

## SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 31, 1967

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, pastor, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord and Father of mankind, give us open minds this day to receive Thy guidance. Enlighten dark paths that are before us. Reveal Thy will in the knowledge of new light for this day. Give us the courage to change our minds when that is needed. Make us tolerant of others, for we never know in what voice we may hear Thy voice.

Be with those who suffer and die today because of the evil of war. Keep our ears open, dear Lord, to the clear voice of peace for all men. We pray in the name of Jesus, the Prince of Peace. Amen.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of John Harold Fanning, of Pawtucket, R.I., to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 10915) to amend section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

## HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 10915) to amend section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

## THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, October 30, 1967, be dispensed with.

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

## LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in

relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

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

## ORDERS FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATORS HARRIS AND CARLSON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] be allowed 30 minutes today, at the conclusion of the transaction of morning business, to engage in colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] on the subject of social security.

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

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

## U.S.-ADMINISTERED TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, three recent articles in the Nation's press serve as a timely reminder that all is not well in the U.S.-administered Trust Territory of the Pacific.

Frank McCulloch, with an article in Time magazine, and Robert Trumbull, with two in the New York Times, have painted an accurate picture of the needs of nearly 100,000 people who are dependent upon the largesse of the United States for their well-being. It is a depressing picture—not only for the outward conditions which meet the eye, but also for the history of neglect which reflects harshly on this great Nation.

The authors are two of the most respected reporters in the Pacific area. They tell the story of certain islanders who talk with nostalgia of Japanese rule. They tell of the inhabitants of the islands of Bikini and Eniwetok who were uprooted by our atomic testing program and now live with hunger on tiny islets which cannot support them. They tell of roads which tear vehicles to pieces, and of ship transportation so sporadic that traveling dentists have only time to pull a few teeth before their commercial vessel is loaded and moves on.

It is true that gains have been made, Mr. President. Large numbers of Peace Corpsmen have been introduced. The islands have been given new leadership. There are stirrings of economic activity in the field of tourism. But the basic problems of education, health, transportation, and jobs remain. And they will remain until Congress sees fit to provide the money to do the job.

The administration has requested substantial sums for the development of Micronesia, and the Interior Committees of both Houses of Congress have authorized an adequate program. However, Congress refuses to appropriate the nec-

essary amounts. It is my earnest hope that the administration will include in the supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal 1967 those funds which will be sufficient to do the job and that Congress will treat any such request sympathetically.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following articles be inserted at this point in the RECORD: "Micronesia," by Frank McCulloch, from the November 3 issue of Time magazine; "Micronesia: 2,141 Islands Forgotten by United States," and "Pacific Islanders Often Go Hungry," by Robert Trumbull, from the October 30 and 31 issues of the New York Times.

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

[From Time magazine, Nov. 3, 1967]

## MICRONESIA

## A SPRAWLING TRUST

Micronesia's 2,141 islands are so widely dispersed over 3,000,000 sq. mi. of cobalt-blue Pacific that Magellan sailed through their very midst without sighting a single one. In their glittering lagoons and rain-forested redoubts, the Japanese positioned their power to control all the Pacific in World War II—and the U.S. fight to thwart them made a litany and legacy forever of such unlikely flecks on the map as Kwajalein, Eniwetok, Saipan, Tinian and Peleliu. The *Enola Gay* roared off from Tinian to drop the A-bomb on Hiroshima; years later the shock waves of the world's first H-bomb tests rolled out from Micronesia, denuding the little atolls of Bikini and Eniwetok. Today, Nike X anti-ballistic missiles zoom up from Kwajalein in test interceptions, and Atlas and Titan missiles from California end their long trial runs with gigantic splashes in the Kwajalein lagoon.

## HARSH BUT EFFECTIVE

Almost unnoticed in the vitriolic debate over the Viet Nam war and the U.S. presence on the Asian mainland is the U.S. responsibility for these sprawling islands. Their 95,000 inhabitants range from the brainy and enterprising Palauans of the Carolines chain to the grass-skirted inhabitants of Yap. After the U.S. took over the islands in a military caretakership of the spoils of war, the United Nations in 1947 bequeathed them to the U.S. as a trust territory. Ever since then, the U.S. has been a benign, if a bit abstracted presence in the vital geopolitical center of the Western Pacific. It is not a duty that the U.S. has performed with any notable enthusiasm, particularly in contrast with Micronesia's previous rulers, the Japanese.

Japan took over Micronesia from Germany after World War I and immediately set about seriously developing and colonizing the islands. Japanese methods were often harsh, but they were vigorous and effective. Koror became a miniature Miami Beach for winter-weary Japanese, a sophisticated city of 30,000 replete with fine restaurants, geisha houses and Shinto shrines. Trading vessels from Japan were soon exporting great quantities of fish, pineapple, sugar and pearls from the islands. The Japanese paved roads, built hospitals and ports and laid down a rudimentary infrastructure for economic growth.

## LESS THAN THE NAVAJOS

Today, with few exceptions, Micronesia looks—and is—a poorer place than in the heyday of the Japanese, reports Time Correspondent Frank McCulloch after a five week tour of the islands. Occupying U.S. forces leveled much of what the Japanese built that was still intact after the war. Even what survived was seldom maintained,

such as the once excellent water system on the island of Dublon, in Truk lagoon, now rusting in disuse, or the jungle-swallowed road on Badelthup that once enabled outlying copra farmers and fishermen to bring their goods to market.

Micronesia's plight is not the result of malice or considered U.S. policy but of the islands' place far down on any list of Washington priorities. Supplies ordered through the Department of the Interior can take as long as 16 months to reach the islands, and money for Micronesia is hard to come by. This year Washington has budgeted \$14 million for the vast territory, a sum that disgruntled local U.S. officials like to point out is only a fifth of that targeted for a single Navajo reservation in the U.S. The Micronesians' copra and fishing trade hardly enables them to do much to help themselves: the entire trust territory has a gross national product of about \$12 million.

But the U.S. performance is not altogether bad, and in some areas is looking up sharply. Four short years ago, for example, there was only a single public high school in all Micronesia; today there are eight. In addition, 325 new elementary classrooms have been built, so that some 20,000 Micronesian children are receiving U.S.-sponsored education; another 5,500 are in missionary schools operated by U.S. Catholics and Protestants. Many of the schools are manned by the 600 Peace Corpsmen who work throughout the islands—a massive invasion in per capita terms that was ordered by President Johnson in 1966.

#### ROLLER SKATING

The missionaries, mainly Jesuit, are among the most effective Americans in Micronesia. "If you want to get 50¢ out of every dollar, let the government do it," says one U.S. trust-territory officer. "If you want to wring \$1.10 out of every dollar, let the missionaries do it." Best known of the missionaries is Father Hugh F. Costigan, who runs the Jesuits' Ponape Agricultural and Trade School, training 160 Micronesians at a time in such basic skills as mechanics, construction and animal husbandry. Another hard-driving missionary is the Rev. Edmund Kalau, a Lutheran and onetime Luftwaffe pilot (now a U.S. citizen), who is building a youth center in his home base of Colonia featuring hobby shops, an art studio, handball and tennis courts and Micronesia's first roller-skating rink.

In his own free-enterprising fashion, Kenneth T. Jones, a big affable North Carolinian who came to the Pacific as a Seabee during the war, is as effective as the missionaries. Jones stayed on in the U.S. possession of Guam, amassed a \$10 million fortune in supermarkets, department stores, motels, hotels, a construction company and ranching—and is increasingly spreading out into the nearby trust territories. Next week on Saipan he will open Micronesia's first modern hotel, the Royal Taga. Already booked for months in advance, the Taga is certain to bring tourists and money to Saipan; Jones is offering native Micronesians a cut in the profits through \$10 shares of stock in the hotel. But his largest investment in Micronesia's future has been carved out of the jungle on Tinian; a cattle ranch of a planned 7,500 acres, 12,000 head of cattle and an equal number of hogs and chickens.

Perhaps the largest official legacy the U.S. is creating for the Micronesians is the fostering of a slow but steady growth of Micronesian political consciousness. At municipal, district and territory-wide levels, the Micronesians have been taught to elect their own officials and legislative bodies, and to begin to establish the appurtenances of self-rule. So far they are only appurtenances, since the word of U.S. High Commissioner William R. Norwood—and ultimately of the U.S. Congress—remains final law.

Last August, at President Johnson's re-

quest, Congress shaped a resolution, now under consideration, that would grant the Micronesians a vote on their future by 1972. Few seem interested in complete independence from the U.S., but the debate leading up to such a vote might well have the beneficial effect of placing Micronesia a little higher on the list of U.S. priorities and increasing its share of U.S. aid and know-how. As World War II demonstrated, Micronesia, the Pacific's heartland, is far too important a part of the world to let fall by default into malevolent hands.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 30, 1967]  
MICRONESIA: 2,141 ISLANDS FORGOTTEN BY THE UNITED STATES

(By Robert Trumbull)

SAIPAN, MARIANAS ISLANDS.—Leaders among the more than 90,000 Micronesians under United States rule are demonstrating growing disenchantment with the American administration of the United Nations trusteeship.

Peace Corps workers and other Americans—officials as well as visitors—also voice concern at the conditions they find in the great belt of islands in the mid-Pacific.

"Volunteers fresh out of school arrive out here believing in the American dream of the good life and are shocked to find that the dream is far from reality in the Trust Territory," said James Schmitt of Aurora, Ind., director of the Peace Corps in the Palau district of the Western Caroline Islands.

Many in the islands have also expressed fears that stringent economies ordered by President Johnson in all Federal Departments are jeopardizing long-awaited improvement projects and may dissipate the more hopeful atmosphere induced by the appearance of a new High Commissioner, William R. Norwood of Honolulu, and the infusion of hundreds of eager young Peace Corps volunteers.

President Johnson has also urged that a plebiscite be held by 1972 to determine the island's future, and he is supporting legislation to establish a preparatory commission, the Congress of Micronesia. A legislature with limited powers has set up its own study group in the question despite a widespread conviction among islanders that 1972 is far too early for a vote on whether to be associated with the United States or to be independent.

Americans and Micronesians, interviewed in a month-long tour of 4,000 miles to more than two dozen islands in all six administrative districts of the far-flung Trust Territory, believe that there has been too little concern in the United States for an area considered vital to national security.

Older Micronesians compare the United States administration unfavorably with the pre-war Japanese rule. "This is not the American Government that I observed and studied in the United States," said Amata Kabua, the political leader of the Marshall Islands. He was educated in Hawaii and is a member of the Congress of Micronesia.

Micronesia means "small islands." There are 2,141 of them, flecks of green in an azure sea, in a broad belt about 2,400 miles from east to west and more than 1,000 miles northward from the Equator.

Dotting an ocean expanse as big as the continental United States, they add up to only 700 square miles of land, about half the area of Rhode Island. Only 96 are inhabited permanently.

#### MOST ISLES ARE ATOLLS

Some, like nearly all the Marshall Islands, are typical atolls: flat, sandy outcroppings, covered with palm trees, atop a ring of coral where a volcanic crater, it is believed, has sunk beneath the sea. On most of them, a boy standing on the beach with a baseball bat could hit a fly ball to the opposite shore.

In contrast, the high islands of the Mari-

anas and the Caroline archipelagoes rise a thousand feet or more in volcanic peaks cloaked with dense rain forests.

The islands have been held in turn by Spain, Germany, Japan and the United States. Much of the area was a scene of crucial action in the Pacific phase of World War II.

#### USED FOR ATOM TESTS

In 1947, at the request of the United States, the United Nations designated Micronesia a strategic trusteeship, the only one in the world.

This means that the administering power is entitled to use the islands for military purposes. The United States has exercised the right with nuclear tests at Bikini and current antimissile operations at Kwajalein, both atolls in the Marshall Islands.

The Central Intelligence Agency used part of Saipan Island from 1953 to 1962 to train Chinese Nationalist guerrillas. The well-built administrative and housing structures, on a secluded height now called Capitol Hill, became Trust Territory headquarters when the agency departed.

In contrast, the district administrative centers, at Saipan for the Marianas, Koror and Yap for the Western Carolines, Truk and Ponape for the Eastern Carolines and Majuro for the Marshall Islands, present depressing vistas of rusting Quonset huts and other dilapidated buildings of corrugated metal, abandoned by the armed forces as they left the scene many years ago.

"The most beautiful scrap heap in the world," said Michael Malm of Rochester, N.Y., an official recently arrived at Koror, in describing his initial reaction to the ramshackle tin towns that disfigure some of the most spectacular island landscape on earth.

American officials acknowledge that another major blotch on the record is the lack of roads, attributed to budget limitations.

"With few exceptions," said Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, whose department is responsible for the islands, "roads in the Trust Territory are generally deplorable, yet our essential programs of education, health and economic development are clearly dependent upon an adequate road system."

Engineers in the Trust Territory have estimated that the cost of resurfacing major roads would be recouped every four years in the saving on vehicle maintenance and replacement.

#### SEA TRANSPORT SPARSE

In the Yap Islands, usually described as primitive because most villagers prefer their traditional loin cloths or grass skirts to western garb, the rural roads are among the best in the Trust Territory, because the Yapese maintain them themselves with equipment borrowed from the Government.

Sea transportation, in islands dependent upon ships, is so sparse that the Congress of Micronesia petitioned the Government this year to invite a Japanese line to serve the area.

Movements of private commercial ships that run errands for the Trust Territory Government, in return for a subsidy, are heavily influenced by the hard economic necessity of loading and unloading as quickly as possible in island ports. Health services are at the mercy of schedules for loading copra, the dried coconut meat—used in making soap that is Micronesia's principal export.

"The dentists who serve the islands from ships have time only for extractions," said Robert Law, assistant district administrator of the Marshall Islands and a retired naval officer. "Many teeth could have been saved if there had been more time."

Pending a new airline contract now under negotiation, plane travel in the Trust Territory is limited to two DC-4 propeller-driven planes of World War II vintage and two SA-16 Albatross amphibians. The SA-16's are kept in service because only a few of the

islands have usable landing strips. Under the Japanese, the area was dotted with military air bases. These have been allowed to revert to jungle.

A German Protestant missionary who was once a pilot in the Luftwaffe plans to institute what may become an airborne medical service.

The Rev. Edmund Kalau, pastor of the Lutheran mission at Yap, is awaiting the delivery of a six-passenger Cessna with a 1,300-mile range that can land and take off on short airstrips. He plans to use it for medical work in the isolated outer islands of the Yap district.

Such private efforts are helpful, but the main problem is money.

Congress had never appropriated more than about \$6-million a year until the Kennedy Administration in 1961 authorized \$17.5-million. Under President Johnson the figure was increased to \$35-million.

But Congress has never appropriated the authorized amount, nor has it funded an Administration program for spending \$172-million on capital improvements—roads and other permanent construction—over a five-year period that was to start this year.

The appropriation for the current fiscal year was held to \$23.1-million, and President Johnson's freeze order on new construction and hiring in all Federal departments has affected about \$8-million of the total budget—"an absolute disaster for planning," said Deputy High Commissioner Martin Mangan.

#### PEACE CORPS RAISES HOPE

Among the projects listed for postponement under the austerity program are a territorial vocational school. The lack of the school has been criticized by United Nations inspectors and others as a glaring omission in preparing the Micronesians to be more self-reliant.

Other programs presumably delayed are two new hospitals to replace the substandard makeshift institutions at district centers on Ponape Island and Moen Island, Truk.

New power plants and other machinery to replace hand-me-down equipment, in many cases discarded by the military as worn out, may remain unordered.

But the year-old work of the Peace Corps, now 550 strong and soon to reach 700, has brought new hope to the islanders.

"The United States had done nothing on this island before the Peace Corps came," said the head man of Udot Island.

Volunteers are serving on nearly all the permanently inhabited islands, mostly living with—and like—Micronesians.

"They are the only Americans who eat in native restaurants," a touring anthropologist from Seattle said admiringly.

They are also the only Americans who can converse in any of the nine major languages spoken in Micronesia, with the exception of some missionaries and a few dedicated Trust Territory officials, such as Robert Halvorsen, the District Administrator at Ponape, who came to the islands 22 years ago as a naval officer and stayed.

Peace Corps volunteers are involved in virtually every aspect of Micronesian life.

Tom Brunt, a fledgling architect from Philadelphia, has nearly completed a coral-block school complex on Wonei Island, Truk, that is becoming known as the only American building project using local materials in an imaginative way suited to the tropical surroundings.

Donald T. Bliss Jr., who plans to join a Manhattan law firm when his Peace Corps term is up, remarked that "New York will be anticlimatic" after two years of tutoring Micronesian lawyers of Ponape in the application of a Trust Territory legal code.

A couple of miles from the tin-roofed courthouse where the young lawyer works, Mike Ezzell of Austin, Tex., was coaching a volleyball team while his wife, Peggy, taught

children from Kapingamarangi, a Polynesian island with a different language, how to speak Ponapean.

#### PERFORM DOUBLE DUTY

The largest number of Peace Corps volunteers are English language instructors, but they are found working also as nurses, X-ray technicians, civil engineers, radio operators, surveyors, recreation directors, business specialists and in community development activities of all kinds.

Peace Corpsmen who came to the Trust Territory from stations in newly independent countries of Africa and Asia were astonished to find the Micronesians almost totally lacking in the fervent nationalism seen in other peoples brought under colonialism.

We will be ready for a plebiscite on our future status only after the islands have become more developed," said Thomas Remengesau, the Assistant District Administrator in Koror, capital of his native Palau Islands.

"We should remain a trust territory until all six districts decide on a common destiny, which may take 10 or more years," said Petrus Mallo, a hereditary chief and leading politician and businessman of Truk.

Francis Nuuan, who represents his native Yap in the Micronesian Senate, laughed when asked about the general reaction to President Johnson's proposal for a plebiscite by 1972.

"Only the few Micronesians who can read English are even aware of such things," he said.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 31, 1967]  
PACIFIC ISLANDERS OFTEN GO HUNGRY—NATIVES, SHIFTED BY UNITED STATES FOR ATOM TESTS, ON TINY ISLETS

(By Robert Trumbull)

MAJURO, MARSHALL ISLANDS.—Many of the natives of Eniwetok and Bikini, evacuated from their homes for the United States atomic tests two decades ago, are now going hungry for weeks at a time.

Their plight is confirmed by American officials here in Majuro, the administrative center of the Marshall Islands in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, a United Nations trusteeship under United States administration.

"Yes, we are often hungry," Naptali, a native of Eniwetok, said in an interview here. A Government construction worker, he lives with his wife and child in a one-room beach shack made of corrugated metal sheeting.

Nearly 300 people of Eniwetok now dwell on the atoll of Ujelang, which has 32 islets with a total land area of about a third of a square mile, not large enough to feed them.

Eniwetok, the atoll from which they were evicted, has 40 islets with a total area of 2.26 square miles. More important, to people who use coral reefs as marine gardens to produce food, the Ujelang lagoon is only about one-sixteenth the size of the 388-square-mile lagoon that they were forced to leave.

The people forced to leave Bikini by the 1946 atomic tests are even worse off. Their new home, a lonely outcropping in the Pacific wastes called Kill, has no lagoon at all. Rough seas have often prevented ships from landing supplies, or removing produce for as long as four months, according to official reports.

"As soon as the scientists find that there is no more radioactivity at Bikini, we all want to return," the Rev. Josaia, the Protestant pastor on Kill, told an interviewer.

Meanwhile, the 277 Bikinians on Kill augment their sparse income by handicraft, specializing in a bag of finely woven fiber lined with matting.

"Their only hope is to go back to Bikini," said Dr. John A. Tobin, a Trust Territory anthropologist who has spent much time on the island. "They'll never make it on Kill." The Eniwetok people transplanted to Uje-

lang are so far off the normal Marshall Islands trade routes that staple food supplies often run out weeks before a ship appears, said Naptali, the Ujelang man now working at Majuro.

"At such times we have had to live on coconuts, fish and arrowroot," he said through an interpreter. "It's no good telling us that our ancestors lived on this kind of diet, for we have been accustomed to imported rice and canned foods in the Marshall Islands for generations," he added.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. METCALF, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 1391. A bill to cancel certain construction costs and irrigation assessments chargeable against lands of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont. (Rept. No. 691).

By Mr. METCALF, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 1119. A bill to grant minerals, including oil and gas, on certain lands in the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont., to certain Indians, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 690).

By Mr. KUCHEL, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 5091. An act to amend Public Law 87-752 (76 Stat. 749) to eliminate the requirement of a reservation of certain mineral rights to the United States (Rept. No. 692).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 561. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for Cape Hatteras National Seashore (Rept. No. 694);

H.R. 845. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Nebraska mid-State division, Missouri River Basin project, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 695); and

H.R. 5364. An act to provide for the conveyance of the interest held by the United States in certain real property situated in the State of Georgia (Rept. No. 696).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 1946. A bill to amend the repayment contract with the Foss Reservoir Master Conservancy District, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 702).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 1321. A bill to establish the North Cascades National Park and Ross Lake National Recreation Area, to designate the Pasayten Wilderness and to modify the Glacier Peak Wilderness, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 700); and

S. 2336. A bill to determine the respective rights and interests of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation and the Yakima Tribe of Indians of the Yakima Reservation and their constituent tribal groups in and to a judgment fund on deposit in the Treasury of the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 697).

By Mr. HANSEN, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 220. A bill to authorize the sale of certain public lands (Rept. No. 693).

By Mr. GRUENING, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 876. A bill relating to Federal support of education of Indian students in sectarian institutions of higher education (Rept. No. 703); and

S. 1367. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to prevent terminations of oil and gas leases in cases where there is a nominal deficiency in the rental payment, and to authorize him to reinstate under some conditions oil and gas leases terminated by operation of law for failure to pay rental timely (Rept. No. 698).

By Mr. MCGOVERN, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 6. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the first stage of the Oahe unit, James division, Missouri River Basin project, South Dakota, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 699).

By Mr. MUSKIE, from the Committee on Government Operations, with amendments:

S. 699. A bill to strengthen intergovernmental cooperation and the administration of grant-in-aid programs, to extend State and local merit systems to additional programs financed by Federal funds, to provide grants for improvement of State and local personnel administration, to authorize Federal assistance in training State and local employees, to provide grants to State and local governments for training of their employees, to authorize interstate compacts for personnel and training activities, to facilitate the interchange of Federal, State, and local personnel, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 701).

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 49. Concurrent resolution extending congratulations to the Parliament of Finland on the 50th anniversary of Finland's independence.

**AUTHORIZATION FOR JUDICIARY COMMITTEE TO FILE REPORT AND INDIVIDUAL VIEWS**

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary have until midnight Thursday, November 2, 1967, to file its report, together with individual views, on the civil rights bill, H.R. 2516.

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

**PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON LITTLE DELL PROJECT, SALT LAKE CITY STREAMS, UTAH (S. DOC. NO. 53)**

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated September 12, 1967, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the report on Little Dell project, Salt Lake City streams, Utah, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

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

**EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE**

As in executive session,  
The following favorable report of a supplementary convention was submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without reservation:  
Executive L, 88th Congress, first session, Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery (Ex. Rept. No. 17).

**BILLS INTRODUCED**

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

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 2599. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alberto M. Hernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS (for himself, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. CURTIS):

S. 2600. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the valuation of a decedent's interest in a closely held business for estate tax purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. PERCY (for himself and Mr. JORDAN of Idaho):

S. 2601. A bill to increase employment opportunities for individuals whose lack of skills and education acts as a barrier to their employment at or above the Federal minimum wage and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 2602. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to establish the National Law Foundation to promote improvements in judicial administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INOUE:

S. 2603. A bill for the relief of Chun Choi Lam and Tsang Loi Hing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2604. A bill relating to the investment of certain funds appropriated to the State of Hawaii for the support and maintenance of colleges at which agricultural and mechanical arts are taught; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. MUSKIE:

S. 2605. A bill to provide for the construction by the Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army, of a high-level bridge over Cowseagan Narrows to connect Wiscasset on the mainland with the northwestern end of the island of Westport, Maine; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 2606. A bill for the relief of Yung Sun Chin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELL:

S. 2607. A bill to amend Title II of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

**THE EMPLOYMENT INCENTIVE ACT OF 1967**

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, in testimony before the Congress late last year, Daniel P. Moynihan, director of the Joint Center for Urban Studies of MIT and Harvard, noted:

The minimum wage seems to be ominously close to raising the level of unemployment.

At that time, the minimum wage was \$1.25 an hour. It has since gone to \$1.40

an hour and next February will rise again to \$1.60.

The opinion of many economists and the results of numerous empirical studies confirm Dr. Moynihan's concern over the undesirable side effects of rapid increases in the minimum wage. I believe the time has come for Congress to consider the evidence that the minimum wage is contributing to unemployment and underemployment among those most in need of our help. Individuals of low skills, little education, and no job experience are being priced out of the labor market and denied needed and deserved opportunities as a direct result of Government policy. Ironically, this is happening at the very time that the Government is spending billions of dollars to reduce poverty and solve some of the critical needs in America's urban ghettos.

In order to meet this problem and at the same time preserve the minimum wage, I am introducing the Employment Incentive Act of 1967. The bill is being cosponsored by Senator LEN B. JORDAN, of Idaho, and is being sponsored in the House of Representatives by Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri. Congressman CURTIS is also introducing the bill today and including in the RECORD numerous materials relating to the need for a program of this kind.

