading from?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am reading from the committee report, page 8, which lists all these items.

Mr. LAUSCHE. All right.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The House included one building in Lincoln, Nebr., which has been kicked around I do not know how many years, back and forth between the House and the Senate, and is a much-needed project; and the Federal building in Buffalo N.Y.; and a Federal office building and courthouse in Rochester, N.Y.

The others are items the Senate committee added. Among others, we added one in Fargo, N. Dak., which has been available for construction for 19 months. The bids were higher than the original funding. In Tennessee, we added one at Oak Ridge.

All this adds up to a \$70 million total, or a sum of \$8 million more than the recommended total of the budget estimates—\$8 million for the whole country.

The House added items, but postponed a large item, a post office and Federal building in Puerto Rico; so the proportion between the House and the Senate recommendations is \$54 to \$70 million.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think this is a modest amount compared with the need compared with the number of places involved and the number of people served, for the whole country. This is what the

committee did, and it was not done lightly. Of all the items we have to consider, this is always the most difficult.

It is not difficult to establish the need for these facilities, or the savings to be effected by building them. The difficult thing is to establish the priorities, because there never has been enough funding to do the job right.

I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Page 7 shows that the 1967 appropriation was \$125,318,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What does the committee recommend for this year?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is \$70 million. Normally, we have recommended around \$170 to \$200 million, which has seemed to be a minimum annual figure just to keep up. This year, we have cut that average still making an effort to take care of those projects upon which we could not save a nickel by not doing them now. Our problem, as I say, is the priorities, because there has never been enough in this budget.

We have cut out all the building we could think of in the District of Columbia. We have been doing that for 3 years; but because of the substructure situation at the Department of Labor, we thought that to proceed with it was wise and would represent an economy.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. What amount does the bill now carry from both the House and the Senate for the Tax Court?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senate bill carries \$1.1 million for the Tax Court.

Mr. CURTIS. In connection with the Tax Court, is it correct that that money is for a substructure, and it is, in a sense, tied in with some of the highway construction?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. If it is not done at this time, would it perhaps be more cumbersome?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Colorado can answer that question because he did take a long look at it in the course of the testimony.

Mr. ALLOTT. I believe that is a true statement. Under the scheduled program, that construction would come across the Mall and come directly across this area.

It is a question of doing this now in conjunction with the construction of this underground freeway or else doing it later at a greatly increased cost.

It is the same situation exactly as that which we had last year in the consideration of the labor building, shown here under South Portal.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been very much interested in the separation of the Tax Court as to function and status, as well as physical location. I think they should be moved as soon as possible from where they are.

Mr. ALLOTT. I agree, while we are on the subject, I will read a paragraph from a letter from T. F. Airis, Director of the Department of Highways and Traffic, of the government of the District of Columbia, in which he said, under date of August 24, 1966:

As you know, our engineers have been examining the proper sequence of construction operations in this entire area and they warned me that if the Freeway and the Tax Court cannot proceed simultaneously and the Freeway is open to traffic before the construction of the Tax Court building is completed, either the Freeway traffic which will exit on 2nd and D Streets will suffer heavy congestion or the street must be cleared of construction and impedimenta which will result in substantial increase of cost for the building contractor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the committee amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 10, line 25, strike out "\$70,641,900" and insert "\$49,605,700."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the purpose of my amendment is to reduce the figure from \$70,641,900 to \$49,605,700, thus eliminating from the bill all of those projects which were not recommended in the budget.

If we were to adopt this amendment, it would leave sufficient money in the bill with which to carry out the financing of every single public works project recommended in the President's budget.

The budget recommendation originally was \$62,545,700; however, \$12,940,000 of that was for a project in San Juan, P.R. That project has been eliminated and is not a part of the bill either in the House or in the Senate version. So we can eliminate that approximate \$13 million. That leaves \$40 million of budgetary items.

The House committee added a couple of new projects. They added one in Buffalo, N.Y., in the amount of \$2 million. That project was not recommended in the budget. They included another project for a courthouse and post office building in Rochester, N.Y., in the amount of \$2,036,800. That project was not recommended by the budget.

The Senate committee added \$5,784,000 for a Federal office building in Mobile, Ala. That project was not recommended in the budget. It would be eliminated by this amendment.

The post office and courthouse facilities in Hammond, Ill., in the amount of \$265,000 is not a budgetary item.

The post office and Federal office building in Springfield, Mass., in the amount of \$1,177,000 is not a budgetary item.

The Federal office building in Goldsboro, N.C., in the amount of \$205,000 is not a budgetary item.

The post office and Federal office building in Raleigh, N.C., in the amount of \$1,693,000 is not a budgetary item.

The post office and courthouse in Wilkesboro, N.C., in the amount of \$234,000 is not a budgetary item.

The post office and Federal office building in Fargo, N. Dak., in the amount of \$437,000 is not a budgetary item.

The Federal office building at Oak Ridge, Tenn., in the amount of \$735,000 is not a budgetary item.

The Federal office building in Seattle, Wash., in the amount of \$4.5 million is not in the budget.

The U.S. Tax Court building in the District of Columbia in the amount of \$1.1 million is not a budgetary item.

I am completely in agreement with what has been said, that in the long range it would be well to have the Tax Court in a separate building from that of the Treasury. I will support that principle at the appropriate time; however, we have gone for 100 years with the Tax Court located in the Federal Treasury building. And certainly they can continue with that operation until we have won the war in Vietnam or until we have this budget under a little better control than we do today.

I think that with a war going on and with a \$29-billion deficit confronting us, the time is long past due when we should reduce and postpone some of these new construction projects.

I do not see how we can ask the taxpayers to finance all of these new construction projects at a time when we are running a deficit that is estimated to be approximately \$2 billion a month.

During World War II we had a policy enacted and approved by Congress and the executive branch of the Government that all public works projects of any nature would be held in abeyance until after the war was over unless those projects were certified as being essential to the national defense or there were reasons why it would not be economically feasible to postpone their construction. All public works projects were held in abeyance.

During the Korean war President Truman acted likewise by Executive order, and I supported him in his action. He ordered that all public works projects be held in abeyance until the war was over or until the projects were certified as being essential to the war effort.

I think that this administration has been negligent in recognizing that we do have an expensive war going on and that the American taxpayers cannot continue to pay for all of the business as usual at home while we are at the same time fighting this war abroad.

The idea that we can have both butter and guns has already created a dangerous inflationary atmosphere here at home.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, looking at the bill, pages 10, 11, 12, and 13, am I correct that all of the italicized items on pages 11, 12, and 13 would be eliminated?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It would eliminate the money for those projects. From a procedural standpoint the projects would have to be eliminated later by a vote; however, that would be automatic if this amendment were agreed to because the money would not be available.

I first suggested that we vote on individual projects first and then adjust the total dollar figure. However, the chairman of the committee insisted, and properly, that this is the first amendment and that we would vote on it first.

I am approaching it from the standpoint of eliminating money for the items not included in the budget. However, that would be the effect of the amendment, yes.

Mr. DOMINICK. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. So that the effect of it, as the Senator has outlined, would be to eliminate the italicized items, and it is my understanding that then the Senator would eliminate some that are not italicized.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. On page 12, the Federal office building in Buffalo, N.Y., \$2 million, and the courthouse and Federal office building in Rochester, \$2,036,800, were nonbudgeted items. The money for these items, which was in the House version of the bill, would be eliminated.

As I have stated, my objective would be to eliminate the nonbudgeted items.

Mr. DOMINICK. That is the point I desired to make crystal clear, because the report, on page 7, only refers to three that were not included in the budget estimate. I wondered how we got the remainder of them.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not know where they came from. They were not included in the budget as submitted by the President.

Mr. DOMINICK. I wonder whether we can develop this matter in the process of the discussion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am sure we will.

I am speaking of the original budget submitted by the President, and I do not find them as part of the recommendation.

The original budget item did have the \$12,900,000 for Puerto Rico, which has been eliminated from both the House and the Senate proposals.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What was the total expenditure recommended in the budget for building?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It was \$62,245,700; but that included a recommendation for \$12,940,000 for a building in Puerto Rico, and that has been eliminated from both the House and the Senate proposals.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That would mean, then, according to the budget, \$50 million was recommended to be expended. The bill reported by the committee provides for \$70 million.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It is \$70 million. The budget recommended \$62 million.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We are \$8 million over the budget recommendation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator—

Mr. LAUSCHE. But the \$12 million—

Mr. MAGNUSON. Well, there are

some changes. That cannot be taken as a criterion.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have it clearly now. I am not arguing the matter. Recommended in the budget was \$72 million.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It was \$62 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And included in that was \$12 million for the Puerto Rico building.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct; \$62,545,700 was in the budget. Of that, \$12.9 million was for Puerto Rico. That has been eliminated.

Mr. LAUSCHE. According to the report, the expenditures recommended are \$70,641,900.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. This includes about \$21 million in projects which were not budgeted.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That would be a difference of \$21 million between what is recommended by the committee and what was recommended in the budget, with the \$12 million for Puerto Rico eliminated.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the manager of the bill a question.

Is it not a fact that in respect of the Buffalo, N.Y., structure, these amounts for the building had been appropriated; that it is an ongoing matter; that what we are dealing with is the difficulty of the GSA in dealing with the bid problem in view of increased costs, and that it does not represent a new start or anything like that?

Mr. ALLOTT. May I answer?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator has stated the situation correctly. I might add that in the critical atmosphere in which we find ourselves, the same is true with respect to the North Dakota appropriation. It is an ongoing situation, and simply to take care of costs, we had to do the same thing.

Mr. JAVITS. In other words, the committee is dealing with a financial reality and not with a new start, which is the basis for the policy argument as made by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is correct. For example, with respect to the Buffalo office building, approximately \$11 million had been appropriated, and we had to add \$2 million to the figure.

Mr. JAVITS. It seems to me that that explanation clearly differentiates the point of the argument from the policy question which the Senator from Delaware has raised in other matters.

I thank the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I note that the report states:

The committee points out that the estimate for 1968 of \$62,545,700, which is less than half the amount appropriated in 1967, does not cover the Post Office buildings that are now appropriated in another bill, for

which the estimate for construction and the sites and expenses is \$55,853,000.

Does this mean that this is an additional item for post office construction that was not in the original bill?

Mr. ALLOTT. It means that the post office items for construction are carried in a separate bill in the Subcommittee on the Departments of Treasury and Post Office.

It should be remembered that most of these buildings in the various areas also contain post offices, so we have an ambivalence so far as the appropriation process is concerned.

Mr. CARLSON. Has it been the policy in the past to come up with new post office building construction in the independent offices bill?

Mr. ALLOTT. It always has been so in the past. Up to this year, they have been constructed by GSA; and through some executive legerdemain at GSA, apparently, by legal opinions of the Attorney General and other people who testified at the hearings, they transferred the building of post offices per se to the Post Office Department this year. So that those items do appear this year for the first time in the Treasury and Post Office appropriations bill, which has already been passed.

Mr. CARLSON. My question is simply this, Has it been the policy of the subcommittee dealing with appropriations for the Post Office and Treasury Departments to handle these items? Were these particular post offices considered in the testimony before the Subcommittee on the Departments of Treasury and Post Office?

Mr. ALLOTT. They were considered. On two occasions, I questioned the postal people quite thoroughly about their authority, and also questioned the GSA about their authority, to transfer this function to the Post Office Department.

As to my personal belief—if it has any weight with the Senator from Kansas—I have grave doubts as to the feasibility of doing this, but it has already been done.

What it means is that, instead of having all this construction in one place, as we have had in the past, where this one committee could watch over it all and balance the needs, the equities, and everything else, we will now have two committees handling it, and we might even get into a somewhat competitive situation with respect to this construction.

The distinguished Senator from Kansas is the ranking minority member of the Post Office Subcommittee, and it would be my hope that he would look into the matter, because I believe we are taking an unwise step in moving in this direction. It was done without any legislative authority.

Mr. CARLSON. This is the first time the matter has been called to my attention, and I have some concern about it. I shall look into the matter, with the thought that it may not be in the interest of our Government to do this. I have an interest in the Post Office Department, and I assure the Senator that I view the matter with concern.

Mr. ALLOTT. I call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Kansas

particularly to the RECORD of yesterday, page 25862. I placed in the RECORD the full details on construction for the United States. I then said, on page 25864:

Mr. ALLOTT. One further remark: I believe a word of caution is necessary, because close coordination will be required in the future between the Treasury and Post Offices Subcommittee and the Independent Offices Subcommittee, to keep a tight rein on the matter and to look into this construction.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to add to what the Senator from Colorado has said to the Senator from Kansas.

Another reason why this is not a good situation is that many of these buildings, with two or three exceptions, also contain a post office. It is a Federal building, and usually a large building. They are now dealing with only those buildings which would be a post office proper, and they are mainly in the smaller communities. The post office would not be in a big Federal building.

Then, they have many lease-purchase contracts going on. This is what we used to try to look at the matter. However, those smaller post offices, where there was going to be a post office only, were taken away.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I would just add one point to the statement of the Senator from Washington. Personally, I favor the Federal Government constructing Federal buildings. I think in the long run it is the best thing to do and it is a tax advantage to all of us. Regrettably, in the past we have opposed Federal construction. Perhaps we are getting back to it, which would be the proper thing to do.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I concur in the statement of the Senator from Kansas.

I wish to address a question to the Senator from Colorado. I am trying to get information at this time. On page 7 of the report it is stated that the 1967 appropriation was \$125,318,000. Am I correct that that \$125,318,000 covered not only general buildings but also post office buildings, and that some of the post office buildings, however, are not included in this appropriation?

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the Senator able to tell how much money will be expended to construct buildings that will accommodate the Post Office Department alone?

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes. That figure would be \$55,853,000.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That would mean the committee recommendation of \$70,641,000 should have added to it the \$55 million just mentioned by the Senator from Colorado to justify the comparison of what was spent last year and what is being spent this year.

Mr. ALLOTT. To place the matter in perspective, the Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That would mean for the 1968 appropriation we would be spending practically the same amount that we spent for 1967?

Mr. ALLOTT. If we consider the total, the Senator is correct, yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Of \$125 million?

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further point?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Is not one of our real problems that construction costs are constantly going up and, therefore, we have found by experience, where we are under way and building, a deferment costs more money and we are not doing ourselves a favor?

Mr. ALLOTT. We figure in the committee, based upon testimony over the years, from GSA particularly, that this amounts to an annual increase of about 5 percent. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Colorado is correct; building costs are increasing each year. Looking at the matter strictly from that standpoint, perhaps it would be cheaper to build this year than next year. However, I point out that the President has called on all of the American citizens to postpone repair jobs to their homes, to postpone new construction and plans for expanding that which can be postponed until the war is finished. The President said he was setting an example by postponing the remodeling of his ranch in Texas until the war is over.

Mr. President, I point out that if building costs are more each year, that is not an argument for us to go further into deficit spending and to build Government projects for fear of an inflation which the Government is creating by its own reckless spending policies. If we do, where do we stop?

The suggestion is made that if we agree to this measure we would handicap some construction which has already been started. We propose in this amendment to strike out \$21 million in connection with the items mentioned.

I call attention to the fact that included in this section is a new Federal office building in Mobile, Ala., at a cost of \$5,784,000 that has not been approved or started; there is a new post office and Federal building at Talladega, Ala., at a cost of \$385,000; a new post office and courthouse in Honolulu at a cost of \$22 million; a new courthouse and Federal office building at Frankfort, Ky., at a cost of \$1,868,000. These are entirely new projects; there is a Federal motor vehicle facility in Houston, Tex., at a cost of \$780,000, entirely new; a courthouse and Federal office building in Lubbock, Tex., at a cost of \$4,508,000, which is an entirely new project; a Federal office building in Seattle, Wash., at a cost of \$4.5 million, entirely new.

Mr. President, there are other new projects in the bill. I do not question for a moment that, taking them individually, each one could be defended if we had the money. I do not question for a moment that it may be favorable to build these buildings at a later and more appropriate date.

The question I do raise is that at a time when we are in the midst of financing an expensive war in Vietnam with no foreseeable end to that war, at a time

when our deficit is running better than \$2 billion a month, estimates of \$20 billion to \$25 billion and some running as high as \$25 billion to \$30 billion for the fiscal year, at a time when the administration is asking all taxpayers for an increase in taxes of 10 percent, we should eliminate some of these new construction projects. I seek a postponement of some of these projects.

Every Senator has made speeches and said much about supporting a reduction of Government expenditures. I venture to say that there is not a single Senator who, in answering his mail, has not endorsed reduced Government spending.

The bill before us provides for \$10.4 billion, which is \$445.5 million over the House bill. This bill is \$880 million over the 1967 appropriation.

In addition, the bill, under another section, provides an extra \$2.795 billion in new spending money over and above the amount the House provided by authorizing a sale of \$2.385 billion more in participation certificates than approved in the House bill. That \$2.385 billion will go into the spending stream and furnish extra spending money for the agencies covered, and when added to the \$445 million increase in cash appropriations, we have an increase of over \$2¾ billion.

We are voting on a bill that, if passed as reported by the committee, would provide \$2.75 billion more spending money than the bill passed by the House of Representatives just a few weeks ago and considerably more than was spent by the same agencies last year.

Mr. President, it is my position that there is only one way we can prove that we are sincere in cutting appropriations and that is by our votes.

Mr. President, I have asked for a roll-call vote on this amendment, which would strike out the extra money added for those projects which had not been heretofore approved by the Bureau of the Budget. This is a modest approach on a bill of this size. There will be votes on the other increases later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YARBOROUGH in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the committee amendment on page 10, line 25.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Wyoming

[Mr. MCGEE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORROW], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 63, as follows:

[No. 253 Leg.]

YEAS—24

Bennett	Griffin	Murphy
Byrd, Va.	Hansen	Pearson
Carlson	Hickenlooper	Prouty
Church	Jordan, Idaho	Proxmire
Cooper	Kennedy, Mass.	Smith
Dirksen	Lausche	Thurmond
Dominick	Miller	Williams, Del.
Fannin	Monroney	Young, Ohio

NAYS—63

Allott	Gruening	Metcalf
Anderson	Harris	Mondale
Baker	Hart	Montoya
Bartlett	Hartke	Morse
Bible	Hayden	Moss
Boggs	Hill	Mundt
Brooke	Holland	Nelson
Burdick	Hollings	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Hruska	Pell
Cannon	Inouye	Randolph
Case	Jackson	Ribicoff
Clark	Javits	Scott
Cotton	Jordan, N.C.	Sparkman
Curtis	Kennedy, N.Y.	Spong
Dodd	Long, Mo.	Stennis
Eastland	Long, La.	Talmadge
Ellender	Magnuson	Tower
Ervin	Mansfield	Tydings
Fong	McClellan	Williams, N.J.
Fulbright	McGovern	Yarborough
Gore	McIntyre	Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—13

Aiken	McCarthy	Russell
Bayh	McGee	Smathers
Brewster	Morton	Symington
Hatfield	Muskie	
Kuchel	Percy	

So the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was defeated.

Mr. ALLOTT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I now move to adopt the committee amendment on page 10, line 25.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Senate has just rejected the amendment which would have stricken out all nonbudgeted items and reduced the appropriation by about \$21 million.

Some Members of the Senate raised the point that a part of this money was to provide money to continue construction of buildings that had been started and that if only new buildings had been involved they might take a different position.

I call attention to the fact that included in this appropriation are three items, all new construction projects, which were added by the Senate commit-

tee but which are not budgeted. I refer to page 7 of the committee report. I read from that page of the committee report:

The committee recommends adding three projects which have been previously funded for sites and expenses and are now ready for construction funds and have high priority in the construction program, though they were not included in the budget estimate.

The three projects which were added were a new Federal office building in Mobile, Ala., for \$5,784,000; a new Federal office building in Seattle, Wash., \$4,500,000; the U.S. Tax Court Building in the District of Columbia, adding \$1.1 million.

In recommending these, the committee said in its report:

The committee believes that the Tax Court should be appropriately housed in its own building as soon as possible.

I agree that it would be advisable to have a separate building. The question is, Is this the time to do it? Would it not be better to postpone the construction of these new buildings? In this instance, not one of them had been started. Not one of them had been recommended by the Budget Bureau as being feasible at this time. If these projects are approved they will involve \$11.384 million over what was recommended by the budget.

As I pointed out before, this bill is already \$445 million more than the House provided. It is \$880 million above last year's appropriation. In addition to those two figures, \$2.350 billion of extra spending is provided by way of additional sales of participation certificates, the proceeds of which go into the spending stream normally. It just does not show up in the deficit and debt figures.

Therefore, to accomplish the objective of eliminating the three projects which were not in the budget at all and were not in the bill as it came from the House I send to the desk another amendment and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment to the committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 10, line 25, to strike out "\$70,641,900", and insert in lieu thereof "\$59,257,900."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Maine

[Mr. MUSKIE], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] would each vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is absent by leave of the Senate. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 57, as follows:

[No. 254 Leg.]