We do not claim that this legislation would provide a complete answer to our hard-core unemployment problem. That problem has many causes, and no single solution will respond to all aspects of it. We do believe, however, that selective approaches to meet specific needs can contribute to a solution. This bill represents such a selective approach. It is our hope that the bill will encourage discussion and some thoughtful suggestions for improvements which can be incorporated in the legislation in the next session of Congress.

The Employment Incentive Act of 1967 enlists private industry in the effort to give disadvantaged workers an opportunity to escape the cycle of unemployment and poverty and to begin a new life as productive members of society. It would do this by offering private employers an incentive to hire and train workers of low skill and education at the minimum wage. The incentive would be in the form of a refund to the employer which would approximate the difference between the value of the worker's product to the firm and the minimum wage.

Our estimates show that the gross cost to the Government of employing 100,000 workers for 1 year under this program would be \$72 million. Tax receipts from those individuals under the program, as well as reduced Government welfare and unemployment outlays, would bring the net cost to the Government down to about \$50 million—or \$500 for each individual employed.

This \$500 Federal outlay certainly compares favorably with Job Corps expenditures. Last week I visited the Job Corps camp in Chicago operated by the Brunswick Corp. under the able direction of William P. Kelly. While the Job Corps is now much more efficiently managed by such fine American corporations as IBM, Textron, ITT, and Brunswick, and

overall are under tighter control than before, nevertheless it is obvious that the cost for each individual in training is still extremely high. In fact, the cost for a Job Corps enrollee is more than 10 times that of the cost for each job under the program I am proposing here today. When you take into account the dropout rate and those who when they complete their training cannot find jobs, the cost ratio is probably closer to 20 times that of the Employee Incentive Act.

In brief, the program would operate as follows:

First. The U.S. Employment Service would certify an individual as eligible to receive an employee certificate for participation in the program if his skill, training, education, or job experience is below that normally required for steady employment at or above the minimum wage. If the individual is unemployed at the time of making application, he or she must have sought employment at or above the minimum wage for at least 5 weeks or longer. Employee certificates shall have a duration of 6 months for unskilled occupations and 1 year for skilled occupations, and they shall be nonrenewable.

Second. Employers shall be certified as eligible to participate in the program by the Administrator of the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division of the Department of Labor. Employers shall be certified if they are covered by the minimum wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 and if they meet several additional requirements to protect the wages, working conditions, and opportunities for employment of existing and fully qualified workers. The employer must also make available to participants in the program formal or on-the-job training and agree to afford participating employees a full opportunity for employment at or above the minimum wage after the expiration of the employee's certificate. Employer certificates shall be for 1 year, renewable upon finding of continued eligibility by the Administrator.

Third. A certified employer who hires a certified employee shall receive a refund—the minimum wage equivalency refund—from the Federal Government which shall be equal to 40 percent of the minimum wage in effect at that time for the first half of the employee's period of certification. The refund shall drop to 20 percent of the wage during the last half of the period of certification.

Fourth. The act authorizes the appropriation of \$72 million for fiscal 1969 for the payment of the refund for the employment of not more than 100,000 certified employees, and of \$144 million for fiscal 1970 to provide for the payment of refunds for the employment of not more than 200,000 certified employees.

Fifth. Other provisions of the act guarantee equal opportunity, forbid discrimination of the employment of certified employees, provide for enforcement of the act, and for appropriate reconsideration and review of administrative decisions.

Under the Employment Act of 1946, it is the policy of the U.S. Government that "there be afforded useful employment

opportunities for those able, willing and seeking to work." Under this bill, the Government would reduce the effective costs to a firm of low-skill workers to the level of their economic contribution. It thereby would provide the initial impetus for their employment and training. With the skills and experience thus acquired, these individuals would be prepared to stand on their own feet as self-supporting and contributing members of the community. I can think of no objective that is more in keeping with the spirit and intent of the Employment Act or with the needs of our times.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the Employment Incentive Act of 1967 be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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. 2601) to increase employment opportunities for individuals whose lack of skills and education acts as a barrier to their employment at or above the Federal minimum wage and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PERCY (for himself and Mr. JORDAN of Idaho), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2601

*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 Incentive Act of 1967."*

#### STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The purpose of this Act is to increase employment opportunities for individuals whose lack of skills and adequate education acts as a barrier to employment at or above the Federal minimum wage, and thus to help provide useful employment and training opportunities for individuals who might otherwise be trapped in the cycle of poverty by persistent and recurrent unemployment or underemployment.

#### MINIMUM WAGE EQUIVALENCY REFUND

SEC. 3. Certified employers who employ certified workers at not less than the minimum wage applicable under section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 shall receive, in accordance with the provisions of this Act, a minimum wage equivalency refund (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "refund") consisting of a portion of the wages paid.

#### PAYMENT OF REFUND

SEC. 4. (a) The refund shall be paid quarterly to those employers who—

(1) have applied for and been issued employer certificates, as provided in section 8 of this Act;

(2) employ workers holding employee certificates, as provided in section 6 of this Act at least 40 hours per week;

(3) pay certified employees the minimum wage applicable under section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 in addition to fringe benefits received by comparable non-certified employees; and

(4) report quarterly to the Administrator of the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division of the Department of Labor (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Administrator") on the status, number, and total hours worked of employees holding employee certificates.

(b) The refund shall be an amount equal to—

(1) 40 per centum of the wages paid at the rate referred to in section 4(a)(3) to all employees certified pursuant to sections 5 and 6 for the first half of the period of such certification for each such employee; and

(2) 20 per centum of the wages paid at the rate referred to in section 4(a)(3) to all employees certified pursuant to sections 5 and 6 for the remainder of the period of certification for each such employee.

#### DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR EMPLOYEE CERTIFICATE

SEC. 5. An individual shall be eligible to receive an employee certificate if—

(1) his skill, training, education, or job experience is below that normally required for steady employment at or above the minimum wage, as determined by his local United States Employment Service Office, and

(2) if unemployed, he or she has sought but has not been able to obtain employment at the minimum wage or above after a period of unemployment of 5 weeks or longer.

#### EMPLOYEE CERTIFICATE

SEC. 6. Upon application, the appropriate local office of the United States Employment Service may issue an employee certificate to any individual who meets the requirements set forth in section 5. The form of such certificate shall be prescribed by the Director.

#### DETERMINATION OF EMPLOYER ELIGIBILITY FOR CERTIFICATE

SEC. 7. An employer shall receive a certificate of eligibility to receive the refund for the employment of employees certified under sections 5 and 6 upon application, if the Administrator determines that—

(1) the employer is covered by the provisions of section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938;

(2) the employer applying for a certificate has not raised his hiring requirements following or in expectation of the enactment of this Act;

(3) an adequate supply of qualified workers is not available despite reasonable efforts by the employer to recruit them;

(4) the refund will not have the effect of impairing or depressing the wages, working standards, or opportunities for full employment of existing employees;

(5) abnormal labor conditions, such as a strike, lockout, or similar condition, do not exist at the firm;

(6) the employer will afford certified employees full opportunity for continued employment at the minimum wage or above after the expiration of the employee's certificate; and

(7) the employer has a formal or on-the-job training program to upgrade the skills and enhance the productivity of certified employees.

#### EMPLOYER CERTIFICATE

SEC. 8. (a) An employer may apply for a certificate as soon as it decides to hire an individual eligible to be a certified employee under this Act. If the employer hires such an individual before its application is accepted, and the application is subsequently accepted, the refund shall be retroactive to the date the employee was placed on the employer's payroll.

(b) An employer certificate, if issued, shall specify—

(1) the number of certified employees authorized to be employed at any one time, which shall not exceed 25 percent of an employer's total labor force; and

(2) the effective date and the expiration date of the certificate.

Such certificate shall be in the form prescribed by the Administrator.

#### DURATION OF CERTIFICATES

SEC. 9. (a) The duration of employer certificates shall be one year, renewable upon finding of continued eligibility by the Ad-

ministrator. In the event an employer chooses not to renew a certificate, he shall continue in the program until all employees hired under the previously existing certificate, have completed the duration of their certificates.

(b) There shall be the following two classes of employee certificates:

(1) A six-month certificate for nonskilled occupations.

(2) A one-year certificate for skilled occupations. The local office of the United States Employment Service shall issue a qualified individual a certificate of eligibility prior to his employment. After the certified individual is employed, the local office shall determine on the basis of his occupation whether his certificate shall have a duration of six months or one year.

(c) Not more than one employee certificate shall be issued under this Act to any individual and such certificate shall be non-renewable.

**EQUAL OPPORTUNITY**

SEC. 10. No certified employer shall discriminate on account of race, color, religion, or national origin in the employment of certified employees.

**ENFORCEMENT**

SEC. 11. (a) The provisions of this Act relating to employer certificates and the distribution of the refund and all regulations pertaining thereto shall be enforced by the Administrator. He shall conduct investigations of possible violations of employer certificates upon—

(1) a complaint by either an employee or an employer under a certificate, or

(2) a complaint by a competitor of a certified employer, or of an experienced worker who claims to have lost employment or to be unable to obtain employment because of competition from certified employees.

(b) The provisions of this Act relating to employee certificates, their issuance, and all regulations adopted under these provisions shall be enforced by the Director of the United States Employment Service (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Director"). He shall conduct investigations of possible violations of employee certificates upon—

(1) a complaint by either a certified employee or employer, or

(2) a complaint by an experienced worker who claims to have lost employment or to be unable to obtain employment because of competition from certified workers.

(c) If after notice and hearing the Administrator or Director finds that there has been a violation of the provision of this Act, or regulations thereunder, the Administrator, in the case of an employer, and the Director, in the case of an employee, shall cancel the certificate issued under this Act, and deny the privilege of obtaining a new certificate for such period as the Administrator or the Director, as the case may be, shall determine.

**ADMINISTRATION**

SEC. 12. (a) The Administrator shall administer the provisions of this Act relating to employer certificates and payment of the refund.

(b) The Director shall administer the provisions of this Act relating to employee certificates.

(c) The Administrator and the Director are authorized to establish such rules and regulations as are necessary and appropriate to carry out their respective functions under this Act.

**CRIMINAL PENALTY**

SEC. 13. A certified employer who knowingly violates the conditions of an employer certificate or the other provisions of this Act shall be deemed to have committed a misdemeanor, and shall be subject to a fine not to exceed \$1,000.

**RECONSIDERATION AND REVIEW**

SEC. 14. (a) (1) Any person aggrieved by the action of an authorized representative of the Administrator in denying or granting an employer certificate may, within 15 days after such action, (A) file a written request for reconsideration thereof with the authorized representative of the Administrator who made the decision in the first instance, or (B) file a written request for review of the decision with the Administrator or an authorized representative who has taken no part in the action which is the subject of review.

(2) Any person aggrieved by the action of an authorized representative of the Administrator in denying a request for reconsideration may, within 15 days thereafter, file with the Administrator a written request for review.

(3) Any person aggrieved by the determination upon reconsideration of an authorized representative of the Administrator may, within 15 days thereafter, file with the Administrator a written request for review.

(b) (1) Any person aggrieved by the action of a local United States Employment Service office in denying or granting an employee certificate may, within 15 days after such action, (A) file a written request for reconsideration thereof by the local United States Employment Service office which made the decision in the first instance, or (B) file a written request for review of the decision by the Director, or (C) file a written request for review of the decision by an authorized representative of the Director who is not attached to the local office making the decision in the first instance.

(2) Any person aggrieved by the action of a local United States Employment Service office, or of an authorized representative of the Director in denying a request for reconsideration may, within 15 days after such determination, file with the Director a written request for review.

(3) Any person aggrieved by the determination upon reconsideration of a local office, or of an authorized representative may, within 15 days thereafter, file with the Director a written request for review.

(c) A request for reconsideration shall be accompanied by a statement of the additional evidence which the applicant believes may materially affect the decision together with a showing that there were reasonable grounds for failure to present such evidence in the original proceedings.

(d) A request for review shall be granted where reasonable grounds for the review are set forth in the request.

(e) If a request for reconsideration or review is granted, the Administrator, the Director, their authorized representative, or a local United States Employment Service officer may, to the extent he deems it appropriate, afford other interested persons an opportunity to present data and views.

**SECRETARY'S EVALUATION AND REPORT**

SEC. 15. Prior to March 1, 1969 and again prior to March 1, 1970, the Secretary of Labor shall make a report to Congress. Such report shall contain an evaluation of the program authorized in this Act, including the number of persons employed and trained, the employment experience of individuals who have completed the program, the response of employers to the program and recommendations for improvement.

**AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS**

SEC. 16. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated \$72,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, for payment of the refund for the employment of not more than 100,000 certified employees; and \$144,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, for payment of the refund for the employment of not more than 200,000 certified employees. There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for administrative

expenses for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970. Such sums may be appropriated for each fiscal year thereafter as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I wish to heartily endorse the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Illinois, Senator CHARLES PERCY, with respect to the proposed legislation entitled "The Employment Incentive Act of 1967." Although, as he mentioned, this bill does not purport to be the answer to all the unemployment problems facing the country, it does, at least, present one means of offsetting what I consider to be the principal shortcoming of the minimum wage law. This shortcoming is I think, that it precludes hiring unskilled, willing laborers by willing employers at less than the minimum wage. This bill will encourage the private business sector to hire the unskilled unemployed and to train them to fill skilled-level jobs. It will provide a means of hope for the jobless to become employable without suffering the indignities and self-disrespect of being on the receiving end of straight Government handouts. In other words, it helps them to help themselves.

I hope my colleagues in the Senate will reflect primarily on the concept of this type of legislation, improve upon this bill and thus help to resolve the serious, double-edged national dilemma of unemployment and public welfare.

**INVESTMENT OF CERTAIN FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE STATE OF HAWAII**

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, after Hawaii became a State in 1959, the 86th Congress approved the Omnibus Act—act of July 12, 1960—which authorized the appropriation of \$6 million to the State of Hawaii in lieu of a land grant subject to the provisions of the Morrill Act and such funds were subsequently appropriated.

Section 302 of the Morrill Act provides that funds received by the States are to be invested in bonds of the United States or of the States or in some other State bonds, or that the proceeds may be invested by the States having no State bonds in any manner the legislature of such States agree to, provided that the funds yield a fair and reasonable rate of return as designated by such State legislature.

Unfortunately, the provisions of the Morrill Act governing investment of funds do not provide a means whereby the capital may be protected from erosion due to inflationary tendencies or to benefit from increases in economic productivity.

It is a matter of record that most college and university investment portfolios include a combination of both variable and fixed value securities which provide protection against price increases and also offer opportunities to benefit from the growth of the economy.

For this reason, I am introducing a bill to amend section 14(e) of the Omnibus Act to enable the State of Hawaii to invest its grant in corporate equities, including mutual funds.

I should point out that section 5 of the

First Morrill Act specifically protects capital derived from Morrill Act funds from impairment by stipulating that should any portion of the fund which is invested be diminished or lost that it shall be replaced by the State to which it belongs so that the capital of the fund shall remain forever undiminished.

My proposed amendment to the Omnibus Act would not affect this requirement in any way.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill 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. 2604) relating to the investment of certain funds appropriated to the State of Hawaii for the support and maintenance of colleges at which agricultural and mechanical arts are taught, introduced by Mr. INOUYE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2604

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the second sentence of section 14(e) of the Act entitled "An Act to amend certain laws of the United States in light of the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, and for other purposes", approved July 12, 1960 (74 Stat. 414), is amended by striking out "Amounts" and inserting in lieu thereof "Except as provided in the foregoing sentence, amounts".*

(b) Such section is further amended by inserting immediately after the first sentence a new sentence as follows: "Amounts appropriated under this subsection shall be invested by the State of Hawaii in bonds of the United States, bonds of the State of Hawaii, or in some other safe bonds, or shall be invested in such other manner as may be authorized by the legislature of such State, subject to the conditions that the legislature of such State shall require that (1) the investment shall yield a fair and reasonable rate of return, fixed by the legislature, and (2) the principal of any such amounts so appropriated shall forever remain unimpaired."

#### AMENDMENT OF TITLE II OF MARINE RESOURCES AND ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1966

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to bring to your attention the status of the Sea Grant College and Program Act of 1966 which I had the honor to introduce. Its purpose is to speed development of this Nation's marine resources through support of and encouragement to academic institutions, research institutes, and laboratories. The program envisioned by this act has richly lived up to the hopes of us who sponsored its passage through the Congress.

In fact, as the oceanology periodical, *Undersea Technology*, reported in its September 1967 issue, the sea-grant program has been "a smash hit." More than 400 schools and institutions have informed the Office of Sea Grant Programs of the National Science Foundation that they intend to file proposals. Robert Abel, head of the program, has formed a fine staff which includes Harold Leland Goodwin, formerly with NASA; Robert

Wildman, formerly with AEC; and Arthur Alexiou, formerly with the Naval Oceanographic Office. This talented team is moving effectively to implement the broad mandate which the Congress provided, and many excellent program proposals are already under study by the Sea Grant Office and its advisory panel.

Mr. President, the basic act authorized funds for this program for fiscal years 1967-68. It is now necessary that the Congress move to continue this vital program on which such a fine beginning has been made.

In this connection, Mr. President, I introduce on request and send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to amend title II of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966. This bill has been submitted by the National Science Foundation and was reviewed by the Bureau of the Budget which stated that it has no objection. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this bill be inserted in the RECORD, together with a section by section analysis and a letter from Leland J. Haworth, Director of the National Science Foundation, to the Vice President, dated October 18, 1967.

I also intend to introduce tomorrow a bill differing from the administration one in that it substitutes specific figures in lieu of the open end authorizations approved by the administration.

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

The bill (S. 2607) to amend title II of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966, introduced by Mr. PELL, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2607

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Title II of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 is amended as follows:*

(1) Section 203(b)(1) of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 is amended by inserting immediately after "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, not to exceed the sum of \$15,000,000," the following: "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, such sums as may be necessary."

(2) Section 204(d)(1) of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 is amended by deleting the phrase "in any fiscal year" each time it appears therein.

The section-by-section analysis and letter presented by Mr. PELL are as follows:

#### SECTIONAL ANALYSIS AND EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO TITLE II OF THE MARINE RESOURCES AND ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1966

1. Section 203(b)(1) authorizes appropriations for the Sea Grant Programs only for fiscal years 1967 and 1968 leaving further appropriations to be authorized in the future. Since the participants in the Sea Grant Programs are asked to make substantial investments of their own, it is highly desirable to assure continuity of the program in order to attract the right kind of institutions and to induce them to commit adequate resources and personnel of high competence to their projects. Therefore, the proposed amend-

ment of Section 203(b)(1) authorizes appropriations for fiscal years 1969 and 1970.

2. Section 204(d)(1) limits the application of the cost sharing formula to payments made in each fiscal year. This imposes an administrative obstacle to the orderly conduct of program activities. It is to be expected that the contributions by participants will take many different forms which cannot be expected to be consumed at the same rate as the cash flow from the Foundation. For example, suppose a participant's contribution consists entirely of the use of facilities and the salaries of a few permanent staff members and that the Government is requested to provide funds for materials, supplies and the salaries of summer employees. The contribution of the participant being necessarily uniformly spread over the term of the project, it would be purely fortuitous and very unlikely that the requirements for materials, supplies and short term personnel should arise in an amount precisely equal to twice the fixed contribution of the participant during any given time period. This problem would be particularly acute if a contract or grant is awarded late in a fiscal year, in time to purchase substantial quantities of materials and supplies but with little time for the use of facilities and the services of permanent employees. Removal of the requirement that the cost sharing formula be satisfied in each fiscal year would permit the contributions of the Government and the participant to be utilized at their most efficient rates during the entire term of the grant or contract while preserving the intent of Congress that the total cost of the project be shared. This would also make unnecessary the establishment of special accounting procedures and time periods by both the Government and the participant to maintain a current account of their relative contributions.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION,  
Washington, D.C. October 18, 1967.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,  
President of the Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The National Science Foundation herewith submits proposed legislation to amend Title II of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 in two respects.

The two proposed changes are of the following nature:

(1) Under the existing Title II of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966, appropriation authorizations terminate with fiscal year 1968. In accordance with policy guidance received from the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, it is recommended that appropriation authorizations be provided for at least the next two fiscal years (1969 and 1970) in order to give impetus and continuity to the program.

(2) The Act now provides that payments in any fiscal year from the Government shall not exceed two-thirds of the total cost of the program. This poses a technical difficulty of an administrative nature for which legislative relief is recommended.

These matters are discussed further in the enclosed Explanation of Proposed Amendments to Title II.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised the Foundation that it has no objection to the submission of this legislation from the viewpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

LELAND J. HAWORTH,  
Director.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 427

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the House-passed social security bill has re-

defined "disability" so that a person could be determined to be disabled only if he is unable to engage in any kind of substantial gainful work which exists in the national economy even though such work does not exist in the general area in which he lives. The House report cites as its reason for its new definition its concern over the way the present definition of disability has been interpreted by the courts and the effects of court decisions on the administration of the disability program. I agree that the definition of disability under present law is in need of revision. However, I do not agree with the form this revision has taken. If we adopt the definition of disability as set forth in section 156 of H.R. 12080 we will be forcing those whom we seek to assist to tear up roots and seek employment in areas removed from family, friends, and associations that have been built over a lifetime.

For these reasons, I am submitting an amendment that redefines the term disability to include an individual only if his physical or mental impairment or impairments are of such severity that he is not only unable to do his previous work but—and now follows the language of my amendment—because of such impairment or impairments is, as a practical matter, unable to obtain in the general area in which he lives any kind of gainful work which—considering his age, education, and work experience—he is able to perform.

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

The amendment (No. 427) was referred to the Committee on Finance.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 428

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, an amendment to H.R. 12080, the omnibus social security and welfare bill now pending in the Senate Finance Committee.

This amendment would correct a long overlooked inequity in the social security laws, and I urge its adoption.

It would provide for the continuation of a mother's benefits if her child were a full-time student in an elementary or secondary school.

Presently, the surviving wife of a deceased worker is entitled to receive a mother's benefit, provided she has in her care a child of the deceased worker who is under age 18 or who was disabled before reaching that age. The mother's payment is equal to 75 percent of the deceased worker's full rate of social security benefit. This benefit terminates when the mother becomes entitled to widows' insurance benefits at age 60, or when the deceased worker's child attains age 18, unless, of course, the child is disabled.

It may occur that a child who is in high school and reaches age 18 before he completes his high school education may very well have to leave school in order to support his mother whose benefits cease on his 18th birthday. Thus, the child is unable to complete his education, particularly where the mother cannot find any work to provide her son and herself with the necessities of life.

This amendment would eliminate this

inequity and remove the penalty presently imposed upon a mother and her son or daughter who wishes to complete his education, but finds it impossible to do so. This amendment would permit the mother to continue to receive the social security benefit after her child reaches age 18, provided that her son or daughter is a full-time student in high school or elementary school.

I ask speedy acceptance by the committee and final enactment by the full Senate.

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

The amendment (No. 428) was referred to the Committee on Finance.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND RESOLUTION

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2530) to clarify the relationship of interests of the United States and of the States in the use of the waters of certain streams.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the able Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2466) to amend section 704 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] I also ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the following bills, the name of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] be added as a cosponsor:

S. 2589. A bill to provide for the regulation in the District of Columbia of retail installment sales of consumer goods (other than motor vehicles) and services, and for other purposes;

S. 2590. A bill to provide maximum finance and other charges in connection with retail installment credit sales in the District of Columbia;

S. 2591. A bill to provide a right to cancel retail installment sales contracts in the District of Columbia in certain circumstances; and

S. 2592. A bill to amend section 521 of the Act approved March 3, 1901, so as to prohibit the enforcement of a security interest in real property in the District of Columbia except pursuant to court order.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, my name be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2554) to provide for orderly marketing of flat glass imported into the United States by affording foreign supplying nations a fair share of the growth or change in the U.S. flat glass market.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] be added as a cosponsor of the resolution—Senate Resolution 180—seeking U.S. initiative to assure United Nations Security Council consideration of Vietnam conflict.

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

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR TO HOLD HEARINGS ON BILL TO AMEND LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Labor Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I wish to announce that hearings on S. 2485, my bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act to improve its benefits, will begin on Thursday, November 16, 1967.

All persons wishing to testify at these hearings should contact subcommittee counsel, Mr. Robert O. Harris, in room 4230, New Senate Office Building.

#### POPULATION CRISIS HEARING ON DOMESTIC FAMILY PLANNING PROGRAMS SCHEDULED FOR THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 2, AT 10 A.M.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the fact that the Government Operations Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures has scheduled a public hearing on S. 1676 and the population crisis for Thursday, November 2. The hearing will be held in room 3302, of the New Senate Office Building, starting at 10 a.m.

The subcommittee is interested in learning more about the domestic family programs which are being funded by the Federal Government.

Witnesses Thursday will include the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's newly appointed Deputy Assistant Secretary for Family Planning and Population, Katherine B. Oettinger, and Oscar Harkavy, Ph.D., of the Ford Foundation, who has just completed a study of domestic Federal population for the Department. It is the first time Mrs. Oettinger has testified before a congressional committee in her new capacity as the highest ranking U.S. civil servant charged with the direction of family planning policy.

I ask unanimous consent that the list of witnesses and the text of a news release about the hearing appear at the close of my remarks.

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

WITNESSES BEFORE U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AID EXPENDITURES, HEARINGS ON S. 1676, ROOM 3302, NEW SENATE OFFICE BUILDING, NOVEMBER 2, 1967, 10 A.M.

1. Mrs. Katherine B. Oettinger, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Family Planning and

Population, Department of Health, Education and Welfare and Director, Children's Bureau, HEW.

2. *Dr. Philip R. Lee*,\* assistant secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs, HEW.

3. *Dr. Gerald LaVeck*, director, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, National Institutes of Health, HEW.

4. *Dr. Joseph English*, Director, Office of Health Affairs, Office of Economic Opportunity.

5. *Dr. Gary London*, Health Division, Office of Economic Opportunity.

6. *Oscar Harkavy*, Ph.D., Program Officer in Charge, Population Office, The Ford Foundation, New York City.

7. *Frederick S. Jaffe*, Vice President for Program Planning and Development, Planned Parenthood-World Population, New York City.

8. *Dr. Samuel M. Wishik*, Director, Division of Program Development and Evaluation, Institute of Child Health and Human Development, International Institute for the Study of Human Reproduction, Columbia University, New York City.

**GRUENING SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ASKS HEW, OEO TO DESCRIBE FAMILY PLANNING PROGRAMS IN UNITED STATES AT NOVEMBER 2 HEARING**

The federal government's financial support of family planning programs may surpass \$55 million in Fiscal Year 1968. The Senate Government Operations Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures would like to know more about how the money is being spent and what is planned. Subcommittee chairman Senator Gruening (D-Alaska) has scheduled a hearing Thursday, November 2, to examine domestic programs, starting at 10 a.m.

Senator Gruening believes U.S. programs should be showcases from which other parts of the nation or other countries can learn. He said the Subcommittee would also look into U.S. family planning expenditures overseas at a subsequent hearing.

Witnesses on November 2 in Room 3302 of the New Senate Office building will include HEW's newly-appointed Deputy Assistant Secretary for Family Planning and Population Katherine B. Oettinger and Dr. Oscar Harkavy of the Ford Foundation who has just completed a study of domestic federal population programs for H.E.W. It is the first time Mrs. Oettinger has testified before a congressional committee in her new capacity as the highest ranking U.S. civil servant charged with the direction on family planning policy. Mrs. Oettinger still heads HEW's Children's Bureau.

The HEW delegation will be headed by Dr. Philip R. Lee, assistant secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs. He will also be accompanied by Dr. William Stewart, Surgeon General of the United States, and representatives of the Office of Education and the Food and Drug Administration.

The Subcommittee will also hear from Office of Economic Opportunity representatives Dr. Joseph English, Director of the Office of the Health Affairs, and Dr. Gary London, a member of his staff.

The Gruening subcommittee held 28 public hearings on the Population Crisis and S. 1676, a bill to coordinate and disseminate birth control information upon request at home and overseas, during the 89th Congress. The extended public dialogue appears to have been useful in opening up discussion and encouraging government and private programming.

Now the subcommittee wants to determine if the creation of some new jobs and some

new programs has created a viable situation or just a growing, headless body without proper direction.

Gruening and the Senate cosponsors of his bill S. 1676 believe there should be offices for population to coordinate domestic and international U.S. family planning programs. Gruening thinks HEW is best equipped and qualified to handle domestic programs while the Department of State could best handle programs overseas. The offices for population they seek would be headed by assistant secretaries, a sufficiently high governmental level to be effective. Identical legislation has been introduced in the House of Representatives by several members. Principal House sponsor this Congress and last is Rep. Morris Udall (D-Ariz.).

Less than two years ago the Government Operations Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures called in top level spokesmen from the Departments of State and Health, Education and Welfare and the Agency for International Development to comment on the population problem and S. 1676. The Executive branch spokesmen while not endorsing the bill agreed there was a problem. However, since those sessions in April 1966, important changes have taken place in the family planning programs of the Executive branch and the Congressional interest seems to have helped.

The Department of State now has a special assistant to Secretary Rusk for Population Matters and he has an assistant.

The Agency for International Development has a new War on Hunger Office which contains a Population Service.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has revised its guidelines for family planning and has increased its expenditures in this area through its Community Action programs upon request of the communities.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare after initially opposing the use of titles in its family planning organization has reversed itself and also set up a number of intra-agency committees to work on family planning problems.

This year because more than \$30 million will be spent domestically on family planning, the Gruening Subcommittee wants to find out more about the programs and how they are coordinated.

Senator Gruening pointed out that the U.S. National Academy of Sciences and the Royal Society of London this month announced the beginning of their historic, joint scientific study on many aspects of the population problem. When representatives of the Swedish government testified before the Gruening Subcommittee on March 9, 1966, they stressed the need for international coordination in family planning.

90th Congress Senate cosponsors of S. 1676 are: Senators E. L. (Bob) Bartlett (D-Alaska), Robert C. Byrd (D-W. Va.), Joseph Clark (D-Pa.), Peter H. Dominick (R-Colo.), Clifford P. Hansen (R-Wyo.), Mark O. Hatfield (R-Ore.), Philip A. Hart (D-Mich.), Daniel K. Inouye (D-Hawaii), Gale W. McGee (D-Wyo.), George McGovern (D-S. Dak.), Lee Metcalf (D-Mont.), Walter F. Mondale (D-Minn.), Frank E. Moss (D-Utah), Joseph D. Tydings (D-Md.), Ralph W. Yarborough (D-Tex.), and Stephen M. Young (D-Ohio).

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

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

By Mr. ELLENDER:

Address by Senator HOLLAND before the 62d Annual Convention, Gulf Intra-Coastal Canal Association, Jacksonville, Fla., October 30, 1967.

**ORDER OF BUSINESS**

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. 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.

**EMPLOYERS SHOULD NOT BE DENIED INFORMATION CONCERNING ARREST RECORDS OF PROSPECTIVE EMPLOYEES**

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, an article appeared on the front page of the Washington Post of Friday, October 27, entitled "City Set To Limit Use of Arrest Data." This article was deeply disturbing to me, and I believe it should be of concern to the Congress, to prospective employers and employees, and, for that matter, to the general public. The gist of the article was to the effect that, based upon recommendations of a committee headed by the Corporation Counsel, there would shortly be an administrative edict whereby the police would be forbidden to release arrest records, except in cases which had resulted in convictions, and further, that the practice of employers requesting prospective employees to furnish them with copies of their police arrest records would be discouraged by this limitation and by the charge of a fee for obtaining copies of such police records.

For anyone familiar with the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police arrest records, it is well known that it is the exception, rather than the rule, where a final disposition of an arrest is noted on the police record, and that it takes hours, if not days, to trace through the records of the U.S. Attorney's office and the courts, to determine the final disposition or present status of a particular case. This was established in connection with hearings on crime and court congestion which the District of Columbia Appropriations Subcommittee conducted this past summer incident to its examination of appropriation requests.

Of course, the condition of the police records is a reflection on the whole recordkeeping system of the law enforcement agencies of the city. Without doubt, the establishment of a uniform and coordinated record system should be given the highest priority.

While it is understandable that an applicant might well feel it unfair to have to explain to a prospective employer that he had been acquitted of a particular charge as set forth on his arrest record, or that the charge had been dropped—the other side of the situation, as was also developed at the subcommittee hearings, is this:

First. The average time lapse between the arrest and trial of a serious crime in the District of Columbia is approximately 1 year. Further, it is not uncommon that the same person will be charged with three or four different felonies before ever being tried on the first offense and

\*Accompanied by Dr. Herbert L. Ley, Jr., director of The Bureau of Medicine, Food and Drug Administration, and a representative of the Office of Education.

during this time, he will be on the street on personal recognizance or on low bond, and, accordingly, be eligible to seek employment. In other words, if this regulation were put into effect, the employer could be considering the employment of a person charged with robbery, burglary, and dope addiction, or any other combination of crimes, and such employer would be barred from having access to this information.

Second, it also was developed at such hearings that a very substantial percentage of original arrests for felonies were dropped entirely—"no papered" or were reduced to misdemeanors, with the indication that this sometimes was done to relieve the burden on the courts or because the many continuances granted had resulted in complaining witnesses failing to appear in court, or because the person charged had pleaded guilty, for example, to one of five serious charges and the other four were dropped by the Government as a practical expedient.

If the regulation, as proposed by the special committee were put into effect, it seems inevitable that the employer, running the risk of hiring a dangerous criminal, would merely eliminate from consideration anyone whose past record he was unable to fully determine, and thereby defeat the apparent objective of this ill-advised regulation.

Increased efforts should be directed not only toward improving the law-enforcement records system, but also to bringing about the speedy trial of serious criminal charges—rather than to devising procedures whereby information in records indicating involvement in serious crimes would be denied prospective employers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 27, 1967]  
CITY SET TO LIMIT USE OF ARREST DATA  
(By Carl Bernstein)

A special committee headed by Corporation Counsel Charles T. Duncan has recommended that police release arrest records only in cases that have resulted in convictions. However, the Metropolitan Police Department, which was represented on the committee, has refused to endorse the recommendation.

Despite police opposition, the recommendation is expected to be made District government policy in the near future. The outgoing Commissioners are known to be anxious to implement the new policy as one of their final official acts.

The new city government headed by Mayor Walter Washington is reported to be eager to solve the problem of arrest records if the Commissioners do not have time to act on the issue.

As standard practice, many firms here require prospective employees to provide them with a copy of their police records. The records issued by the Police Department include all arrests, but do not reflect the dispositions of the cases.

Civil rights organizations have long charged that the Department's policy fosters unemployment and presumes the guilt of persons even if they are declared innocent in court.

The Duncan committee's report, which also recommends that no individual's record be released if ten years have elapsed since

his last conviction, was sent to the desk of Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner this week.

The report contains a third recommendation that would require persons seeking arrest records to pay a fee to police. Committee members were reported to have made the fee recommendation as a means of discouraging the use of arrest records by employers.

Sources said the report received the endorsement of all organizations represented on the committee except the Police Department. The committee's membership included representatives of the Board of Trade, the city's Central Labor Council and the Department of Corrections.

As the special committee's views took shape in recent months, sources reported that the Police Department began indicating differences of opinion on both administrative and substantive grounds.

Inspector James J. McAuliffe, the police representative on the committee, was said to object to changing the current system because it would cause the Department extensive administrative difficulty and would require extra staff.

On other occasions, McAuliffe was said to argue that police see no reason why employers cannot accurately interpret arrest records in their present form.

McAuliffe met regularly during the committee's months of deliberations with his superiors in the Department and received guidance on policy matters from them.

During their deliberations, most members of the committee were reported to be swayed by three principal arguments advanced by opponents of existing policy. The critics charged that:

Current arrest records create false impressions of criminality because acquittals and dropped charges are not noted by police.

Such false impressions are most damaging to Negroes from inner-city neighborhoods who are more prone to arrests for minor infractions than are middle-class whites—arrests which very often lead to acquittals and dropped charges.

Ghetto residents are deterred from applying for jobs if they have any arrest records and are sent by prospective employers to get a transcript.

As the city moved to change police policy, a Court of General Session judge yesterday ordered police not to release the record of a defendant in a disorderly conduct case in which the charges were dropped.

#### "FAMILY FARM WILL SAVE AMERICA"—ARTICLE BY LEONARD KENFIELD

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the issue of the Great Falls, Mont., Tribune of October 22, 1967, published a feature story on Leonard Kenfield, president of the Montana Farmers Union, and his belief that the family farm will save America.

I share his view that we must restore a rural-urban balance in our Nation. As he stated:

It would cost far less to help people in the rural areas, to help them make a decent living there, than to bring them to the cities and stack them up in tenements on welfare programs.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

FAMILY FARMS WILL SAVE AMERICA  
(By Carla Beck)

Leonard Kenfield, Montana Farmers Union president, has the capacity to view things in

their relationship to other things and in their relative importance, one to the other. In other words, he sees the world in perspective.

For instance, the other day he said that he didn't think solving the farm problems will solve all the problems of the cities. One wonders how the two are related.

Kenfield went on to explain his statement. "Overcrowded conditions in the cities have resulted because the cities are the refuge for rural migrants. The cities, which are already short of schools, water, sewerage plants, housing, health and other facilities, become even more short. The riots—which I cannot explain myself—are indications of disturbance and a very unsatisfactory situation. The Washington Post editorialized some time ago that we were transferring the problems of rural America to the urban centers. It would cost far less to help people in the rural areas, to help them make a decent living there, than to bring them to the cities and stack them up in tenements on welfare programs."

Kenfield calls this movement from farm to city "one of the largest human migrations in history." Facts support his statement. Since 1940, 30 million have migrated out of the rural areas of America. Since 1950, 17 million have left the farm. Montana has contributed. In 1950, Montana had 35,000 farm and ranch operators. In 1964, there were 27,000. It is estimated that today 23,000 commercial operators are still on state farms. Commercial is the term used to differentiate between the serious farmer and the "hobby" farmer.

This movement of farmers off the land is very dangerous, Kenfield believes. "Movement of people off the land is a condition for revolution. When there are revolutions elsewhere in the world, redistribution of the land is an immediate goal. There's a basic yearning for land."

MacArthur's land reform in Japan is the underpinning of that country's amazing recovery from World War II, Kenfield said. The land redistribution there also involved fertilizer grants, organization of cooperatives and making low cost credit available.

United States aid to Venezuela is now being used to buy land from plantation systems—the feudal domains—to divide among the agricultural workers. Kenfield reported a recent edition of World Book Encyclopedia relates how part of the 1.4 billion dollars Uncle Sam has spent in bolstering the economy of Taiwan (Formosa) has gone to reforming agriculture there to establish the family farm.

"Few people know our government is doing this. It seems to me we need such concern for agriculture here. We need to provide such opportunities for our people," Kenfield said.

"Here in the U.S., surplus money from the city is wrecking the rural economy through the land transfers going on now," Kenfield charged.

"The young man going into farming nowadays has to marry a farmer's daughter or have a father ready to retire," Kenfield said. "The land here is going to affluent individuals and corporations interested in a tax savings."

Kenfield says the Farmers Union has an idea worth talking about in this area. It would have to be a voluntary thing. The proposal is this: A farmers' agency—perhaps the Farmers Home Administration—would be authorized to become the transfer agency for farm and ranch lands. When a farmer or rancher wished to retire, he could sell to the agency at an appraised price and take his money either in a lump sum, an annuity or however he wants. A young couple or a young man who wanted to go into farming would have available long term credit at a low rate of interest which would enable them to take over a farm or ranch which is

available. As things stand now, it is almost impossible for a young person to go into agriculture on his own.

This brought Kenfield to another subject, the average age of today's farmer, which is past 50. "He is farming more areas and handling more livestock and he suffers more heart attacks than any other segment of the population. Is it any wonder? Look at the burden he is working under."

What is worrying Kenfield is the growth of the city-oriented corporation farm movement. "Such corporations, entirely unrelated to farming, are diversifying into agriculture production, not only processing, but planting and harvesting. It will be a sad development if American agriculture is taken over by a few 'General Motors' farms. I think this concept of this type of giant farm is a valid one. In my opinion, this vast organization will not serve the needs of the people. It will be out for profit on a scarcity basis. A consumer can expect to pay \$1 for a loaf of bread and \$3 a pound for steak. With that kind of development, we'll have an utter breakdown of rural communities and rural services, all of which have been damaged too much already."

"In summary," he said, "to save America we must save the family-type farm and ranch or you could say it in another way. The family-type pattern of agriculture will save America."

What does Kenfield define as a family-type farm? It would vary in size and function. But it would be of sufficient size, in production units, to enable the family that furnishes the management and most of the labor to maintain itself in a fair and adequate American standard of living. This would include paying all the costs of production, taxes, wages, returns on investment and a certain enough net income to enable them to keep themselves in "health and happiness."

Basically, the size could be a 160-acre dairy farm, a 2,000-acre wheat farm, a 10,000-acre sheep ranch or 10 acres of berries.

"The main criteria of the family farm is that it would be under the control of the family that works the land, whether they own it wholly or lease part of it. The decision making would be in the hands of the farmer, his wife and family," Kenfield said.

Kenfield echoed the cry that farmers are badly underpaid. He said the parity ratio between what they have to pay for supplies, goods and services and what they get for what they produce has dropped down to 73 per cent. This means they are 27 cents short on every dollar. There's another aspect to this, he said. It means the farmer is subsidizing the rest of society.

"Although it sounds redundant, we must remember the American family spends only 18 per cent of its income for food, the lowest percentage of all nations of the world. This is another testament to the efficiency of family-type agriculture," he reminded.

Kenfield said a reversal of the migration of people from farms to cities must be sought. "We need more farmers because we are facing a serious food shortage. In fact, a number of people, economists and nutritionists, are making dire warnings about the results of the present race between population growth and the means of providing food."

He said the population in the U.S. will pass the 200 million mark sometime this December. "A Senate committee found hunger in almost every one of the 50 states—from serious cases of malnutrition to actual starving in Mississippi."

Kenfield's solution to the food problem in the world is two-fold. First, he sees the need to step up a Food for Peace program as an emergency operation. But no matter how much American agriculture improves, he said it is impossible for America to feed the world.

So, secondly, Kenfield would help farm

people in the developed and developing nations help themselves. Sensitive to the feelings of people, Kenfield emphasized that it would be bad to force our specific ways of doing things on to other people, who, after all, have ideas themselves. But he sees technical help, research and techniques as helping to improve food production throughout the world.

"We can do more with food than we can with guns," he said.

This quiet, studious man, whose work is his foremost interest, started his political career as a voter for FDR. He was attracted to the Farmers Union movement by a man—H. D. Rolph, a Joplin farmer who was a member of Montana's House of Representatives in the '20s and '30s—and by the essentially democratic character of Farmers Union meetings he attended. He recognized the movement was one through which the farmers could speak and act to solve their problems. That was in 1935.

A country newspaper editor in Texas, Newt Gresham, had worked with farm people and knew of their plight. They were short-weighted. Transportation charges were excessive. Prices were low. Marketing abuses were rampant. They couldn't get credit. So he and his neighbors came up with the idea that something more enduring than the Populist-type grassroots organization was needed. Besides knowing the techniques of production, farmers must know what was going on in the social, political and economic spheres. That was in 1902.

Three thrusts—cooperation, legislation and education—became the dominant aspects of the Farmers Union, with emphasis on education. Educator Kenfield, a teacher in a family of three generations of homesteaders, had found his niche. Now, 32 years later, cooperation, legislation and education remain the dominant interests of Kenfield and his fellow 10,000 Montana Farmers Union families.

#### ENDORSEMENT OF JOB CORPS BY NATIONAL CONGRESS OF AMERICAN INDIANS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the National Congress of American Indians, NCAI, recently paid well-deserved tribute to the Job Corps. In a resolution adopted at its convention, NCAI called on its tribal and individual members "to support the program of Job Corps with interest, involvement, and participation." This enthusiastic endorsement of the Job Corps is a measure of the success achieved not only by Indian youth but by all the more than 100,000 corpsmen and corpswomen who have gained new motivation and skills since the program's inception.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the NCAI resolution printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

#### JOB CORPS SUPPORT

Whereas the Job Corps was designed under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (with amendments) to help poverty-stricken youth who have been deprived of educational and vocational training opportunity, and does, in fact, provide such opportunity.

Now therefore be it resolved by NCAI in convention assembled in Portland, Oregon, October 2-6, 1967, that its tribal and individual members are urged to support the program of Job Corps with interest, involvement, and participation, and

Be it further resolved that tribes encourage the enrollment of eligible Indian youth in Job Corps, the completion of courses and

assignments by those who do enroll, and the utilization of their new skills after enrollees complete their courses.

WENDELL CHINO,

President.

W. E. MCINTOSH,

Resolutions Committee Chairman.

#### THE CHURCH AND CONSERVATION

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, an editorial in the October 1967 issue of American Forests discusses the moral and theological base of the conservation movement and, especially, the views of Prof. Richard A. Baer, Jr., of Earlham College, as expressed in a recent issue of Conservation Catalyst. This is a thoughtful editorial which I commend to my colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the editorial.

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

#### THE CHURCH AND CONSERVATION

In the current issue of *Conservation Catalyst*, Professor Richard A. Baer, Jr., hazards the prediction that "future generations will sooner judge us by what we have done to the Redwoods, the Northern Cascades or the Hudson River Valley than by our yearly output of autos or electricity."

Perhaps more cheering in this otherwise morose era is the fact that more and more Americans are coming to believe that Professor Baer is 100 percent right—and they are the people who are in a position to do something about it, not future generations.

Professor Baer's interesting article in *Catalyst*, partly the result of a seminar at Earlham College where he teaches, has to do with the attitude—or rather lack of attitude—of the church in regard to conservation.

In demythologizing nature, Dr. Baer points out, Israel divested nature of all supernatural qualities. Unlike previous cults that regarded nature as divine, Israel accepted the commission of a single god to "rule over nature and subdue it."

This "subdue" nature business has been a source of concern to conservationists for a long time. Moreover, many believe the "subdue" interpretation, which has been used repeatedly by apologists for development, may have been a bit wide of the mark. Among those of this view is Professor Baer.

"The symbol of man as lord over nature is a potentially dangerous one," Dr. Baer writes. "Modern man has accepted freedom from religious bondage to nature" (in other words we do not see the storm at sea, or the earthquake, or drought as divine manifestations that must be appeased), "but in his freedom he has become arrogant and has forgotten how much of a part of nature he really is." In fact, man has gone so far in the opposite direction "he has treated nature as possessing no intrinsic value or rights of its own, and has exploited it in whatever manner he chose."

This point of view did no great harm to nature until comparatively recent years when man's newly-acquired technological know-how enabled him to start subduing nature in earnest. Some compare modern man with a mental pygmy mounted on a monstrous earth-moving machine and imbued with a zeal to "subdue" everything in his path. This is not a pretty picture so far as conservationists are concerned.

But Professor Baer turns the tables on the "subdue" boys as their belief relates to the Bible by pointing out it is not necessarily so when one uses the Bible and Biblical history for his proof. God, he says, took joy in his

creation of the Earth and found it good. Nor did he believe that recreation was sinful, either, for did he not form Leviathan, the great sea monster, "to play with?" There is considerable evidence God may have valued nature quite apart from its immediate importance to man. Furthermore, there is evidence that Biblical man himself possessed no strictly utilitarian view of nature. Says Professor Baer, "Modern man's ravaging of his natural environment would have been viewed by the Biblical writers as essentially sacrilegious."

If the church is to become involved in the conservation battle, and one judges Professor Baer is all for it, the time is now, he stresses. Man today has his all-powerful tools to subdue nature. He also has a powerful tendency to inquire, "What good is it?" when a beautiful tree, beautiful river, beautiful mountain, or a beautiful almost anything stands in the path of those tools. This man who asks "what good is it?" is the man to watch and who has to be converted. The church could help.

How? We are all guilty of self interest to a degree. Self interest "also shows itself in more tightly structured forms, such as bureaucratic establishments and businesses. Facts and figures are often distorted to offer economic justification for projects which ignore the broader range of human values, particularly aesthetic values.

"It is in just such situations of conflict that the church could play a significant role," Professor Baer says. Future effective action will, of course, have to be based on scientific know-how of which we have great quantities. The contribution of the church, on the other hand, would be to challenge society to re-examine its values. "Just as Israel demythologized nature and thus helped pave the way for the development of modern science, so the church today needs to dethrone such contemporary gods as the erroneous belief that progress can be measured only in terms of the Gross National Product," Professor Baer sums up. In brief, the church could and should be of immense aid in helping man to develop and define an ethic of land usage.

Professor Baer's statement would be of interest at any time but its timeliness at this particular moment makes it truly significant. There is a wave of conservation sentiment in the land. It is reflected on every side. Small but potent segments of the public are challenging business as usual as regards dams in the Grand Canyon, power lines in historic Pennsylvania, a power plant on Storm King Mountain, the necessity for cutting timber in the Magruder Corridor or remaining virgin redwoods, and pulling the plug on Everglades National Park. These small groups are demanding alternatives to these proposals. They do not say the public should be denied power or whatever or that science is a monster; they do ask all possible alternatives to these proposals be explored and in many cases they have not been so explored.

These people are potent but they are few in number. They take it seriously when they read aloud on Sundays the rather terrifying creed of the church that "... we have left undone those things we should have done." The conservation movement itself, which thinks it is a lot more important than it actually is, is also too thinly manned. It needs help and it deserves help that must come from a truly converted public. That the church could and should be a powerful force in this conversion process is self evident if it truly comes to grips with the subject on Professor Baer's terms.

While Professor Baer doesn't put it in just these terms, what he is actually saying is that "God is a conservationist." Quite so. When one stops and thinks about it, how could He be otherwise? Just take a look at

the fall foliage in your neighborhood and be convinced.

J. B. C.

#### PROGRAMS FOR THE AGING TO MEET MANPOWER PROBLEM

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, an editorial published by the Great Falls Tribune on October 8 calls attention to a manpower problem that is bound to become critical within the next 5 years.

In that length of time, 35,000 lawyers, 3,000 dieticians, 18,000 college professors, 12,000 social workers, 11,000 librarians, 32,000 physicians, 43,000 registered nurses, and many thousands of school-teachers are going to retire in this country.

The editorial attributes these figures to Allen M. A. Buckingham, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's regional office at Denver.

While these people retire, all of us in the helping services are crying for more help—

Mr. Buckingham said at a recent conference on social welfare in Butte, Mont.

Manpower is one of the biggest social problems we face.

He suggested an accelerated program to make use of the talents of older persons, and he recommended planning now to relate the needs of older citizens with the communities in which they live.

The Great Falls Tribune observes that my State of Montana has made a fair start on a program for the aging. I am grateful to have its views and its comment on Mr. Buckingham's speech. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### SCRAP METAL OR GOLDEN INGOTS?