YEAS—27

Baker	Fannin	Monroney
Bennett	Fong	Murphy
Boggs	Griffin	Pearson
Byrd, Va.	Hansen	Prouty
Carlson	Hickenlooper	Proxmire
Church	Jordan, Idaho	Smith
Cooper	Kennedy, Mass.	Thurmond
Dirksen	Lausche	Williams, Del.
Dominick	Miller	Young, Ohio

NAYS—57

Allott	Hartke	Montoya
Anderson	Hayden	Morse
Bartlett	Hill	Moss
Bible	Holland	Mundt
Brooke	Hollings	Nelson
Burdick	Hruska	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Inouye	Pell
Cannon	Jackson	Randolph
Case	Javits	Ribicoff
Clark	Jordan, N.C.	Scott
Cotton	Kennedy, N.Y.	Sparkman
Curtis	Long, Mo.	Spong
Dodd	Long, La.	Stennis
Eastland	Magnuson	Talmadge
Ellender	Mansfield	Tower
Fulbright	McGovern	Tydings
Gore	McIntyre	Williams, N.J.
Gruening	Metcalf	Yarborough
Hart	Mondale	Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—16

Aiken	Kuchel	Percy
Bayh	McCarthy	Russell
Brewster	McClellan	Smathers
Ervin	McGee	Symington
Harris	Morton	
Hatfield	Muskie	

So the amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the committee amendment on page 10, line 25.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I might make an inquiry of the majority leader?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a number of us have been invited to the State Department for a luncheon being held by the Vice President in honor of the President of Italy.

I wonder what the procedure will be here for the next hour and a half or so. I would dislike to go there and be called back. I would rather remain here, if that is to be the case.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I know that other Senators are in the same position.

The next vote will be on the committee amendment. Some of us want a rollcall on that also. However, we could have that vote immediately as far as I am concerned. We have already made a decision by our actions on the other amendments.

I stated earlier that I would have preferred to vote on each project separately; however, voting on these amendments as offered was the only way in which we could get to the question of new projects. The next rollcall vote will be on the committee amendment which increases the House appropriation by about \$16 million. As far as I am concerned that can be had within 5 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As far as I am concerned, it can come within 1 minute.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is satisfactory.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The amendment now pending is the committee amendment on page 10, line 25.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a time limitation of not to exceed 10 minutes on the pending amendment, the time to be equally divided between the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the distinguished Senator from Washington, the manager of the bill [Mr. MAGNUSON], and that immediately upon the conclusion of that vote the Senate stand in recess for 1 hour.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate I will only take 1 minute.

We have already debated this issue. By agreeing to the committee amendment we would be increasing the appropriation over the House figure by \$16,130,000.

The Senate committee made 60 changes in the House bill, 58 of those provide for increases, and only 2 provide for reductions. Those 58 increases totaled over \$445 million extra.

Unless we cut the bill below the figure reported by the Senate committee we will be passing a bill which provides a grand total of approximately \$2¾ billion more than the House provides in spending money for those same agencies.

I think the very least we can do is to reject some of the Senate increases. I urge that the committee amendment be rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a vote "yea" would be a vote for the committee amendment, and a vote "nay" would be a vote against the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

I also announced that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] are necessarily absent.

I further announced that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] would each vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 63, nays 23, as follows:

[No. 255 Leg.]

YEAS—63

Allott	Harris	Montoya
Anderson	Hart	Morse
Baker	Hartke	Moss
Bartlett	Hayden	Mundt
Bible	Hill	Nelson
Boggs	Holland	Pastore
Brooke	Hollings	Pell
Burdick	Hruska	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Inouye	Randolph
Cannon	Jackson	Ribicoff
Case	Javits	Russell
Clark	Jordan, N.C.	Scott
Cotton	Kennedy, N.Y.	Sparkman
Curtis	Long, Mo.	Spong
Dodd	Long, La.	Stennis
Eastland	Magnuson	Talmadge
Ellender	Mansfield	Tower
Fong	McGovern	Tydings
Fulbright	McIntyre	Williams, N.J.
Gore	Metcalf	Yarborough
Gruening	Mondale	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—23

Bennett	Griffin	Murphy
Byrd, Va.	Hansen	Pearson
Carlson	Hickenlooper	Proxmire
Church	Jordan, Idaho	Smith
Cooper	Kennedy, Mass.	Thurmond
Dirksen	Lausche	Williams, Del.
Dominick	Miller	Young, Ohio
Fannin	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—14

Aiken	Kuchel	Muskie
Bayh	McCarthy	Percy
Brewster	McClellan	Smathers
Ervin	McGee	Symington
Hatfield	Morton	

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order previously entered, the Senate will stand in recess for 1 hour.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess for 1 hour.

The Senate reassembled at 2:06 p.m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair).

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 11, after line 8, to insert: "Federal Office Building, Mobile, Alabama, \$5,784,000;".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment [putting the question].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 11, after line 19, to insert: "Post office and court house (construction and alteration), Hammond, Indiana, in addition to the sum heretofore appropriated, \$265,000;".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment [putting the question].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 11, after line 24, to insert: "Post office and Federal office building, Springfield, Massachusetts, in addition to the sum heretofore appropriated, \$1,177,000;".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment [putting the question].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 12, line 13, to insert:

"Federal office building, Goldsboro, North Carolina, in addition to the sum heretofore appropriated, \$205,000;".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment [putting the question].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 12, after line 15, to insert: "Post office, courthouse and Federal office building, Raleigh, North Carolina, in addition to the sum heretofore appropriated, \$1,693,000;".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment [putting the question].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 12, after line 18, to insert: "Post office and courthouse, Wilkesboro, North Carolina, in addition to the sum heretofore appropriated, \$234,000;".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment [putting the question].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 12, after line 20, to insert: "Post office and Federal office building, Fargo, North Dakota, in addition to the sum heretofore appropriated, \$437,000;".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment [putting the question].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 13, after line 4, to insert: "Federal office building, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, in addition to the sum heretofore appropriated, \$735,000;".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment [putting the question].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 13, line 10, after "\$4,508,000", to strike out the word "and". and on page 13, after line 10, to insert: "Federal office building (substructure), Seattle, Washington, \$4,500,000;".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment [putting the question].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 13, after line 12, to insert: "United States Tax Court Building (substructure), District of Columbia, \$1,100,000; and".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment [putting the question].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, for the Record it should be pointed out that the vote on these amendments

by voice was a confirmation of the roll-call votes which we had earlier, because the only way we could accomplish this was by rollcall vote. This was the same procedure as was followed in the rollcall votes.

I was opposed to these amendments but we lost on rollcall votes.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I would like the RECORD to show the same explanation with respect to my votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 29, line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$300,000,000" and insert "\$850,000,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, this amendment has not been acted upon. For the information of the Senate there will be a yea-and-nay vote on this amendment.

Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to increase the House authorization on participation sales by \$550 million.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Does the Senator wish to oppose the amendment before we explain it?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No; but I am serving notice that there will be a yea-and-nay vote, I did not want this amendment to go through on a voice vote.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, under the previous agreement, this brings us down to this item beginning on page 28, which involves the matter of participation sales authorization for the Veterans' Administration, in which the House limited the amount to \$300 million, the budget recommended \$850 million, and the Senate committee restored the amount of \$850 million.

In the meantime, however, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] has an amendment on page 24 involving the Selective Service System. The Senator from Maine is ready to proceed with her discussion of her amendment. I am wondering whether we should do that first or, if she is willing, we would go ahead with the participation sales authorization amendment and then come back to her amendment.

Mrs. SMITH. I am ready to discuss my amendment now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment has been stated on page 29, line 4.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we revert to page 24, line 20. This amendment has been adopted by the Senate but it is subject to amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 24, line 19, it is proposed to insert:

Provided further, That any officer who has served with the Selective Service System in the position of a State Director of Selective Service or comparable executive position on the Staff of the Director of Selective Service for a period of fifteen years will, upon retirement from active duty, be advanced in rank on the retired list to the next high-

est pay grade and be entitled to the retired pay of that grade as computed under appropriate provisions of law applicable to such person.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I make the point of order that this is legislation on a general appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules under rule XVI that the point of order made by the Senator from Maine is well taken and, therefore, sustains it; the amendment will be stricken since it is legislation on a general appropriation bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, this matter is a very difficult one. I am fully aware of the position of the distinguished lady from Maine and, of course, I do think, as we knew when we put it in the bill, that it was legislative and the Chair correctly ruled it is subject to a point of order.

However, I would hope we could establish a little legislative history about this situation.

There are several people—I believe five—in the United States who have been members of the Selective Service System, State directors of the Selective Service System. One of them has 27 total years of military service; one has 45 years; one has 48 years; one has 46 years; one has 50 years. In the same order they have 27 years of service with the Selective Service System, 25 years, 27 years, 27 years, and 26 years.

Now the problem in the situation which we are trying to correct is that these gentlemen have served their country long as members of the military—some of them for over a quarter of a century with respect to the Selective Service System. Under the present promotion and retirement system, these gentlemen cannot secure promotions before they end their service and retire. I think the distinguished chairman has some figures on the amount of difference it would make—very small—but we felt that justification and sheer equity required that we try to do something about it.

Therefore, with this preliminary statement I should like to inquire of the distinguished Senator from Maine if it is possible that something could be done legislatively to try to help these people, not for their immediate promotion, but at the point that they retired they would be entitled to promotion and a very slight increase which would come in their retirement as a result.

Mrs. SMITH. I would be openminded to such a move, but this would be entirely a matter for the Armed Services Committees of both the House and the Senate. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], who is the ranking member on the Armed Services Committee, might be willing to speak to that point if the Senator from Colorado would like to have him do so.

Mr. ALLOTT. I would appreciate it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senator will yield to me first, let me take a few minutes to add to what the Senator from Colorado has just said.

We found ourselves in this position; traditionally, the Selective Service laws have provided that the National and

State administration of the System be handled for the most part by selected National Guard and Reserve officers. The National Defense Act specifically provides for a National Guard section in each State to assist the Governors in the administration of the draft. Under the draft laws, the Governors are the nominal heads of the Selective Service System in their States, and they select usually from the National Guard section or the Reserves. The President appoints as officer as State director to administer the Selective Service in the State. The national Director of the Selective Service System is nominated, I wish to point out—as did the Senator from Maine—by the President, and his nomination confirmed by the Senate. His small staff at the present time is composed of 12 officers, for the most part taken from the National Guard sections of the State or from selected Reserve officers.

Most of these officers, of course, have served in the military, some of them with great distinction. One or two have disabilities. But they have worked for many years in selective service. The fact that they have served with the Selective Service System, we are informed, on a detached basis from the regular forces, removes them from consideration for advancement as given by the selection board maintained by the regular forces.

The purpose of the amendment is to take care of five of these men who have served a total of 27, 25, 27, 27, and 26 years in selective service. As to military service, one in Colorado totals 45 years. One in Rhode Island totals 48 years. One in Virginia totals 46 years. One in the District of Columbia totals 50 years.

The purpose of the amendment is to see if we cannot take care of these men as they should be taken care of, because they have been in almost continuous service in the Selective Service System—some of them—since 1940.

The total cost, \$4,000 a year for the five men if they are promoted, goes into effect only when they retire. Most of them are ready to retire and probably would do so. Had they been under the regular Defense Act Personnel Section they would have been promoted a long time ago. Their age averages are from 63 to 75 years. We thought that in justice to these men, we should take care of them.

I understand, of course, that this is subject to a point of order. There is also the problem, which the Senator from Mississippi has stated, of violating the procedures and the integrity of the military promotion system as it stands now.

Somehow, we have got to take care of these men, and I want to make this statement for the RECORD.

Mrs. SMITH. I am now happy to yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Maine. The point raised about the proposed amendment to the appropriation bill is that this would be permanent legislation and would open the door in future years to setting up a substitute way of promoting people in addition to our own regular board of promotions which deals with regular military officers. As the years accrue, many additional people serving in this way would auto-

matically come under it, and then other groups would want to enlarge the scope of the law so that they could come in under it with equal logic.

Another reason, though, is that we must maintain the integrity of our board of military promotions—at least that is the term I use—which is our method of selection for promotion of our military officers. This is not a new question. The subcommittee is composed of the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from North Carolina, and I am the third member and chairman; and we have consistently opposed these proposed legislative promotions.

I recall one who was worthy of a promotion, a few years ago, who had been with the Veterans' Administration for a long while. But, under our obligations to the Senate, as we saw them, our subcommittee opposed that legislative promotion. There is a great deal to be said, though, for some method.

I trust that the Senate will not set up a precedent here to let such promotions be added on to any kind of legislative bill.

We have had a special statute, which was an old carryover for many years, in the Navy Department whereby under the statute retired Navy officers were automatically promoted one grade when they retired. However, a few years ago, Congress repealed that law.

Thus, let us not go back into it, under any guise.

As to the merits of promotions of these people, many of them are considered for promotion, and they are promoted. But there needs to be an additional method, perhaps. Let a bill be introduced, be referred to a committee for hearings on it, which will place the problem in its proper focus and proper perspective, to be considered on its merits. If there is enough merit to it, then an additional board to meet this problem and others like it should be created whereby we can consider such matters on their merits and bring in promotions for consideration in due time. Let us approach the problem in that manner.

With all due deference to everyone, a Senator should not be left to decide when anyone in his State is going to be promoted. He should not be left to say yes or no. It undermines the whole structure of sound military promotions. I hope that it will not be done. I commend the Senator from Maine for her diligence and her consistency in following up on these matters, in her fine and highly effective way—but she is always fair.

Of course, we will consider such proposed legislation in the Armed Services Committee. Speaking for myself—but I think the same sentiments for others, too—we will weigh the matter on its merits, and do so with reasonable dispatch, so that this matter can be resolved in the proper way.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate what the Senator has said. I hope the Senator from Colorado, the Senator from Rhode Island, and I will get the proper legislation. I am glad the Senator from Mississippi said it would be done with proper dispatch, because these fellows are getting pretty old, and I would not want them to lose their due. I do not mean that

the Senator from Mississippi does not do things with dispatch. He does. I am hopeful he will give consideration to this unusual matter.

Mr. STENNIS. I am sure we should. It is not a pleasure to oppose our friends from Colorado and Washington in this or any other matter, but, we feel that this amendment should be opposed as a matter of duty.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine has the floor.

Mrs. SMITH. I am pleased to yield first to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the words of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, who will act with dispatch, I am sure. I think it needs to be said that this matter was not raised by our committee. It seems, in a way, an extraneous matter to this bill. In a true sense, it was raised by the Selective Service Board itself, which is one of the separate agencies provided for in this bill. This is the way it arose. Upon the presentation made to the distinguished chairman and myself, we felt, in equity and justice, something should be done. I do not think anything more needs to be said about it. We will try to do this and submit it to the proper legislative committee for consideration.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I may say it just so happens that when the matter was suggested by General Hershey, three members of the subcommittee had three of these people involved. As a matter of fact, I did not know how long the director in my State had been serving. Neither did the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] or the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. But General Hershey raised the question. This was attempted once before with General Hershey. Finally, due to the attempt, he did get a promotion. I do not remember the exact procedure, but the only place he could do it at that time was in this committee.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Maine.

I would like to be associated with the remarks made on this subject by the distinguished Senator from Maine and the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. In our generation I do not know of any public servant who has rendered finer service than has General Hershey, the Director of the Selective Service System, and I would certainly consider most carefully any recommendation or suggestion he makes with regard to that Service. He is among the most competent people in Selective Service, where there are very competent officers.

I do feel, however, Mr. President, that this is not the place to consider promotions for officers in the armed services. This is a substantive matter. It is one that should receive the careful consideration of the Armed Services Committee. A bill can be introduced, and I am sure

the Armed Services Committee will give it its most careful consideration to see that something will be done for officers who find themselves in the position in which these officers referred to here find themselves.

Mr. President, I hope that a bill will be introduced and that this matter will receive careful consideration. I feel its merits will be gone into at that time and whatever action is appropriate will be taken.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD at this point a letter sent to me from General Hershey, dated August 1.

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

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D.C., August 1, 1967.

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: I am pleased to confirm to you my enthusiastic endorsement of an amendment which you have under consideration which will, upon retirement, advance several officers of the Selective Service System in rank to their next highest grade with entitlement to retired pay at that grade. As I understand, the amendment which you have under consideration reads as follows:

"Any officer who has served with the Selective Service System in the position of a State Director of Selective Service or comparable executive position on the Staff of the Director of Selective Service for a period of fifteen (15) years will, upon retirement from active duty, be advanced in rank on the retired list to the next highest pay grade and be entitled to the retired pay of that grade as computed under appropriate provisions of law applicable to such person."

The officers affected by this amendment through their long tenure of outstanding service to their State and Nation richly deserve this recognition. It will serve, to some extent, to compensate for the lack of opportunity for career advancement assignment resulting from their special assignment to the Selective Service System.

I certainly appreciate the efforts which you are making on behalf of these members of my staff and the Selective Service System, and assure you that in these efforts you have my wholehearted support.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Director.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will return to the consideration of the amendment on page 29.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Chair has sustained the point of order; has he not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has sustained the point of order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Unless there are some amendments to be offered by Members of the Senate on the Selective Service System, the next item—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Page 29.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Between the items for public buildings, under General Services Administration, and this item, there are other items involving GSA, to which, so far as I know, no amendments are to be offered.

The item for the Interstate Commerce Commission appears on page 22 of the bill.

With respect to the National Science Foundation, which is on the same page,

it is my understanding that one or two Senators want to submit an amendment or amendments to the figure reported by the Senate committee. I believe the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] or other Senators may wish to offer an amendment to that item, but they are not present at this time, so we will pass that over, without prejudice.

Then there is the item with respect to the Renegotiation Board.

I am listing these so that any Senator will have an opportunity to submit an amendment to them.

Next is the Securities and Exchange Commission. Then the Selective Service System. The amounts there are approximately the same as last year. I read this in my earlier statement.

The Veterans' Administration has several items in the bill. This is by far the largest item in the bill. It needs a great deal of money for medical care and for fixed charges, insurance, and indemnities, and for many other purposes. The payments to the disabled and others involve several billion dollars.

The committee went over this item with a great deal of care, but most of the charges are fixed charges by law, and there is not much we can do about it. We added a small amount to the medical research and medical item.

The item for the Veterans' Administration on page 28 involves a great deal of paper in connection with sales of veterans housing, and FNMA has been handling that matter. With respect to participation sales, which have been authorized by Congress, that agency has a great deal of paper that can be released as certificates.

The Bureau of the Budget suggested that \$850 million of other paper should be made available, with proper market conditions, under the Participation Sales Act. The House placed a ceiling of \$300 million on that item; the Senate has restored the amount to \$850 million. This is not an appropriation of any money whatsoever; it is merely a grant of authority to sell up to \$850 million of Veterans' Administration participation certificates. In a nutshell, that is the purpose of this item.

The appropriation bill for the Department of Housing and Urban Development will contain another item on the same subject.

Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, who wishes to submit a conference report.

FOOD STAMP APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 953) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT
[To accompany S. 953]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 953) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, having met, after full and free conference, have been unable to agree.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
JOSEPH M. MONTOYA,
WALTER F. MONDALE,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
J. CALEB BOGGS,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

W. R. POAGE,
E. C. GATHINGS,
FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD,
PAGE BELCHER,
CHARLES M. TEAGUE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment in the nature of a substitute for S. 953 with an amendment which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment, it is proposed to insert the following:

That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended by inserting after "June 30, 1967," the following: "not in excess of \$200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; not in excess of \$225,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969;"

Sec. 2. Section 16(a) of such Act is further amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "This Act shall be carried out only with funds appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury for that specific purpose and in no event shall it be carried out with funds derived from permanent appropriations."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana to concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to the title of the Senate bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana that the Senate concur in the House amendment to the title of the Senate bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the

distinguished Senator from Louisiana yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Do I correctly understand that the amendment proposed by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and also chairman of the Senate conferees would, in effect, continue the program for 2 years instead of the 3 years heretofore provided in the bill or the 1 year provided in the House bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Do I correctly understand that the wording with reference to the funding of the program from year to year means that it must be funded out of general revenue appropriations, and not from a special fund, like the section 32 or other special funds earmarked for similar objectives?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

I may add that we are really adopting the Senate bill as it was passed by the Senate in June, except that instead of being a 3-year bill, it will be a 2-year bill.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9960) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 29, line 4.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I merely wish to add, because I know there will be further discussion on this matter, the following:

The Participation Sales Act of 1966 was enacted May 24, 1966, as Public Law 89-429, and participation sales authorizations in varying amounts for the accounts of the Farmers Home Administration, the Office of Education—the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Veterans' Administration, and the Small Business Administration were included in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act for 1967, together with an appropriation for the payment of insufficiencies.

For 1968, these authorizations are included in four appropriation bills. The large items, the VA and the FHA, of course, are in this bill. The Farmers Home Administration has been taken care of in the agricultural bill.

The Office of Education is in HEW, and that is now in conference. The Small Business Administration was handled by another committee. But the bulk of the amounts we are talking about is in the Veterans' Administration and HUD.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the committee amendment would strike the House of Representatives figure of \$300 million and insert in lieu thereof \$850 million, an increase of \$550 million over and above the House figure.

This is an authorization for the sale of so-called participation certificates. This provides additional spending money for

these agencies, exactly as would be done if we were to appropriate the \$850 million directly. The difference is that by camouflaging this \$550 million under the guise of selling our assets labeled as participation certificates it does not show up in the reported deficit at the end of the year, neither does it show up as a part of the national debt nor does it come under our national debt ceiling.

So the sole purpose of adopting this procedure to finance the cost of the Government is to give the administration a chance to deceive—and I emphasize the word "deceive"—the American taxpayers as to the true amount of the expenditures under this Great Society program.

In order to achieve that purpose these participation certificates are selling in the open market at an average interest rate of slightly more than six-tenths of 1 percent higher than Government bonds; yet they carry a guarantee on each of these participation certificates, pledging the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government toward not only repayment of the principal but also payment of all the interest. So they are just as solid and carry just as strong a guarantee from a financial standpoint as do our Government bonds themselves. Every banking institution in America knows that, but members of the general public, in buying securities, automatically picture a Government bond as being more solid than a security that carries some other name. The fact that these are named participation certificates and sold by the FHA confuses them. They do not read the fine language which say that these are just as solid and have just as much of the faith and credit of the U.S. Government behind them as do series E bonds or any other Government bonds.

In order to deceive the American taxpayer as to the extent of the deficit this back door method of raising money is being used, and to do that, as I have stated, we are paying an extra 0.6 percent in interest charges.

We already have outstanding a little more than \$9 billion in this type of participation certificates. They are costing us today around \$54 million a year more just to pay the additional interest charges on these bonds. This is above what it would cost if we had financed the cost of Government in the normal manner and as it has always been done heretofore. That \$54 million is being paid for one purpose only, to give the administration a chance to deceive the American people as to how much it is spending under these programs.

This proposed \$550 million alone will cost an additional \$3.3 million—\$3.3 million a year in interest charges above what it would cost if we struck this item out, appropriated the money in a normal manner, and sold Government bonds. I repeat, they will have the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government behind them.

Over in another section we have a request for an additional authorization to sell \$2,385,000,000 participation certificates. If that is added, by adopting this bill as reported by the committee we will be providing \$2,804,000,000, additional

spending money for these agencies over and above the amount that was provided in the House bill. The only difference is that it will not be shown on the front page of the committee report, which shows the amount being appropriated for these agencies; it will not show in the deficit reported next June 30 by the administration; and it will not show in the national debt.

But the money will be spent. We will eventually have to pay it just the same as we would any other Government bond; and on just this additional \$2,804,000,000 provided for in the Senate bill it will cost \$20 million a year extra interest for the life of the bonds, whether that be 5 or 6 years. If they are 5-year bonds we will be paying an additional \$100 million to finance the Government in this manner for the sole purpose—and there is no other purpose for financing the Government in this manner—of deceiving the American people as to how much is being spent on these Great Society programs.

Under this procedure the expenditure will not show up anywhere in the budget. It can be used to defray the general cost of operating the Government in the same manner as any other appropriated funds.

This is a deceitful method for financing the Government. It is deceitful for such a proposal to be advanced by an administration which has said so much about advocating truth in lending and truth in packaging.

Then the administration comes along with this proposal. The White House has not been telling the American people the truth about the cost of government.

I think it is time that this administration started practicing what it preaches. Let the Senate be on notice that if we agree to the committee amendment, not only are we approving a procedure by which to deceive the American people but we are also approving a procedure to give to these agencies an extra \$550 million above the amount that the House gave them, and that increased amount will not show up anywhere at all in the budget.

This is \$550 million which the agency itself does not need.

This issue was debated in the House, and the RECORD shows that the Veterans' Administration will need an estimated \$156,210,000 to take care of its direct loan programs. It will also need an approximate \$20 million for administration expenses. That is a total of approximately \$176 million that the House provided, even under the same procedure. So if this proposal is rejected, the agency would have more money than the administration would even need to carry out its operations next year.

Why give an extra \$550 million for one purpose only? As I said, so that this administration will have an extra \$550 million in the kitty to spend for some of the Great Society programs. Then it can go out and tell the American people how it is cutting down on expenditures and trying to reduce the cost of government when in reality they are not doing so at all. They are increasing spending.

It is the same procedure as if a wage

earner who was earning \$150 a week were to pawn or sell his watch for \$50 and then say: "I have \$200 to spend this week."

The Government is selling its assets and putting the money in the general revenue of the Government, using it as normal income or normal spending money, and thereby increasing its daily expenditures without showing it on the record.

The only objective to be achieved by the adoption of this method of financing is to postpone the day of accounting until after the election.

I think this is one of the most deceitful and expensive methods of financing ever proposed to Congress.

I hope the committee amendment is overwhelmingly rejected.

The administration does not need this \$550 million.

I have pointed out that the bill already contains \$445 million more than the House bill. The amount is already \$880 million more than the same agencies received last year, and here the committee would add another \$550 million to those figures.

The amendment should be rejected.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware suggests that we go back to the House figure. However, he then makes a very startling statement about this being a deceitful program.

If it is deceitful with relation to \$850 million, it must be deceitful with relation to \$300 million. I do not follow the argument of the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Washington whether he will go along with me on a vote to strike it all out.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Perhaps we should if we are not going to allow the full amount.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington and myself, I will amend the amendment and move to strike it all out.

Is the Senator with me on that?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No. I am for the program, and the Senator from Delaware is against it.

I would think the Senator would vote to strike it all out. If it is bad with relation to \$850 million, it is bad with relation to \$300 million.

Everyone knows what the argument is about. Many Senators sincerely and honestly voted against the authorization for participation sales in 1966. There was a long debate in the Senate. It was a very controversial matter in the House, too.

Those who do not like the idea of participation sales are always against the proposal to allow the amount of authorization to be used by these agencies that participate in this program.

We held long hearings on the matter. The hearings were open to the public. We have gone into the matter backwards and forwards.

It all adds up to the same thing. Those who are against the program that was

passed by Congress are against authorizing any ceiling for these people that participate.

If we are going to have the program—and it is now the law—we ought to give them leeway to sell these certificates. Perhaps they will not sell the entire amount.

The testimony is clear. They sell them when the market is favorable in their opinion. And they do not sell them when the market is not favorable.

What is the use of saying that we can only sell a portion of the certificates under the law when it might be advisable to sell more?

The proceeds of these sales are not applied against any of the expenses of government. The proceeds go back into the separate trust funds. Instead of having paper in the Treasury for all these agencies, we have received cash from the certificates.

It is not a part of the debt. We have gone through that argument here. I listened to it for many days.

I know why they want to make this part of the debt. Everybody knows that. There is no secret about that. I suppose, in all fairness, this might have happened if the tables had been turned. We would be politically against the proposal.

The only obligation on the part of the Government would be with respect to those matters that are in default.

The default record of the Veterans' Administration and the FHA and the Farm Home Mortgage Association is very good, as I remember, and the college house loan program has shown a profit. It is not a part of the debt.

I do not think that we should belabor this matter. These are the same arguments that were made with respect to the bill. This is now the law. We have the authority to sell participation certificates. I do not see why we do not say that they can sell any piece of paper they have if the market is right. Otherwise, we should cut it out altogether. Why should we put a ceiling on it?

That is the argument that was made in committee. I know that those who are against the original act will vote against this. They probably should vote to cut it all out. However, I cannot follow the argument that it is deceitful with relation to \$850 million if they have the paper, but it is not deceitful with relation to the \$300 million.

I am no bond expert. I am no fiscal expert. However, I do think I know something basic. If the law is there, let them go ahead and sell as much as they can when the market is right. If we do not want to do that, we should repeal the law.

I know that many people do not agree with the law. However, to say that it is part of the debt is not true. There is no testimony to the effect that it is part of debt. It could not be part of the debt.

This does not involve the appropriation of any money. And the only time it could be different would be when the certificates or mortgages became due. And our record on that, with respect to default, is far better than the record of private industry.

I just wanted the record to be clear. I hope the Senator from Delaware was not suggesting that the committee was practicing some kind of deceit.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No, not at all.

As I say, it is deceitful from the standpoint of the administration.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Nothing is discussed more and understood less on the part of some people than this matter.

A lot of people do not believe in this method. This method has been suggested by other administrations. It is not new with this administration.

It is a method by which it is possible to take advantage of a lot of paper that is lying around, paper running into the sum of billions of dollars, and getting some cash for it.

And it can only stay in the separate trust funds. Otherwise, there may have to be some further borrowing and addition to the debt.

It is true that we have to appropriate, as the market changes, for the sales in insufficiencies. In this particular case, that amounts to \$946,000 for the sale of \$850 million.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BURDICK. Is it true that the participation sales certificates will carry a higher rate of interest than the original obligations, part of which will have been sold?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. In VA, it is higher.

Mr. BURDICK. How much higher?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That depends on the market. There has been much testimony, but the total for the estimated insufficiencies would be \$946,000. Last year, the general sales—this includes all of them—were different because the rates went up.

The insufficiencies, of course, are the difference between the interest accrued on participation certificates and the net interest income on the pooled obligations.

In only one agency, VA, the income exceeded the interest on the certificates, resulting in no insufficiency. For HUD, last year, \$1,420,000,000 was authorized, and the insufficiencies were \$8,200,000.

Mr. BURDICK. Who makes up the difference?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Congress makes up the difference by an appropriation; \$8,200,000 for the sale of \$1,420,000,000. Of course, that varies.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. In respect to the interest, is it not true that the only additional interest we will appropriate will be the difference between the interest that these securities bear and the amount for which the certificates will be sold?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. And we are making an appropriation for that purpose?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

In the case of the VA, we are able to sell the certificates with no insufficiency. With respect to HUD, we authorized \$1.4

billion last year, with an insufficiency of \$8.2 million for an estimate of the indefinite, as we call it. On these sales, the books showed an insufficiency totaling \$6.9 million, which is further reduced by the use of reserves in the trust account in the amount of \$440,000.

I say to the Senator from North Dakota that the total insufficiency on the total amount and the net added up to \$5,564,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. The record does show that if we borrow the money instead of selling these securities, the interest might be a little less. I presume that is what the Senator from North Dakota has in mind.

Mr. BURDICK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We have the cost of selling participation certificates compared with the cost of Treasury borrowing.

The director stated in his testimony before the committee that recent experience showed that the Treasury can borrow at the rate of, roughly, .4 percent to .5 percent points below the rate paid on the guaranteed participation certificates. Based on this experience, the difference in the annual cost of selling \$3.2 billion worth of participation certificates, proposed by the administration for these departments, and the Treasury borrowing the same amount, would be between \$12 million and \$16 million, on \$3.2 billion.

Mr. ELLENDER. And the record further shows that this gap is becoming narrower.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Also, it is believed that after those who purchase these certificates become more familiar with them, the certificates will probably bear the same interest as would a bond.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The fiscal experts suggest that they will seek a level, and this is the only cost we had.

Mr. BURDICK. But at this moment, it would be cheaper to borrow the money than to sell participation sales certificates?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It would be cheaper by \$12 million to \$16 million at present. But you still have the use of \$3.2 billion of participation certificates in this particular case.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it seems to me that we are making an awfully complex issue out of this matter, when it is not so at all. People are always complaining that the Government does not operate as a well organized and well managed business would operate. Here we have a government trying to operate as a well-organized and well-managed business would operate, by marshaling its assets, by pledging some of the good securities it holds, and by avoiding the necessity to borrow on the open market and to drive up the borrowing price for its securities generally. Instead, the Government is simply trying to obtain the present worth, by this method, of good securities which it holds, to keep borrowing to a minimum.

There is no possible deceit in this method. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the very next section on page 29 shows that we are appropriating money to pay for the sale of insufficiencies in the amount of \$946,000—that is, not to exceed \$946,000. We cannot tell exactly what it will be, because we do not know what the market is going to permit.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It can be no higher than that.

Mr. HOLLAND. It can be no higher than that.

We know that, under our system, no money can be spent except under appropriations made by Congress or pursuant to laws passed by Congress, and every dime that is spent will be shown in the spending budget that comes in at the end of the year.

I am sorry that the distinguished Senator from Delaware has used the word "deceit," when the act itself lays the entire matter on the line, and when everybody knows that this is simply a marshaling of assets to proceed in what Congress has decided is the most prudent way to proceed; and I hope the Record will clearly show that.

Nothing can be concealed. The act itself shows a minor appropriation of not to exceed \$946,000, to make good any deficiency that may result in the matter of the VA participation sales.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And it may not even amount to that.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Constitution requires—and will continue to require—that no money of the Federal Government can be spent except by appropriation of Congress or pursuant to laws passed by Congress. So the entire matter will be just as clear as a bell.

I am surprised that my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Delaware, whom I admire greatly on most points and who is a successful businessman himself, is not able to see that in this instance the Government is adopting a practice which sound business would always adopt; because it is foolish to overborrow when you have good paper which you can hypothecate to ease your problem of the moment.

I believe this is a wise course to pursue, and I thank the Senator from Washington for having made the point.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from Florida for putting this matter into proper perspective.

Some fiscal experts suggested that if the certificates were not available, or the potential for buying the certificates, the interest on Government bonds might go up a little, so that they might even be higher.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point the cost statement in full, with respect to the insufficiencies, and a statement from the Department of Housing and Urban Development on income and expenses relating to FNMA. This is the entire group. Income and expenses relating to the participation sales trust fund for fiscal year 1967.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

COST OF SELLING PARTICIPATION CERTIFICATES COMPARED TO COST OF TREASURY BORROWING

As the Director stated in his testimony before the Senate Committee, recent experience shows that the Treasury can borrow at an interest rate roughly .4 to .5 percentage points below the rate paid on guaranteed participation certificates.

Based in this experience, the difference in the annual cost of selling the \$3.2 billion of participation certificates proposed by the Administration for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Veterans Administration (the two agencies included in the Independent Offices Appropriation bill) and Treasury borrowing of the same amount would be between \$12.9 and \$16.2 million.

The similar difference for the \$881 million of participation sales included in the House passed bill would be between \$3.5 and \$4.4 million.

However, we do not expect that the rate differential experienced in the first year of selling these participation certificates will continue as the market becomes familiar with them. We have been advised by at least one investment banker that over a period of time, as the certificate is improved as a market instrument and the market becomes fully familiar with it, we might reasonably expect the yield spread to decline as low as .1%.

Probably even more "objective" is the following excerpt from the highly critical article in the Morgan-Guaranty Survey last fall:

"Currently, outstanding PC's are typically changing hands in markets at yields about 50 basis points higher than is true in the case of regular government obligations of the same maturity. This, however, undoubtedly overstates somewhat the "normal" yield spread, since the supply of longer-term Treasury obligations has been kept artificially low by the legal prohibition against selling new Treasury issues at a rate above 4 1/4%. A true "normal" probably would be closer to 25 basis points—a figure that Administration spokesmen think can be approached as buyers become more familiar with PC's and as they come to appreciate the strength of the guarantee behind them."

The .25% differential would make this difference in cost for the \$3.2 billion recommended by the Administration \$8.1 million, and the .1% differential would reduce it to \$3.2 million.

THIS IS NOT THE TIME TO CHANGE AN ESTABLISHED PROCEDURE

There is nothing new in this year's request for authorization to sell participation certificates. It continues established practice.

Sales of individual loans have been made for two decades or longer. During the Eisenhower Administrations they amounted to an estimated \$1.6 billion. In Fiscal Year 1954,

that Administration invented two interesting forerunners of present day participation sales. The CCC in October 1953 sold the first of a series of "certificates of interest" for participation in pools of price support loans. In February 1954, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation placed 2,800 loans valued at \$50 million in a pool and sold "certificates of interest" in the pool. Increased emphasis was placed on asset sales in the 1960 Budget, particularly sales by FNMA and by the Export-Import Bank.

In a January 1959 press conference on the 1960 Budget, Director Stans said in response to a question dealing with FNMA and Export-Import Bank sales in the budget estimates:

"I will defend it on this ground and I think this is adequate. The alternative, frankly, is to run a deficit and sell Government bonds to finance it or to raise taxes, and I think it is proper business judgment in the Federal Government as in any other enterprise, when you are in that kind of position to look to assets that you can liquidate in order to pay your bills . . . It is like an individual selling off 100 shares of stock in some year in which he has to pay for some operation for his wife."

As you know, the President has established a Commission to study current budgetary concepts and make recommendations for changes in budget presentation. The distinguished Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member of the Senate Appropriations Committee are on this Commission. I understand that the Commission will be reporting in the near future on the whole question of treating lending programs in the budget. Under these circumstances, it is particularly inappropriate to change an established procedure. This budget handles loan programs in the same manner as other budgets submitted to Congress over the last two decades. Clearly, we should continue this practice for another fiscal year.

CONGRESSIONAL CONTROLS OVER USE OF PROCEEDS FROM SALES OF PARTICIPATIONS IN POOLS OF LOANS

The sales of participations in pools of loans have not in any way changed the controls which Congress has over the various loan programs involved.

Basically, each of the loan programs has been financed by the Congress through a revolving fund, in recognition of the business-like character of the programs. The Congress provides the capital for the fund, either through appropriations or authorizations to borrow from the Treasury. This capital is used by the agencies to make the loans authorized by the basic statutes. As the principal of the loans is recovered by the agencies, through regular repayments, prepayments and sales of loans or participations in pools of loans, the capital can be

used to make additional loans. The sale of loans or participations in pools of loans does not increase the capital of the fund, but does speed up recovery of this capital and increases the frequency at which new loans can be made.

In addition to the basic limitation of the amount of capital in the fund, Congress has in many cases added additional limitations on the use of the capital of the revolving funds for loans. This has been done in two ways:

First, basic authorizing statutes limit the total number of loans, commitments for loans, and, in some cases, loan guarantees that may be outstanding.

Second, Congress has in some cases enacted in annual appropriation acts limits on the annual use of the capital of the funds.

Finally, the proposed use of the capital in each of the funds is presented to the Congress in the budget each year, and is subject to review by the Appropriations Committees, and the Congress.

CONTROLS IN BASIC STATUTES

The outstanding loans, commitments, or guarantee of the Small Business Administration (excluding disaster loans) cannot exceed \$2 billion. Loans or mortgages placed in participation pools still count against the limitation, since they are guaranteed by SBA. The agency is now approaching this limitation, and legislation is pending before the Congress to increase it.

ANNUAL LIMITATIONS IN APPROPRIATION ACTS

The basic statutes authorizing the loan programs of the Farmers Home Administration and the academic facilities program of the Office of Education require specific appropriation authorizations for new loans. Therefore, regardless of the amount of the capital in the various revolving funds, the agencies cannot make new loans during the year in excess of the amount provided in the annual appropriation act.

In addition, the Congress has for several years placed a limit on the use of capital in the Veterans Administration Loan Guaranteed Revolving Fund. Although this capital is used only to pay claims made by holders of guaranteed loans which have defaulted, and therefore is uncontrollable since the agency cannot control the number of claims, the Congress has limited the amount which can be spent for such claims in the year.

These limits are in no way affected by the amount of capital in the funds involved, or by the recovery of capital through sales of participations.

OTHER APPROPRIATION CONTROL

Not only the programs discussed above, but every one of the major lending programs authorized to issue certificates of participation submits budgets for review.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT—FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION—FEDERAL ASSETS LIQUIDATION TRUST—INCOME AND EXPENSES RELATED TO PARTICIPATION SALES TRUST FUND, FISCAL YEAR 1967¹

	Total	FNMA SAF	FNMA M. & L.	HUD	VA	FHDA	HEW	SBA
Net interest income on pooled obligations.....	\$28,534,730	\$2,178,156	\$7,056,774	\$4,118,157	\$3,523,212	\$5,998,588	\$1,098,212	\$4,561,631
Interest accrued on participations certificates.....	36,537,778	3,539,753	9,133,411	6,689,346	3,242,801	6,614,471	1,586,949	5,731,047
Insufficiency (—).....	8,283,459	1,361,597	2,076,637	2,571,189		615,883	488,737	1,169,416
Excess.....	280,411				280,411			
Net income on investments by the trust less expenses of the trust.....	953,897	57,210	377,387	10,151	63,568	198,396	3,292	243,893

¹ Fiscal year 1967 sales under the 1967 Appropriation Act (in millions of dollars):

	Total	FNMA SAF	FNMA M. & L.	HUD	VA	FHDA	HEW	SBA
Jan. 19, 1967.....	1,100	100	365	150	100	170	60	155
Apr. 5, 1967.....	900	100	50	265	75	220	15	17
June 29, 1967.....	900	100	25	265	85	210	25	190
Total sales.....	2,900	300	440	680	260	600	100	520

Source: Program and Operations Analysis Division, Aug. 28, 1967.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield the floor.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I regret very much that on this matter I must differ with my chairman. I am sure that he would be the first person to say that I did reserve all of my rights in committee and that the entire committee was fully aware that this was one portion of the bill with which I could not agree.

During the course of the committee hearings various efforts were made to arrive at compromise figures. None of these efforts could be agreed upon because the chairman himself felt that he wished every one of these dollars in the participation sales certificates, as it applied to this bill, to be in the bill.

There are two items, one under the Department of Housing and Urban Development, which we will come to later, and this item for \$850 million for the Veterans' Administration. These two items together constitute \$3,235,000,000 of the total \$4.4 billion for which the President has asked authority this year.