Senior citizens are truly golden ingots, according to Allen M. A. Buckingham of Denver, regional representative on aging for the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Mining and bringing resources of senior citizens to the surface is not always easy and some of the nuggets seem to become lost in the smelting processes of our modern society, Buckingham contends.

In a talk, "Scrap Metal or Golden Ingots?" which he presented at the recent Montana Conference on Social Welfare at Butte, Buckingham emphasized there is a great potential in the senior citizens.

During the next five years, the following will retire, he said: 35,000 lawyers, 3,000 dieticians, 18,000 college professors, 12,000 social workers, 11,000 librarians, 32,000 physicians, 43,000 registered nurses and many thousands of school teachers.

"While these people retire, all of us in the helping services are crying for more help," Buckingham said. "Manpower is one of the biggest social problems we face."

Buckingham said there surely are ways of using retired talents on a part-time employed or volunteer basis.

Attitudes toward aging are changing in a positive direction, he said.

Aging is relatively new to our society, Buckingham pointed out. In 1900 the average person could expect 2½ years of retirement; today he can expect 15 years of retirement.

Aging is now regarded as a kind of social disease rather than a disease process as it used to be, he explained.

Complimenting Montana for being con-

scious of its rich resources in the state's senior citizens, Buckingham called for an accelerated program to take advantage of the talents of older persons. He strongly recommended comprehensive planning to relate the needs of our golden ingots to the total community and its needs.

Montana has made a fair start on a program for the aging. The state can brighten its reputation as the "Treasure State" if it regards its senior citizens as golden ingots rather than as scrap metal.

#### THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, Editorial Projects for Education, a non-profit organization associated with the American Alumni Council, has prepared a detailed account of the role and impact that Federal funds have had in higher education. The report is entitled: "America's College and Universities, Recipients of Billions in Federal Funds, Have a New Relationship: Life With Uncle." This report has appeared in various alumni publications as a special insert.

The relationship between higher education and the Federal Government has been growing steadily during the years. The complexity of this relationship and problems which tend to weaken the partnership are openly considered. Since Federal aid to higher education is an accomplished fact, it would seem to me that we should seek to refine and improve our communication in this area. Because of the importance of higher education as it affects the lives of all of us, and the completeness of this report, I call this timely article to the attention of my colleagues. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

#### AMERICA'S COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, RECIPIENTS OF BILLIONS IN FEDERAL FUNDS, HAVE A NEW RELATIONSHIP: LIFE WITH UNCLE

What would happen if all the Federal dollars now going to America's colleges and universities were suddenly withdrawn?

The president of one university pondered the question briefly, then replied: "Well, first, there would be this very loud sucking sound."

Indeed there would. It would be heard from Berkeley's gates to Harvard's yard, from Colby, Maine, to Kilgore, Texas. And in its wake would come shock waves that would rock the entire establishment of American higher education.

No institution of higher learning, regardless of its size or remoteness from Washington, can escape the impact of the Federal government's involvement in higher education. Of the 2,200 institutions of higher learning in the United States, about 1,800 participate in one or more Federally supported or sponsored programs. (Even an institution which receives no Federal dollars is affected—for it must compete for faculty, students, and private dollars with the institutions that do receive Federal funds for such things.)

Hence, although hardly anyone seriously believes that Federal spending on the campus is going to stop or even decrease significantly, the possibility, however remote, is enough to send shivers down the nation's academic backbone. Colleges and universi-

ties operate on such tight budgets that even a relatively slight ebb in the flow of Federal funds could be serious. The fiscal belt-tightening in Washington, caused by the war in Vietnam and the threat of inflation, has already brought a financial squeeze to some institutions.

A look at what would happen if all Federal dollars were suddenly withdrawn from colleges and universities may be an exercise in the absurd, but it dramatizes the depth of government involvement:

The nation's undergraduates would lose more than 800,000 scholarships, loans, and work-study grants, amounting to well over \$300 million.

Colleges and universities would lose some \$2 billion which now supports research on the campuses. Consequently some 50 per cent of America's science faculty members would be without support for their research. They would lose the summer salaries which they have come to depend on—and, in some cases, they would lose part of their salaries for the other nine months, as well.

The big government-owned research laboratories which several universities operate under contract would be closed. Although this might end some management headaches for the universities, it would also deprive thousands of scientists and engineers of employment and the institutions of several million dollars in overhead reimbursements and fees.

The newly established National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities—for which faculties have waited for years—would collapse before its first grants were spent.

Planned or partially constructed college and university buildings, costing roughly \$2.5 billion, would be delayed or abandoned altogether.

Many of our most eminent universities and medical schools would find their annual budgets sharply reduced—in some cases by more than 50 per cent. And the 68 land-grant institutions would lose Federal institutional support which they have been receiving since the nineteenth century.

Major parts of the anti-poverty program, the new GI Bill, the Peace Corps, and the many other programs which call for spending on the campuses would founder.

The Federal Government is now the "Big Spender" in the academic world. Last year, Washington spent more money on the nation's campuses than did the 50 state governments combined. The National Institutes of Health alone spent more on educational and research projects than any one state allocated for higher education. The National Science Foundation, also a Federal agency, awarded more funds to colleges and universities than did all the business corporations in America. And the U.S. Office of Education's annual expenditure in higher education of \$1.2 billion far exceeded all gifts from private foundations and alumni. The \$5 billion or so that the Federal government will spend on campuses this year constitutes more than 25 per cent of higher education's total budget.

About half of the Federal funds now going to academic institutions support research and research-related activities—and, in most cases, the research is in the sciences. Most often an individual scholar, with his institution's blessing, applies directly to a Federal agency for funds to support his work. A professor of chemistry, for example, might apply to the National Science Foundation for funds to pay for salaries (part of his own, his collaborators', and his research technicians'), equipment, graduate-student stipends, travel, and anything else he could justify as essential to his work. A panel of his scholarly peers from colleges and universities, assembled by NSF, meets periodically in Washington to evaluate his and other applications. If the panel members approve, the professor usually receives his grant and his college or

university receives a percentage of the total amount to meet its overhead costs. (Under several Federal programs, the institution itself can request funds to help construct buildings and grants to strengthen or initiate research programs.)

The other half of the Federal government's expenditure in higher education is for student aid, for books and equipment, for classroom buildings, laboratories, and dormitories, for overseas projects, and—recently, in modest amounts—for the general strengthening of the institution.

There is almost no Federal agency which does not provide some funds for higher education. And there are few activities on a campus that are not eligible for some kind of government aid.

Clearly our colleges and universities now depend so heavily on Federal funds to help pay for salaries, tuition, research, construction, and operating costs that any significant decline in Federal support would disrupt the whole enterprise of American higher education.

To some educators, this dependence is a threat to the integrity and independence of the colleges and universities. "It is unnerving to know that our system of higher education is highly vulnerable to the whims and fickleness of politics," says a man who has held high positions both in government and on the campus.

Others minimize the hazards. Public institutions, they point out, have always been vulnerable in this sense—yet look how they've flourished. Congressmen, in fact, have been conscientious in their approach to Federal support of higher education; the problem is that standards other than those of the universities and colleges could become the determining factors in the nature and direction of Federal support. In any case, the argument runs, all academic institutions depend on the good will of others to provide the support that insures freedom. McGeorge Bundy, before he left the White House to head the Ford Foundation, said flatly: "American higher education is more and not less free and strong because of Federal funds." Such funds, he argued, actually have enhanced freedom by enlarging the opportunity of institutions to act; they are no more tainted than are dollars from other sources; and the way in which they are allocated is closed to academic tradition than is the case with nearly all other major sources of funds.

The issue of Federal control notwithstanding, Federal support of higher education is taking its place alongside military budgets and farm subsidies as one of the government's essential activities. All evidence indicates that such is the public's will. Education has always had a special worth in this country, and each new generation sets the valuation higher. In a recent Gallup Poll on national goals, Americans listed education as having first priority. Governors, state legislators, and Congressmen, ever sensitive to voter attitudes, are finding that the improvement of education is not only a noble issue on which to stand, but a winning one.

The increased Federal interest and support reflect another fact: the government now relies as heavily on the colleges and universities as the institutions do on the government. President Johnson told an audience at Princeton last year that in "almost every field of concern, from economics to national security, the academic community has become a central instrument of public policy in the United States."

Logan Wilson, president of the American Council on Education (an organization which often speaks in behalf of higher education), agrees. "Our history attests to the vital role which colleges and universities have played in assuring the nation's security and progress, and our present circumstances magnify rather than diminish the role," he says.

"Since the final responsibility for our collective security and welfare can reside only in the Federal government, a close partnership between government and higher education is essential."

The partnership indeed exists. As a report of the American Society of Biological Chemists has said, "the condition of mutual dependence between the Federal government and institutions of higher learning and research is one of the most profound and significant developments of our time."

Directly and indirectly, the partnership has produced enormous benefits. It has played a central role in this country's progress in science and technology—and hence has contributed to our national security, our high standard of living, the lengthening life span, our world leadership. One analysis credits to education 40 per cent of the nation's growth in economic productivity in recent years.

Despite such benefits, some thoughtful observers are concerned about the future development of the government-campus partnership. They are asking how the flood of Federal funds will alter the traditional missions of higher education, the time-honored responsibility of the states, and the flow of private funds to the campuses. They wonder if the give and take between equal partners can continue, when one has the money and the other "only the brains."

Problems already have arisen from the dynamic and complex relationship between Washington and the academic world. How serious and complex such problems can become is illustrated by the current controversy over the concentration of Federal research funds on relatively few campuses and in certain sections of the country.

The problem grew out of World War II, when the government turned to the campuses for desperately needed scientific research. Since many of the best-known and most productive scientists were working in a dozen or so institutions in the Northeast and a few in the Midwest and California, more than half of the Federal research funds were spent there. (Most of the remaining money went to another 50 universities with research and graduate training.)

The wartime emergency obviously justified this concentration of funds. When the war ended, however, the lopsided distribution of Federal research funds did not. In fact, it has continued right up to the present, with 29 institutions receiving more than 50 per cent of Federal research dollars.

To the institutions on the receiving end, the situation seems natural and proper. They are, after all, the strongest and most productive research centers in the nation. The government, they argue, has an obligation to spend the public's money where it will yield the highest return to the nation.

The less-favored institutions recognize this obligation, too. But they maintain that it is equally important to the nation to develop new institutions of high quality—yet, without financial help from Washington, the second- and third-rank institutions will remain just that.

In late 1965 President Johnson, in a memorandum to the heads of Federal departments and agencies, acknowledged the importance of maintaining scientific excellence in the institutions where it now exists. But, he emphasized, Federal research funds should also be used to strengthen and develop new centers of excellence. Last year this "spread the wealth" movement gained momentum, as a number of agencies stepped up their efforts to broaden the distribution of research money. The Department of Defense, for example, one of the bigger purchasers of research, designated \$18 million for this academic year to help about 50 widely scattered institutions develop into high-grade research centers. But with economics induced by the war in Vietnam, it is doubtful whether

enough money will be available in the near future to end the controversy.

Eventually, Congress may have to act. In so doing, it is almost certain to displease, and perhaps hurt, some institutions. To the pessimist, the situation is a sign of troubled times ahead. To the optimist, it is the democratic process at work.

Recent student demonstrations have dramatized another problem to which the partnership between the government and the campus has contributed: the relative emphasis that is placed on research and on the teaching of undergraduates.

Wisconsin's Representative Henry Reuss conducted a Congressional study of the situation. Subsequently he said: "University teaching has become a sort of poor relation to research. I don't quarrel with the goal of excellence in science, but it is pursued at the expense of another important goal—excellence of teaching. Teaching suffers and is going to suffer more."

The problem is not limited to universities. It is having a pronounced effect on the smaller liberal arts colleges, the women's colleges, and the junior colleges—all of which have as their primary function the teaching of undergraduates. To offer a first-rate education, the colleges must attract and retain a first-rate faculty, which in turn attracts good students and financial support. But undergraduate colleges can rarely compete with Federally supported universities in faculty salaries, fellowship awards, research opportunities, and plant and equipment. The president of one of the best undergraduate colleges says: "When we do get a young scholar who skillfully combines research and teaching abilities, the universities lure him from us with the promise of a high salary, light teaching duties, frequent leaves, and almost anything else he may want."

Leland Haworth, whose National Science Foundation distributes more than \$300 million annually for research activities and graduate programs on the campuses, disagrees. "I hold little or no brief," he says, "for the allegation that Federal support of research has detracted seriously from undergraduate teaching. I dispute the contention heard in some quarters that certain of our major universities have become giant research factories concentrating on Federally sponsored research projects to the detriment of their educational functions." Most university scholars would probably support Mr. Haworth's contention that teachers who conduct research are generally better teachers, and that the research enterprise has infused science education with new substance and vitality.

To get perspective on the problem, compare university research today with what it was before World War II. A prominent physicist calls the prewar days "a horse-and-buggy period." In 1930, colleges and universities spent less than \$20 million on scientific research, and that came largely from private foundations, corporations, and endowment income. Scholars often built their equipment from ingeniously adapted scraps and spare machine parts. Graduate students considered it compensation enough just to be allowed to participate.

Some three decades and \$125 billion later, there is hardly an academic scientist who does not feel pressure to get government funds. The chairman of one leading biology department admits that "if a young scholar doesn't have a grant when he comes here, he had better get one within a year or so or he's out; we have no funds to support his research."

Considering the large amounts of money available for research and graduate training, and recognizing that the publication of research findings is still the primary criterion for academic promotion, it is not surprising that the faculties of most universities spend

a substantial part of their energies in those activities.

Federal agencies are looking for ways to ease the problem. The National Science Foundation, for example, has set up a new program which will make grants to undergraduate colleges for the improvement of science instruction.

More help will surely be forthcoming.

The fact that Federal funds have been concentrated in the sciences has also had a pronounced effect on colleges and universities. In many institutions, faculty members in the natural sciences earn more than faculty members in the humanities and social sciences; they have better facilities, more frequent leaves, and generally more influence on the campus.

The government's support of science can also disrupt the academic balance and internal priorities of a college or university. One president explained:

"Our highest-priority construction project was a \$3 million building for our humanities departments. Under the Higher Education Facilities Act, we could expect to get a third of this from the Federal government. This would leave \$2 million for us to get from private sources.

"But then, under a new government program, the biology and psychology faculty decided to apply to the National Institutes of Health for \$1.5 million for new faculty members over a period of five years. These additional faculty people, however, made it necessary for us to go ahead immediately with our plans for a \$4 million science building—so we gave it the No. 1 priority and moved the humanities building down the list.

"We could finance half the science building's cost with Federal funds. In addition, the scientists pointed out, they could get several training grants which would provide stipends to graduate students and tuition to our institution.

"You see what this meant? Both needs were valid—those of the humanities and those of the sciences. For \$2 million of private money, I could either build a \$3 million humanities building or I could build a \$4 million science building, get \$1.5 million for additional faculty, and pick up a few hundred thousand dollars in training grants. Either-or, not both."

The president could have added that if the scientists had been denied the privilege of applying to NIH, they might well have gone to another institution, taking their research grants with them. On the other hand, under the conditions of the academic marketplace, it was unlikely that the humanities scholars would be able to exercise a similar mobility.

The case also illustrates why academic administrators sometimes complain that Federal support of an individual faculty member's research projects casts their institution in the ineffectual role of a legal middleman, prompting the faculty member to feel a greater loyalty to a Federal agency than to the college or university.

Congress has moved to lessen the disparity between support of the humanities and social sciences on the one hand and support of the physical and biological sciences on the other. It established the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities—a move which, despite a pitifully small first-year allocation of funds, offers some encouragement. And close observers of the Washington scene predict that the social sciences, which have been receiving some Federal support, are destined to get considerably more in the next few years.

Efforts to cope with such difficult problems must begin with an understanding of the nature and background of the government-campus partnership. But this presents a problem in itself, for one encounters a welter of conflicting statistics, contradictory information, and wide differences of honest opin-

ion. The task is further complicated by the swiftness with which the situation continually changes. And—the ultimate complication—there is almost no uniformity or coordination in the Federal government's numerous programs affecting higher education.

Each of the 50 or so agencies dispensing Federal funds to the colleges and universities is responsible for its own program, and no single Federal agency supervises the entire enterprise. (The creation of the Office of Science and Technology in 1962 represented an attempt to cope with the multiplicity of relationships. But so far there has been little significant improvement.) Even within the two houses of Congress, responsibility for the government's expenditures on the campuses is scattered among several committees.

Not only does the lack of a coordinated Federal program make it difficult to find a clear definition of the government's role in higher education, but it also creates a number of problems both in Washington and on the campuses.

The Bureau of the Budget, for example, has had to wrestle with several uncoordinated, duplicative Federal science budgets and with different accounting systems. Congress, faced with the almost impossible task of keeping informed about the esoteric world of science in order to legislate intelligently, finds it difficult to control and direct the fast-growing Federal investment in higher education. And the individual government agencies are forced to make policy decisions and to respond to political and other pressures without adequate or consistent guidelines from above.

The colleges and universities, on the other hand, must negotiate the maze of Federal bureaus with consummate skill if they are to get their share of the Federal largesse. If they succeed, they must then cope with mountains of paperwork, disparate systems of accounting, and volumes of regulations that differ from agency to agency. Considering the magnitude of the financial rewards at stake, the institutions have had no choice but to enlarge their administrative staffs accordingly, adding people who can handle the business problems, wrestle with paperwork, manage grants and contracts, and untangle legal snarls. College and university presidents are constantly looking for competent academic administrators to prowl the Federal agencies in search of programs and opportunities in which their institutions can profitably participate.

The latter group of people, whom the press calls "university lobbyists," has been growing in number. At least a dozen institutions now have full-time representatives working in Washington. Many more have members of their administrative and academic staffs shuttling to and from the capital to negotiate Federal grants and contracts, cultivate agency personnel, and try to influence legislation. Still other institutions have enlisted the aid of qualified alumni or trustees who happen to live in Washington.

The lack of a uniform Federal policy prevents the clear statement of national goals that might give direction to the government's investments in higher education. This takes a toll in effectiveness and consistency and tends to produce contradictions and conflicts. The teaching-versus-research controversy is one example.

President Johnson provided another. Last summer, he publicly asked if the country is really getting its money's worth from its support of scientific research. He implied that the time may have come to apply more widely, for the benefit of the nation, the knowledge that Federally sponsored medical research had produced in recent years. A wave of apprehension spread through the medical schools when the President's remarks were reported. The inference to be drawn was that the Federal funds supporting the elaborate

research effort, built at the urging of the government, might now be diverted to actual medical care and treatment. Later the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, John W. Gardner, tried to lay a calming hand on the medical scientists' fevered brows by making a strong reaffirmation of the National Institutes of Health's commitment to basic research. But the apprehensiveness remains.

Other events suggest that the 25-year honeymoon of science and the government may be ending. Connecticut's Congressman Emilio Q. Daddario, a man who is not intimidated by the mystique of modern science, has stepped up his campaign to have a greater part of the National Science Foundation budget spent on applied research. And, despite pleas from scientists and NSF administrators, Congress terminated the costly Mohole project, which was designed to gain more fundamental information about the internal structure of the earth.

Some observers feel that because it permits and often causes such conflicts, the diversity in the government's support of higher education is a basic flaw in the partnership. Others, however, believe this diversity, despite its disadvantages, guarantees a margin of independence to colleges and universities that would be jeopardized in a monolithic "super-bureau."

Good or bad, the diversity was probably essential to the development of the partnership between Washington and the academic world. Charles Kidd, executive secretary of the Federal Council for Science and Technology, puts it bluntly when he points out that the system's pluralism has allowed us to avoid dealing "directly with the ideological problem of what the total relationship of the government and universities should be. If we had had to face these ideological and political pressures head-on over the past few years, the confrontation probably would have wrecked the system."

That confrontation may be coming closer, as Federal allocations to science and education come under sharper scrutiny in Congress and as the partnership enters a new and significant phase.

Federal aid to higher education began with the Ordinance of 1787, which set aside public lands for schools and declared that the "means of education shall forever be encouraged." But the two forces that most shaped American higher education, say many historians, were the land-grant movement of the nineteenth century and the Federal support of scientific research that began in World War II.

The land-grant legislation and related acts of Congress in subsequent years established the American concept of enlisting the resources of higher education to meet pressing national needs. The laws were pragmatic and were designed to improve education and research in the natural sciences, from which agricultural and industrial expansion could proceed. From these laws has evolved the world's greatest system of public higher education.

In this century the Federal involvement grew spasmodically during such periods of crisis as World War I and the depression of the thirties. But it was not until World War II that the relationship began its rapid evolution into the dynamic and intimate partnership that now exists.

Federal agencies and industrial laboratories were ill-prepared in 1940 to supply the research and technology so essential to a full-scale war effort. The government therefore turned to the nation's colleges and universities. Federal funds supported scientific research on the campuses and build huge research facilities to be operated by universities under contract, such as Chicago's Argonne Laboratory and California's laboratory in Los Alamos.

So successful was the new relationship that it continued to flourish after the war.

Federal research funds poured onto the campuses from military agencies, the National Institutes of Health, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Science Foundation. The amounts of money increased spectacularly. At the beginning of the war the Federal government spent less than \$200 million a year for all research and development. By 1950, the Federal "r & d" expenditure totaled \$1 billion.

The Soviet Union's launching of Sputnik jolted the nation and brought a dramatic surge in support of scientific research. President Eisenhower named James R. Killian, Jr., president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, to be Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration was established, and the National Defense Education Act of 1958 was passed. Federal spending for scientific research and development increased to \$5.8 billion. Of this, \$400 million went to colleges and universities.

The 1960's brought a new dimension to the relationship between the Federal government and higher education. Until then, Federal aid was almost synonymous with government support of science, and all Federal dollars allocated to campuses were to meet specific national needs.

There were two important exceptions: the GI Bill after World War II, which crowded the colleges and universities with returning servicemen and spent \$19 billion on educational benefits, and the National Defense Education Act, which was the broadest legislation of its kind and the first to be based, at least in part, on the premise that support of education itself is as much in the national interest as support which is based on the colleges' contributions to something as specific as the national defense.

The crucial turning-points were reached in the Kennedy-Johnson years. President Kennedy said: "We pledge ourselves to seek a system of higher education where every young American can be educated, not according to his race or his means, but according to his capacity. Never in the life of this country has the pursuit of that goal become more important or more urgent." Here was a clear national commitment to universal higher education, a public acknowledgment that higher education is worthy of support for its own sake. The Kennedy and Johnson administrations produced legislation which authorized:

\$1.5 billion in matching funds for new construction on the nation's campuses.

\$151 million for local communities for the building of junior colleges.

\$432 million for new medical and dental schools and for aid to their students.

The first large-scale Federal program of undergraduate scholarships, and the first Federal package combining them with loans and jobs to help individual students.

Grants to strengthen college and university libraries.

Significant amounts of Federal money for "promising institutions," in an effort to lift the entire system of higher education.

The first significant support of the humanities.

In addition, dozens of "Great Society" bills included funds for colleges and universities. And their number is likely to increase in the years ahead.

The full significance of the developments of the past few years will probably not be known for some time. But it is clear that the partnership between the Federal government and higher education has entered a new phase. The question of the Federal government's total relationship to colleges and universities—avoided for so many years—has still not been squarely faced. But a confrontation may be just around the corner.

The major pitfall, around which Presidents and Congressmen have detoured, is the issue

of the separation of state and church. The Constitution of the United States says nothing about the Federal government's responsibility for education. So the rationale for Federal involvement, up to now, has been the Constitution's Article I, which grants Congress the power to spend tax money for the common defense and the general welfare of the nation.

So long as Federal support of education was specific in nature and linked to the national defense the religious issue could be skirted. But as the emphasis moved to providing for the national welfare, the legal grounds became less firm, for the First Amendment to the Constitution says, in part, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion. . . ."

So far, for practical and obvious reasons, neither the President nor Congress has met the problem head-on. But the battle has been joined, anyway. Some cases challenging grants to church-related colleges are now in the courts. And Congress is being pressed to pass legislation that would permit a citizen to challenge, in the Federal courts, the Congressional acts relating to higher education.

Meanwhile, America's 893 church-related colleges are eligible for funds under most Federal programs supporting higher education, and nearly all have received such funds. Most of these institutions would applaud a decision permitting the support to continue.

Some, however, would not. The Southern Baptists and the Seventh Day Adventists, for instance, have opposed Federal aid to the colleges and universities related to their denominations. Furman University, for example, under pressure from the South Carolina Baptist convention, returned a \$612,000 Federal grant that it had applied for and received. Many colleges are awaiting the report of a Southern Baptist study group, due this summer.

Such institutions face an agonizing dilemma: stand fast on the principle of separation of church and state and take the financial consequences, or join the majority of colleges and universities and risk Federal influence. Said one delegate to the Southern Baptist Convention: "Those who say we're going to become second-rate schools unless we take Federal funds see clearly. I'm beginning to see it so clearly it's almost a nightmarish thing. I've moved toward Federal aid reluctantly; I don't like it."

Some colleges and universities, while refusing Federal aid in principle, permit some exceptions. Wheaton College, in Illinois, is a hold-out; but it allows some of its professors to accept National Science Foundation research grants. So does Rockford College, in Illinois. Others shun government money, but let their students accept Federal scholarships and loans. The president of one small church-related college, faced with acute financial problems, says simply: "The basic issue for us is survival."

Recent Federal programs have sharpened the conflict between Washington and the states in fixing the responsibility for education. Traditionally and constitutionally, the responsibility has generally been with the states. But as Federal support has equaled and surpassed the state allocations to higher education, the question of responsibility is less clear.