Contrary to the feeling of some people, there were certain basic political issues that I think we all understand in this matter, but I do not think there are many persons who understand completely the ramification of the participation sales program. For example, I do believe it is a sale of Government assets. People may differ as to this view, but what we do is to take notes and mortgages that one department or branch of the Government may hold and we combine this, and then cover them by a certificate which is handled through the Federal National Mortgage Association, commonly called FNMA, and they are resold to the people of the United States.

Mr. President, several interesting things happen in the course of this process. No. 1, there is no question that increased spending—and it is increased spending—for which Congress does not immediately appropriate or directly appropriate, is brought about by this process. In other words, in the case we have before us in connection with the Veterans' Administration participation certificates, the Veterans' Administration has deducted from it by FNMA the expense of issuance and marketing of the participation certificates, and the expense of the interest differential. Then, that money goes back to the Veterans' Administration in its revolving fund. If it were not done by this process, Congress would have to vote money into that revolving fund in order to carry on that activity. So, in my opinion, the normal legislative processes of the Congress are averted.

To be more specific in this area, it occurs to me that the committee dealing with veterans' affairs, and in this instance it would be the Committee on Finance, should have to delve deeply into the need for additional moneys or additional obligations for the Veterans' Administration and would then have to authorize it and appropriate it.

As it is, we have increased the amount they can spend or would increase it by some \$850 million by this bill without anyone—and I say anyone—in committee having taken a hard look at the actual needs of the Veterans' Administration for more money in this fund.

There are some other interesting things that happen. I believe that this participation certificate item is inflationary. We cannot pick up the papers on any day of the week or be in contact with the news media without seeing literally dozens of articles discussing the inflation in this country.

Last summer at a conference I heard the Secretary of the Treasury and the President's Chief Economic Adviser admit the impact of deficit spending in this Government was in the ratio of \$4 to \$1, so that with the total participation certificate program the effect of enacting and authorizing it is the same as printing \$16 billion worth of money and throwing it into the economy.

I do not think that any economist will deny this is inflationary and in this period in our history when according to the President, we are facing some \$28 billion worth of deficits for the fiscal year. I think we do not wish to add any more fuel to the fire of inflation in this country.

There is another interesting result of this process that I think should be noted by every person. A few days ago a gentleman from my State was in my office. He is the president of a savings and loan institution in one of the three largest cities in my State. Purely out of a casual conversation, he told me the following: He said that he had put in an order for some Government bonds and he had been told when he put in his order, that he could get only 20 percent of the order which he had placed. However, after a few days, they gave him 38 percent of the order, indicating, I think, a pretty soft market for Government bonds.

Now, do I say that only upon the basis of my thinking? Not at all, because at that time the bonds which he purchased, which bore 5½ percent interest, were discounted to a price of \$990.20 per thousand and bore maturities of about 3½ years. However, the significant thing about it is that these bonds of the Federal Government, bearing a maturity of about 3½ years, bore him a 5.40-percent yield for the purchase price that he paid.

In other words, just a few days ago, and this is an actual purchase, which yielded 5.40 percent for U.S. bonds. I do not have permission to use the gentleman's name but I can give it to anyone who wants it and they can check it out.

It is an incomprehensible situation. Last year when we had the participation sales program in effect we had one purchase that yielded up to 5.75 percent interest on participation sales certificates.

The testimony in the hearings was that the average price for participation certificates was near 50 points or one-half percent, above Treasury issues. So on that basis, with U.S. bonds selling at a yield of 5.40 percent, with the requirement of law that the participation certificates must sell at par, which they must under present law, we are faced with seeking a method of financing today which must bring in the neighborhood of 5.90-percent yield.

This would not be too bad, because most of us could not go to the bank and borrow money at that rate. But this is the Federal Government. The participation certificates carry on their face—I do

not have the exact words, but the substance of it is that it is the absolute guarantee of the Federal Government, the Federal Government is responsible solely and wholly for repayment of the certificate.

Another interesting thing happens when this occurs. On this particular item we are talking about now, it is true that the interest differential for which we would be appropriating is only \$946,000.

I see my friend from North Dakota, the junior Senator [Mr. BURDICK] in the Chamber, who asked a question about this a while ago.

Take the situation with college housing loans. Last year, \$100 million was authorized. This year, \$200 million is asked for.

Those particular loans carry interest only at the rate of 3 percent. Thus, with respect to that item, and to try to explain the question the Senator asked of the distinguished chairman, at the present price of the certificates, it would mean, in all probability, that the Government would have to subsidize the interest on participation certificates as they relate to college housing loans to the extent of almost 2.9 percent.

In other words, the sale of the certificate today, if the testimony given to us in committee is true—and I think it is—with Government bonds selling at 5.40-percent yield, and we add 50 points to that, which is half of 1 percent, the going price for the participation sales certificates would be somewhere in the neighborhood of close to a 5.9-percent yield. So, in the case of college housing, we would have an interest differential of almost 2.9 percent.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator may have discussed this, but I ask this question: Are the proceeds from the sale of participation certificates allocated to a specific purpose?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Trust funds; yes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes, in each instance, the proceeds of the sales, while they are amalgamated and combined in FNMA, the proceeds of the sales go back to the individual trust funds, whether it be agriculture, Farm Home Administration, college housing loans, Public Health Service, Small Business Administration, Veterans, or housing. In each instance, the funds go back through FNMA to the agency.

Mr. COOPER. My next question: Would this not enable the agency to make additional loans?

Mr. ALLOTT. That is right. They could then make additional expenditures.

Mr. COOPER. I asked that question, bearing in mind the great interest which has developed in housing.

Another question: Will this enable the agency which makes the loans, say, for housing, to do something they would not otherwise be able to do other than appropriate funds themselves?

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes, it does. I should say, unless Congress would either increase the amount of the trust funds or appropriate funds for it—that is, unless Congress would do that.

Mr. COOPER. One further question: Was it stated in testimony that sale of participation certificates was a necessity in view of the present shortage of housing? Was that argued?

Mr. ALLOTT. No, it was not. It was not argued. That is one of the points I made previously, that by taking this route of participation sales—if we are thinking, for example, of housing for the elderly—we do not have a specific program coming before the Subcommittee on Banking and Currency to determine at what level housing should be funded in this country, nor do we have that particular item, without a hard look at that and the authorization, unless it is before the Appropriations Committee to determine whether the findings of the authorization committee are correct as to the level of housing that should be funded.

Mr. COOPER. Assuming that Congress did not approve this sale of participation certificates, whereby the proceeds would not be paid into these funds, would that seriously affect or prevent the provisions of housing about which Congress talks a great deal and about which the country is so much concerned?

Mr. ALLOTT. No; because they could come in with a supplemental request. In other words, the only way they could be thwarted is if Congress refused to act. I would assume that Congress would act if it was justified.

Mr. COOPER. The point is, the trust funds must have this money either through the sale of participation certificates or through direct appropriations by Congress.

Mr. ALLOTT. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. What is the attitude of the committee toward appropriation of funds which will be needed if the sale of the participation certificates is not approved?

Mr. ALLOTT. These funds were built up in the original instance by Congress authorizing them and appropriating them.

Mr. COOPER. I understand the way we have been creating them. My direct question now is: If Congress does not approve this sale of participation certificates, and the use of the revenues from the proceeds of the certificates to replenish the funds of the different agencies, will that mean that the provision of housing for the elderly, for middle income housing, or for low rent housing would be seriously affected or denied to these people?

Mr. ALLOTT. I do not think so, because the effect would be at least 9 months away and Congress, if the need was there, could authorize additional revolving funds, and appropriate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I refer the Senator to page 29, on loan revolving funds. There we limit that not to exceed \$386 million to be used—

Mr. COOPER. Has that limit been reached?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No.

Mr. ALLOTT. No. That has a ceiling on it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Colorado stated, in answering the Sen-

ator from Kentucky, that the sale of participation certificates will make available money that will go into the treasuries of the different agencies engaged in providing housing; is that not correct?

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes, the trust fund.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In the trust fund.

Mr. ALLOTT. In most cases.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not a fact that when we sell participation certificates and turn the proceeds over to the different trust funds at a later date, we will have to make repayments and, thus, at a later date reduce the amounts of moneys which will be available.

Mr. ALLOTT. I do not know that anyone can answer this question. I doubt it very much. But the money later will have to come out of the trust fund, as I understand.

Mr. LAUSCHE. To pay the trust certificates.

Mr. ALLOTT. To pay the certificates.

Mr. LAUSCHE. To pay the certificates.

Mr. ALLOTT. So we are really deferring and putting off facing the situation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. We are deferring and putting off the facing of the situation. We are saying that we will sell these participation certificates to get money now, although we realize that these participation certificates will have to be paid, and when they are paid, there will be that much less money left in the revolving fund.

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They are paid for by the receipt of payments of the people who owe the money, not the Treasury.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But the ability of the trust is gone; the revolving fund will be reduced.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The only thing the Treasury would have to pay for would be defaults.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If we are now getting money hurriedly to meet services we want to render by selling certificates, we are doing the equivalent of borrowing. If we are doing the equivalent of borrowing, we have to pay the man who lends us the money. When we pay him, we have that much less money.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We do not pay anything.

Mr. LAUSCHE. We have to pay off the certificates.

Mr. ALLOTT. There is confusion about this, but the Senator from Ohio has put the picture clearly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I think it should be pointed out that the original money that went into the trust fund was money appropriated by the Congress. That money was loaned in the form of mortgages. The idea was that when the mortgages were repaid that money could be put back into the trust fund and used to repay the Treasury. Instead of that we are selling the mortgages as participation certificates, pledging the mortgages as collateral. We are therefore draining the trust fund, as was pointed out.

The Senator from Kentucky asked the question, What would happen if we did not authorize the sale of the participa-

tion certificates? The answer is, Congress would have to appropriate money as needed and as we have always done; but when we did it that way it would show up as a part of the appropriation, it would show up as part of the expenditures, it would show up as part of the national debt, and the American people would know about it.

As it is now the money goes to agencies, and it is extra spending money; but it does not show up that way at all.

If we look at the committee report it says on the first page that this is an appropriation bill for \$10.431 billion. Yet we are really appropriating about \$13 billion of spending money, because that spending money is not counted or shown at all on the front page of the committee report. That is why I say it is deceitful and that the American people are not being told the truth. This money does go into the normal spending stream, but this money is spent without any public accounting being made for the amount of expenditures or spending. It is deceitful as far as the American taxpayers are concerned.

When I say "deceitful" I mean that under this procedure the Senate would be passing a bill on the assumption that it is appropriating \$10.4 billion when in reality if all the committee amendments are accepted it will be authorizing expenditures for these same agencies during fiscal 1968 of close to \$14 billion. Why not tell the truth?

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I cannot agree with the last statement of the distinguished Senator from Delaware—I think there is an accounting—no matter how much I disagree with the method of handling this.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I regret that my good friend from Delaware has again used the word "deceitful." To begin with, all the collateral the Senator is speaking of has to be made available in appropriated funds to each of these departments. The whole amount appears in our debt structure.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the law, if the securities are redeemed at maturity, the receipts are placed in the trust fund and they may be used by the Veterans' Administration or any other agency that has issued them.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, may I interrupt a moment? But in the meantime the trust fund has to reimburse FNMA.

Mr. ELLENDER. But as the money is collected, even after the certificates are issued, the collected funds are set aside to redeem those certificates. It is not used over and over, as the Senator from Delaware said.

In selling these certificates, we in effect accelerate the program. Instead of waiting 5 or 10 years to use the money collected, we borrow it, and the only additional amount of money the Government will be out is the difference between the rate of interest that these collateral securities bear and what we sell the certificates for. That will be the only additional cost placed on the Government.

Mr. ALLOTT. I do not agree exactly with the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. What did I say that is not right?

Mr. ALLOTT. We are not only turning over and escalating the amount of money, which does increase inflation, but we are doing it at an additional cost to the Government. For example, the total that would be required as indefinite appropriations for the interest for these items, which is interest deficiency, would be \$58.6 million.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the difference in interest.

Mr. ALLOTT. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I just said. I did not give the amount. The Senator has given the amount. But that is the additional fund we must provide, and that is the difference between the rate of interest the certificates bear and the rate which the Government receives on the collateral. That is the only difference.

Mr. ALLOTT. It is a great difference, I believe.

There is one other unusual result of the indulgence in participation certificates, and that is that in such instance these certificates are sold in amounts which are not less than \$5,000. This may not be significant, and I do not like to tweak the nose of people, but it is a fact that what we are doing by this process is giving to the people who manage large funds, loan institutions, mortgage institutions, insurance institutions, foundations, people who can invest in large amounts, in effect a one-half percent interest subsidy over what they could get on a U.S. bond.

I have listened to all the testimony. I am aware that perhaps it is not feasible to issue \$4 billion worth of certificates in denominations of \$1,000 or less, but I am also aware that, through this process, the banks and the people I have mentioned are the only ones who can participate in this extra one-half percent interest subsidy from the Federal Government.

This is a practice which I think should be corrected in some way, and it ought to be corrected administratively. I think it can be, without any additional legislation. If it is not done, I think Congress can do it.

For these reasons, I feel that the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Delaware has great merit.

I am really sorry to have to disagree with my good friend, the chairman, on a major matter like this, involving a bill over which we have both worked laboriously, and in which he has done such a fine job; but I think the points that I have made here illustrate adequately why we should support the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

It has been said here today that we ought to go all or none. The House spoke very forcibly to this point. They said they were afraid of building up the activity too far.

We live in a political climate. The Senate is a political body, and the House is a political body. As such, we operate within the realm of what is possible; and I think doing what is within the realm of possibility is to go with the House fig-

ure, which it seems to me is wholly reasonable.

For those reasons, I support the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Delaware, and I hope it will prevail.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado called attention to the variation in the interest rates. I refer to today's Wall Street Journal. Senators will find listed there two issues of FNMA notes and debentures, one drawing 5½ percent and one a 6-percent issue due in December 1969. Those participation certificates have been selling on an average interest rate of about six-tenths of 1 percent higher than they would have if Congress had appropriated the money and let the Government borrow the money in the normal manner, issuing a Government note.

Emphasis has been placed on the small cost of financing this \$850 million in this manner. Mr. President, the next amendment provides \$946,000 to defray the extra cost. I point out that one should not sneeze at the \$946 million but that is only the beginning. This is a new program, just authorized, to sell these VA certificates, and it has not really had time to get underway. The real cost will show up in next year's appropriations bill.

When we turn over to page 40 of this same bill we find the proposal to sell \$2.385 billion worth of FHA participation certificates, and we find that \$42,115,000 has been included for the payment of insufficiencies on that item alone.

So we have in this bill a total of \$43 million to pay for extra cost of using this procedure of financing.

In 10 years that is \$430 million spent for what? To promote a plan for deceiving the taxpayers.

Mr. President, there are many things we could do with that \$43 million. Here it buys absolutely nothing except a method of deceiving or misleading—and I do not care which word is used—the American taxpayers as to the true cost of the Great Society.

There is no dispute about the fact that although the committee added \$2.8 billion under these two items—\$550 million under this item and \$2.3 billion over on page 34—at no point on the face of this report is that total included as an expenditure. Read it. Where is it? It says that the Senate bill is \$445,582,118 over the House bill.

Mr. President, that is the total cash appropriations over the House bill. It says absolutely nothing about the \$2.8 billion that is added over and beyond that \$445 million for spending by these agencies. This will not show up in the deficit at the end of the year, and it is costing the taxpayers an average of an additional six-tenths percent interest. The only thing being achieved, as far as I can see, is help for the Johnson administration in deceiving the American taxpayers.

Lest there be any misunderstanding, this unique method of financing was first proposed under the Eisenhower administration. I opposed it then. I joined with the chairman of the Committee on Finance, the late Senator from Virginia,

Mr. Byrd. We opposed the plan and were successful in having the administration drop it after they had sold a few million dollars worth of participation certificates. It was proportionately as expensive then, and the principle was wrong. I am not saying there is any difference in the principle, but it has been greatly expanded.

I believe it was in 1955 or 1956 when they authorized the sale of assets in certain agencies, which are enumerated chiefly on page 40 of the committee bill.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. As a result of selling all these assets in the past 3 years, we now have outstanding around \$9 billion in participation certificates—or will have when we get through here, and they will cost us an unnecessary \$50 million a year in interest, just to deceive the American people.

As the Senator from Colorado has stated, this procedure is highly inflationary, even more inflationary than if we did the borrowing direct, because each time we issue a 100-percent-Government-guaranteed mortgage with a 6-percent certificate we are encouraging higher interest rates. Thus, though perhaps not deliberately, indirectly the administration is pushing interest rates forward.

I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware mentioned that President Eisenhower originally recommended the adoption of this program of selling participation certificates, to be paid out of the proceeds collected on mortgages held by the Government in connection with the building of different types of housing.

What happened to President Eisenhower's recommendation?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have the figures here. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

SALES OF FINANCIAL ASSETS, 1954-68¹

(In millions of dollars)

Fiscal year	Direct sales	Participation sales	Total
1954	796	47	843
1955	228	—	228
1956	9	—	9
1957	6	—	6
1958	122	—	122
1959	37	—	37
1960	335	—	335
1961	64	—	64
1962	204	300	504
1963	892	250	1,142
1964	704	373	1,077
1965	814	750	1,564
1966	360	2,601	2,961
1967 (estimate)	342	3,580	3,922
1968 (estimate)	275	5,000	5,275

¹ Excluding (a) direct sales incident to insurance or guarantee of loans, (b) direct sales from one Government agency to another, (c) sales of CCC certificates of interest, and (d) direct sales of RFC loans.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The total sales of participation certificates was less than \$100 million before we got it stopped. The record will show exactly

when and what was sold. Direct sales were somewhat higher.

Mr. LAUSCHE. All right. The program was stopped?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The sale of participation certificates was stopped.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Delaware participated in opposition to the program recommended by President Eisenhower?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. The chairman of the Committee on Finance, the Senator from Virginia, led the fight, but I joined and supported him; and we were able to stop it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What was the argument made at that time in behalf of President Eisenhower's program providing a bonanza for the buyers of the participation certificates, and using the disposition of capital assets to finance current operations?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The argument used for doing it at the time was that we had a tight ceiling on the national debt, and in order to get around that ceiling somewhat they decided they would sell these assets, raising the money, and, as I have stated, by so doing the funds raised would not show up as part of the national debt nor as expenditures.

The chairman of the Committee on Finance denounced that procedure in far more bitter terms than I have here today. I supported him, and we stopped it. The Secretary of the Treasury, testifying before our committee, agreed it was a more expensive method of financing the debt and should not be resorted to. I agreed fully with that conclusion.

There is no question about it. Check every sale of these participation certificates. In every case they have varied from one-half to three-quarter percent higher on interest rates than comparable Government bonds sold the same day.

Taxpayers have to make up that difference. It is true that here we have \$850 million, and we figure \$946,000 additional cost; but that is just to pay what will accrue in this fiscal year. They have not sold that \$850 million yet, so we will not have much of that extra cost in this current fiscal year.

But if we approve the sale of these extra \$850 million and the certificates are outstanding the next fiscal year, they will have been outstanding for the entire fiscal year; then we will see quite a sizable difference in the appropriation next year to pay for this difference in interest rates. Where the program has been functioning for a year or two, as indicated over on page 40, the bills shows that we are paying \$42 million now for the privilege of financing under FNMA. This covers the cost under the various agencies and programs enumerated on that page.

I ask, why pay six-tenths of 1 percent interest more than necessary? Why pay \$50 million a year just to give the administration a chance to claim to the taxpayers, the American citizens, a little lower rate of expenditures when in reality they will ultimately have this money to pay?

I do not think any member of the Appropriations Committee would dispute

the fact that if we wanted to make available for the Veterans' Administration \$850 million of spending money under normal procedures, we would have to amend the bill by making a direct appropriation of \$850 million.

It would then show up as an increase in expenditures. It would show an increase over the House bill of \$1.3 billion instead of \$445 million. It would show up in the national debt, and it would show up as an increase in the deficit at the end of next year. All I am saying is that for an administration that has said so much about truth-in-lending and truth-in-Government, it is time for it to start telling the truth itself.

I hope that the committee amendment will be rejected and that we will at least stand by the House figure. Personally, I would like to see this entire procedure abandoned. However, recognizing the facts of life, I suggest now that we just stand by the House figure.

The House has decided already that by so doing it would give this agency all the money it needs. Why give them an additional \$550 million?

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not a fact that the proposal of President Eisenhower was practically identical with the proposal involved in the issue we are now debating?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes, as far as the principle is concerned.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not a fact that the Senate at that time rejected President Eisenhower's proposal because the Senate concluded that it was not fiscally sound and was not in the interest of the taxpayers?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And is it not a fact that we are now proposing to do the very same thing which the Senate repudiated under the Eisenhower recommendation?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. The party on the other side of the aisle was very strong in its denunciation of that program as being inflationary and promoting higher interest rates and being a deceitful method of financing the cost of operating the Government. I supported them in that contention, and we stopped the practice.

Ironically some of the Senators who were so vocal in their denunciation of this practice when the Eisenhower administration sold a much smaller amount are now strangely silent and even voting for the multibillion-dollar sales of the Johnson administration.

Could it be that they too have been brainwashed?

The program that we are considering here today is exactly the same procedure. It involves the same principle except that the Johnson administration is now doing in a wholesale manner what was proposed in a retail manner before. However, I will not argue the difference based on the dollar volume. The principle is the same.

It was wrong then, and it is wrong today.

I certainly hope that the Senate will reject the Senate amendment. The Senator from Florida said that we are only doing what any well-managed business would do, and that is to finance its business by selling its assets.

I operated a business before I came here. If I had anybody connected with any business with which I had any authority who proposed any such scheme I would fire him before the sun set.

In the first place, one in his own business would not take notes that he had in his portfolio, pledge them as collateral for a loan, and pay one-half percent more interest than he could get from a bank if the bank were to say: "I will lend you that money direct at a much lower rate."

Any businessman who would not take advantage of the lower interest rate is not capable of running an office. He would not be associated with me very long.

Nobody can contradict the fact that this is costing approximately 0.6 percent more than it would cost if we were to finance the expenditures in the proper manner. There is no question that if we approve the committee bill with all of its amendments, we will be giving the agencies about \$2.8 billion above the House-passed measure, and the amendment will let these agencies spend the money without showing on the report next July.

It will not be included as part of the deficit or as a part of the national debt. Certainly the only advantage would be to deceive the American taxpayer. If anybody can think of a better word than "deceive" I shall be glad to substitute it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, for the purpose of information—and the Senator need not answer this question unless he desires to—why is there now support for a principle which, when it was recommended by President Eisenhower, was rejected? Now that it is recommended by a different party, they recommend that it be accepted?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I wish I knew the answer. I do not understand why that should be, particularly when the arguments they used then were sound. I agreed with the arguments at the time. They were sound arguments against what the Eisenhower administration proposed.

It was not a proper method of financing the cost of government then, and it is not proper now. It was an extra expense for the taxpayers. As they said at that time, it was deceitful.

I do not claim to know why they have changed their minds, but the same principle is involved. I think the amendment should be rejected.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator for his candid answers to the questions which I asked. I recognize the difficulty to which I put him by asking the last question.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a statement in one of the Comptroller General's newsletters wherein he comments on this program and points out

the extra costs that the taxpayers will unnecessarily have to pay as a result of these increased interest rates which are being paid under this type of financing. This is a report dated May 10, 1967, issued by a Comptroller General appointed by this administration.

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

EXIMBANK PARTICIPATION CERTIFICATES

The Export-Import Bank will incur extra interest costs of about \$4.3 million by selling participation certificates to private investors in fiscal year 1966 rather than relying on straight Treasury financing, a GAO audit showed.

The extra cost estimate was made by comparing the interest rates on participation certificates with rates on obligations issued directly by the government. The bank, and other government agencies, for some years have sold interests in pools of loans they have made. Money raised in this way does not count in the national debt, as would issues of Treasury securities.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I think that the Senator from Delaware has very clearly pointed out that this is an unsound method of financing.

I would be the first to join him in his particular effort to deal with it if it were not for the fact that going along with his method would mean the destruction of the programs involved here. And I am not for that.

Since I am not given the opportunity by the administration to support the programs in the right sense, I will support them, even though the present method of financing is unsound, as pointed out by the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate the position of the Senator from New Jersey.

The House allowed \$300 million for participation sales to finance this agency, which it said was all it needed to carry out the programs this year.

Why spend an extra \$550 million. I hope that the committee amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Schultze, appeared before our committee, as did Administrator Driver of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. Driver made arguments with respect to this matter that were similar to those made by the Bureau of the Budget. In the testimony they stated one thing to which the Senator from New Jersey has referred. Mr. Driver said, talking about mortgage loans and fluctuations, and realizing cash from private financing:

In order that these advantages may be realized to the maximum extent and to provide funding reserves to meet increased future year housing credit assistance demands, resulting primarily from the recently enacted new GI bill, it is urged that our request for sales authorizations of \$850 million be restored in full.

That was done to take care of a bill we passed here. I want to put all of this in the RECORD in full later, but I will also

check on the colloquy had here concerning how this matter was rejected under different administrations.

The idea of pooling loans and selling participation certificates from such pools is far from new. It dates back at least to the certificates of interest issued by the Commodity Credit Corporation and similar certificates sold by the RFC in 1954. The Export-Import Bank has been offering participation certificates regularly since 1962 and FNMA since 1964.

The main thing the 1966 act did was to broaden the FNMA authority to cover more programs and more types of loans than were formerly eligible for such sales. It did this in large part by making it possible to place into the pools loans with interest rates below market levels.

The Director of the Veterans' Administration said this was proposed to take care of the recent GI housing bill.

So this is not new. It has been done for a long time, dating back to the certificates by the CCC. As I recall, Congress heartily approved that method.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD portions of the statement made by the Director of the Veterans' Administration, Mr. Driver, and by the Director of the Budget, Mr. Schultze.

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

Administrator Driver stated to the committee (p. 289):

"Our 1968 budget requests authorization for the sale of \$850 million in Participation Certificates under the Direct Loan and Loan Guaranty Revolving Funds. It also requests indefinite appropriation language to cover insufficiencies that may arise in connection with Participation Certificates sold under the 1968 authorization.

"The Housing proposes a reduction in the Participation Certificate sales authorization for 1968 from \$850 million to \$300 million. It also replaces our request for indefinite appropriation language to cover insufficiencies with a definite appropriation of \$333,892.

"The Participation Certificate sales program continues a long-standing policy of substituting private for public financing in Federal credit programs. The technique of pooling loans and selling participations in such pools offers distinct advantages over sales of loans directly to private investors:

"Mortgage market fluctuations significantly affect our ability to sell loans directly to investors. Participation Certificates are sold in a much broader market, thus assuring a more even flow of available capital for program operations.

"It provides a means for realizing cash from loans which are not salable, either because they carry sub-market rates, or because they are located in areas where there are no private mortgage servicing facilities.

"It ensures the receipt of necessary revenues in periods when the direct sale of loans is not desirable or possible because the market cannot absorb them, i.e., when FNMA is buying loans to support the market.

"It has a less disruptive effect on the mortgage market because the heavy majority of such certificates is purchased by non-mortgage oriented institutions.

"In order that these advantages may be realized to the maximum extent and to provide funding reserves to meet increased future year housing credit assistance demands, resulting primarily from the recently enacted new G.I. Bill, it is urged that our request for sales authorizations of \$850 million be restored in full."

STATEMENT OF CHARLES L. SCHULTZE, DIRECTOR OF THE BUREAU OF THE BUDGET, BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT OFFICES SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, ON PARTICIPATION SALES AUTHORIZATIONS FOR 1968

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I welcome the opportunity to discuss again with you the participation sales program recommended by the President to help finance the budget for the fiscal year 1968. I am especially happy that the subcommittee has invited members of other subcommittees responsible for considering the specific proposals for participation sales by other agencies.

As the committee will recall, the President, in proposing, and the Congress in enacting, the Participation Sales Act of 1966 had two major purposes. These were:

First, to encourage private participation in financing of credit requirements; and

Second, to establish a more efficient and orderly method of selling financial assets owned by Federal agencies.

The portfolio of Federal loans until recently has been growing year-by-year. During the past decade, direct loans outstanding almost doubled—from \$17 billion to \$33 billion. With the aid of the new law, we have now halted this increase and in many programs have substantially reduced the net investment of Federal funds. This is in line with the appeals made by leaders in both parties for increased reliance on private credit rather than continued expansion of direct Federal loans.

In the past, our major efforts to liquidate assets had been devoted to sales of individual mortgages and other types of loans—generally sales to the same types of lenders who make such loans in the private market. Such sales were essentially on a loan-by-loan basis. But disposing of a large number of loans with this technique is rather expensive. Buyers have to examine and select each individual loan and arrange for its servicing. When hundreds of thousands of loans are sold, one by one, the costs tend to mount. And these costs are passed on to the Government through discounts or lower prices.

By contrast, last year, under the new law, FNMA, as trustee, pooled some 380,000 individual loans and mortgages owned by five departments and agencies, and issued guaranteed and sold \$2.9 billion of certificates of participation based on these loans. Through this process, four major advantages were achieved, which could not have been achieved by individual loan-by-loan sales:

1. The cost of the sales, both to the Federal selling agency and to the purchasing institutions, was reduced;

2. The range of the market was substantially broadened by pulling in many more types of buyers who would not be interested in individual mortgages or loans, but were attracted to broader instrument like the participation certificate, which can more easily be traded in the market;

3. The impact of the sales was spread over a wide range of the capital market rather than concentrated on the market for specified types of loans, notably housing mortgages; and, consequently,

4. The net returns on the sales were much greater than could have been achieved on any comparable volume of sales of individual loans.

These achievements are noteworthy. However, we cannot now or in the future reasonably expect to sell certificates in pools of loans at quite the same interest cost as the Treasury borrows in the market. Our recent experience shows that the Treasury can borrow at an interest rate roughly .4 to .5 percentage points below the rate paid on guaranteed participation certificates. As I mentioned to you during my last appearance before this committee, this differential should narrow as the market for P.C.'s expands.

Nevertheless, some differential is wholly understandable.

But the fact that the Treasury securities carry a lower interest rate than any other form of security, does not—I believe—justify reliance on Treasury borrowing in every credit program in which the Federal Government has an interest. Under that philosophy the TVA, the Federal Home Loan Banks, and the various farm credit banks would all use U.S. Treasury financing, rather than tap the private market as they now do.

Similarly, under that philosophy we would have to close down the present guaranteed student loan program and substitute direct Federal loans.

When the Office of Education now insures a student loan made by a commercial bank and pays a portion of the interest on the student's behalf, the net interest cost to the Federal Government is indeed higher than if a direct Federal loan were made, using funds raised by the Treasury. Yet, I do not believe this is a reason to substitute Federal for private credit. Similarly, when the Farmers Home Administration sells to the private market an insured rural housing loan, buyers require a higher yield than the rate on Treasury securities. But, again, I do not believe that this justifies the conversion of this insured program to a direct Treasury operation.

In other words, financing Federal credit programs through the use of participation certificates to tap the private credit market does, indeed, require the payment of a slightly higher interest rate than if these same programs drew their funds directly from the Treasury. But this is true in a host of other cases where we rely on private financing. If we use the fact that Treasury financing is cheaper as an argument against participation certificates, thus implicitly we are saying that all credit activities should be converted from private to Treasury financing. In turn, this would be a complete reversal of the policies pursued in recent years, under both Republican and Democratic Administrations, to substitute private for public credit wherever possible.

As most of you know, the idea of pooling loans and selling participation certificates in such pools is far from new. It dates back at least to the certificates of interest issued by CCC and similar certificates sold by the RFC in 1954. Export-Import Bank has been offering participation certificates regularly since 1962 and FNMA since 1964. The main thing the 1966 Act did was to broaden the FNMA authority to cover more programs and more types of loans than were formerly eligible for such sales. It did this in large part by making it possible to place into the pools loans with interest rates below market levels.

The same legislation explicitly required authorizations to be made in appropriation acts for any sales made by the FNMA as trustee under the broader authority. The requests for such authorizations for the fiscal year 1968 and the related requests for appropriations necessary to cover any insufficiencies in funds are now before your committee for approval—and in one case have already been acted upon.

Participation sales authorizations

In the 1968 budget submitted to the Congress, the President requested specific authorizations necessary to permit estimated sales of \$5,750 million in participations in 1968. Allowing for an estimated \$1 billion of sales by the Export-Import Bank, which do not require specific congressional action, and \$350 million in participation sale authorizations enacted for 1967, which were expected in the January budget to remain available in 1968, the new participation sales authorizations proposed totaled \$4,400 million. The breakdown by major departments and agencies is summarized in the following table:

Department or agency	Budget request	House action	Recommendation
Department of Agriculture.....	\$800	1 \$800	\$800
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.....	215	2 115	2 115
Department of Housing and Urban Development.....	2,385	581	2,385
Veterans' Administration.....	850	300	850
Small Business Administration.....	150	150	150
Total.....	4,400	1,946	4,300

¹ The Senate reduced this to \$700,000,000.

² The House Appropriations Committee deferred action on the request for authorization of \$100,000,000 in participation sales of NDA student loans pending enactment of the authorizing legislation.

The House of Representatives, in acting upon the various appropriation bills involved, reduced the new participation sales authorizations from \$4,400 to \$1,946 million. Apart from the \$100 million disallowed, without prejudice, for participation sales by the Office of Education under proposed legislation not yet enacted, all of the reduction was in the sales authorizations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Veterans Administration. The discussion on the House floor suggests that the advocates of these reductions believed that the amount of the participation sales authorized should be determined solely by the amount required to finance the 1968 program level of the agencies whose assets were being placed in the pool. In other words, participation sales in 1968 should equal loan commitments in each program.

I respectfully suggest that this is a misconception of the basic reasons for the sale of these assets. These are loans which need not continue to be financed by the Treasury. Treasury financing should be replaced by private financing when and to the extent that private investors are willing to provide funds on reasonable terms—given the prevailing private market for comparable loans. We believe there is no reason to continue to carry large portfolios of loans made in prior years.

Let me say this another way. The historic role of the Federal Government in the credit market has been one of *intermediary*—helping to smooth the flow of funds between private lender and private borrower through insurance, guarantee, or regulation. In some cases, these devices do not work. The Congress has therefore authorized the Government to make a direct loan in order to fulfill certain national goals, in education, housing, agriculture, small business and the like. But even when it makes a direct loan, the Federal Government should, to the fullest extent possible, act as an *intermediary* not as a *banker*. In other words, having made the loan, it should seek to find private financing for that loan, rather than carrying it indefinitely in a huge Federal portfolio. In that way, the Government continues its historic role of intermediary in the market, ultimately helping to channel funds from private lender to private buyer. The participation certificate is a most effective device for doing just that.

May I, therefore, earnestly request the committee to restore the sales authorizations for existing programs to the figures requested by the President. The credit programs which repay the Treasury with the proceeds of these sales will still retain the authority to re-borrow equivalent amounts when and to the extent that they require those funds to make future loans which have been authorized by the Congress. The use of such funds will then be proposed in the budget and the volume of such loans will have been authorized by the Congress in a normal manner.

Payment of participation sales insufficiencies

In his 1968 budget the President proposed, as contemplated in the original Participation

Sales Act of 1966, that the respective appropriation bills also authorize *permanent indefinite appropriations* to pay any insufficiencies which might arise for the participation sales authorized by those appropriation acts. Insufficiencies arise primarily from the fact that in most cases the interest rates payable on the certificates of participation will exceed the interest received on the loans placed in the pool, since many of these loans carry statutorily authorized interest rates well below market levels. Permanent indefinite appropriations were, in fact, provided last year for the 1967 sales pursuant to your committee's recommendations.

In its action on the 1968 request, however, the House of Representatives in every case substituted a *definite appropriation* with a specific amount which is intended to cover the payments necessary for one year alone—not for the remaining years the certificates have to run.

There are two reasons why the President requested a permanent indefinite appropriation. The first relates to the impossibility of determining in advance with any precision the amount which will be actually needed to meet the insufficiency. The amount required depends upon (1) the interest rates on the specific loans actually placed in the pools, (2) the interest rates required to sell the participation certificates, and (3) the number of years the participation certificates will be outstanding. Market conditions at the time of the participation sale will be a major determining factor on all three of these variables. Moreover, once the certificates are issued and sold, the requirements for insufficiencies will be inflexible and there will be no advantage for the Congress in going through the process of making specific new appropriations each year.

Secondly, the substitution of a definite one-year appropriation for a permanent indefinite appropriation could adversely affect the market for the participation certificates in the first place. The financial markets are very sensitive to the various features of a financial instrument.

Imagine a buyer deciding whether to purchase a participation certificate with a 10-year maturity. Assume, for example, that the certificate covered a pool of loans made up of college housing and other loans carrying interest rates ranging from 3 to 4 percent. Assume also that the market interest rate on the participations was 5 percent. The funds necessary to cover this interest rate differential are provided by the appropriation for insufficiencies. If this has to be made each year, the prospective buyer has no absolute assurance that the funds will be made available in sufficient amount and on time. While each agency has certain other funds it could put up, and while FNMA itself could cover temporary shortages, this slight added uncertainty might affect the interest rate which would have to be paid on the certificates. If there are doubts that payments will be made in full or on time to meet the participation sale requirements and if a bond counsel advises that such a cloud is on the horizon, it is possible that the Federal Government will have to pay a higher interest rate than would otherwise be necessary for certificates.

A logical dilemma is involved. On the one hand, if the market confidently expects that the necessary appropriations to meet such insufficiencies will be routinely and promptly provided each year or that other sources will always be available, the price it will be willing to pay for the certificates will not suffer. But by the same token there would be no function served by requiring such purely routine actions by the Congress. On the other hand, if the Congress does not want to provide such assurance in advance, its reluctance to do so could cause some investors to give credibility to their doubts and to suspect, however mistakenly, that there might

be a thunderhead somewhere back in the distant clouds. In this case, we would be unable to sell the participation certificates on as favorable terms and would have to pay higher interest rates or sell a smaller volume of the certificates.

My own view—and I am not a bond market expert—is that substitution of definite for indefinite appropriations will have some market effects but I cannot forecast whether these effects will be really significant. Nevertheless, the prudent action, in my judgment, would be to restore the indefinite appropriations like those enacted for 1967 and thus to avoid the possibility of adverse market impacts. The basic control over participation certificates would, of course, still remain with the Appropriations Committee and the Congress through the annual appropriation process which annually authorizes the amounts which may be sold.

I am confident that the committee will weigh these considerations carefully before it takes action on the participation sales authorizations and the insufficiency appropriations.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Senator has pointed out, and I have already stated, that some of these certificates were sold under the Eisenhower administration; I referred to the amounts earlier.

It is true that some were sold under the RFC in 1954—\$47 million worth were sold. Today we are dealing with billions. This information is furnished by the Budget Bureau.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a list of the Federal National Mortgage Association sales of participation certificates since 1954, the sale of participation certificates by the Export-Import Bank since 1954, and the sale by the RFC in 1954.

These figures were furnished by the Budget Bureau.

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

SALES OF CERTIFICATES OF PARTICIPATION AND CERTIFICATES OF INTEREST, FISCAL YEARS 1954-68

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Federal National Mortgage Association ¹	Export-Import Bank	Reconstruction Finance Corporation
1954			47
1955			
1956			
1957			
1958			
1959			
1960			
1961			
1962		300	
1963		250	
1964		373	
1965	300	450	
1966	1,840	761	
1967 estimate	2,880	700	
1968 estimate	4,000	1,000	
Total.....	9,020	3,834	47

¹ Reflects sale of participations in loans owned by FNMA as well as in loans owned by other agencies and sold through FNMA as trustee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. For the information of the Senate, I am not arguing the principle on the basis of how much was sold—I believe the policy is wrong and a waste of the taxpayers' dollars.

I call attention to the fact that the Export-Import Bank started selling

these certificates in 1962, as the chart will show. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation sold \$47 million in 1954 while the first FNMA certificates were sold in 1965. The arguments that were used so eloquently by many Members on the other side of the aisle against this procedure in 1954 are equally applicable today.

I only wish they would vote today as they talked then.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, for the purpose of clarity, the pending amendment is the committee amendment which would increase the amount above the House proposal by \$550 million. A vote "nay" would be a vote for the House figure of \$300 million. I shall vote against the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. A vote "yea" is for the committee amendment, and a vote "nay" is to return to the House figure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 29, line 4. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. If he were present, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I announce that the Senators from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. PERCY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] and the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The pair of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has been previously announced.

If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] and

the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 31, as follows:

[No. 256 Leg.]
YEAS—56

Anderson	Hayden	Monroney
Bartlett	Hill	Montoya
Bible	Holland	Morse
Brooke	Hollings	Moss
Byrd, Va.	Inouye	Nelson
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Pastore
Cannon	Javits	Pell
Case	Jordan, N.C.	Proxmire
Church	Kennedy, Mass.	Randolph
Clark	Kennedy, N.Y.	Ribicoff
Dodd	Long, Mo.	Scott
Eastland	Long, La.	Sparkman
Ellender	Magnuson	Spong
Ervin	McClellan	Talmadge
Fulbright	McGee	Tydings
Gruening	McGovern	Williams, N.J.
Harris	McIntyre	Yarborough
Hart	Metcalf	Young, Ohio
Hartke	Mondale	

NAYS—31

Aiken	Fannin	Pearson
Allott	Fong	Prouty
Baker	Gore	Russell
Bennett	Griffin	Smith
Boggs	Hansen	Stennis
Burdick	Hickenlooper	Thurmond
Carlson	Hruska	Tower
Cooper	Jordan, Idaho	Williams, Del.
Cotton	Lausche	Young, N. Dak.
Curtis	Miller	
Dominick	Mundt	

NOT VOTING—13

Bayh	Mansfield	Percy
Brewster	McCarthy	Smathers
Dirksen	Morton	Symington
Hatfield	Murphy	
Kuchel	Muskie	

So the committee amendment on page 29, line 4, was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. HOLLAND moved to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

EXPLANATION FOR NOT VOTING

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, because of a prior engagement at the White House earlier today, I was unable to participate in legislative rollcall vote No. 254, the second Williams amendment to the committee amendment on page 10, line 25, and on legislative rollcall vote No. 255, the committee amendment itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 29, line 13, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$333,882" and insert "\$946,000".