The great growth in quality and Ph.D. production of many state universities, for instance, is undoubtedly due in large measure to Federal support. Federal dollars pay for most of the scientific research in state universities, make possible higher salaries which attract outstanding scholars, contribute substantially to new buildings, and provide large amounts of student aid. Clark Kerr speaks of the "Federal grant university," and the University of California (which he used to head) is an apt example: nearly half of its total income comes from Washington.

To most governors and state legislators,

the Federal grants are a mixed blessing. Although they have helped raise the quality and capabilities of state institutions, the grants have also raised the pressure on state governments to increase their appropriations for higher education, if for no other reason than to fulfill the matching requirement of many Federal awards. But even funds which are not channeled through the state agencies and do not require the state to provide matching funds can give impetus to increased appropriations for higher education. Federal research grants to individual scholars, for example, may make it necessary for the state to provide more faculty members to get the teaching done.

Last year, 38 states and territories joined the Compact for Education, an interstate organization designed to provide "close and continuing consultation among our several states on all matters of education." The operating arm of the Compact will gather information, conduct research, seek to improve standards, propose policies, "and do such things as may be necessary or incidental to the administration of its authority. . . ."

Although not spelled out in the formal language of the document, the Compact is clearly intended to enable the states to present a united front on the future of Federal aid to education.

In typically pragmatic fashion, we Americans want our colleges and universities to serve the public interest. We expect them to train enough doctors, lawyers, and engineers. We expect them to provide answers to immediate problems such as water and air pollution, urban blight, national defense, and disease. As we have done so often in the past, we expect the Federal government to build a creative and democratic system that will accomplish these things.

A faculty planning committee at one university stated in its report: ". . . A university is now regarded as a symbol for our age, the crucible in which—by some mysterious alchemy—man's long-awaited Utopia will at last be forged."

Some think the Federal role in higher education is growing too rapidly.

As early as 1952, the Association of American Universities' commission on financing higher education warned: "We as a nation should call a halt at this time to the introduction of new programs of direct Federal aid to colleges and universities. . . . Higher education at least needs time to digest what it has already undertaken and to evaluate the full impact of what it is already doing under Federal assistance." The recommendation went unheeded.

A year or so ago, Representative Edith Green of Oregon, an active architect of major education legislation, echoed this sentiment. The time has come, she said, "to stop, look, and listen," to evaluate the impact of Congressional action on the educational system. It seems safe to predict that Mrs. Green's warning, like that of the university presidents, will fall to halt the growth of Federal spending on the campus. But the note of caution she sounds will be well-taken by many who are increasingly concerned about the impact of the Federal involvement in higher education.

The more pessimistic observers fear direct Federal control of higher education. With the loyalty-oath conflict in mind, they see peril in the requirement that Federally supported colleges and universities demonstrate compliance with civil rights legislation or lose their Federal support. They express alarm at recent agency anti-conflict-of-interest proposals that would require scholars who receive government support to account for all of their other activities.

For most who are concerned, however, the fear is not so much of direct Federal control as of Federal influence on the conduct of American higher education. Their worry is not that the government will deliberately

restrict the freedom of the scholar, or directly change an institution of higher learning. Rather, they are afraid the scholars may be tempted to confine his studies to areas where Federal support is known to be available, and that institutions will be unable to resist the lure of Federal dollars.

Before he became Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, John W. Gardner said: "When a government agency with money to spend approaches a university, it can usually purchase almost any service it wants. And many institutions still follow the old practice of looking on funds so received as gifts. They not only do not look a gift horse in the mouth; they do not even pause to note whether it is a horse or a boa constrictor."

The greatest obstacle to the success of the government-campus partnership may lie in the fact that the partners have different objectives.

The Federal government's support of higher education has been essentially pragmatic. The Federal agencies have a mission to fulfill. To the degree that the colleges and universities can help to fulfill that mission, the agencies provide support.

The Atomic Energy Commission, for example, supports research and related activities in nuclear physics; the National Institutes of Health provide funds for medical research; the Agency for International Development finances overseas programs. Even recent programs which tend to recognize higher education as a national resource in itself are basically presented as efforts to cope with pressing national problems.

The Higher Education Facilities Act, for instance, provides matching funds for the construction of academic buildings. But the awards under this program are made on the basis of projected increases in enrollment. In the award of National Defense Graduate Fellowships to institutions, enrollment expansion and the initiation of new graduate programs are the main criteria. Under new programs affecting medical and dental schools, much of the Federal money is intended to increase the number of practitioners. Even the National Humanities Endowment, which is the government's attempt to rectify an academic imbalance aggravated by massive Federal support for the sciences, is curiously and pragmatically oriented to fulfill a specific mission, rather than to support the humanities generally because they are worthy in themselves.

Who can dispute the validity of such objectives? Surely not the institutions of higher learning, for they recognize an obligation to serve society by providing trained manpower and by conducting applied research. But colleges and universities have other traditional missions of at least equal importance. Basic research, though it may have no apparent relevance to society's immediate needs, is a primary (and almost exclusive) function of universities. It needs no other justification than the scholar's curiosity. The department of classics is as important in the college as is the department of physics, even though it does not contribute to the national defense. And enrollment expansion is neither an inherent virtue nor a universal goal in higher education; in fact, some institutions can better fulfill their objectives by remaining relatively small and selective.

Colleges and universities believe, for the most part, that they themselves are the best judges of what they ought to do, where they would like to go, and what their internal academic priorities are. For this reason the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges has advocated that the government increase its institutional (rather than individual project) support in higher education, thus permitting colleges and universities a reasonable latitude in using Federal funds.

Congress, however, considers that it can

best determine what the nation's needs are, and how the taxpayer's money ought to be spent. Since there is never enough money to do everything that cries to be done, the choice between allocating Federal funds for cancer research or for classics is not a very difficult one for the nation's political leaders to make.

"The fact is," says one professor, "that we are trying to merge two entirely different systems. The government is the political engine of our democracy and must be responsive to the wishes of the people. But scholarship is not very democratic. You don't vote on the laws of thermodynamics or take a poll on the speed of light. Academic freedom and tenure are not prizes in a popularity contest."

Some observers feel that such a merger cannot be accomplished without causing fundamental changes in colleges and universities. They point to existing academic imbalances, the teaching-versus-research controversy, the changing roles of both professor and student, the growing commitment of colleges and universities of applied research. They fear that the influx of Federal funds into higher education will so transform colleges and universities that the very qualities that made the partnership desirable and productive in the first place will be lost.

The great technological achievements of the past 30 years, for example, would have been impossible without the basic scientific research that preceded them. This research—much of it seemingly irrelevant to society's needs—was conducted in universities, because only there could the scholar find the freedom and support that were essential to his quest. If the growing demand for applied research is met at the expense of basic research, future generations may pay the penalty.

One could argue—and many do—that colleges and universities do not have to accept Federal funds. But, to most of the nation's colleges and universities, the rejection of Federal support is an unacceptable alternative.

For those institutions already dependent upon Federal dollars, it is too late to turn back. Their physical plant, their programs, their personnel are all geared to continuing Federal aid.

And for those institutions which have received only token help from Washington, Federal dollars offer the one real hope of meeting the educational objectives they have set for themselves.

However distasteful the thought may be to those who oppose further Federal involvement in higher education, the fact is that there is no other way of getting the job done—to train the growing numbers of students, to conduct the basic research necessary to continued scientific progress, and to cope with society's most pressing problems.

Tuition, private contributions, and state allocations together fall far short of meeting the total cost of American higher education. And as costs rise, the gap is likely to widen. Tuition has finally passed the \$2,000 mark in several private colleges and universities, and it is rising even in the publicly supported institutions. State governments have increased their appropriations for higher education dramatically, but there are scores of other urgent needs competing for state funds. Gifts from private foundations, corporations, and alumni continue to rise steadily, but the increases are not keeping pace with rising costs.

Hence the continuation and probably the enlargement of the partnership between the Federal government and higher education appears to be inevitable. The real task facing the nation is to make it work.

To that end, colleges and universities may have to become more deeply involved in politics. They will have to determine, more clearly than ever before, just what their objectives are—and what their values are. And they will have to communicate these most effectively to their alumni, their politi-

cal representatives, and corporate communities, the foundations, and the public at large.

If the partnership is to succeed, the Federal government will have to do more than provide funds. Elected officials and administrators face the awesome task of formulating overall educational and research goals, to give direction to the programs of Federal support. They must make more of an effort to understand what makes colleges and universities tick, and to accommodate individual institutional differences.

The taxpaying public, and particularly alumni and alumnae, will play a crucial role in the evolution of the partnership. The degree of their understanding and support will be reflected in future legislation. And, along with private foundations and corporations, alumni and other friends of higher education bear a special responsibility for providing colleges and universities with financial support. The growing role of the Federal government, says the president of a major oil company, makes corporate contributions to higher education more important than ever before; he feels that private support enables colleges and universities to maintain academic balance and to preserve their freedom and independence. The president of a university agrees: "It is essential that the critical core of our colleges and universities be financed with non-Federal funds."

"What is going on here," says McGeorge Bundy, "is a great adventure in the purpose and performance of a free people." The partnership between higher education and the Federal government, he believes, is an experiment in American democracy.

Essentially, it is an effort to combine the forces of our educational and political systems for the common good. And the partnership is distinctly American—boldly built step by step in full public view, inspired by visionaries, tested and tempered by honest skeptics, forged out of practical political compromise.

Does it involve risks? Of course it does. But what great adventure does not? Is it not by risk-taking that free—and intelligent—people progress?

#### PUBLIC WELFARE PROVISIONS OF SOCIAL SECURITY BILL

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, 19 Members of the House of Representatives have voiced their concern to the Finance Committee over the harsh and coercive public welfare provisions of the House-passed social security bill, H.R. 12080. The Finance Committee is currently meeting in executive session on this bill. I ask unanimous consent to have this significant piece of correspondence printed in the RECORD for the benefit of the entire Senate.

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

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., August 25, 1967.

DEAR SENATOR: A number of members of the House of Representatives have been disturbed by some of the unnecessarily harsh public welfare provisions of the Social Security Amendments recently approved by the House.

The enclosed copy of a letter to the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee is self-explanatory.

We seek your efforts to eliminate those restrictive amendments and respectfully urge the adoption of a sound, humane welfare program, one that seeks, not to punish, but to improve the lot of those unfortunate mem-

bers of our society who must rely on public assistance to survive.

Sincerely yours,

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS.

Enclosure.

AUGUST 25, 1967.

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG,  
Chairman, Committee on Finance,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We, the undersigned members of the House of Representatives, strongly oppose the anti-welfare provisions of H.R. 12080, amending the Social Security Act. Since the bill contained improvements in the social security program but was brought before the House under a rule that prevented our offering amendments, we could neither vote against the bill nor amend those parts we believed to be injurious to the poorest people in our society, especially the children in needy families.

The failure of our society to provide decent jobs and adequate social facilities for its people results in many persons becoming unemployed and dependent through no fault of their own. Most of the poor (78%), although legally entitled to public welfare, survive on a hand-to-mouth basis without any public assistance. Of the remaining 22 percent, those who receive welfare, only about half are assisted on programs in which there is Federal matching money and consequently some effort to raise standards.

Of the 7.3 million persons who do receive public welfare, 2.1 million are 65 or older, 700,000 are severely handicapped, 3.5 million are children in needy families, and 1 million are the parents of these children, mostly mothers who need training for themselves and child care for their children if we expect them to seek jobs, if, indeed, they should.

Few persons on relief, therefore, are employable; and if jobs were available, there are millions already in the labor market who are not on welfare and are seeking employment.

H.R. 12080 does not recognize these and similar facts in its anti-welfare provisions. If passed, this bill would (1) freeze the number of children eligible to receive AFDC assistance as of January 1, 1967, (2) compel work assignment without spelling out safeguards, (3) change in purpose the AFDC program from one of protecting children to one of forcing mothers into the labor market without adequate protection for themselves or their children, (4) through its so-called work incentive provision, keep families in poverty in most states which offer low grants, and (5) fall entirely to assure minimum level standards or to provide that states must meet even the minimum needs they fix.

For these reasons we unite our efforts in seeking the cooperation of members of the Senate in rejecting anti-welfare provisions of the House-passed bill; and we further call on public-spirited citizens and organizations to mobilize public opposition to this part of H.R. 12080.

Respectfully yours,

JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., JEFFERY COHELAN, JOHN CONYERS, JR., CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., JOHN G. DOW, DON EDWARDS, LEONARD FARBSTEIN, DONALD M. FRASER, AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, PATSY T. MINK, ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, RICHARD L. OTTINGER, JOSEPH Y. RESNICK, BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, EDWARD R. ROYBAL, WILIAM F. RYAN, JAMES H. SCHEUER, CHARLES H. WILSON.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### URBAN-GRANT COLLEGE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on October 22, 1967, the New York Times published an outstanding article written by Mr. Fred M. Hechinger, entitled "A Call for the Urban-Grant College." Mr. Hechinger's article discusses a proposal made by Dr. Clark Kerr, former president of the University of California, urging the creation of urban-grant universities to be located in the large urban centers of this country in order that they may begin to tackle urban problems similar to the way land-grant universities have tackled rural problems.

As Members of the Senate know, I introduced S. 1999 on June 23, 1967, a bill providing for the establishment of a public land-grant college in the District of Columbia. Should the bill I introduced be approved by Congress, I envision the local land-grant college undertaking some of the programs suggested by Dr. Kerr. I believe that such urban-grant colleges can provide a great opportunity to help rescue American cities from many of the critical and deplorable problems they now face.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the New York Times article printed in the RECORD.

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

#### A CALL FOR THE URBAN-GRANT COLLEGE (By Fred M. Hechinger)

The urban crisis is becoming a cliché, and what was intended as a call to action may turn into a slogan to be talked into inaction. At best, crisis talk often leads to the application of old, patchwork remedies to new emergencies.

Last week, Dr. Clark Kerr launched a trial balloon for a program offering a radical cure of the country's worst domestic disease—the city slums. He said: "The United States today needs 67 urban-grant universities to stand beside its 67 land-grant universities." He urged the Federal Government to provide the funds to start creating these institutions—some from scratch, others by converting existing universities. To create one new institution of this kind for 10,000 students, he estimated, would require \$100-million.

Dr. Kerr, who had been president of the University of California from 1958 until early this year when he was dismissed because of his objections to Gov. Ronald Reagan's budget cut and tuition proposals, now heads the Carnegie Corporation's Commission on the Future of Higher Education.

#### THE LAND-GRANT SCHOOLS

Some basic facts about the history of the land-grant universities must be recalled. The Morrill Act, signed by Abraham Lincoln in the midst of the Civil War in July, 1862, on the same day the President called up 300,000 additional men, transformed American higher education. Through the donation of 17-million acres of Federal land to the states, the means were provided to create colleges "for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts . . . without excluding other scientific and classical studies . . . in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes."

Thus, a break was made with the exclusive tradition that higher education was for the benefit of the professions, the upper classes and the training of the ministry. The land-

grant colleges became the tooling-up device for the agricultural and industrial revolution. Their agricultural agents transformed American farming.

Today, Dr. Kerr pointed out, the universities must make their impact on the urban scene. While there is much talk about urban universities and their mission, he warned, many of these institutions "are very uncomfortable in their setting and would prefer to be somewhere else." The majority of them, he charged, have merely done a little urban facelifting if the slums adjoined their campuses. And this was done in self-defense rather than as a major service to the cities.

"Today's urban universities are less involved in urban problems than they were in the 1930's," he said. "They are in the urban setting but not of it." This complaint, he added, can be made of such institutions as Harvard, Columbia, the University of Chicago and even of tuition-free City College of New York.

The urban-grant university, as he projected, it would assume major responsibilities for "the totality of the city's educational system." The medical school would be at least as much involved with the health of the city as the land-grant university was with the health of the farmers' livestock.

They would help run and rebuild the cities, admit as students as many young people who are committed to urban-service careers as possible, many of them from urban slum background, and would send out faculty members and researchers to act as urban agents to show how to run better urban schools, hospitals, welfare and social aid, police departments and so forth. And they would become chief planners of the structural, cultural and human architecture of the cities.

"Urban-grant universities should be developed in each large city of more than 200,000 population, and several in the largest of the cities," Dr. Kerr said. They would share responsibility not only for all levels of education and health, but for equality of opportunity as well.

#### NEW MODEL NEEDED

He saw the place for such universities "inside Watts" in the center of San Francisco, along the freeways of Los Angeles and in the heart of the slums in New York, Chicago and Newark. They should, he said, rise above railroad tracks and public buildings, and they might be at the center of educational parks, surrounded by elementary and high schools.

"We need a new model," Dr. Kerr said, "None of the existing institutions can be held up as models. The problem is not just one of changing the old a little but of creating something new." He stressed that the basic purpose of such institutions would have to be to salvage the youths of the Negro ghetto—"the only field in which the American promise of equality has failed."

The trial balloon was launched at the centennial meeting of the City College's Phi Beta Kappa chapter, and so the proposal was at once subject to some of the conservative academic doubts which it is sure to encounter in the debate across the country.

Will this create intolerable competition with, and therefore violent opposition from, the existing institutions? Will the urban-grant university lead to a dangerous lowering of academic standards? Will it turn higher education for urban Negroes into just another ghetto? Will the fact that the urban-grant college would have to be in the thick of urban affairs expose it to violent controversy?

The problem of competition with existing universities, public and private—all of them hard-pressed for funds—might be met by giving these institutions the option either of conversion to urban-grant institutions or of establishing branch operations.

The lowering of standards—as a result of opening the doors wider to those whose academic talents are depressed by ghetto deprivation—is a reality to be faced. But those who support the Kerr proposal may point out that the original "aggies" or cow colleges represented a lowering of the then existing—but to many young people irrelevant—academic standards. Yet, from such beginnings have grown such high-quality universities as the University of California.

#### SKIRMISHES EXPECTED

But Dr. Kerr also warned that if the faculty believes that a problem is of low-quality because it is a local city problem, then the urban-oriented institution is sure to remain either irrelevant or consumed by an inferiority complex. Why, he asked, are grubby, practical issues considered of high priority when they deal with international problems in underdeveloped countries, but of low priority when they are local?

The ghettoization of urban-grant universities would probably be the most difficult objection to answer. The fact is, however, that none of the existing institutions, except possibly a few two-year community colleges, have begun to take in an appreciable number of the underclass minorities of the slums. The academic cream is being skimmed off, but for the great mass there still is no educational escape.

Finally, there is the issue of controversy. There are likely to be serious skirmishes whenever the university steps on the toes of vested interests. The only answer to such clashes with the outside world is a strong non-political board of trustees, acting as a buffer.

Nobody could pretend that implementation of the revolutionary proposal would be easy. In fact, the first effort to establish a land-grant college failed in 1851 and again in 1853. Dr. Kerr admits that the urban problems are more complex than the rural ones were then.

But, he added last week, his own university, a land-grant institution, had been instrumental in releasing atomic power. Should the academic world be afraid to "come in with its shirt-sleeves rolled up" when the great contemporary issue is the rescue of the cities?

Mr. MORSE. 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. HARRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MORSE, and by unanimous consent, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I report from the Committee on the District of Columbia, nine nominations, which I ask be placed on the Executive Calendar, as follows:

John Walter Hechinger, of the District of Columbia, to be Chairman of the District of Columbia Council for the term expiring February 1, 1969; and

Walter E. Fauntroy, of the District of Columbia, to be Vice Chairman of the District of Columbia Council for the term expiring February 1, 1969.

Terms expiring February 1, 1968: Margaret A. Haywood, of the District of Columbia; J. C. Turner, of the District of Columbia; and Joseph P. Yeldell, of the District of Columbia.

Term expiring February 1, 1969: John A. Nevius, of the District of Columbia.

Terms expiring February 1, 1970: Stanley J. Anderson, of the District of Columbia; William S. Thompson, of the District of Columbia; and Polly Shackleton, of the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MORSE, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

#### THE "OLD CROWS" WHO KEEP OUR ELECTRONIC WARFARE CAPABILITY AT TOP PERFORMANCE LEVELS

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. President, as the war in Vietnam goes on, there is a tendency to ignore the vital electronic warfare aspect of this struggle. Each day, with little if any fanfare and publicity, electronic warfare as waged by our own and allied forces pits itself against the best equipment produced by the Soviet Union.

It is a well-known but not-often-mentioned fact that our electronic warfare measures and countermeasures are daily saving the lives of American service personnel.

This is an area of research where we dare not fall behind, as the Soviets are devoting consistent and far-reaching efforts aimed at mastery in this field.

In the past we have played a dreary game with this unique sector of endeavor. It has been "feast or famine" for the dedicated workers in this field, which has traditionally been concentrated around White Sands Missile Range in New Mexico.

We have either accelerated our work here when a crisis of a military nature has arisen, or we have allowed our electronic warfare capability to decay.

An organization devoted to fostering and preserving the art of electronic warfare for the benefit of this Nation is "the Old Crows." It also promotes the exchange of ideas and information in this area, and seeks to extend recognition to advances made in this field.

These Americans are further determined to see to it that the "cycle" of all or nothing efforts in electronic warfare by this country is ended. They are hopeful of seeing our efforts here stay at a level consistent with the challenge presented by the Soviets.

The history of the Old Crows is as fascinating as their goals are patriotic and altruistic. Bernie Zettl, president of the Old Crows, and Willie Crawford, their national secretary, have contributed far more to the well-being of America than most of our countrymen will ever know. In fact, it can be said that this type of altruistic behavior is typical of Old Crows everywhere.

I believe that many of the Members

of this body will find the history of the Old Crows rather fascinating reading. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that three articles on the subject be printed in the RECORD for the enlightenment of the Senate.

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

**THE HISTORY OF ELECTRONIC WARFARE OR WHEN THE OLD CROW WAS A FLEDGLING**

(FOREWORD.—During the past year, H. F. Smith, Chairman of the Historical Committee has been compiling a history of Electronic Warfare. Information has been gathered from numerous sources and there are still areas which are very scantily represented or not covered at all by the information available. This history needs help and the help required is available through you Crows. Please fill in the details and add to the history in any way you can. Take a few minutes and write down your additions and or corrections and send them to the Association or directly to H. P. Smith, Box B, Pennsauken, New Jersey.)

No one is quite sure when electronic warfare first began. We do know that as far back as May 31, 1916 the Admiral of the fleet, Sir Henry Jackson, employed EW as a preliminary to the battle of Jutland. Sir Henry used evidence of coastal radio direction finders under Admiralty supervision to detect movement of the German fleet. The changes in the apparent directions of arrival of radio signals from the enemy fleet were very slight, but Sir Henry dared to move the opposing British fleet on the basis of this information.

In the early World War II period the British Admiralty and the U.S. Navy worked together as a scientific team. Direction finding techniques in the high frequency band had already been developed to give satisfactory performance prior to World War II. This was prior to the establishment of the National Defense Research Committee in the U.S. Effort in the ECM field on the part of the U.S. Army by the Signal Corps provided the ground based and airborne U.S. Army Air Corps equipment for the very early phases of Electronic Warfare activity both in the European and CBI theatres of operation.

Electronic Warfare (EW) was first recognized as a vital phase of military operations in World War II. In the use of EW, the World War II allies jammed both German and Japanese electronic equipment. Countermeasures saved 450 United States bombers and 4500 American airmen from destruction by radar-controlled German flak, and turned back Japanese torpedo plane attacks in the battle of Leyte Gulf. One of the first leaders in World War II to recognize electronic warfare as a vital phase of military operations was Winston Churchill. In his war memoirs he writes:

"During the human struggle between the British and German Air Forces, between pilot and pilot, between A.A. batteries and aircraft, between ruthless bombing and fortitude of the British people, another conflict was going on, step by step, month by month. This was a secret war, whose battles were lost or won unknown to the public, and only with difficulty comprehended, even now, to those outside the small high scientific circles concerned. Unless British science had proven superior to German, and unless its strange, sinister resources had been effectively brought to bear in the struggle for survival, we might well have been defeated, and defeated, destroyed.

Churchill called this secret war "The Wizard War" and we know it as "EW". In the above paragraph he was specifically referring to activities which occurred during the bombing of Britain by the Luftwaffe. It made an ardent EW supporter of Britain's Prime Minister.

Electronic Countermeasures use was first recorded in the early stages of World War II

when communications and radar became necessary parts of the weapons arsenal. Churchill referred to the first employment of Electronic Warfare, at that time called RCM, (Radio Countermeasures) as the "Battle of the Beams". This Battle took place in England during 1940. In order to accomplish their bombing of Britain, the Germans established an extensive series of radio stations (200 Kc-900 Kc) in northern France. These stations were beamed over London. An aircraft equipped with a loop antenna could get on any of these beams and follow it directly over London. Primarily a navigational aid, this system was known as "Lorenz".

After considerable study, the British countered Lorenz with a system known as "Meaconing" which was designed to actually bend the navigational beams. A meacon (masking beacon) consisted of a receiver and transmitter separated by five to ten miles. The receivers intercepted the navigational beams and relayed them to the transmitters for retransmission. Hence, German bombers attempting to obtain bearings received signals from the Lorenz transmitters and the meacons. This countermeasure was apparently very effective since on several occasions German crews became so completely confused and disoriented that they actually landed at British air bases.

When it became obvious to Germans that Lorenz was being effectively countered, they switched to a new system. Two intercommunicating transmitters were established on the French coast; while one transmitted dots, the other transmitted dashes. Since the two beams were transmitted parallel to one another, an aircraft flying a course directly between the beams received a solid tone and any deviation from the prescribed course resulted in the reception of either dots or dashes. The width of the solid tone was such that it enabled the German bombers to determine their position over the target within approximately 800 yards. This "Knickebein" (curtsey) system was called "Headache" by the British. The British had a choice of two countermeasures to this system.

They could jam the receivers in the bombers, in which case the Germans would most likely immediately abandon Headache, or the British could use deception and actually neutralize the system without the Germans knowing about it. They chose deceptions and, once again with transmitters, strengthened one side of the beam so that it was literally bent. Not so surprising, this countermeasure was called "Aspirin". The British had excellent intelligence concerning the Headache system and were able to put Aspirin into operation the very first time the Germans used Headache. For the next two months the British had the Germans so confused that very few bombs were dropped on the assigned targets. There is a story that during these two months of Headache being dosed with Aspirin, no one had the courage to tell Goering that his beams were being twisted. Special lectures and warnings were delivered to the German Air Force, assuring them that the beams were infallible, and that anyone who cast doubt on them would be eliminated. The German air crews suspected that the beams were being mauled but, naturally enough, did not voice their suspicions.

In the Fall of 1940 the Germans initiated the use of "Ruffian", a propaganda transmitter which operated twenty-four hours a day. Propaganda was normally transmitted from a nondirectional antenna; however, just prior to a raid the transmitters switched to a directional antenna and beamed its transmission over the selected target area. In addition, the German used another narrow beam which crossed the propaganda beam to mark the bomb release point. The discovery of the bombing system can be credited to the people of London. They noticed that if they were

listening to the propaganda broadcast and their radios became increasingly louder a raid would then be imminent. The radios of those listening outside London would become weaker prior to a raid. Consistent reports from people in and around London soon revealed Ruffian's primary function. The counter-measure to Ruffian was known as "Bromide". It consisted of retransmission of the propaganda on the same frequency as the navigational aid but with a nondirectional antenna thus making the navigational aid useless. The British also used directional antennas to rebroadcast the beam in such a manner that the bomb loads were dropped in the channel. The British press credited the erratic German bomb drops to evasive action against British Spitfires to keep the Germans in ignorance of the success of Bromide.

At this point in the "Wizard War" the Germans evidently became quite distressed over the effectiveness of the British countermeasures program. They equipped one squadron "Kampf Gruppe 100" with all of the available navigational aids. The various aids were used alternately in order to reach the target. Once these aircraft reached the target they dropped incendiaries to visually mark the target for the following formations. This system was first used on November 14, 1940 to bomb Coventry. The initial countermeasures used by the British consisted of decoy fires called "Starfish". After the KG-100 squadron had dropped its incendiaries large numbers of Starfish were ignited in open spaces about the target, resulting in a dispersal of the bomb load.

One of the last schemes devised by the Germans was called "Benito". At this time frequency modulation was not common, and the Germans assumed that the British would probably not be monitoring f-m. (Sadly enough—they were right.) As a result, portable f-m stations along the bombing route in France and England were established by strategically located agents who actually talked the pilots in over London. To the dissatisfaction of the Germans, however, the British were not outdone and they eventually intercepted the transmission and countered very effectively by using a skilled linguist who transmitted false orders to the German pilots on the original f-m frequency. This countermeasure known as "Domino", was so effective that some of the German pilots became disoriented to such a degree that they were forced to land in England. Benito was used until about June 1941. The success of Domino as a countermeasure is evident from the bitter remarks heard passing between the bombers and their controlling ground stations. The bombing of Dublin on the night of May 30-31, 1941, may have been an unforeseen and unintended result of Domino.

The first case of British jamming of radio channels occurred in the Libyan campaign during November, 1941. The British had not used communications jamming prior to this time because of their fear of retaliation by the Germans. However, a decision was made to jam the German tank communications operating from 27 mc to 33.5 mc. The jamming equipment, compared with modern standards was very crude, but it did the job. If you can imagine tank formations with no means of inter-tank communications, you have a clear picture of the success of this EW operation. However, there was one fault in the British tactics; they neglected to provide fighter protection for the airborne jammers and consequently the jamming was soon brought to an abrupt halt by German fighters.

During this same period, the British were being seriously hampered in moving shipping through the English Channel. The Germans had accurate, radar controlled, coastal guns located on the Continent side of the Channel. This situation led the British to construct ground jammers, which effectively countered these German radars. However, the

tables were turned when the Germans thoroughly jammed nearly all British radars and proceeded to move the Scharnhorst successfully from Brest through the Channel to the North Sea. During the classic EW operation, every British radar was completely jammed but one, and the British didn't believe that one. Even though the life of the Scharnhorst was prolonged, the British learned a profitable lesson. The effectiveness of radar jamming was proven and, in addition, the German had tipped their hand as to their capabilities.

Later, German Production jammers were employed extensively to ring the Mediterranean. Allied shipborne metric radars had their scopes completely jammed from the time they entered the Mediterranean until they left. German jammers passed the Allied ships from one CM group to another, keeping the vessels constantly under the devastating effects of the metric jammers.

The Germans also demonstrated their ability to take the offensive in ECM when they intercepted and took control of a group of U.S. radio-controlled boats also in the Mediterranean. On this occasion the boats were sent in tight circles; thus expending their fuel harmlessly. It was a disheartening experience for the Navy to encounter such proficient employment of electronic warfare by the Germans.

The United States had observed with keen interest, this battle between offensive electronic systems and the countermeasures techniques employed to reduce their effectiveness. It had become apparent that future operations would become increasingly dependent upon electronic warning and control systems. Also, it was quite obvious that these systems would be susceptible to electronic warfare action.

#### EARLY U.S. ORGANIZATIONS

The importance of EW grew as did all electronic activities. Thus, it became necessary to train U.S. Air Force officers in the field of countermeasures.

In an effort to supplement, the already overburdened Army and Navy research programs, OSRD, the Office of Scientific Research and Development, was established by executive order in June 1941. It contained 3 major branches, of which one, NDRC, was in turn divided into 19 divisions. Administrative functions and liaison with the Army and Navy were performed by the headquarters of OSRD.

OSRD was founded for the purpose of carrying on research in support of the Army and Navy on an emergency basis. It was provided with its own funds for financing research contracts with universities and industrial organizations throughout the country to fulfill the urgent wartime requirements of the Army and Navy.

The National Defense Research Committee (NDRC) was the branch of OSRD which was concerned principally with the physical sciences, and it was within the structure of NDRC that the OSRD countermeasures program was carried out. Each of the 19 "divisions" of NDRC was headed by a committee. The Division 15 Committee, under Dr. C. G. Suits, administered the countermeasure program. Division 15 contained several major subdivisions, including an office at Schenectady, New York, responsible for tube contracts with various manufacturers; an office in New York City, which administered contracts for countermeasures; and an office in Cambridge, Massachusetts, responsible for the administration of contracts in the Boston area, including the contract under which RRL, the Radio Research Laboratory at Harvard University, was operated.

The Army and Navy coordinated ECM program was carried out by NDRC in cooperation with the various laboratories and bureaus of the Armed Services. Chief among the agencies representing the Services were the Aircraft Radio Laboratory at Wright

Field, Ohio, the Naval Research Laboratory, the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, the Bureau of Ships, the Bureau of Aeronautics, the Office of the Chief Signal Officer, and the Signal Corps Engineering Laboratories at Fort Monmouth, New Jersey. Each of the service laboratories involved had its independent program of research and development but coordination among laboratories was maintained. For example, one of the Services might express an operational requirement for a particular type of equipment. The initial investigation might be carried on solely by NDRC or by one of its laboratories in collaboration with the operating Service. Later, development and procurement would be handled by the Service involved. In general, the operational need for particular development was established and expressed by the Service on an informal basis, usually in meetings attended by the personnel of the various laboratories and agencies concerned.

The Spring of 1942 welcomed to England a small number of research personnel from the U. S. who were designated to work with the RAF radiation countermeasures program. From this embryonic organization, a laboratory specifically designed to work on countermeasures design was established in 1943 at Great Malvern, England. The work of these individuals early in 1943 produced the first U. S. designed jammer.

#### RADIO RESEARCH LABORATORY

Work in the field of radar countermeasures was started prior to the establishment of the Division 15 organization when, in 1942, a small group was set up in Division 14's Radiation Laboratory at M.I.T. under the direction of Dr. F. E. Terman, for the purpose of developing jammers to use against enemy radar and also of developing anti-jamming devices for incorporation in our own radar.

The general problem involved was the development of means whereby the effectiveness of the enemy's radar equipment might be nullified. It became evident in the early days of the war that radar was not only a very useful weapon but that it was useful both for ourselves and for the enemy. It was also evident that it was a very vulnerable weapon. On the one hand it appeared prudent to take steps to make this weapon as useless to the enemy as possible in case he should attempt to use it against us, and on the other hand it seemed practically essential to do something about the vulnerability of our own radar in case the enemy should attempt to jam us.

It soon became clear that the radar countermeasures program was much too extensive to be carried on as a part of radar development activities. Steps were accordingly taken soon after the establishment of the radar countermeasures group to move it to Harvard, where it was established as the Radio Research Laboratory, operated exclusively for Division 15 of NDRC by Harvard University under the direction of Dr. Terman. During its approximately 3½ years of existence, Radio Research Laboratory grew to a peak strength, in August 1944, with some 810 persons.

#### INITIAL NAVY TACTICAL APPLICATIONS

Following the issuance, in July 1941, of a Presidential order to the U.S. Navy to attack all enemy submarines, the Navy established a complex of shore DF stations with the technical assistance of the NRL. The successful "Wolf Pack" tactics developed by the Germans for the exploitation of their attacks on convoys required that high-frequency communications be employed in making a rendezvous for the pack. The DAJ hf direction-finding equipment was guided into production by NRL engineers and formed the backbone of the Navy's shore DF program. This equipment was produced by the Bureau of Ships in large quantities, based on improved NRL designs. A shipboard counter-

part of the shore-based DF was also produced. Improvements in the model DAQ equipment were worked out jointly with the British, and a program was also initiated to train personnel to install and operate this new equipment for the Navy. Unquestionably, these equipments, developed jointly by the Admiralty and NRL, and produced separately, spelled the doom of the "Wolf Pack" tactics of the German submarines, even though their transmissions grew shorter and shorter as time went on. The initial location of the enemy submarine was the most important phase of the antisubmarine warfare success achieved by the Navy. Sonar and radar were brought into play for the kill, but the oceans are large and the small number of antisubmarine warfare units urgently needed clues on where to hunt. These clues were always provided by the hf DF operators.

A major naval effort at the Naval Research Laboratory was concerned with the employment of countermeasures against the Germans' HS-293 glide bomb. Early in the war the use of this bomb offered severe resistance to our naval units in the Mediterranean. This weapon was first used operationally to sink the Italian battleship Roma as she was attempting to escape to join the Allies. It was used also to sink the British ship Warsprite, and it damaged the U.S. Cruiser Savannah. It was a report by the crew of the Savannah that gave the Naval Research Laboratory the clue that indicated that the Navy was faced with a guided weapon. Later one of these HS-293 glide bombs sank in a near miss in shallow water off Libya and was recovered by the British.

Meanwhile NRL engineers were called to work around the clock on the research and development of equipment to counter the threat of this bomb. Experimental equipment, fitted on ships in only six weeks time, was used to intercept, record, and analyze the guided-bomb control signals. It was desired to obtain shipboard recordings, while the ship was under attack, of the radio control signals for complete laboratory analysis. In practice, two of the four control tones employed were above the audible frequency range, and also were above the frequency range of World War II recorders. Only after a series of ingenious maneuvers were these radio frequencies and their associated tones successfully located and accurately analyzed. Soon after the first control signals were analyzed, two destroyer escorts, the U.S.S. Davis and the U.S.S. Jones, were supplied with experimental NRL equipment which so successfully jammed the guided bombs that the effectiveness of the weapon was very nearly neutralized. After this jamming program gained full momentum, no major fleet unit was sunk by the glide bombs.

Following these initial successes by the Navy with the Naval Research Laboratory experimental equipment, Airborne Instruments Laboratories at Mineola, New York, undertook a project for the development of production jammers for use against the German HS-293 glide bomb for the Navy. This equipment, known as the MAS jamming system, involved the development of several types of multiple-channel receivers and manually tuning spot jammers, and some automatic search receiver-spot-jammer combinations. A crash program was also undertaken at RRL at the time when these German glide bombs were first used in the Mediterranean, in March 1944. RRL was asked to produce on a crash basis a quantity of 30 jamming systems for use against the glide bombs. In response to this request, RRL converted a quantity of AN/ARQ-8 transmitter-receivers, which were then in crash production for the Air Force, and made them suitable for the Mediterranean operation. Developments in the theatre of operation, however, changed the operational needs, and none of the equipments saw service in the field.

Airborne Instruments Laboratories also

worked on an airborne jammer (AN/ARQ-11) having a power output of about 1 kw. Ten of these units were delivered to the Air Force as prototypes of a high-power airborne jammer. In the V-T fuze jamming field, the Signal Corps Laboratory, Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, developed the AN/TRT-2, a convoy jammer with approximately 100 watts output, swept CW, covering the frequency range 75-200 MC.

The Westinghouse Research Laboratories was responsible for the development of a 10-kw ground-based communication jammer known as "Ground Cigar", for the frequency range from 38 to 42 Mc. Other work in the field of communications countermeasures and communications antijamming was done by the Bell Telephone Laboratories, by the Federal Telephone & Radio Corporation, and by the Radio Corporation of America.

#### RADIO AND RADAR COUNTERMEASURES

Behind the great battles of wits between Allied and German scientists for leadership in the operational use of radar is a remarkable story of measures and countermeasures designed to jam and confuse the enemy's radio communications and radar warning systems and so create a chaotic muddle in enemy intelligence.

"Mandrel", "Grocer", "Boozer", "Tinsel", "Ground Cigar", "Airborne Cigar" and "Window" were among the code names given to the Allied operations which successfully defeated every enemy attempt to gain ascendancy in the radar battle.

#### "WINDOW"

"Window" was introduced in a raid on Hamburg on the night of July 24-25, 1943. Seven hundred and ninety-one bombers dropped (in addition to bomb loads) one bundle of 2,000 aluminum foil strips each, every minute—a total of over 2½ million strips weighing 20 tons. To the enemy radar defenses this represented approximately 12,000 aircraft over Hamburg, and the effect on the enemy was devastating. The result, which reduced losses from 5.4% to 1.5%, was a tremendous achievement, and was a spectacular justification for R.A.F. radio countermeasures. After two months of use by the British, the RAF estimated that Chaff had been responsible for saving at least 200 planes and between 1200 and 1500 men.

The first known German use of Chaff was at Bizerte on 6 September 1943 in which less than 50 airplanes were involved. However, the U.S. and British warning reported an excess of 200 aircraft. Result was a dilution of allied fighter effort.

#### THE HISTORY OF ELECTRONIC WARFARE, OR WHEN THE OLD CROW WAS A FLEDGLING

(NOTE.—This is a continuation of the History of Electronic Warfare article which was started in the Convention Issue of Crow Caws. H. F. Smith, Chairman of the Historical Committee and author of this article, solicits additional information regarding the subject. The classified nature of the Electronic Warfare business makes even past history hard to come by. Scratch a Crow and you will find a story. So, let's get them down on paper for all to see. Send all information to the Association or directly to H. F. Smith, Box B, Pennsauken, N.J.)

#### U.S. DEVELOPMENTS IN EW

The First Air Force EW school began operations at Boca Raton AFB, Florida in January 1943. Capt. Hugh Winter was the Director, Lt. Jack Prewett an instructor. Of the six hundred officers graduated by this school, approximately two hundred saw field experience. The first class began in January and consisted of four officers and 24 enlisted men.

Two of the graduates of the first class, Lts. Ed Tietz and Bill Praun, performed the first ECM ferret operations against Kiska. Selected members of the first class were sent to Eglin AFB, where they activated Field 9

(now Hurlbert) and formed the 1st Proving Ground Electronics Unit. The 1st PGEU was given responsibility for initial service testing of jammers and after EW equipment being developed. Most of this came from the RRL at Harvard or under its sponsorship.

The first B-17's equipment with ECM were modified at Oklahoma City AMA and were then run through tests at 1st PGEU. They were then sent to the European Theatre for combat use. The problem of selling an all out reconnaissance program to theatre commanders was not difficult, for they were eager to know the extent and location of the enemy electronic activities. Thus, more reconnaissance type B-24's were equipped, manned and placed in the field. More and more EW observers were trained in both reconnaissance and jamming techniques. These first searching aircraft were known as "ferrets" for their specific task was to "ferret-out" any and all information possible about electronic activity in a given area over which they operated.

Ferretting out information concerning enemy electronic systems was the first step in countering these systems. The data obtained from the reconnaissance mission was relayed to evaluation units where it was compiled and collated with information from other sources. Radar coverage charts of many areas were drawn, showing the actual visibility of the enemy networks. These charts along with other information were used to plan active countermeasures tactics for use during bombardment missions. Bombardment aircraft were being equipped with jamming transmitters ("Carpet") and Chaff ("Window") as rapidly as production would permit. Extensive coordination was required to make the electronic countermeasures program function effectively, and due to the tireless efforts of many, it was accomplished in a superlative manner.

The actual tactical use of jamming and deception was of paramount importance in the European theatre since the German development of excellent search and gunlaying radar threatened a successful attack by air and sea. In the Pacific Theatre Electronic Warfare first appeared in the reconnaissance role. A B-24 ferret operating out of China collected large quantities of information concerning Japanese radars on the mainland of China. In Addition, Australian and British Ferret Aircraft flew out of India to plot the locations and record characteristics of Japanese radars on the Andaman Islands and throughout the length of the Malay Peninsula.

The initial EW activity of the 20th Bomber Command operating out of India in 1944 was that of reconnaissance. A number of B-29 Aircraft in each of the four groups operating out of India were equipped with radar receivers, pulse analysers and direction finding antennas. No special ECM reconnaissance missions were run with the B-29, however, officer ECM operators rode along in the aircraft during bombardment missions and thus collected electronic intelligence data along the route. By the time this organization had joined the remainder of the B-29's forming the 20th Air Force on the Island of Tinian, the Japanese radar inventory and operating techniques had been well catalogued.

During raids out of the Mariana Islands against Japan, it became necessary to shift from the reconnaissance to the radar jamming phase due to high damage rates sustained by attaching B-29's.

At this time virtually all aircraft were equipped with spot jamming type equipment, which was either pre-set on the ground and simply placed in operation by a crew member or operated by ECM officers to accurately spot jam radars. The primary interest was against the gun laying and searchlight controlled radars in the target areas.

In addition, Guardian Angel aircraft were developed to assist in target areas where air-

craft were forced to penetrate the major defenses individually rather than in formation. In order to provide these Guardian Angels the bomb-bay was equipped with a platform containing extra inverters and jamming equipment so that a minimum of sixteen jamming transmitters could be operated simultaneously from a single aircraft. The technique for their use was to have a number of Guardian Angel aircraft arrive at the target just ahead of the first penetrating bombardment aircraft and to loiter in the immediate target area until the last bombing aircraft had departed.

The effect of these tactics were startling to say the least. On heavily defended targets where flak damage to aircraft had previously exceeded 60%, this now was reduced to less than 10% and ECM was sold not by talk, but by demonstration of its effectiveness. As a result active jamming was employed by the 20th Air Force until the end of the war.

#### EFFECTS OF THE PROGRAM

Before the end of the German war, following construction of prototype models, most of the equipment developed by the Joint Army-Navy-NDRC program had been placed in procurement, and nearly every bomber in the 8th Air Force had been equipped with at least one, and in some cases up to four, Carpet jamming transmitters. Results were anxiously awaited. Representatives of Radio Research Laboratory stationed at the Division, 15 British Laboratory ABL-15, at Malvern, England, and at other strategic points in the operational theatres, made operational analyses to determine the effect on the enemy. Soon after the equipment came into full use against the enemy, losses in the 8th Air Force began to drop. While initially it had been expected that an appreciable fraction of our bombers would fail to return from raids over Germany, the percentage of losses was now reduced to a very low figure.

These operational analyses were not conclusive. The Germans had lost much of their anti-aircraft equipment in bombing raids, and the Luftwaffe had practically stopped operating. The weather had also changed during the period when statistics were accumulated. It was known that the losses had decreased, but it could not be proved that the countermeasures program had achieved this result, or had even helped.

#### THE HISTORY OF ELECTRONIC WARFARE OR WHEN THE OLD CROW WAS A FLEDGLING

(NOTE.—This is the conclusion of the History of Electronic Warfare article which was started in the first issue of CROW CAWS. H. F. Smith, Chairman of the Historical Committee and author of this article earnestly solicits additional information regarding the subject. The classified nature of the Electronic Warfare business makes even past history hard to come by. However, we know there are many facets to this article. So, to borrow a phrase "What did you do in the war, Daddy?" Write it down, and send all information to the Association or directly to H. F. Smith, Box B, Pennsauken, N.J.)

The sum total of the investigations in Germany confirmed the view that the ECM program had been a success. It was true, to a very considerable extent, that the countermeasures gear had been a major factor in the reduction in losses. The entire Nazi radar network, according to the people operating it, had been reduced to about one-fifth of its normal effectiveness. Fairly early in the war the Germans had learned to depend almost entirely on radar for anti-aircraft gun control, because it gave a much more accurate range and was reliable in all kinds of weather. When the 8th Air Force began using window and electronic jamming, the German anti-aircraft crews had been blinded. Try as they might, they had been unable to determine the location of our flights through the dazzling glare of their radar scopes. Orders had been issued to continue firing in spite of the interference in order not to re-

veal to us the fact that our countermeasures had been successful. Then, so poor was the record of planes shot down under these conditions, that these orders were replaced with orders not to fire at all unless good visual aim could be obtained—orders equivalent to abandoning radar anti-aircraft control entirely.

In the German laboratories, scientists had been at work attempting to lessen the vulnerability of their radar equipment ever since the British had dropped the first window in the raid over Hamburg in 1943. After the German bombing raids on England in 1940, Hitler had thought the war was won and had ordered the demobilization of a great part of the German scientific effort and the induction of the scientists into the Army. With the Hamburg raid, and the capture of one of our advanced airborne radar sets, the Germans had seen the error of this decision and had immediately reconstituted the scientific organization. At the end of the war, the laboratories had been operating at full capacity, and about half the German scientific effort in the field of electronics had been directed against our countermeasures activity. So large a force, in fact, had been engaged in this work, that efforts along other lines of scientific war developments were neglected and it was the opinion of investigators that the countermeasures program had not only nullified the German anti-aircraft fire but the entire scientific program in general, through the preoccupation of the German scientific organization with the countermeasures program.

#### THE LET DOWN

When the Japanese war ended, in August 1945, steps were immediately taken to place in effect plans which had already been worked out for the demobilization of the Radio Research Laboratory. Certain projects for which there was no further need were terminated immediately. Other activities which were near completion and which had continuing values, were completed in order to preserve those values. Certain other projects which evidently could not be completed in the near future, but which had considerable long-range importance, were transferred to laboratories of the Armed Services, such as the Naval Research Laboratory and the Aircraft Radiation Laboratory. All laboratory work at the Radio Research Laboratory was stopped by November 1, 1945. By January 1946 only about 230 persons were left on the RRL payroll, and of these, less than 10 percent were scientific personnel, all of whom were engaged in working on reports.

A limited amount of research and development effort took place at the end of World War II and continued for a year or so thereafter. Many of the personnel in the Armed Services who had been engaged in this effort returned to civilian life, and the greater part of the equipment produced for ECM purposes during World War II was sold on the surplus market.

#### THE BUILD UP

In the late 1940's, ferret activities showed that a radar net was being built rapidly around the Iron Curtain. The ECM program was thereupon re-established, starting, on the part of the Navy and Air Force, with a small research and development effort, schools, and continued ferret activities. World War II equipment was obtained from Warehouses and the surplus market, and the need for newer and better equipment was recognized.

In 1947 a decision was made to reactivate ECM training within the Air Force at Boca Raton, Florida. The reactivation of the Air Force electronic warfare program was to run three phases in sequence: first, the existing; second, the interim; and third, the future. The existing phase required the use of selected items of World War II equipment still available in sufficient quantity to meet immediate needs.

Operationally, this equipment had not proven completely satisfactory because it was originally designed to meet specific needs against World War II enemy electronic equipment. Quantities of this equipment were shipped to Boca Raton, Florida and an enlisted man's training course was established there.

The Electronic Warfare Officers' course was not established within the training command but was organized by the Strategic Air Command at the newly opened Maguire Air Force Base, New Jersey.

Training aircraft consisted of twelve (12) B-29, 6 position Ferret Aircraft. Thus the emphasis in this early phase was on the reconnaissance side.

The course at Maguire was devised to train Electronic Warfare Officers for the Strategic Air Command, and because of limited facilities classes were small. The first several classes consisted of no more than three to four officers. At this rate it would have taken years to provide a sufficient number of trained officers to provide the other commands. The school was moved from Maguire to Barksdale Air Force Base, La. in 1949 and later to the Air Training Command at Keesler Air Force Base. It remained at Keesler until 1961 and was then moved to Mather Air Force Base where it is located today.

The interim equipment provided in the second phase consisted primarily of updated World War II equipment with all its complexity. The result was that the services were obtaining trained personnel but limited equipment capability.