VISIT TO THE CAPITOL BY THE PRESIDENT OF ITALY, GIUSEPPE SARAGAT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to announce to the Senate that the President of Italy, His Excellency Giuseppe Saragat, will be in the Foreign Relations Committee room on the first floor very shortly.

It would be the hope of the leadership that as many Senators as possible would be able to go to the Foreign Relations Committee room for the purpose of meeting our distinguished visitor at this time.

I have asked for these moments for the purpose of making that announcement.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—
ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 828. An act to amend section 5(b) of the act of March 18, 1966 (Public Law 89-372), so as to make the prohibition contained therein on the filling of certain vacancies in the office of district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania inapplicable to the first vacancy occurring after the enactment of such act;

S. 1165. An act to provide for the disposition of judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe of Indians on behalf of the Mississippi Bands and the Pillager and Lake Winnibigoshish Bands of Chippewa Indians;

S. 1465. An act to provide for holding terms of the District Court of the United States for the eastern division of the Northern District of Mississippi in Ackerman, Miss.;

S. 1657. An act to extend for 1 year the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make indemnity payments to dairy farmers who are directed to remove their milk from commercial markets because it contains residues of chemicals registered and approved for use by the Federal Government; and

S. 1972. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Emigrant New York Indians in Indian Claims Commission Docket Numbered 75, and for other purposes.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPRO-
PRIATIONS, 1968

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9960) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the amendment, on page 29, line 13, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$333,882" and insert "\$946,000," merely coincides with Senate action in making the Veterans' Administration participation certificates amount to \$850 million. I hope that there would be no problem about the Senate's approving the amendment on payment of sales insufficiencies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 33, after line 13, it is proposed to insert:

ALASKA HOUSING

For assistance in the provision of housing and related facilities for Alaska natives and other Alaska residents, as authorized by section 1004 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (80 Stat. 1284-1285), \$1,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 33, line 22, after "(42 U.S.C. 3103)", to strike out "\$27,000,000" and insert "\$42,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, if I may be recognized—

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do have the floor. If I could explain the grants for neighborhood facilities, the House suggested \$27 million. The budget amount, on page 15 of the Senate report, was \$42 million. The committee recommended going to the budget estimate of \$42 million. There is a good reason for that. If anyone wishes to cut the amount, why, of course, we will have some discussion on it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the House approved \$27 million for this particular item. The Senate raised that another \$15 million to \$42 million. In the last fiscal year the same agency received \$17 million. The House already increased the appropriation over the preceding year for this Department by \$10 million. The Senate amendment adds another \$15 million. As I pointed out before, we are confronted with the question of how far down the road can we go in increasing the items.

The Senate bill already increases this appropriation by \$445 million over the House. The most recent rollcall vote added another \$550 million. We now have the bill approximately \$1 billion over the House.

The Senate amendment would add another \$15 million to an item that had already been increased \$10 million by the House.

I think the committee amendment should be rejected.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, there is a principle involved here which worries me very much. As the Senator from Delaware has pointed out, the current appropriation was for \$17 million. Now it is proposed to increase it to \$42 million—more than double. I might say that I recognize a great deal of merit in the program, but we are faced with a \$29 billion deficit.

As other Senators do, I run into a great many people back home who wonder about the responsibility of Congress at a time like this in enlarging some of the programs. When we have to tell them that we have more than doubled the amount for the current year, my guess is that they will wonder still more about it. I hope that this could be reduced at least to what the House allowed, which still is \$10 million more than the present appropriation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I merely want to suggest that this is, to me, one of the really important programs. It will be a program in the urban areas that will be close to the people. It would involve a solution to a great many of the problems of the cities. Since the House passed this amount, many things have happened, and I am not so sure that the House itself would not consider the amount, were it to be in front of them now.

These would be grants to encourage community programs, to make the people feel that they really belong to the community. In many cases, they will find a storeroom or a warehouse and convert

it into a meetingplace for basketball courts and for participation in other recreation games. It is just what it says, a neighborhood facility.

It is a very important matter. It involves grants, and in many cases, local contributions. It is pretty much a bootstrap operation, because the grants are usually to get them started. I think it is one of the fine programs in lieu of many of the needed programs for the cities which are going to take a long time to bring into operation.

I cannot state this categorically, but I really believe, if the House were to reconsider this one item, it would agree to it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CANNON. Would a successful "nay" vote on this amendment reduce the amount from the proposed \$42 million to \$27 million? Or would it strike out the entire \$42 million?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A "nay" vote would reject the committee amendment and the figure would revert to the House figure.

Mr. CANNON. To the \$27 million figure?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The \$27 million figure.

The question is on the committee amendment on page 33, line 23. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the affirmative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] would each vote "yea."

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I announce that the Senators from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. PERCY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The pair of the Senator from Illinois

[Mr. DIRKSEN] has been previously announced.

If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY], and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 23, as follows:

[No. 257 Leg.]

YEAS—60

Alken	Hartke	Morse
Allott	Hayden	Moss
Baker	Hill	Mundt
Bartlett	Holland	Nelson
Bible	Inouye	Pastore
Brooke	Jackson	Pell
Burdick	Javits	Proouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Proxmire
Cannon	Kennedy, Mass.	Randolph
Case	Kennedy, N.Y.	Ribicoff
Clark	Long, Mo.	Scott
Cooper	Long, La.	Smith
Cotton	Magnuson	Sparkman
Dodd	McClellan	Spong
Ellender	McGee	Stennis
Ervin	McGovern	Talmadge
Fulbright	McIntyre	Tydings
Griffin	Mondale	Williams, N.J.
Gruening	Monroney	Yarborough
Harris	Montoya	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—23

Anderson	Eastland	Lausche
Bennett	Fannin	Miller
Boggs	Fong	Pearson
Byrd, Va.	Hansen	Russell
Carlson	Hickenlooper	Thurmond
Church	Hollings	Tower
Curtis	Hruska	Williams, Del.
Dominick	Jordan, Idaho	

NOT VOTING—17

Bayh	Kuchel	Muskie
Brewster	Mansfield	Percy
Dirksen	McCarthy	Smathers
Gore	Metcalf	Symington
Hart	Morton	Young, Ohio
Hatfield	Murphy	

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 34, line 4, to strike out "\$31,950,000" and insert "\$32,773,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 35, line 1, after "(12 U.S.C. 1701q et seq.)", to strike out "\$20,000,000" and insert "\$40,000,000".

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall not ask for a record vote on this amendment in view of the earlier results, but I point out that for this agency's appropriation the House allowed \$20 million. The Senate amendment would double this amount to \$40 million, which is \$20 million above the House figure. I shall vote "no" on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 35, at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "\$40,000,000" and insert "\$50,000,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, what page was that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Page 35. Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. What line?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Page 35, line 6. The House allowed \$40 million, and we made it the budget estimate for fiscal year 1968, or \$50 million.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, this figure likewise has been raised by both the House and the Senate. In fiscal year 1967 the Congress appropriated \$33 million for this department. The House raised this figure \$7 million, to a total of \$40 million for fiscal 1968. The Senate committee proceeded to increase this further by adding another \$10 million, bringing the total to \$250 million. An argument can be made that there is some merit in any of these programs, but at some point these increases have got to stop.

I shall vote "no."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this program is for cities, mainly, of less than 50,000 population, to do some kind of planning for their sewers and water systems, and things of that nature, or in some cases, transit systems going through the town. They are little places, which have no city engineers and no funds to do many of these things, and this figure would provide matching funds. It has resulted in a great number of eligible applications. The reason the amount is a little higher than last year is because more of the small cities have asked for this service.

When they do this, and if and when they pass a bond issue for the city of X for a sewer system, this grant, the amount we put in, is paid back to the Federal Government. I believe it is one of the finest programs we have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 35, line 13, after "(including the undertaking of studies and publication of information)" to strike out "\$75,000,000" and insert "\$100,000,000".

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, once again I point out that in 1967 for this same program there was appropriated a total of \$55 million. The House raised that figure by \$20 million, bringing it up to \$75 million. The Senate now seeks to add another \$25 million, making the total \$100 million, or almost double the amount appropriated for the same program in fiscal year 1967.

It is time that the Senate ask itself, "How long can we keep doubling these programs?"

I think as Senators vote to double these expenditures they should remember also that they are voting for an inevitable tax increase. I most respectfully suggest that those who vote for these increases carry their enthusiasm back to their constitu-

ents and tell them they are the ones who must assume the responsibility for the tax increase when it comes.

I get a little impatient with these liberals who vote for the increases in all these appropriations and then shed their crocodile tears for the overburdened taxpayers.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the amount is \$25 million under the budget estimate for this year.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, it is true that the budget estimate was \$125 million, but just because an agency sees fit to ask for three times what they spent last year is no reason why Congress should give them double instead.

I repeat, for this particular program the appropriation last year was \$55 million; the House raised this by \$20 million, to \$75 million, and the Senate amendment now before us would raise it another \$25 million, to \$100 million. There is a limit, and the amendment should be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 35, line 21, after the word "That", to strike out "no part" and insert "not to exceed \$1,000,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 35, at the beginning of line 23, to strike out "a grant" and insert "grants".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 36, line 8, to strike out "\$6,100,000" and insert "\$6,250,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 36, line 12, after the numerals "1969", to strike out "\$175,000,000" and insert "\$205,000,000".

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, once again I point out that for this agency the House allowed \$175 million. That is \$50 million more than the \$125 million they had in 1967. The House allowed \$175 million, or an increase of \$50 million, and the Senate increases the amount by another \$30 million, to \$205 million.

Once again, I say this is part of the escalating process of increasing these appropriations, and I shall vote no on the amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this is \$25 million under the budget estimate. I think we should provide more than the budget figure. If there is anything we need to do, it is to do something about the transportation problems in the cities,

which constitute one of the chief causes of the trouble we have been having. This is not only money well spent, but it is matched by the cities, and is doing something about the welfare of this country.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I should like to say just a word about this particular amendment.

I agree entirely with the part of the statement made by the distinguished chairman as to the importance of the problem, but I must say here that, in providing this additional money, which is still \$25 million under the budget figure, my personal feeling, from listening to the testimony, is that we would accomplish relatively little in the field of urban mass transportation.

Some of the testimony which we heard was simple almost to the point of naivete, and would tax the credulity of anyone who listened to it.

Next year we expect that we will be presented with some hard facts as to what has actually been accomplished in this area. It does constitute one of the major problems we have in the country today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, we are considering today an appropriations bill of paramount importance to the future of our cities and the future of our country. I would like to comment briefly on three programs which would be funded by this measure; the model cities program, the rent supplement program, and the metropolitan expediter program.

It is impossible to overemphasize the significance of the new approach to urban problems embodied in the model cities program and the hope it offers for upgrading vast slum areas in our cities.

The model cities program has already stimulated 193 cities to take new looks at the interrelationship between the physical, social, and economic problems of their slum neighborhoods and to apply for money to work out a blueprint for confronting these problems. A neighborhood without recreational facilities breeds delinquency. Poor transportation augments unemployment. Joblessness contributes to housing decay. A lack of day-care centers for working mothers increases welfare dependency.

The chain is endless and attacking the cycle at one point, as we have done in the past, lacks needed effectiveness. The model cities program offers the cities a truly new and better approach.

We cannot afford at this time of ever-increasing crisis for our cities to dim the bright hope the model cities program offers. Rather we should encourage this new dynamic approach by appropriating the \$537 million included in this bill.

The rent supplement program, besides being a sound program, is the means for providing good, decent housing for low-income families in normal living conditions. Rent supplement tenants are not set apart from their neighbors who can afford economic rents. They live, instead, under the same roof with them.

I am deeply concerned with the life of our distraught times and with what can be done in the long range to improve it. This program can, I believe, make a major contribution.

The housing provided by it is sponsored by nonprofit organizations or limited dividend corporations, built by private builders with Government-underwritten market rate financing, and privately owned and managed.

Rent supplement tenants, in short, live in private housing. In addition, they may live immediately next door to tenants paying a market rent.

By living in regular housing in this normal environment, they are certain to develop a feeling in the community. The spread of this sense of things could go a long way to building neighborly understanding, a feeling of being accepted.

Thus, this program provides not only much needed physical shelter for our less fortunate fellow citizens, but it also is the means of nourishing that most delicate of all organs, the human spirit.

As Senator MAGNUSON said as his committee recommended \$40 million for this program:

It offers 20th century answers to 20th century problems. Having stimulated these massive efforts, having aroused the expectations of millions of our fellow citizens, we dare not now renege on our commitment.

We Americans are generous and our generosity is well deserved here. Moreover, our self-interest in an orderly community dictates that we act affirmatively. We must vote a really adequate funding of the rent supplement program.

I am very pleased that the Appropriations Committee recommended the deletion of the proviso contained in the House-passed bill prohibiting metropolitan expeditors. St. Louis was one of the few cities in which an expediter was appointed.

The expediter assigned to St. Louis, Milton Morales, was very well received, and his value to the city government and the Federal agencies interested in the city's problems was inestimable. I am certain that the continuation of the program on an experimental basis will indicate the desirability of making it a permanent part of our Federal housing program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter I received from the Honorable Alfonso J. Cervantes, mayor of the city of St. Louis, be printed in the RECORD.

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

CITY OF ST. LOUIS, Mo.,
June 12, 1967.

HON. EDWARD V. LONG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ED: It has come to our attention that Congress is closely examining the funding and continued existence of the Metropolitan Expediter Program which has only recently been put into effect.

I would like very much to take this opportunity to express our City's extreme interest in this program and to say how much we feel the program has helped us, even at this early stage. As St. Louis has been fortunate enough to receive one of the first Federal expeditors in the country, Mr. Milton Morales,

we have had the opportunity to see how effective a force toward meaningful Federal-local relationship such a man can be.

It is our feeling that the position which the Federal expediter occupies is of real value in bringing about a harmonious relationship between the Federal and City governments. We feel the expediter has the opportunity to understand what is really going on in a city and in a metropolitan area; and when this position is in capable hands, such as Mr. Morales', the value to the City government and to the Federal agencies interested in the City's problems is inestimable.

Not only can a man in this position helpfully advise those responsible for formulating municipal policy as to the thinking and direction of applicable Federal programs, but he can also assist in communicating with the Federal agencies and explaining to them, in objective terms, what the City is trying to do and why a particular method has been chosen. In short, we are strongly of the opinion that the program should be continued, and even increased in scope, and we respectfully urge you to support this program at every opportunity.

Please let me also thank you, again, for your many helpful and successful efforts on behalf of the City of St. Louis. The people of St. Louis and the metropolitan area are very grateful.

Sincerely,

ALFONSO J. CERVANTES,
Mayor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 36, line 20, after the word "including", to strike out "\$75,000,000" and insert "\$125,000,000"; and, in line 25, after the word "Act", to strike out "\$237,000,000" and insert "\$537,000,000".

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, that item involves the model cities program.

If I might have the attention of the majority leader and the other Senators, many Senators have asked me in the last 20 minutes whether we would have any more votes.

Some Senators have appointments downtown.

This is an item on which there will be a great deal of debate. I do not know whether we should proceed with this amendment or go over until tomorrow and perhaps have a limitation of time and vote at a certain time tomorrow.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is the Senator talking only about the amendment on lines 20 and 21 or is he also talking about the amendment extending from line 25 of page 36 over to the top line of page 37?

Mr. MAGNUSON. We are taking the amendments in sequence. This involves the model cities program. Since we are taking them in sequence, I am perfectly willing to agree to go on. However, I will make a brief statement at this time on the amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so that I may ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Does the Senator mean on the amendment on page 36, lines 20 and 21, which would increase the model cities program from \$75 million to \$125 million for grants for urban renewal projects within approved demonstration cities programs?

Mr. HOLLAND. Do I understand that

the distinguished Senator is asking that these two matters be considered together, this amendment and the amendment beginning on line 15?

Mr. MAGNUSON. They are together. So, I would suggest that we have a roll-call vote on both of them.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the amendments are to be considered together, I would like to ask for the yeas and nays on that vote.

Mr. MAGNUSON. On both of the amendments?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. There being a sufficient second, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this is a comparatively new program, and although in 1967 there was an appropriation for \$11 million, it was merely to do the preliminaries leading up to the recommendation by HUD of a permanent model cities program.

The principal responsibilities of the division that will be involved in this relates to model cities program including the amount provided for grants for urban renewal projects within approved city demonstration programs.

The budget proposed \$662 million for comprehensive city demonstration programs to help cities plan, develop, and carry on programs to rebuild and restore slums and blighted areas.

This includes \$12 million for planning grants, \$400 million for supplementary grants, and \$250 million for grants for new urban renewal projects within the model cities.

A model city would be a demonstration city. It would be within an urban area.

The Secretary of HUD suggested to us that he thought approximately 70 places in the United States would be eligible under the model city program.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is correct. Mr. MAGNUSON. And they have not announced those locations.

Mr. ALLOTT. I think it should be plainly spelled out that this is a program which will only affect relatively a small number of cities, and they will be the larger cities in the country.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The committee recommended these amounts and has made a reduction of \$125,000 under the urban renewal section. The Congress proposes that model city funds be made available for obligation over a 2-year period instead of until expended as proposed in the budget.

The Department recommends the full restoration of the \$425 million which would at least begin a program to the extent they suggest to develop local programs to revitalize these areas.

I could go on and on about this from the testimony of Secretary Weaver and others. If there is any misunderstanding

about it, I hope that questions will be asked.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the so-called justification by the committee for this amount, and I include in that request some excerpts from the statement of Secretary Weaver.

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

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN
DEVELOPMENT
DEMONSTRATION AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL
RELATIONS

Model cities program

(House hearings, Part 3, pp. 2, 55, 483, 673;
Senate hearings, p. —)

1967 appropriation	\$11,000,000
Estimate, 1968	412,000,000
Additional contract authority from July 1, 1967, on urban renewal projects under Sec. 113	250,000,000
House allowance	237,000,000
Committee recommendation	

Amendments Requested

(1) Page 34, line 16, strike out "\$75,000,000" and insert "\$250,000,000", the estimate, or an increase of \$175,000,000 for grants for urban renewal projects within approved city demonstration programs.

(2) Page 34, line 21, strike out "\$237,000,000" and insert "\$662,000,000," the estimate of \$412,000,000 plus the addition of \$250,000,000 for urban renewal projects, or an increase of \$425,000,000.

HOUSE REPORT (p. 14)

DEMONSTRATIONS AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL
RELATIONS

The principal responsibilities of this division of the Department relate to Model cities and other programs, including technical assistance and research. These programs are designed primarily to encourage State and

local governments to raise their capabilities to deal with municipal problems.

Model cities programs.—The budget proposes \$662,000,000 for comprehensive city demonstration programs to help cities plan, develop, and carry out programs to rebuild and restore slums and blighted areas. This includes \$12,000,000 for planning grants, \$400,000,000 for supplementary grants, and \$250,000,000 for grants for new urban renewal projects within approved model cities programs.

The Committee recommends the appropriation of \$12,000,000 for planning grants, \$150,000,000 for the model cities program, and \$75,000,000 for grants for new urban renewal projects within model city areas—a total of \$237,000,000. The Committee has made a reduction of \$425,000,000 in this new program which is still in the planning stages.

The Committee proposes that model cities funds be made available for obligation over a two-year period instead of until expended as proposed in the budget.

Testimony indicates that it will take from six months to a year to prepare and process specific and adequate plans. The Department expects to work closely with cities as the plans are developed so that final selections of model cities for the supplemental grants may then proceed without delay. The model cities program should play a vital part in meeting the challenges of our Nation's cities. Meaningful solutions to the problems of our cities will require the highest degree of co-operation between the Federal government and the people at the local level. In the opinion of the Committee, initiative and co-operation are equally as important as appropriations.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

The Department recommends full restoration of \$425,000,000, of which \$250,000,000 would restore the full budget estimate for supplementary grants for carrying out model cities programs, and \$175,000,000 to be restored for grants for urban renewal projects which are part of the model cities programs. The request may be summarized as follows:

	Budget estimate	House bill	Restoration requested
Grants for planning model cities programs	\$12,000,000	\$12,000,000	—
Grants for carrying out model cities programs (supplementary grants)	400,000,000	150,000,000	+\$250,000,000
Grants for urban renewal projects part of model cities programs (urban renewal "add-on")	250,000,000	75,000,000	+\$175,000,000
Total estimate	662,000,000	237,000,000	+\$425,000,000

Justification

Grants for carrying out approved model cities programs.—The Department recommends restoration of the full \$400,000,000 as proposed in the Budget.

Improving the quality of urban life constitutes our most critical domestic problem. Title I of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 was designed to assist cities of all sizes to plan and develop local programs to revitalize slum and blighted areas, expand and improve public services, and coordinate government and private programs.