In 1951 the Strategic Air Command organized the 20th Squadron of the Second Bombardment Wing at Hunter Air Force Base, Georgia, into an ECM Squadron for the purpose of developing the best tactics and techniques for employment of the existing and interim ECM equipment. Within one year this effort had expanded to include the entire Second Bombardment Wing.

Tests were conducted primarily against the Air Proving Ground Command at Eglin Air Force Base and resulted in the modification of each of the existing equipment in order to improve its capability. The results of this effort were so successful that the 376th Bombardment Wing was organized into an ECM Wing with a special Directorate of Electronic Countermeasures Test and Tactics. A part of this directorate was an ECM Laboratory consisting of approximately seventy (70) people who designed either modifications for existing equipment or completely new techniques. Much of the thinking of this early effort is now incorporated in the existing military equipment.

The 376th Bombardment Wing was later augmented by the 301st Bombardment Wing. The two wings were organized as the 801st Air Division and provided the Strategic Air Command with a force of over 90 specially equipped B-47 electronic warfare aircraft for both test and combat. This Air Division was transferred to Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio, where it continued to function as the mainstay of the Strategic Air Command Electronic Warfare capability until phase three began to take effect and the future electronic warfare equipment began to appear in the inventory in quantity. This phase is not complete as yet, however, much progress has been made.

#### UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE CAMPUS VISITS IN THE VIRGINIAS REVEAL WHOLESOMENESS OF YOUTH THERE—STUDENT EDITOR ASKS HOW LONG ARE WE GOING TO ALLOW LEFTIST INFILTRATION TO MOCK "THIS IS MY OWN, MY NATIVE LAND"?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, recently, I have visited the campuses of West Virginia University, Salem, and

Glennville Colleges in our State, and Ferrum Junior College in Virginia.

It was heartening to talk with hundreds of students who are not "off beat" but, instead, are wholesome youth. They are thinking clearly and are diligently at work. They are not interested in channeling their energies and talents into the tearing-down types of activities. It was my observation that they are in the process of building for themselves careers of meaning and service, as well as success.

These young university and college students of whom I speak are not wreckers. They are less confused than we may think or as we would be informed by listening to some sources, and as heralded in some headlined articles.

It was gratifying, Mr. President, to be in the hills of the Virginias and to realize that these young people know why they are in the educational institutions there—why they are studying—and where they wish to go.

And, Mr. President, it was satisfying to read the leading editorial in the October 26, 1967, issue of the Daily Atheneum, the student newspaper of West Virginia University, Morgantown. Written by editor in chief Martin Coy, the editorial carries the headline, "This Is My Own, My Native Land." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### THIS IS MY OWN, MY NATIVE LAND

They sit at a table in front of Moore Hall passing out "resistance" material.

They quote Marxist and Socialist military leaders against United States policy.

They reject established law and order and strive to organize civil disobedience.

Admitted Communists and Communist sympathizers hold a number of leadership positions in their National Mobilization Committee.

The left stands up and advocates that all young men burn their draft cards, defect to Canada, plead homosexuality or become conscientious objectors.

The War Resisters League, the Jewish Peace Fellowship, the Central Committee for Conscientious Objectors, the American Friends Service Committee, Inc., the Catholic Peace Fellowship have material on these subjects available on campus through Students for a Democratic Society.

Too many times is the press accused of printing things out of context. Is this not what the "left" is doing?

They use famous quotes most apropos to their own situations, but there are other quotes apropos to the situation, too.

"I have never advocated war, except as a means of peace," Ulysses S. Grant said.

"If peace cannot be maintained with honor, it is no longer peace," Lord Russell said.

"To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace," George Washington said.

"Swim or sink, live or die, survive or perish with my country was my unalterable determination," John Adams said.

"I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country," Nathan Hale said.

"Every citizen should be a soldier. This was the case with the Greeks and Romans, and must be that of every free state," spoke Thomas Jefferson.

We can't help but wonder if the "left" recalls the words of Abraham Lincoln in his second inaugural address:

"Let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan—to do all which may achieve a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

How long are we going to allow leftist infiltration to mock "... this is my own, my native land!"?

#### FORMER CEA CHAIRMAN NOURSE: HOW TO MAKE PROSPERITY LAST

Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. President, on Wednesday the current period of economic expansion will become the longest in the Nation's history. In recognition of this achievement, United Press International has asked the present and former Chairmen of the Council of Economic Advisers to give their views on how to make this prosperity last. The first article in this series written by Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, the first Chairman of the Council, appears in this morning's Washington Post.

Dr. Nourse, who served as Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers from 1946 to 1949, was the person primarily responsible for launching and giving professional status to this new arm of the President. Dr. Nourse has had a long association with the Brookings Institution, and for many years after his service on the Council he was Vice Chairman of the Joint Council on Economic Education. He is truly one of the deans of the economics profession.

True to his belief in the policy set forth in the Employment Act, Dr. Nourse thinks that there is no reason why we cannot have another 81 months of well-sustained prosperity, or, indeed, an indefinite period of economic growth. His article places the new economics in healthy perspective by pointing out that sole reliance on the fine tuning of monetary and fiscal policies is not practical and will not alone sustain prosperity. Quite correctly he notes that such factors as wage-price adjustments in the private sector will be of equal importance. However, he fails to draw the most important conclusion from this observation—that wage-price behavior consistent with sustained prosperity will depend upon the development of an imaginative wage-price policy at the Federal level.

Mr. President, I think this series of articles is a most constructive step in promoting a better understanding of economic policy. I ask unanimous consent that the first article, entitled "How To Make Prosperity Last—I," be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### HOW TO MAKE PROSPERITY LAST—I: NOURSE PREDICTS CONTINUED BOOM

(NOTE.—Edwin G. Nourse says there's "no real reason" why we can't have 81 more months of prosperity.)

(Leon H. Keyserling warns that the expansion is falling about \$40 billion short of its potential.)

(Raymond J. Saulnier attributes the current prosperity "in large part" to Vietnam.)

(Walter W. Heller is concerned that "old politics" may discredit "new economics.")

(And Gardner Ackley says the "immediate challenge" is to raise taxes and curb spending.)

(These men have three things in common. They all have been—one now is—top economic adviser to the President of the United States.)

(They all believe that the current economic expansion—which on Wednesday becomes the longest in the Nation's history—can continue, if the Government has the courage to act.)

(And all have been asked by United Press International to outline what they would do to make the longest expansion longer.)

(By Edwin G. Nourse)

There is no real reason in the book of economics as I read it—both old and new testaments—why we should not treat ourselves to another 81 months of well-sustained prosperity—or indeed to an indefinitely continuing future of healthy national growth.

We have the productive plant, capital funds, and credit resources, the labor power, administrative talent, and technological know-how.

The unanswered question is: do we have the individual and group morale needed to achieve these capabilities through the structures and practices of our democratic enterprise system, private and public?

When I read the book of politics and the book of individual and mass psychology, my confidence is somewhat shaken. So—back to the economic potentials.

The high priests of the "new economics" proclaim fiscal and monetary policy as the master tools for assuring the full employment and maximum production goals set up in the Employment Act of 1946. Administer doses of Government stimulant at the proper time and in the right amount, and simply reverse this procedure when needed to sustain the ever-normal boom within safe limits of reasonable price stability and dollar value.

This "fine tuning" of the economic mechanism—impeccable as arithmetic—assumes and, for full success, requires unified central control or sensitive and sophisticated coordination of policy and action among the various subordinate centers.

But this concept of "fine tuning" has a rather hollow sound when we look at the realities of executive leadership and congressional implementation, with a dog-fight now going on between proponents of tax increase and those for spending cuts—and the special interest groups, factions, and lobbies behind our national policy—and program-makers.

The new economics has been preoccupied with problems of the public sector. But sustained prosperity depends no less on private sector wage-price adjustments, consumer prices and profit rates, than on public spending and tax adjustments. Paralleling the congressional dog-fight is the collective bargaining dog-fight between the automotive industry and the United Automobile Workers, not to mention the steel haulers' strike and the recent insurrections of school teachers and guardians of the public safety—policemen and firemen.

As I survey the total scene, I am moved to doubt that maintaining aggregate demand for the output of a full-employment use of our resources and our racing scientific technology will be as easy in the next dozen years as it has been from 1960 to 1967—particularly if there is a truce in southeast Asia and disenchantment with projects for manned flights to distant planets and "permanent colonies on the moon."

Even so, it is my personal guess that, thanks to the considerable common sense of the American people and the degree of economic literacy that is being nourished by our universities and research institutes and disseminated through our lively communications media, we shall avoid both the scylla of deep or prolonged recession or the charybdis of runaway inflation.

#### NATIONAL GRANGE CENTENNIAL

Mr. PEARSON, Mr. President, during the week of November 13 to 22, members of the National Grange will gather for their annual meeting. This meeting will have special significance because this year will mark the 100th anniversary of the Grange.

Mr. President, those who gather at the centennial session can look back with pride to the accomplishments of this, the oldest farm organization in the United States.

The National Grange led the fight to give Cabinet status to the Department of Agriculture and helped develop the original Farm Credit Act.

It helped to develop the concept of parity and to translate that concept into legislative reality.

It was primarily responsible for the establishment of rural free delivery and our parcel post system, and contributed significantly to the creation of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Its earliest activities paved the way for the creation of the Interstate Commerce Commission and, more recently, it helped pass legislation establishing our current system of interstate highways.

It played paramount roles in the development of our cooperative extension service and formation of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization.

Its efforts on behalf of the school lunch and school milk programs and food for peace are well known, and the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 incorporated a number of longstanding Grange policies.

These are only some of the National Grange's great accomplishments on behalf of American agriculture, but the dedication and progressive commitment which made this record possible means that the centennial session of the National Grange will not simply be a review of past accomplishments, but a renewed dedication to a continuation of yeoman efforts to protect and advance the interests of American agriculture in the years ahead.

Mr. President, I applaud the National Grange in its 100th year, and welcome its continued contributions in the future.

#### MISSILE ELECTRONIC WARFARE AND THE FUTURE OF OUR COUNTRY

Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. President, electronic warfare poses a challenge that could well determine the future of our Nation and the world. The more I have investigated this area of scientific endeavor, the more convinced I have become that the future military posture and defense of our Nation rests upon a first-rate EW capability.

Soviet research in this field is intense, broad ranging, and well supported. It is also, most of all, consistent. This is a virtue our effort has heretofore lacked.

As usual, we are on a "feast or famine" cycle. When a war situation presents itself to our Nation, we pour money and talent into EW research. The moment the crisis passes, we allow our EW establishment to decay, making our efforts next time around that much more expensive.

Even now as we sit here, American EW specialists and equipment are engaged in a series of mortal encounters with the best the Soviet Union can produce over in Vietnam. Also, our EW capability in Vietnam is saving American lives.

It is important that we realize how much the future of this Nation depends upon EW, which has traditionally centered its activities around the White Sands missile range in my home State of New Mexico. A unique band of Americans dedicated to the preservation and extension of the art of EW in this Nation has long fought for the necessary goals I have described.

Mr. President, I refer to the "Old Crows," headed by Bernie Zettl. This country knows too little of what this band of men have done.

The Old Crows are joining in sponsoring a symposium on EW at the White Sands facility tomorrow. I shall deliver an address there, joining with the people who form the backbone of our EW effort.

It is important to note here that the White Sands missile range is the very heart of our EW research effort. It also is the location where most of the proving out of this research is carried on.

The missile electronic warfare technical area, or MEWTA, at White Sands, under the excellent guidance of Mr. McKinley Jones, has rendered immeasurable service to this Republic.

Today, the value of MEWTA's varied fixed and portable electronic countermeasures-related equipment exceeds \$30,000,000. The area has at its disposal the facilities of the White Sands missile range, largest missile range in the continental United States, where more than 2,000 missiles are fired annually.

Without going too far into the intricacies of this facility, it can be said with certainty that White Sands is equipped to do a total and fully effective job for this Nation in EW research and testing.

MEWTA, headed by McKinley Jones, stands ready to do the job I believe must be done, and done on a broad front as swiftly as possible. If we are to maintain our EW effort at the level it has at last reached, we must make use of this facility.

There are, Mr. President, several indications of how dangerous this situation is, and how fast we must act. An article published in Aviation Week and Space Technology deals with how the penetration capacity of our missile systems is eroding.

It points out a clear and growing danger. It highlights the necessity of a heightened effort in EW on our part, and the fact that we must make swift and effective use of facilities such as White Sands and the EW team of MEWTA headed by Mr. Jones. 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:

U.S. PENETRATION CAPABILITY ERODES  
(By Barry Miller)

LOS ANGELES.—Superiority of the retaliatory capability of U.S. intercontinental ballistic missiles over the defenses of potential adversaries has slowly eroded during the past

several years in the face of significant advances in missile-defense technology and the absence of corresponding progress on the offensive side.

This is the gloomy consensus of knowledgeable observers, who not long ago confidently echoed Defense Dept. assurances that American missile strength was years ahead of any potential enemy's missile defense (AW&ST Jan. 20, 1964, p. 72). The threat of a retaliatory strike against an aggressor by this missile force has been the cornerstone of recent American nuclear defense posture.

The ability of American missiles to penetrate to their targets is not so much in question, at least at the moment, as is their capacity to perform the mission without extremely-costly saturation assaults.

The gap between offensive and defensive technology apparently is being closed by a complex, difficult-to-assess combination of factors. These include:

Important known advances in both U.S. and Soviet defense radar technology, particularly the sensor's ability to discriminate and track live warheads, discarding the decoys.

Progress in high-acceleration or longer-range missile interceptors such as the Army's Sprint and Spartan.

Refinement of warheads for exoatmospheric interceptors, using the devastating emission of high-energy X-rays as their principal kill mechanism (AW&ST May 15, p. 22). The Russians are known to have been at work on this concept, as has the Atomic Energy Commission, since 1963.

SOVIET DEPLOYMENT

Also, the deployment by the Russians of an anti-missile system around Moscow (see p. 78) poses a threat of undetermined severity, where none existed previously, to the ability of American ICBMs to penetrate.

In addition, substantial advances in military space technology over the past several years have led to informed speculation that the Soviets have the same ability the U.S. now possesses for detecting missile launches during their boost phases and tracking these from space.

This places an even greater burden on missile penetration aids, those devices and techniques that would assist missiles in reaching their targets by confusing, deceiving or destroying the missile defense systems.

Many of these considerations have converged to push the tasks of penetration aids, once primarily concerned with re-entry into the earth's atmosphere and subsequent descent on target, back through the early phases of mid-course flight and perhaps also into boost.

Now, decoys—those real, flying objects ejected from missiles and intended to resemble actual warheads to confuse an enemy—must, in turn, be disguised by enveloping them in "chaff puffs" to confuse both ground-based radar and space-borne sensors.

Further compounding the situation, American development of penetration aids has butted against serious limitations, in some cases, of fundamental physical nature.

For a number of years, U.S. penetration-aids work was aimed towards reducing radar cross-section of missile re-entry systems, or the areas of the vehicle that effectively return tell-tale echoes to defense radars. Pains-taking advances in re-entry body shaping, attitude-control techniques and cooling or quenching body wakes, which otherwise behave as giant reflectors for hostile radars, have reduced the radar target presented by U.S. re-entry vehicles. Smaller wakes have lower ion density, hence offer less reflectivity for searching or tracking radars. This, in turn, has prompted defense technologists to develop radars with longer wavelengths that can pick out reduced cross-section targets.

OTHER DIFFICULTIES

The use of lower frequencies, dipping down into the UHF and even into the VHF regions, poses other difficulties for the offense. The

various techniques of reducing radar target size, or radar observability, can go only so far. Certain minimal physical dimensions must be retained if antennas for radar fuzes carried by American missiles are to have a window through the ionized plasma sheath created on re-entry. This accounts for the lessening interest in reducing radar observability found in missile circles today. By going to lower frequencies, radar defense technologists, for the time being, at least, may have gained an upper hand over their adversaries.

The Soviets are known to have operational UHF and possibly VHF missile tracking radars as well. About four years ago, American intelligence agencies identified a 500-ft.-long VHF phased array radar, centered in the 150-200-mc. range, installed and operating at Sary Shagan in the Tyuratam area near the Aral Sea.

At the same time, the use of lower frequency defense radar makes more difficult the job of carrying and deploying the radar-spoofing metal foil known since its introduction in World War 2 as chaff. Since the size of chaff is directly related to the radar wavelength, the longer the wavelength the longer must be the chaff. Carrying and deploying large quantities of six or seven-foot-long metal strips from a missile or decoy in ballistic flight add weight and complexity to the task.

The Air Force's Rome Air Development Center has LTV ElectroSystems' Continental Electronics at work building a multi-million-dollar VHF radar as part of the Advanced Ballistic Re-Entry Systems (ABRES) program. With it, Air Force presumably hopes to learn more about effectively countering such a threat.

VEXING CHALLENGE

The continuous updating of a potential enemy's radar threat is one of the most vexing challenges for designers of penetration aids. It has thus far confounded still-undampened U.S. hopes of effectively using electronic countermeasures (ECM) techniques against enemy radar defenses.

Some time ago, Air Force flight tested with partial success an active ECM technique developed by Sperry Gyroscope Co. Using this technique, ECM noise jammers intended to confuse enemy radars with their minute-long high-power bursts of noise are deployed in precursor decoys from a reentry vehicle. Once the knotty problem of supplying high power for available weight and volume was solved and tubes generating the high CW power in the radar band of interest were found, the estimate of the radar threat changed. Furthermore, the 1,500-mi.-range Russian frequency radar, code named Doghouse, could track these decoys for at least 1,000 mi. before their little jammers turned on.

In the face of an ever-more ominous defense environment, a missile warhead today faces a tougher battle for survival than in the past, informed observers point out. And, survival will be more difficult tomorrow.

In this climate, the inclination to adopt a saturation, or "barrage," type of missile re-entry system scheme for assured penetration appears to be gaining greater favor. Many warheads carried on board a single missile carrier statistically increase the chances of penetrating into and striking target areas by overloading or saturating the defense. This approach appeared to be evolving for the Air Force's latest re-entry system, the Mk. 18, which has temporarily been shelved because of budgetary squeezes. In this concept, the Mk. 18 system would carry many small, probably unguided, warheads for sequential ejection from the guided re-entry system during the time of maximum threat. These would descend onto a large "footprint" area.

Such a concept is an outgrowth of earlier studies by Avco Corp. and the General Electric Co., USAF's primary re-entry vehicle

sources, in the CRESS program (Combined Re-entry Effort in Small Systems), which also was sponsored by the Atomic Energy Commission.

This program was aimed at coordinating ballistic missile re-entry vehicle and warhead activities in an effort to optimize the design of missile re-entry systems, including the warheads themselves—and particularly to get better use of space in the system (AW&ST Mar. 8, 1965, p. 13). The "barrage" concept also is a logical step beyond the development of the General Electric Mk. 12 re-entry system for the Boeing Minuteman 2, the first operational ICBM system to have multiple warheads.

For the past six years, the U.S. has been spending what is believed to be in excess of \$200 million a year on penetration techniques. Through its ABRES program, which is administered for the Defense Dept. by the Air Force, actively aided by the Army and Navy, the Pentagon has spent more than \$100 million a year since 1962, or a total of about \$0.75 billion over a six-year period.

Another \$250 million has been budgeted for Fiscal 1968 and 1969, although budgetary cuts may curtail this. Much of the money, of course, is spent on boosters, range fees and other items needed to support penetration-aids development but not directly related to the development itself.

On the opposite side of the ledger are surprisingly large quantities of money spent by weapon systems offices on operational re-entry systems, more accurate guidance concepts and the purchase of penalds packages.

A large quantity of this annual investment in ABRES is going into flight evaluation of maneuverable re-entry vehicles which offer advantages of evasion and, in one case where the vehicle has aerodynamic glide qualities, extended range or payload as well.

The initial flight of the Boost Glide Re-entry Vehicle (BGRV) developed by McDonnell Douglas Corp. probably will take place this month on board a General Dynamics Atlas F ICBM booster from Vandenberg AFB, Calif. BGRV, formerly known as the Aball or 122M Aeroballistic missile, will be fired into a high ballistic path, then re-fired downward from a high altitude into the earth's atmosphere. It will make a short ascent, revert to a relatively-flat, decaying aerodynamic glide so that it can skip along to a target. It would be hidden by its low altitude flight path within the ground clutter of the defense radar. Gas jets on BGRV execute roll and steering maneuvers.

The flight altitude of BGRV may be so low as to make terrain clearance radar mandatory.

The advantage of such a system is that the pre-programmed evasive maneuvering of the vehicle might preclude effective calculation of its trajectory by the defense forces. This would make intercept computation more difficult.

#### SUSCEPTIBILITY

Because the vehicle glides over greater distances within the earth's atmosphere, it is susceptible to action by defense forces for a relatively-long period. In addition, the longer, more-complicated flight path places greater strains on the vehicle's inertial guidance system, making accuracies comparable to those of conventional nuclear warheads on straight, non-maneuvering ballistic flights more difficult to achieve. This shortcoming might be overcome if any of the terminal ballistic missile guidance schemes now under study materialize. Air Force also is looking at a maneuver-for-accuracy concept which might side-step the problem.

Unlike BGRV, which begins its maneuver long before re-entry, the other maneuvering concepts envision maneuver at the start of re-entry. One of these, the General Electric Maneuvering Ballistic Re-entry Vehicle (MBRV), finally achieved a successful flight this summer after three failures due to power

dropout, guidance difficulties and booster failure, in that order.

In the MBRV concept, the vehicle might traverse a shorter-range ballistic trajectory, deceiving the enemy into anticipating assault at a given target. At a pre-determined altitude above the false target area, MBRV would go through a pre-programmed pull-up, followed by another ballistic descent on a more-distant target. It might force the enemy to commit his weapons to defense of a given area prematurely, as it feinted toward unintended targets. The MBRV is believed to have complex hydraulic-driven moving surfaces. Perhaps \$50-\$100 million have been spent on the two efforts.

A third approach, somewhat similar to MBRV in that it is ballistic rather than aerodynamic in nature, is under investigation by McDonnell Douglas. Known as the MARCAS concept, it calls for the injection of fluids into the slipstream and the use of reaction-control gas jets for roll control. Test flights down the inland range are planned.

Critics of the maneuvering re-entry approach cite the great expense involved in these techniques, the extra cost of strengthening the missile boosters and the need for extra equipment such as hydraulics and gas generators that add undesirable weight. In addition, they point to the need for developing nuclear-hardened guidance systems for any maneuvering vehicles.

Since the guidance system must be active and functioning for prolonged periods of time in what would be a nuclear-defense environment, it would have to be hardened against acoustic and nuclear effects. A conventional missile guidance system would be less susceptible because of its essential quiescence after re-entry and the shorter duration of its exposure in the hostile environment.

#### SABRE SYSTEM

Air Force and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Instrumentation Laboratory have been developing a guidance system specifically designed to withstand high accelerations experienced by maneuvering vehicles and hardened against nuclear effects. The Self-Aligning Boost and Re-entry System (SABRE) might be applicable to other re-entry vehicles, but its expense and complexity may restrict it to maneuvering applications. Two aerospace contractors, General Motors AC Electronics and North American Autonetics, are developing prototype inertial platforms to MIT design and Bendix prints (AW&ST Mar. 23, 1964, p. 82), while Sperry Rand Univac is building the hardened computer.

In Operational Maneuvering Re-entry Vehicle (OMRV) studies, McDonnell and General Electric are looking at a maze of requirements for maneuvering re-entry. They are examining body shapes, the advantages of maneuvering against specific targets, the number of vehicles needed to knock out specific targets, the constraints maneuvering imposes on vehicle and guidance system design.

Another technique for countering missile-defense radars using at least a rudimentary maneuverable re-entry vehicle is under investigation by TRW Systems Group, assisted by Raytheon Co. This program, known as Degradation of Radar Defense Systems (DRADS), began about three years ago, was cut back and then was resumed recently.

DRADS would employ a separate re-entry vehicle, possibly carried piggyback on a ballistic missile for release to radiate jamming signals or to home on hostile radar signals, and having sufficient maneuverability to dive into hostile radiating antennas. In many respects, DRADS would be a ballistic-missile counterpart to the Navy's aerodynamic Shrike anti-radar missile, serving the same countermeasures' function against missile defense radar as Shrike is intended to provide against tactical air-defense radars.

#### REACTIVE ECM

The possible use of active electronic countermeasures to confuse or spoof missile defenses is regarded as one of the more promising penetration aids-techniques, although it has been beset with severe obstacles. Such an approach is a natural extension to missile warfare of airborne and ground-based ECM techniques, refined in the years since the Korean War.

To date, however, the difficulty has been to secure extremely-rugged transmitting tubes in the microwave bands of interest capable of withstanding severe environments and generating a maximum amount of broadband power with a minimum amount of weight. Suitable sources of kilowatt dc. power having high specific weight and high specific volume first had to be developed to meet these needs.

Air Force has funded several efforts in active ECM in recent years. Philco-Ford's Space and Re-entry Systems Div. developed small jammers that were deployed from re-entry vehicles in parachutes at the time of re-entry. The Sperry system went through tests on board four-stage Atlantic Research Corp. Athena rockets before being backlogged for operational systems should they be desired. The pioneer electronic countermeasures jamming program, conducted by Borders Electronics, advanced through prototype before termination.

#### SOLID-STATE ADVANCES

Recent advances in solid-state and other avionics technologies have significantly re-kindled latent enthusiasm for electronic countermeasures. Advances in solid state microwave bulk-effect generators, like Gunn effect devices, that are capable of generating quantities of CW microwave power could help change the picture.