Following the issuance of the Program Guide, the response to the program has reflected keen interest by cities across the country. A net 189 applications for planning grants have been received and are being processed. During June and July of 1967 HUD will be making planning grants to approximately 70 cities to help finance the development of model city plans. The planning period will range from 6 to 12 months. Beginning in January 1968, cities will be filing plans which will call for supplementary grants totaling about \$400 million. That amount will be needed if the plans are to have the impact called for by the model

cities statute. Cities can not be expected to carry on this complicated planning, to effect the often politically difficult changes in social and physical development policies which may be necessary to ensure full value from development funds, or to build up the expectation of residents of disadvantaged neighborhoods unless they know that the funds needed to carry out the model cities plans will be forthcoming.

Since HUD and other Federal agencies involved will be working closely with the cities during the planning period, supplementary grants can and will be made shortly after model cities plans are final. In the normal course of the administration of the Model Cities Program, therefore, it is estimated that the bulk of supplementary grant funds will be obligated before June 30, 1968. The other cities, mostly smaller cities and those which in the past have received less Federal planning and program assistance, would be ready for supplementary grants during the early summer of 1968.

Without the full \$400 million, the Department would be confronted with two alternatives, either of which would be detrimental to the success of the program. The first would

be to allocate the available appropriation on a first-come first-served basis, which would tend to discriminate against the smaller, less experienced applicants. The result would be accelerated planning efforts by cities, but not necessarily the best planning results. The second alternative would be to distribute the available funds to all cities. Based on the House Bill, cities would be provided with less than half the amount proposed and less than the amount necessary if the program is to have its full impact. In either case, the objective contained in the Act of developing fully-coordinated model city programs, supported by adequate planning funds and by assurances that the supplementary grants necessary for their execution, would be lost. Lost, too, would be the momentum now created and the collaboration at the Federal and local levels for the effective solution of the most serious problems of the cities.

Urban Renewal "Add-on"—Grants for Urban Renewal Projects which are Part of Approved Model Cities Program.—The full budget estimate of \$250 million for transfer to the appropriation "Urban renewal program" is urgently requested for fiscal year 1968.

Section 113 of Title I of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 authorizes \$250 million in additional urban renewal grant authority, to be available after July 1, 1967. This additional authority would be limited to urban renewal projects which are identified and scheduled to be carried out as projects or activities included within an approved comprehensive city demonstration program. On the basis of applications filed the Department estimates that the 70 model cities to be selected will need all of the \$250 million of urban renewal add-on funds authorized for fiscal year 1968.

While Model Cities plans will include many social programs, the total demonstration effort must include physical renewal and rehabilitation where such treatment is necessary. Urban renewal projects will be needed to provide or rehabilitate housing in model neighborhood areas and to upgrade or expand public facilities to assure long-range physical stability of the selected neighborhoods. Grant reservations for such projects must be made as early as possible in the model cities' planning period to fit the time schedule for the model cities objective of substantial impact on physical and social restoration of neighborhoods during the 5-year period of the model cities plans.

Review of model cities planning grant applications received indicates that some identify specific immediate urban renewal requirements, for which the cities will apply as soon as funds are available. Other Model Cities applications recognize that need for urban renewal treatment and indicate that specific projects will be identified early in the model cities' planning period. In both instances, urban renewal planning advances and project grant reservations would be sought before the end of fiscal year 1968.

It is estimated that Model Cities will need the entire \$250 million during 1968, in addition to the portion of other urban renewal grant authorizations which might normally be approved in these areas during the year or which had been approved earlier for activities still under way. Accordingly, appropriation of less than \$250 million for this purpose would make it necessary for some model cities to defer urban renewal planning. The House allowance of \$75 million would permit approval of only 30 percent of the amount expected to be needed, causing significant reduction in scope of projects for some cities and total deferral for others.

In the past urban renewal project planning has taken about 31 months, on the average. Some streamlining of Federal and

local procedures might effectively shorten this average more than one-third. On this basis, the execution stages of projects started in planning during 1968 would not begin until 1970. Postponement of urban renewal planning starts means the loss of an equal time period in reversing the tide of urban blight in the model neighborhoods. Of equal importance is the dilution of effectiveness which such postponements are likely to cause. Scheduling adjustments and/or reduction in project scope necessarily detract from the degree of coordination and concentration on the whole array of social and physical problems which can be attained under the Model Cities concept.

SENATE HEARINGS

Secretary Weaver stated to the committee:

The issue is basically the same, I think, with the Model Cities program. Of course, it is much newer. In an operating sense it has not even started yet. But I am sure you all know, as we do, how large it looms already on the national scene. Even we in the Department, though we had high hopes have been astonished at the amount of creative excitement and activity it has generated in cities all across the country—and that even before it has actually started.

The House Committee, in proposing a two-thirds reduction in the budget estimate, commented that "... this new program ... is still in the planning stages", and added, "Testimony indicated that it will take from six months to a year to prepare and process specific and adequate plans." Factually, there can be no quarrel with those statements; they are quite correct.

But I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the issue before us is not to attempt to measure with a micrometer the dollars which will be required for the execution of contracts month by month as the program progresses. At this stage that is quite impossible—for the cities, for us, and for you. The issue is whether the program is to be launched with the full support of the Congress, with funding up to the restricted limits written into the authorizing legislation, or whether it is to be presented to the cities cut to the bone, clouded with doubt as to its future, so that every city will feel that it proceeds at its peril because the Congress may lose interest—indeed, may have already lost interest—in the whole idea. On that issue turns the question whether the energies already released will continue, or whether we shall see confidence begin to falter and enthusiasm to fade.

The Model Cities program puts the major responsibility squarely on the elected officials in the cities. Mayor after mayor has expressed his concern about the danger inherent in the gamble they would be asked to take: going ahead with planning without the assurance of availability of funds as a guide to planning and a guarantee of the feasibility of execution. The mayors fear the consequences of expectations aroused and then frustrated—and with good reason.

This program has attracted the keen interest of cities across the country. Around 189 applications have been reviewed, and we expect very soon to announce about 70 cities which will be the initial recipients of grants for planning model city programs. We assume that subsequent to that, with a planning period running from 6 to 12 months, most of the cities receiving planning grants would be ready to apply for supplementary grants before the end of 1968.

If the program is to have the impact which we believe it can and should have, the full amount of our estimate will be needed. I believe that we should be fully ready to go with the cities which will have gone through the extensive and complicated planning

which is required. These cities will be working to bring about politically difficult changes in their local social and physical development policies, and to gear their energies toward carrying out a successful program. To help them, we will be working closely with them, providing advice and assistance in this difficult planning job. Obviously this inevitably builds up expectations and hopes in the cities and neighborhoods involved. It will do incalculable damage to them and to the programs if we are forced to ask them to stop or to hold back because of lack of funds.

As a practical matter, we would have two alternatives if enough supplementary grant funds are not available. First, we can allocate what is available on first-come first-served basis until the funds are committed. The bigger, more experienced cities would benefit from this; the smaller ones would be left to wait. Furthermore, we would run the risk of creating a competition for funds, rather than for quality, causing hasty planning and with a result that the losers would be the ones needing the program's help the most. Clearly that would not be a workable solution.

Second, we could attempt to distribute the available funds among all the cities as equitably as possible. The result, I believe, would be that cities would be getting less than they need, and less than they have prepared themselves to handle through the energy and effort put into the planning. The danger here is not only that of creating disillusionment but also of dragging the whole process out in time. After having developed with much effort a spirit of enthusiasm, cooperation and collaboration within the cities and among all participating public and private organizations in the community, we run the risk of letting the whole effort sag in frustration and delay.

These remarks apply, also, to the amounts needed for the urban renewal add-on. The local programs developed by most cities are certain to include extensive renewal and rehabilitation. The Model Cities Act requires that a city's program be of sufficient magnitude to make a substantial impact on the physical and social problems therein and to remove or arrest blight and decay. This can only be done in many situations if the urban renewal program—including rehabilitation and code enforcement—is made an integral part early in the city's program.

The lead time involved in the urban renewal program means that reservations of funds must be made early in the city's program. In some cases, it is possible to identify the projects almost immediately in the planning process.

If the urban renewal funds are not available for this early commitment, we are risking a slow-down in the entire program, as well as preventing the initiation of well planned, well staged city programs. The inevitable result, it seems to me, would be an unfortunate reduction in the scope of city programs, the deferral of some altogether and an irretrievable loss of time. More generally, I think that the knowledge that the Department does not have adequate urban renewal funds would inevitably create a psychological pressure on cities which would bias their planning efforts in a most unfortunate and unsound way.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this afternoon, it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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

PERIOD FOR THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS TOMORROW MORNING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a brief period of not to exceed 15 minutes for the transaction of routine morning business tomorrow morning.

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

AUTHORIZATION FOR ALL COMMITTEES TO MEET DURING THE SESSION OF THE SENATE TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. The purpose of the short morning hour on tomorrow will be to serve notice that not later than 11:15 a.m. we will be back on the pending amendment.

I think this will be the best way to handle the situation in view of the circumstances that developed since our initial conversation.

Mr. ALLOTT. It will be the purpose of the majority leader not to have any more votes tonight, and at, perhaps the termination of the speech of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], we will recess.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if we are going to do that, I wish we would adjourn now so that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] could begin his presentation tomorrow.

I think his background and experience on these matters is so great and his interest and his dedication on some of these matters is so great that I would rather have more Senators present when he makes his speech. If there are not to be any further votes tonight, there would not be very many Senators present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I think that is a good idea. However, if other Senators want to speak on other matters, they can do so.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as I understand, the amendments concerning the model cities program are to be considered en bloc, and the yeas and nays are ordered. That will be the pending business when we resume the consideration of the bill at 11:15 tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE TO BRAZIL

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, on September 13, 1967, I inserted in the RECORD a report by Charles Keely, Latin American correspondent for the Copley News Service, describing his problems in getting answers to some relatively simple questions from U.S. AID in Rio de Ja-

neiro. Mr. William S. Gaud, Administrator of AID, has written me in regard to this matter. In view of his frank, intelligent evaluation of this situation, I ask unanimous consent that his letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, AGENCY FOR
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C., September 14, 1967.

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER, JR.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BAKER: I have just seen the article by Charles Keely of the Copley News Service concerning economic assistance to Brazil which you inserted in the Congressional Record on September 13, 1967. I agree completely with your statement that the public has a full right to know what use is made of tax dollars that we are spending for foreign aid. We have consulted the A.I.D. officials in Rio de Janeiro with whom Mr. Keely talked, and I am convinced there was no attempt to hide any facts about our large, complicated assistance efforts in Brazil from Mr. Keely.

We assist Brazil's education efforts in a variety of ways, with dollars for technical assistance, with local currency cruzeiro grants, with local currency loans, and with local currency "counterpart" generated by dollar loans which finance general imports from the United States. It is not always easy to give simple statistics which summarize such a complex program, especially where different exchange rates for local currency costs are involved. Nonetheless, I regret that Mr. Keely could not obtain the quick, satisfactory answers to his questions which he certainly should have been furnished.

From July 1, 1962 through June 30, 1967, the Agency for International Development has extended \$145.3 million in aid to Brazilian education. This represented 10.4 percent of A.I.D.'s total economic assistance to Brazil in this period.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM S. GAUD.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McIntyre in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

THE BEAR'S CLAWS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, American newspapers have carried several articles on the case of the Soviet scientist, Dr. Vladimir Tkachenko, who was forcefully removed by the British police from a Soviet Aeroflot plane at London Airport Saturday. This morning's papers say that the British Government has returned Dr. Tkachenko to Russian custody, according to his own wishes. However, many interesting aspects of this case have not yet been brought out in the American press and were discussed yesterday in the London press. Most interesting of these is that the British doctors who examined Dr. Tkachenko said that drugs were administered to him against his will. It is clear

from the Soviet reply that they would not hesitate to do such a thing.

It is worthwhile to note at this point that agreements have been almost completed for the landing of Aeroflot planes in this country. The only delaying factor at the moment is the Soviet reluctance to reveal technical and financial details of their operations. The Soviets are not yet ready to make the open disclosures which all civilized countries now make in international airline operations. Nevertheless, when they decide that it is to their advantage to use American airports, they may well make these concessions. At that time, we may expect to find instances such as the Tkachenko case in which the brutal Soviet system will be an open operation on our soil.

I find it difficult to understand why the British, after reporting that Dr. Tkachenko was drugged, now have handed him over to Soviet authorities, obviously before he has had a chance to fully recuperate. Nevertheless, the important point for Americans to realize is the cynical attitude that the Soviet State still takes against its citizens.

This fact was very successfully brought out in an editorial in yesterday's Daily Telegraph, of London, entitled "The Bear's Claws." Since many Senators may not have immediate access to this editorial, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. THURMOND. Furthermore, since the British accounts much more graphically describe the attacks on Dr. Tkachenko's human rights, I also ask unanimous consent that the accounts of this case from yesterday's edition of the Times, of London, and the Daily Telegraph be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

EXHIBIT 1

[From the London Daily Telegraph, Sept. 18, 1967]

THE BEAR'S CLAWS

For some years it has been fashionable in certain quarters to say that the Soviet Russians are becoming more "like us" every day, and that it is only a matter of time before virtually the same way of life holds sway from the offshore island to well beyond the Urals. But events all too often intrude on this Gaullist—or plain homespun Leftist—vision of the future; certainly the attempted kidnapping of a young Russian student enjoying British hospitality fits ill with Western canons of civilised behaviour. The Foreign Office is right to protest vigorously, and the police deserve an accolade for acting so promptly and firmly to prevent a flagrant breach of diplomatic custom. Chinese wielding axes in a London street was bad enough. But this incident, in its way, is worse, for it confirms that, despite the years of so-called dialogue and détente, the Bear's claws are still there.

Whether it was ever right to predicate a basic change of heart merely from the Russian economic growth and relative peaceful co-existence of recent years is another matter. Cuba and the Middle Eastern crisis of this summer were nasty reminders of how ruthlessly Russia will pursue her apparent na-

tional interest when opportunity offers; and of how infirmly based have been the two decades of "peace" since the war, hailed already by some optimists as a second Age of the Antonines and ushered in, paradoxically, by the balance of thermonuclear terror. But Russia still gives steady military support to North Vietnam and to the defeated Arab Powers, and has never shown any qualms about clawing back, if she can, those few of her citizens who have worked in the West.

This has surely done Russia's prestige far more harm than anything it can hope to gain by impressing reluctant talent. Would Nureyev ever have danced as well again on the Moscow stage as he does now at Covent Garden if the attempt to force him into an Aeroflot plane had succeeded? Saturday's bid to kidnap Dr. Tkachenko is the more illogical for his work at Birmingham University apparently being neither secret nor unique. Russia does more damage than perhaps she knows by these incidents, and particularly so in the Fiftieth Anniversary year of the Communist Revolution.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the London Times, Sept. 18, 1967]

DECISION TODAY ON RUSSIAN SCIENTIST—RECOVERING FROM DRUGS, HOME OFFICE SAY

NOTE.—A decision about the young Russian scientist, Dr. Vladimir Kachenko, is to be made today, the Home Office said last night. Britain has accused Russia of kidnapping him in London.

In reply to a strong protest the Russian Embassy had said earlier that physical force was used by British police and immigration officials against Dr. Kachenko, his wife, members of the Embassy, and the pilots of the aircraft on which he was Moscow bound.

Mr. Vasev, the Russian Chargé d'Affaires, arrived in Glasgow last night on his way to meet Mr. Gromyko, the Russian Foreign Minister, who is stopping off in Prestwick today on his way to the United Nations in New York. The trip to Scotland was planned several days ago.

INJECTION WAS GIVEN AGAINST WILL

The House Office said that the decision would be taken by Mr. Jenkins, Home Secretary, in consultation with Mr. Brown, Foreign Secretary.

An official added: "All through the day Kachenko has been recovering from the drugs administered by Soviet Embassy officials. He has been examined by doctors and by an eminent psychiatrist.

"Their reports are being urgently forwarded to Ministers who will consider them and, in the morning, make a decision about what should be done."

The exchanges between Britain and Russia followed the intervention on Saturday by British Special Branch officers to prevent Dr. Kachenko from leaving on board a Moscow-bound airliner at London Airport.

Dr. Kachenko, aged 25, had been doing postgraduate research in low temperature physics at Birmingham University.

A statement issued jointly by the Foreign Office and Home Office yesterday said that the Russian Chargé d'Affaires was asked to call at the Foreign Office to see Mr. Peter Hayman, Assistant Under-Secretary of State.

EMBASSY VISIT

Mr. Hayman conveyed to Mr. Vasev "the British Government's strong protest against the lawless and outrageous conduct of certain members of the staff of the Soviet Embassy in kidnapping Dr. Kachenko on the Bayswater Road and in obstructing the British authorities at London Airport when they were engaged in their legitimate duty".

The consequences of this behaviour by Soviet officials were being considered.

Last night Dr. Kachenko's wife went to the Russian Embassy.

At 11:30 on Saturday morning Dr. Kachenko was seen by several members of the public apparently being forced against his will into a car owned by the Russian Embassy. He called for help.

At the airport he said he wished to speak privately to the British authorities, and when they escorted him from the aircraft Soviet officials tried to stop him physically.

He told the British authorities that he did not wish to go to Moscow. He said he had been given an injection against his will at the Soviet Embassy. A medical examination by a British doctor later supported this.

Mr. Vasev's meeting at the Foreign Office lasted more than an hour. Afterwards he said: "I have received the British version of the incident. But I protested and asked for an immediate explanation."

POLICE CRITICIZED

Police action in boarding the aircraft, forcefully removing Dr. Kachenko, and isolating him from his wife and from the people who could help him and speak the same language was "a travesty of anything which any country should offer in the way of hospitality".

As translated by a Tass News Agency correspondent, a Russian Embassy statement last night said that Dr. Kachenko travelled from Cambridge with his wife during Friday night and went straight to the Embassy at 5 a.m. Told to come back later, he returned with her at 9 a.m. The statement said:—

He spoke to Embassy officials saying that he was very tired and was thinking of cutting short his time at Cambridge. His wife had come to see him at Cambridge on her annual leave, and he thought about going back to Moscow with her before her leave expired.

He said his programme at Birmingham University was finished and he saw no special reasons to continue staying here. He was told the Embassy would get in touch with the Academy of Sciences in Moscow and would let him know their decision.

But during the conversation at the Embassy he behaved rather strangely. For example, he suddenly asked someone to confirm that the woman was his wife. Everyone was astonished, and started asking his wife what it was all about. She said that lately her husband had been in some strange nervous condition. She did not know the reasons for this condition.

The only thing she knew was that he was taking some medicine for his nerves.

WIFE IN CHASE

While she was talking with the people at the Embassy, Kachenko left the Embassy after telling the man at the door that it was not the Soviet Embassy at all.

His wife and some Embassy people ran after him and caught up with him near Lancaster Gate. They offered to take him back to the Embassy and got into a car. He hesitated, and then agreed to get into the car.

The statement added:—

When they got back he kept saying it was not the Soviet Embassy and wanted someone to confirm that it was. The Chargé d'Affaires, Mr. Vasev came out. . . . Kachenko asked him to confirm that he was the Chargé d'Affaires and asked him to produce some document.

Eventually, he agreed to come inside the Embassy, where he was seen by the Embassy doctor and some people who knew him personally. Asked how he was feeling, he said that he was feeling very badly, but then he said he was feeling perfectly well.

It was decided he and his wife should leave London on an aircraft which was leaving that day—in about an hour. He agreed, but then said he had some difficulties about leaving keys of his flat in Cambridge, which he was supposed to return. Eventually he agreed that someone else should send them by post.

CALL TO AIRPORT

The Embassy agreed. They telephoned Aeroflot to keep the plane until they came. A representative of Aeroflot agreed, and they went off to the airport.

They passed through all the formalities and the plane was getting ready to leave the airport when the pilot received an order from the control tower to wait because of some technical reasons.

At this very moment, several cars drew up to the plane. In them were police and immigration officials. They entered the plane and one person, in civilian dress, who knew Kachenko, pointed him out. A police officer then demanded that Kachenko leave the plane in order to speak with representatives of the authorities.

According to the statement, Dr. Kachenko refused, but physical force was used against him, his wife, members of the Embassy and the pilots.

Then Dr. Kachenko was pulled off the aircraft. His wife was offered asylum, although she did not ask for it. She refused and returned from the airport to the Embassy.

[From the Daily Telegraph, Sept. 18, 1967]

SOVIET OFFICIALS FACE EXPULSION—BRITAIN CONDEMNS KIDNAP PLOT—DECISION TODAY ON RUSSIAN SCIENTIST

(By Walter Farr and David Loshak)

Britain is considering expelling Russian Embassy officials who tried to kidnap a young Russian physicist on Saturday. This was made clear last night after the Foreign Office sharply protested to the Soviet Chargé d'Affaires, Mr. Vladilleu Vasev, against the kidnapping attempt.

The Soviet Embassy countered with a statement attacking Britain for taking the physicist, Dr. Vladimir Tkachenko, from a Moscow-bound airliner. The Embassy put the blame for "the consequences of these anti-humanitarian actions" on the British authorities.

Mr. Vasev flew last night to Prestwick Airport where today he will see his Foreign Minister, Mr. Gromyko, who is en route to the United Nations. Meanwhile, Dr. Tkachenko has been driven, under Home Office protection to "a place of safety" in southern England where he is under medical supervision.

A Home Office spokesman said last night: All through the day Tkachenko has been recovering from the drugs administered by Soviet Embassy officials. He has been examined by doctors and by an eminent psychiatrist.

Their reports are being urgently forwarded to Ministers, who will consider them and, in the morning, make a decision about what should be done.

JOINT DECISION—TWO MINISTERS

The decision, he said, would be taken by "the Home Secretary in consultation with the Foreign Secretary."

Earlier at the Foreign Office, Mr. Peter Hayman, Assistant Under-Secretary, protested strongly at the "lawless and outrageous" conduct of Soviet Embassy Staff involved in the kidnapping attempt.

Mr. Vasev was told that Britain could not allow the staff of a foreign Embassy to take the law into their own hands. Dr. Tkachenko, it was pointed out, was entitled to the full protection of the police.

Mr. Hayman also protested against the obstructive tactics of the Russians at Heathrow airport after Dr. Tkachenko had been escorted aboard the plane.

WARNING TO VASEV—"CONSEQUENCES" CONSIDERED

Mr. Vasev, who had been summoned to the Foreign Office for the hour-long meeting, was told "that the consequences of this behaviour by Russian officials are being considered."

The question of whether Dr. Tkachenko will be given asylum in Britain will, it was stated, be decided when he is fully recovered from the effects of the injection. His wife flew to London a week ago to see him.

Dr. Tkachenko was seen in Bayswater Road, London, on Saturday, not far from the Russian Embassy, being dragged against his will by four men into an Embassy car, while he shouted for the police. He was traced to Heathrow where he was seen being escorted aboard a Moscow-bound plane.

TUG OF WAR—TUSSELE ABOARD PLANE

Immigration officials boarded the plane, which was not allowed to leave until Dr. Tkachenko had been taken off. A tug-of-war between British and Russian officials developed on the steps to the plane.

Dr. Tkachenko confirmed to the British authorities that he did not wish to go to Moscow in the plane. He said that "after being kidnapped in the Bayswater Road he had been taken to the Soviet Embassy and was there given an injection against his will."

His general manner confirmed that he was under the influence of some drug. Subsequent medical examination by a British doctor showed that an injection had indeed been given and the physical evidence "indicated the use of a drug."

It was emphasized in Whitehall that although expulsions are being considered it is not intended that the incident should be allowed to cast a shadow over Anglo-Soviet relations as a whole.

Mr. Brown, the Foreign Secretary, is expected to meet Mr. Gromyko, the Soviet Foreign Minister, at the United Nations this week.

As a result of information about the kidnapping in the Bayswater Road, the Chief Immigration Officer at Heathrow, accompanied by police officers, boarded the Soviet Aeroflot plane on which Dr. Tkachenko was about to leave for Moscow on Saturday.

Dr. Tkachenko said when they entered the plane that he wished to speak to the British authorities privately. The Soviet Consul, who had joined the aircraft at the same time as the British authorities, attempted to prevent a conversation and said that the British authorities had no right to respond to Dr. Tkachenko's request.

The Consul said Dr. Tkachenko was not to be allowed to leave the plane.

When after prolonged attempts to resolve the matter by discussion had failed, and Dr. Tkachenko was being escorted from the aircraft, Soviet officials tried to obstruct this physically.

After leaving the plane, in the presence of the Soviet Consul and Mrs. Tkachenko, Dr. Tkachenko repeated his request to see the British authorities alone.

After leaving the Foreign Office, Mr. Vasev said Dr. Tkachenko was a very ill man.

"He was not drugged. I must most emphatically deny this."

"The kind of illness he had was mental, which needs isolation and requires him to be with people most close to him, his wife and parents. Certainly treatment in these cases is better in Russia than in a foreign country."

WIFE LEFT PLANE—WHEREABOUTS UNKNOWN

Mr. Vasev added that Dr. Tkachenko was to have been taken to Russia by his wife. Mrs. Tkachenko left the aircraft on Saturday with her husband but her whereabouts are not now known. She is regarded as a free agent by British authorities.

Dr. Tkachenko would probably have returned to Britain.

"The police action in boarding the plane, forcefully removing him, isolating him from his wife and from the people who could help him and speak the same language, under his very medical condition, is, of course, a travesty of anything which any country should offer in ways of hospitality."

BIRMINGHAM STUDIES—DUE HOME NEXT MONTH

Dr. Vladimir Tkachenko, who is about 25, had been at Birmingham University since January, doing post-graduate work in low-temperature physics, using helium gas. He was not due to return to Russia until next month.

He came to Britain under a science student exchange scheme, administered by Royal Society, which was set up by the current Anglo-Russian cultural agreement. He was one of four scientific research workers exchanged in the last academic year.

He was regarded as a highly able student but was not engaged on any secret work. Prof. P. B. Moon, head of Birmingham University's Department of Physics, said yesterday that he was "a very good physicist indeed, good enough for the Russians to want him back."

He is understood to have worked in close and friendly cooperation with British scientists on the highly-specialized problems of low-temperature physics.

Dr. Tkachenko was due in Cambridge in the next few days to work in the Cavendish laboratories. He should have been staying in the Kapitza Hostel, which is leased to Churchill College by the Soviet Academy of Sciences.

Last night Lady Cockcroft, wife of the Master of Churchill College, Sir John Cockcroft, said: that Dr. Tkachenko had visited Cambridge twice. "He was due here shortly and he had been offered the hospitality of the college. He was going to read papers in the Cavendish."

MOSCOW CONFERENCE CALLED

(By John Miller)

Moscow, Sunday.—Russia's Foreign Ministry officials were summoned to a conference in Moscow today to discuss the unsuccessful attempt in London to kidnap Dr. Vladimir Tkachenko.

It was understood that the Russians were not planning to wreck the whole range of Anglo-Soviet cultural exchanges for the sake of Dr. Tkachenko. But the student exchange scheme, which was broadened after talks in London this year, could be jeopardized.

A British spokesman said that 45 British students had arrived in Moscow last week to study at Russian universities.

The Russian embassy's statement that Dr. Tkachenko was suffering from "mental" illness indicated that it believed he was planning to defect. This is a traditional Russian way of explaining a citizen's intention to defect.

The aircraft from which Tkachenko was taken arrived last night at Moscow's International Airport some four hours late.

"OBVIOUSLY DRUGGED"—BRITONS' ACCOUNT

Three British businessmen who travelled to Moscow in the plane said Dr. Tkachenko was "obviously drugged" when dragged aboard the plane an hour after the plane was due to take off.

"He looked like a doped seaman," one said.

"He was obviously drugged," said another. "It stuck out like a sore thumb. He was semi-conscious with his head lolling from side to side. He didn't know where the hell he was."

Another businessman took up the account. He said: "The plane's engines started. But nothing happened and eventually they stopped."

"Two British officials, followed later by a uniformed policeman, boarded the plane."

"We want to talk to this gentleman privately," the businessman quoted the immigration official as saying. "If you can clear the plane, we will talk to him on the plane."

"The lad leapt up, trying to get off the plane. The senior Russian official pushed him back into his seat and said they would not clear the plane."

TALK WITH ENVOY—RUSSIANS ADAMANT

"Then the Russian officials asked to talk to the Russian Ambassador in London. Two Russian officials went to the telephone, returned and remained adamant."

The businessman quoted the immigration official as saying:

"This plane will not leave until we get him off."

"But this is a Russian airplane," the Soviet official reportedly said.

"And this is a British airport," the immigration official replied.

"What if we refuse to obey?" the Russian reportedly asked.

"We will enforce this with violence if necessary," the British official said.

The Russians scoffed at this and pointed out that if there was violence, it would go badly for the British as 80 per cent of the passengers were Russian and 20 per cent were British.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

CONSTRUCTION OF ANTIBALLISTIC MISSILE SYSTEM

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, like many of my colleagues who for several years have urged the construction of an antiballistic missile system for defense of the United States, I welcome yesterday's announcement by the Secretary of Defense that construction of such a system would begin this year.

This represents the first peek of the administration from behind the blinders that they have been wearing. I hope that some day soon Secretary McNamara will take off his blinders and take a good hard look at what is happening in the Soviet Union.

This commitment to proceed is a positive step forward and it is a welcome change from the previous policy of the administration. However, I wish to point out that the program which the Secretary of Defense described is not all that should be done or could be done.

Most of the people do not understand the problems involved in trying to avert a nuclear war. They assume that America is strong enough to deter any country from making that kind of attack, but the development of the nuclear bomb in Communist China and the deployment of the Soviet ABM system means that we will have to do far more than has been planned to protect the American people against a surprise attack.

In this regard I take issue with one of the basic principles of the announced U.S. ABM deployment. It is, according to Secretary McNamara, a "thin" missile defense system that is "Chinese-oriented," and not the more extensive Soviet-oriented system that has been supported by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. In my opinion the real threat still remains with the Soviet Union. Further, the system proposed yesterday by Secretary McNamara is almost "too little

and too late." It will protect some of our missile sites, but it will not protect the American people. Instead of defending against the more serious threat it defends against a lesser danger.

The reason for this unexpected attention of the administration to the threat of a Chinese missile attack was explained by Vice President HUMPHREY last night.

In a televised statement that appeared on the Huntley-Brinkley program, the Vice President said he firmly believed that a portion of the Soviet ABM system was constructed for defense against Communist China. He added that China was a reckless potential nuclear power, and a threat to both the Soviet Union and the United States.

That may be true, but it is a known fact that the major part of the Soviet ABM defense cuts across the "threat corridor" of land-based missiles launched from the United States over the North Pole or from Polaris submarines in the North Atlantic. This fact was discussed in depth in an article by Richard J. Whalen, entitled "The Shifting Equation of Nuclear Defense," which appeared in the June 1967 issue of *Fortune*. He stated that the Soviet ABM installations at Moscow and the several hundred mile installation known as the Tallin Line face the northwest.

Whalen said:

It is the unanimous judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that the Tallin Line is an anti-missile system.

We have, therefore, creditable evidence that the Soviet Union has already deployed a U.S.-oriented ABM defense. In the face of this information, I fail to see how the administration can take the position that we do not now need a Soviet-oriented ABM defense of our own. How can the Vice President say, as he did last night:

We are also seeking to work with the Soviet Union on a basis of responsibility and respect for their power and they for ours by saying, "Look, why waste billions and billions and billions of dollars in a contest over an anti-ballistic missile system which cannot guarantee you with the protection that it seems to on first glance.

There is no doubt that Soviet missiles are aimed at our cities. The Washington Post issue of September 3, 1967, carried a report from Moscow in which Soviet Marshal Nikolai Krylov warned the United States of this fact. The Soviet missile chief said that populated administrative centers were considered targets equally as valid as military installations and industrial objects.

With this clear warning, with the best military judgment of the opinion that the Soviet Union is not only closing the offensive missile race, but also ahead of us in deploying the ABM, I believe that the Secretary of Defense and the Johnson administration are the victims of fallacious reasoning. As early as April 1963, I warned the Senate that Russia had an operational ABM system, and I urged immediate construction of an ABM system for our defense. The problem has not gone away. It cannot be rationalized out of existence.

While I am pleased to see a change of

heart in the administration's stand on this vital issue of missile defense, the proposed system is not enough. I will continue my fight to make the administration take its head out of the sand and give the country the ABM defense that it deserves.

VISIT TO VIETNAM BY HARRY ASHMORE AND WILLIAM BAGGS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I think it is most unfortunate that a public dispute has arisen, growing out of the visit made by Mr. Harry Ashmore and Mr. Williams Baggs to Hanoi. In my opinion, the Department of State, true to its statements, attempted to explore every means of bringing the South Vietnam dispute to the negotiating table. It went out of its way in collaborating with Mr. Ashmore and Mr. Baggs in the hope that they would be able to produce advances toward bringing an end to the South Vietnam war. It should, however, be remembered that while the State Department and the present administration attempted to utilize the services of these two men, it would have been completely wrong to abdicate to them the performance of the principal responsibility, which lay with the President and the Secretary of State.

These two men expected, obviously, by what has recently been said, that the President should have gone into the background and allowed them to be the negotiators of peace, which all our citizens and public officials are praying for. They arrogated to themselves a power and an efficiency which are completely unjustified. They derogated, by the statement which was recently made, the duty and the responsibility of the President.

If any mistake was made by the administration, it was in giving to these two men a credit completely beyond that to which they were entitled.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement issued by the Department of State be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
SEPTEMBER 18, 1967

We have had a number of inquiries concerning news stories published today, based on an article by Mr. Harry Ashmore in a publication of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions (CSDI).

The facts concerning the Department's contacts with Messrs. Ashmore and Baggs are as follows:

1. During the summer of 1966, Mr. William Baggs told the Department that CDSI was planning a major conference in May of 1967 in Geneva, to follow up on the first *Pacem In Terris* meeting held in New York in February of 1965. Mr. Baggs disclosed to us efforts that the Center was making to invite North Viet-Nam to attend, and the Department responded sympathetically to the idea of the Conference and to these efforts. These initial contacts were with Mr. George Ball and Mr. William Bundy. The President and Secretary Rusk were informed, and Mr. Ball was directed to handle contacts with Mr. Baggs on behalf of the United States Government.

2. In mid-November and again in early December, Mr. Baggs was joined by Mr. Ash-

more in calls at the Department. In these calls, the progress of the conference plans was reviewed, and the two visitors indicated that they had a tentative invitation to go to Hanoi, with Mr. Luis Quintanilla of Mexico. Messrs. Baggs and Ashmore also suggested that, if they were able to visit Hanoi, they might be able to conduct useful explorations of North Vietnamese views towards peace. Mr. George Ball having then left the Department, the primary responsibility for these conversations passed to his successor, Mr. Katzenbach, who kept the President and the Secretary of State informed as a matter of course.

In these conversations, Department representatives accepted the Baggs/Ashmore suggestion and undertook to cooperate fully. Accordingly, the position of the United States Government on key issues relating to peace was discussed at some length, so that Baggs and Ashmore could represent it accurately in Hanoi.

3. On December 23, Baggs visited the Department just prior to the departure of the three-man group on December 28. At that meeting, the basic understanding of the United States Government position was reaffirmed, and it was further agreed that Baggs and Ashmore would report confidentially what they were able to pick up in Hanoi.

4. Messrs. Baggs and Ashmore visited Hanoi from January 6 to January 14. They then returned to the US and on January 18 dictated for the Department a full and confidential account of their conversations. This covered in particular a conversation with President Ho on January 12. In this conversation, Ho had insisted that there could be no talks between the US and Hanoi unless the bombing were stopped, and unless also the US stopped all reinforcements during the period of the talks. Ho was reported to be adamant against any reciprocal military restraint by North Vietnam. The record does not show that he solicited any USG response to these remarks.

5. Concurrently, prior to January 18, on US initiative and without any connection to the Baggs/Ashmore actions, US Government representatives had established a direct channel for communication with North Vietnamese representatives in Moscow. With the apparent agreement of both sides, this channel was being kept wholly confidential, and was therefore not revealed to Messrs. Baggs and Ashmore in their discussions at the Department. It is, of course, fundamental to the USG dealing with Messrs. Baggs and Ashmore that there existed at the time this direct and secret channel. Exchanges through this direct channel continued through January and early February and culminated in President Johnson's letter to President Ho of February 8 (mistakenly stated by Mr. Ashmore as February 2). As has been stated by representatives of the Department, a wide variety of proposals was put before Hanoi in these Moscow contacts, without at any time producing any useful response.

6. Toward the end of January, Messrs. Baggs and Ashmore returned to Washington and expressed to the Department the strong hope that they could be given a message for transmission to Hanoi. The Department decided that, while the direct channel in Moscow was crucial and must at all costs be preserved, it would be useful to send a more general message through Messrs. Baggs and Ashmore, which would be consistent with the important messages being exchanged in Moscow. In view of this channel (of which Baggs-Ashmore were unaware) there was some question as to the further utility of detailed informal communications. It seemed clear from the account given by Messrs. Baggs and Ashmore that their channel of communication had been established with the primary purpose of exchanges concerning North Vietnamese attendance at the

May conference. Nevertheless, Baggs and Ashmore said they could send any messages for Hanoi through the regular mail to a North Vietnamese representative in Phnom Penh, who in turn would relay it to a North Vietnamese official who had been the principal contact of Messrs. Baggs and Ashmore in Hanoi. Accordingly, the letter now published by Mr. Ashmore was worked out with the representatives of the Department, and authorized to be sent on February 5. We were subsequently informed by Mr. Ashmore that this letter reached Phnom Penh on February 15.

7. No useful purpose could be served by giving further details on what took place in the Moscow channel. We can say, however, that on February 7, while that channel was still open and in operation, separate discussions were initiated in London between Prime Minister Wilson and Premier Kosygin of the USSR. The combined reading of the Moscow channel and of these discussions led to the dispatch on February 8 of President Johnson's letter to President Ho. This letter was of course published unilaterally by Hanoi on March 21, and is a matter of public record. It rested on, and was of course read by Hanoi in relation to, the various proposals that had been conveyed in the Moscow channel. There was no change of basic position whatever between February 5 and February 8, but President Johnson's letter did include a specific action proposal that speaks for itself, as does the tone of his communication.

8. As already noted, Hanoi had not responded in any useful way to the variety of suggestions conveyed in the Moscow channel. Its sole and apparently final response was reflected on February 13, in a letter by President Ho to Pope Paul VI. This letter, in the words of one press account today, "coupled an unconditional end to the bombing with the withdrawal of American forces and the recognition of the National Liberation Front." On February 15, President Ho replied formally to the President in similar terms. At the same time, Hanoi broke off the Moscow channel.

9. Hanoi's attitude remained negative throughout. The Baggs/Ashmore efforts were necessarily handled by the Department with an eye to the direct and then-confidential channel that existed concurrently to Hanoi. The latter appeared to be by far the more reliable and secure method of ascertaining Hanoi's views.

10. Finally, we note with regret that Mr. Ashmore is apparently ignorant of the subsequently published report of the Moscow contacts, and of their confirmation by Department representatives. We note with still greater regret that at no time since has he consulted with the Department in order to attempt to understand the interrelationship that necessarily obtained between the Moscow channel and his own efforts. As this case shows, the Administration has been prepared at all times to cooperate with private individuals who may be in contact with Hanoi in any way, and who are prepared to act responsibly and discreetly. This policy continues, although it seems clear that the present disclosure will not reassure Hanoi that such private contacts will be kept secret.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McIntyre in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENTS TO 12TH MEETING OF CONSULTATION OF MINISTERS OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS, ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to announce the appointment of Senators WAYNE MORSE and BOURKE HICKENLOOPER as representatives to the 12th Meeting of Consultation of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Member Nations of the Organization of American States to be held in Washington, D.C., September 22 through September 24, 1967.

ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 20, 1967, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 19 (legislative day of September 18), 1967:

INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

Glenn T. Seaborg, of California, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the 11th session of the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

The following-named persons to be alternate representatives of the United States of America to the 11th session of the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency:

Verne B. Lewis, of Maryland.
Herman Pollack, of Maryland.
James T. Ramey, of Illinois.
Henry DeWolf Smyth, of New Jersey.
Gerald F. Tape, of Maryland.

IN THE NAVY

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Rear Adm. Noel A. M. Gayler, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Myron K. Guiler, pastor of the Marietta Bible Center Church, Marietta, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

Proverbs 14: 34: *Righteousness exalteth a nation; but sin is a reproach to any people.*

Eternal God, we approach Thy throne of grace through the person and upon the merits of our Lord Jesus Christ. Our hearts are grateful that Thou hast extended to us this privilege of making our requests known unto Thee.

In these days of struggle with the adversary may our President, our Speaker, and the Members of Congress be

granted wisdom and be sustained by a living faith which will enable them to carry on in confidence.

May Thy wisdom cause us to recognize what Thou hast done for us in the past, may there be thanksgiving for the present, and may it prompt us to walk in Thy precepts as we face the future.

We pray in the name of our Redeemer, the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

SOUTHEAST ASIA TRIP

Mr. McCARTHY. 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. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I returned to Washington late last week following at 2-week tour of Southeast Asia.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] and I went first to Vietnam to observe the September 3 elections, and subsequently visited Thailand, Laos, Hong Kong, and Japan.

Representative WOLFF continued on to the Philippines and to Taiwan while I returned here. When he returns, we will make a full report to the House.

But in the interim—in the thought that some Members would be interested—I will insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD over the next several days a series of nine articles on our trip I cabled home to the Buffalo Evening News.

DETROIT POLICE DEPARTMENT HAS TO DEAL THROUGH NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION

Mr. JACOBS. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, it was reported this morning that since the Detroit Police Department is not allowed to fill its needs by obtaining certain surplus Defense Department equipment, the police are getting it from a higher authority with which the Defense Department can deal—the National Rifle Association. Make your own jokes.

SUPPORT OUR COMMANDER IN CHIEF AND THE MEN IN VIETNAM

Mr. DORN. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.