The latest concept, which USAF recently chose Raytheon to study (AW&ST Sept. 11, p. 106), envisions a package of small mini-jammers, each one tuned to a different frequency band—UHF, L, S, C and X bands—presumably deployed in a precursor decoy. The availability of a group of jammers could simplify the job of thwarting highly-advanced stacked-beam radars where radiation is on widely-separated frequencies, or frequency hop radars, in which frequency randomly changes from pulse to pulse. It also makes counter ECM more difficult to put into effect.

Until now, missile ECM efforts have concentrated on noise jamming, the generation of large bursts of white noise, as essentially the simplest and easiest approach, much as it was in airborne ECM.

There is much current interest, again stimulated by anticipated availability of low power solid-state microwave devices, in the use of deception repeaters as a cheaper, smaller and lighter alternative.

#### "ACTIVE CHAFF"

In this approach, the so-called "active chaff" would be a small, solid-state repeater, possibly using tunnel diode amplifiers, which could pick up radar signals too weak to be detected by the enemy, delay them for fixed periods, then re-radiate them toward the hostile radar. The enemy might then get a false indication as to the whereabouts of the target.

Meanwhile, USAF is continuing to pursue development of new, high-efficiency, high-CW-power traveling wave tubes suitable for re-entry ECM. Rome Air Development Center is believed to be in the process of letting development contracts for re-entry traveling wave tubes to Hughes Aircraft Co. and Watkins-Johnson Co.

Philco-Ford Corp. also is at work on an exoatmospheric jamming vehicle that would radiate signals from outside the atmosphere during the mid-course phase of ballistic-missile flight.

A sizable portion of penalds activity has

concentrated on developing effective decoys to outwit the various sensors—radar, infrared and optical—available to an enemy radar. The long-range, all-weather sensor, is still the prime object of deception, however.

Ideally, decoys should resemble the actual warhead and its behavior from shortly after they are dispensed from the re-entry vehicle until well into the terminal phase of flight. They should fly trajectories similar to those of the warhead they imitate and return deceptive signatures to enemy sensors.

Ever greater degrees of realism are being sought in decoys. Only this summer, the Air Force directed McDonnell Douglas to study a maneuvering decoy (MANDEC) that might more effectively simulate maneuvering re-entry systems.

The tendency toward greater realism requires larger and heavier decoys with chaff, small propulsion and guidance systems and protective shields. This leads some critics to argue that decoys are simply no longer worth the expense and weight that might be spent more effectively on additional warheads.

Decoys that might maintain the deceptive ruse, either in the mid-course or terminal phases of flight and perhaps against different sensors, have all been investigated. Those that fulfill their roles for only brief periods still may add to the enemy's confusion at crucial moments, possibly provoking him into firing missile interceptors at harmless objects before his defense complex sorts the real from the fraudulent targets. A mixed assortment of decoys might compound this confusion.

At a briefing last year, Philco representatives pictured two types of exoatmospheric decoys deployed from a missile carrier that have radar signatures similar to those of missile warheads. Shaped like re-entry vehicles, one decoy, called Dixie Cup, was all metallic, while the other was a wire-grid structure. Both would burn up during atmospheric entry (AW&ST Nov. 28, 1966, p. 94).

Through the Advanced Research Projects Agency's Optical Particle Decoy (OPADEC) program, attempts were made to simulate vehicle observability across the infrared, optical and longer wavelengths during atmospheric reentry. Four of seven Hughes-designed OPADEC decoys were flown, and two of these successfully spoofed observers. Another OPADEC contractor is believed to have had even more encouraging results.

Various problems have besieged decoy designers, not the least of which is the manner in which heavier decoys are deployed at low altitudes.

Air Force devotes continuing attention to seeking solutions to its fuzing and arming problems. Currently, Philco is in the midst of building 7-ft.-long, slender cone-shaped vehicles flown as the fourth stages of Athena rockets down the inland range from Green River, Utah, to the White Sands, N.M., Missile Range.

These small vehicles, which weigh 200 lb. with payloads, are used to investigate effects of simulated ballistic-missile re-entry phenomena on fuzing systems. The Air Force-funded program, called Fuzing, Arming, Test and Evaluation (FATE), permits flight tests of promising warhead-fuzing concepts.

#### FUZING CONSTRAINTS

Ways of evading the constraints of radar fuzing always attract great interest. A radioisotope approach was discarded after early tests. A millimeter wave approach, which could enable electromagnetic signals to penetrate the re-entry plasma sheath at shorter wave-lengths is under study by Raytheon for the Air Force.

In its Re-entry Vehicle Technology and Observables program, USAF is planning to look into many aspects of assuring safe missile re-entry. It may look into several new materials for protection of re-entry vehicles,

or combinations of them, suggested by underground nuclear tests, as promising improved resistance to high energy X-rays. It also will explore new techniques for cooling, hardening and shaping re-entry vehicle surfaces and use of attitude stabilization. This activity is an extension of the successful Avco Low Observable Re-entry Vehicle (LORV) program which produced a long, slender vehicle with a low cross section.

Air Force is devoting considerable attention—although not part of the ABRES program—to improving ballistic missile accuracy, which relates directly to penetration tactics. For, as statistical chances of an individual missile striking a target increase, the demand for penetration by every warhead diminishes.

As guidance circular error probabilities decrease, the effects of climatology, geodetic and geophysical anomalies become increasingly more important. Errors in target altitudes, for example, can result in significant warhead shortfall or overfall, especially as guidance systems accuracies improve. Wind shear, gravity anomalies and cross-track errors are of increasing concern. The Air Force has several groups, including Logicon, Inc., and Geodynamics, analyzing these effects. Geodynamics is investigating a technique to compensate for anomalous gravity effects on guidance systems.

Terminal guidance is one obvious method for wiping out the effects of these anomalies and compensating for additional inaccuracies of maneuvering re-entry.

Aerojet's Space General Div. has been investigating ballistic missile terminal guidance techniques for Air Force's Space and Missile Systems Organization under two overlapping contracts. One of these is a fundamental investigation into terminal guidance with a view toward combining sensors, optics, data correlation and control devices.

In the other, the company is seeking to define specific experiments. One optical device pinpointed in these efforts was carried on the heat shield of a National Aeronautics and Space Administration Gemini capsule to explore the possibility of seeing through the reentry plasma sheath.

Concepts under study include microwave radiometry and map matching. Ling Temco Vought has been at work for SAMSO on adapting a map-matching terminal scheme for the ballistic missile application.

Air Force's focus on guidance updating extends well beyond terminal aids. It is considering a number of midcourse aids, including both one and two-start position fixing, as an outgrowth of General Precision Systems' work on the STAFF program, and various radio guidance ideas.

Emerging from these investigations is an advanced missile-guidance concept which envisages use of a basic inertial guidance system plus three methods of inflight updating, including star tracking and radio guidance. In this way, if one or two techniques should fail or are otherwise inoperative, the re-entry system still retains its basic guidance capability.

Through the post-boost control system, under development by North American Autonetics for future Minuteman missiles, Air Force has the opportunity to trim position and velocity of the re-entry system after final boost stage burnout with small liquid engines on the re-entry vehicle (AW&ST Sept. 26, 1966, p. 40). Post boost control offers a wide opportunity for in-space changes, such as selection of targets of opportunity after launch.

The Air Force also is looking into methods of permitting a guidance computer temporarily shutdown or disrupted during exposure to transient radiation bursts from anti-missile warheads to recover by reconstructing what has been lost during the off-air-interval. The use of advanced self-heal-

ing software techniques could enable a misdirected missile to get back on trajectory.

Several ways of guiding multiple warheads have been explored, but the shift towards un-guided multiples appears to be gaining the upper hand. The original concepts of independently-targeted multiples, once known as the Multiple Independent Re-entry Vehicle (MIRV), required that small warheads be able independently to guide themselves to their targets after mid-course separation.

On the opposite extreme was the small warhead and maneuverable reentry (SWARMS) scheme, in which individual warheads would be separated into terminal trajectories on a more-random or "shotgun" basis. Different combinations of the two ideas still find advocates.

Guidance schemes for individual warheads similarly range from the complex to the elementary. One approach calls for slave guidance units on board the multiples to be initialized before release by a master system aboard the launching vehicle.

A number of systems engineering and software specialty organizations are assisting the military services and APRA in their re-entry and penetrations aids work. Among these are Hellodyne Corp., Van Nuys, Calif., which performs research under contract in reentry physics and runs a data distribution service of field test measurements; GRC, Inc., Santa Barbara, Calif.; Planning Research Corp., Los Angeles, and Logicon, Inc., San Pedro, Calif., which does systems engineering and analytical work in the guidance area.

#### SENATE FAILURE TO RATIFY HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS AMOUNTS TO U.S. REPUDIATION OF U.N. CHARTER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the recognition of human rights as a subject of proper international concern pervades the United Nations Charter.

In the preamble to the charter, the peoples of the United Nations stated clearly their "faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person," and their resolve "to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom."

Article 1 of the charter cites among the main purposes of the U.N. Charter the achievement of international cooperation "in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

Article 55 of the charter again emphasizes the duty of the United Nations to promote "universal respect for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

In article 56, all members of the United Nations "pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the Organization for the achievement of the purposes set forth in article 55."

The Charter of the United Nations was speedily and overwhelmingly ratified by this body 22 years ago. The vote was 89 to 2.

I must reluctantly conclude that the Senate, by its continuing failure to ratify a single human rights convention, has in effect repudiated the United Nations Charter.

The language and provisions of articles 1, 55, and 56 of the charter are unmistakably clear. By ratifying the charter, the Senate pledged our national

willingness "to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the organization to promote" universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

What else does any of us think the human rights conventions are about except "human rights and fundamental freedoms for all"? Freedom from slavery, freedom from forced labor, full political rights of women, freedom of association, and the right to live are all very basic, very fundamental, very human rights.

I urge the Senate to reaffirm our promise made both to ourselves and to the United Nations 22 years ago when we ratified the U.N. Charter by giving advice and consent to all five of the human rights conventions during this session of the 90th Congress.

#### VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD lead editorials from the Wyoming Eagle of Cheyenne for October 17 and October 25, 1967. They speak for themselves, Mr. President, but in so doing they express thoughts which I know a great many Americans share, notwithstanding the antics of the relatively few but noisy critics of U.S. policy.

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

[From the Cheyenne (Wyo.) Eagle, Oct. 17, 1967]

#### CLEAR PRONOUNCEMENTS

In view of the noisy criticism of our efforts and policies in Southeast Asia, both at home and abroad, and in view of protests, non-cooperation and even obstructionism here at home, it is good to see our national leaders come forth with clear and firm statements spelling out our position and our intentions in Vietnam.

President Johnson, himself, set the tone a week ago Saturday, when he said he was firm in his determination to "see it through" in Asia.

He said most of the recommendations he had heard "on how to get out of trouble cheaply and fast . . . come down to this: deny your responsibility."

He said such advice would have the United States behave as if it were "a small nation with a few interests . . . as if the oceans were twice as wide as they are."

"This," he said, "is the voice not of the hawk or dove, but of the ostrich."

Last Thursday, Secretary of State Dean Rusk stepped into the debate over Vietnam with a firm notice that the administration intends to pursue its present war policy no matter what the critics say.

At the same time, he warned the Communist world that any doubts about the United States' determination to honor its commitment in Southeast Asia could lead to World War III.

"Let me say, as solemnly as I can, that those who would place in question the credibility of the pledged word of the United States under our mutual security treaties would subject this nation to mortal danger," Rusk told a news conference.

"If any who would be our adversary should suppose that our treaties are a bluff, or will be abandoned if the going gets tough, the result could be catastrophe for all mankind."

Secretary Rusk said there was "no significant body of American opinion which

would have us withdraw from Vietnam," nor was there any "serious opinion among us which wishes to transform this struggle into a general war."

Therefore, he said, Americans are "debating variations on a theme . . . this or that military move, this or that diplomatic step, this or that formulation of what is in effect a common middle position."

He added, "Hanoi should not misunderstand this debate."

"Our commitment is clear and our national interest is real."

Sunday, Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey contended that the future of America is at stake in the anti-Communist struggle in Asia.

He said that, should communism win in Vietnam, "it would stimulate the appetite for more aggression and conquest. It would represent a defeat not only for America but for freedom anywhere."

The Vice President declared that if communism swept Southeast Asia "the entire power structure of the world would be destroyed . . . the threat to our security is in Asia and we are fighting there not only for the Vietnamese but for ourselves, for the future of our country."

Humphrey declared that Red China, the center of "militant, aggressive Asian communism," had failed to overrun Southeast Asia because the United States is resisting aggression in Vietnam.

He called for "unity, courage and steadfastness," and warned that the Communists were counting on "our division, our weariness and our uncertainty."

We don't suppose the words of these three top United States officials will do much to quiet the relatively few, but noisy critics.

They seem to have discovered that, by using the freedoms guaranteed in the Constitution of the United States to criticize and protest, they can attract the national limelight. No one likes war, and by criticizing the war in Vietnam, the critics have found they can enjoy a certain degree of temporary popularity.

However, it is to be hoped the Communists will understand the clear pronouncements of the nation's leaders and realize they are fooling only themselves if they expect the United States, which isn't really divided at all, to surrender and pull out.

[From the Cheyenne (Wyo.) Eagle, Oct. 25, 1967]

#### DAMAGE BEING DONE

Anyone who doubts that damage is being done to our war effort by irresponsible violence connected with Vietnam protest demonstrations here in these United States need only to take a look at statements coming from Communist quarters this week.

For instance, news dispatches from Hong Kong reported that "Communist China gloated Monday about the antiwar demonstrations outside the Pentagon."

Radio Peking was quoted as saying President Johnson was "seized with fear."

The broadcast, quoting the official New China news agency, said:

"The demonstration took place at a time when U.S. imperialism was badly routed by the heroic Vietnamese people on the battlefield in Vietnam."

The broadcast, monitored in Hong Kong and Tokyo, also said the antiwar demonstration "threw the U.S. ruling clique into a panic."

It said troops and other security measures at the Pentagon "fully showed up the Johnson administration's fear of the people and its true colors as a paper tiger."

Remember, These are the kind of distorted reports fed to the people under Communist domination.

These are the kind of propaganda reports that feed the Communists' one remaining great hope—that a divided United States will grow tired of fighting and pull out of South

Vietnam, leaving Southeast Asia at the mercy of the Communists.

Perhaps the greatest weapon available in the current American efforts to move the Vietnam war from the battlefields to the conference table is a nationwide display of solidarity and unity behind our position in Vietnam.

Such things as the weekend antiwar violence on the part of a relatively few demonstrators do little to help present a united front to the Communist enemy. Quite the opposite.

Apparent Republican determination to play politics with the Vietnam war—as demonstrated by Republican governors' refusal to support a resolution backing our efforts in Vietnam—doesn't help either.

Indeed, the Republicans, in playing politics with the war, might well give the Communists the impression that if they can hang on until after the 1968 election, President Johnson might be defeated and they might somehow win victory in South Vietnam by default.

We suggest that, if the demonstrators and protesters would put away their torches and the citizens of these United States would leave Vietnam out of partisan politics—if we, the citizens of these United States would make it crystal clear to the Communists that we are united in our determination to stop Communist aggression in South Vietnam—the war might be over a lot sooner.

#### PRI-RU-TA

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the November issue of the Rural Areas Development Newsletter carries a story entitled "Farmers Beat Flooding Problem—With Help," which points up another achievement of the Pri-Ru-Ta resource, conservation and development project in Wisconsin.

The Pri-Ru-Ta project is one of the first of its kind in the country. The three counties involved in the project got together because they shared common problems and common goals. Their efforts to date have been tremendously successful and the flood control project described in the Rural Areas Development Newsletter is but one of many.

I am firmly convinced that these resource, conservation and development projects are a sound approach to rural development and hope that we will see more of them in the years ahead. Many future projects will look to the Pri-Ru-Ta project in Wisconsin as a model of an enormously successful program.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the November Rural Areas Development Newsletter be printed in the RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues so that they might see the vast potential of resource, conservation and development projects.

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

#### FARMERS BEAT FLOODING PROBLEM—WITH HELP

Farmers in a 25,000-acre area in Dewey and Grow townships, in the Pri-Ru-Ta Resource Conservation and Development Project in Wisconsin, were losing crops on good silt loam through flooding caused by inadequate channel capacity.

Local landowners sponsored construction of 35 miles of new channels to remove excess water. They agreed to pay for land easements, rights-of-way, roads, and utilities.

The total installation cost of work completed the first 3 years is estimated at \$44,225. Estimated annual benefits are \$36,232. Benefits are expected to increase to \$150,000 a year when the project is completed.

Associated land treatment included surface field ditches, terraces, diversions, grassed waterways, contouring, and conservation cropping systems. Similar work is expected to spread to 130 farms and eventually result in total benefits of more than \$500,000 a year.

The Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service provided cost-sharing to landowners for establishing conservation practices on farm lands. The State Conservation Department provided information and technical assistance. The State Extension Service helped organize and conduct group activities. The Rusk County Highway Committee, and the townships of Dewey and Grow, installed bridges and culverts on road crossings.

The Soil Conservation Service provided technical assistance in planning, design, and construction. The Farmers Home Administration provided association loans, soil and water conservation loans, farm improvement loans, and farm ownership loans.

#### A SOLDIER RETURNS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, often the Halls of Congress ring with rhetoric praising "our boys in Vietnam"—and rightly so. But as I read this week about one fine young man from Utah who has just returned from the war, I wondered if perhaps we should not pause more often and let our returning soldiers speak for themselves.

An enterprising story in the Salt Lake Tribune on October 23 gives that opportunity to 1st Lt. George M. Bapis, of Salt Lake City, a former student body president at his high school who, at 23, has seen more of life and death than many people ever experience.

Lieutenant Bapis' reminiscences of life as an infantryman in Vietnam should make each of us a little more grateful for the tremendous sacrifices of our men to keep freedom alive in Southeast Asia:

In less than a year there was a marked increase in supplies and in the advancement of weapons used by the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong. When I arrived there in September of 1966, some were using primitive-type crossbows and bamboo arrows; when I left there were sporting rifles with the latest in scopes.

Lieutenant Bapis, who received several medals, including two Bronze Stars, told of coming upon one enemy tunnel that had 30,000 hand grenades, hundreds of mines and tons of rice, and pictured the difficulty of fighting "Charlie" as he darted into his steel-reinforced "spider holes" during bombing raids and emerged right after to continue fighting.

The young soldier, who was a member of the 1st Battalion, 28th Infantry of the 1st Division, also made some substantive assessments of the war effort in Vietnam.

He said:

The U.S. sought to bomb the supply points of Hanoi and Haiphong more. As long as the enemy has supplies, it will continue to wage war.

Lieutenant Bapis said that Christmas and New Year truces were truces in name only:

As soon as the U.S. observed the truce and halted bombing runs, you'd see the roads and trails swarming with Viet Cong supply convoys.

Again, Mr. President, I would just like to observe that such firsthand reports do

much to establish a more solid foundation for the unique difficulties facing our men in Vietnam and the need for our unceasing support from home.

I ask unanimous consent to have the news article reprinted at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

[From the Salt Lake City (Utah) Tribune, Oct. 23, 1967]

#### LIEUTENANT BACK FROM JUNGLE—SALT LAKE CITIES CONG WEAPONRY, SUPPLY BOOST

"In less than a year, there was a marked increase in supplies and in the advancement of weapons used by the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong," a Salt Lake Army lieutenant relates.

"Their soldiers were much better equipped when I left Vietnam last month than they were when I arrived there in September 1966."

These were the major observations of a Salt Lake native back from the jungles of Vietnam, 1st Lt. George M. Bapis.

"They went from primitive-type crossbows and bamboo arrows to rifles sporting the latest in scopes," said the infantryman.

#### UNIVERSITY GRADUATE

Lt. Bapis is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Mike M. Bapis, 4308-575 East. He is a graduate of the University of Utah, where he was commissioned through the Army ROTC program. During his tour in Vietnam, Lt. Bapis received several medals, including two Bronze Stars for meritorious service.

Speaking of casualty reports, the infantryman noted they are not always accurate.

"It's difficult to really tell how many enemy are killed in those jungles, the brush is so thick. You can't see 10 meters in any direction. And you don't know how many men the enemy hauls away after a battle. Sometimes the casualty lists are boosted, but these are isolated cases."

On ending the war, Lt. Bapis noted:

"The U.S. ought to bomb the supply points of Hanoi and Haiphong more. As long as the enemy has supplies, it will continue to wage war."

"Bombing of the field units doesn't really do as much damage as you'd think. They (the Viet Cong) have steel-reinforced 'spider holes' they crawl into during bombing raids. After the raids they come out and fight again. Those holes, or tunnels, have caches of food and ammunition to last for months.

"My unit ran into one tunnel that had 30,000 hand grenades, hundreds of mines and tons of rice. They are really well supplied."

As for truces at Christmas and the New Year, Lt. Bapis said they weren't really truces.

#### HARDLY TRUCES

"As soon as the U.S. observed the truce and halted bombing runs, you'd see the roads and trails swarming with Viet Cong supply convoys."

Lt. Bapis, 23, was a member of the 1st Battalion, 28th Infantry of the First Division. He is not among the critics of the M-16 rifle, used by U.S. troops, and said to jam easily. "It's a fine weapon . . . but you must keep it clean. I had no trouble with it and none of the men in my platoon complained."

On the charge that GIs use marijuana in Vietnam, the former platoon leader said he did not see or hear of any such usages.

#### TAP PRYOR: FRONTIERSMAN OF THE SEA

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, when it passed a major oceanographic bill last year, the 89th Congress opened the way to our last frontier: the vast world ocean

which covers nearly three quarters of the earth's surface.

Public Law 89-454 provides for a comprehensive, longrange, and coordinated national program in marine science. It created a National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, and a Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources. Among those appointed to the Commission was a young crusader in oceanography from Hawaii, Taylor A. "Tap" Pryor, founder and head of the Makapuu Oceanic Center.

Life magazine in its current issue features Tap Pryor in a pictorial essay titled "Frontiersman of the Sea." It is an apt title for a Hawaii pioneer who, in his words, envisions "Hawaii as an ocean-oriented community that can serve as a focal point through which the Nation will enter the sea. Once we establish underwater industry—mining, oil, and gas recovery—there will be a need for thousands of people."

Pryor's life-long love of the sea is described in the article as follows:

When Tap Pryor was 11 he made a diving helmet out of a five-gallon can and a bicycle pump and jumped into Long Island Sound. "I've been in love with the ocean ever since."

Now, having taken his adopted state of Hawaii into becoming a center of oceanographic studies and built its unique Makapuu Oceanic Center, Tap (for Taylor All-derdice Pryor) is trying as a member of the President's Commission on Marine Science, Engineering and Resources to pipe the whole nation into the deep.

"This is our frontier," say the 36-year-old marine biologist. "But it is more than that, it's a whole new world."

Pryor's grandfather developed the Remington Arms Company before World War I; his father, Samuel Pryor Jr., helped develop Pan American World Airways. The idea for a seaside oceanarium and oceanic research institute came to Tap when he was studying sharks off Eniwetok, and he got private industry and the State of Hawaii to invest the money and land to set it up.

He plans next year to make a 162-mile voyage in a two-man glass submersible from Oahu to the island of Hawaii, at a depth of 5,000 feet, and later to go from Oahu to California at 20,000.

"We have to turn to the ocean," he says. "We have no other way of solving our terrestrial problems. It's a matter of survival of the species."

I ask unanimous consent to have the article on Tap Pryor, "An Ocean-Lover on His Favorite Subject," which appeared in the October 27, 1967, issue of Life magazine be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From Life magazine, Oct. 27, 1967]

#### AN OCEAN-LOVER ON HIS FAVORITE SUBJECT

(NOTE.—In conversations with Life correspondent Michel Silva, Tap Pryor made the following observations on man's future beneath the ocean.)

I'm excited at what the President's commission is accomplishing, but I think the failure of this country thus far to invest in an area that promises the greatest return the world has ever known is pathetic.

Besides being earth's last frontier, the sea contains most of the world's remaining mineral resources, the largest existing protein resource and probably most of the oil and gas resources left to us.

Any country has a legal right to expand its

national boundaries into the sea—anywhere in the sea below 200 meters—to invade and conquer the ocean.

It will take the skills of everybody to achieve this—teachers, nurses and mechanics as well as oceanographers, engineers, executives and politicians.

I do think the nation is beginning to rise to the occasion. This is evident not just in the work of the commission, but in the almost daily collaboration between cities, states and regional professional committee groups and in the interest of the aerospace industry. The federal government of course, is already involved, particularly through the military.

No one of these things is going to be totally effective in getting the country going, but I think this interest is setting the nation up to be triggered into the sea.

Our projected trip in the glass submersible is something I've been planning for several years. Man with his naked eye has seen only about 200 square miles of the deep ocean bottom, leaving roughly 146 million square miles to go. With the almost unlimited visibility of our glass bubble—if we are successful—we will have seen more of the ocean bottom with the naked eye than anyone else in the world.

Our technology will be either a magnificent tool or a monster, depending on whether we parallel our efforts with conservation thinking. We can alter the conditions of the ocean, change the direction of currents, modify the weather, create upwellings that will bring nutrients off the bottom to the top. Anything done in one part of the ocean affects in some way another part of the ocean. Each change alters the system and must be made with care and planning.

Virtually all of the inshore water around the country, and probably around a great many other countries, is less productive today than it was 30 years ago. Many areas are rapidly becoming wastelands because the habitats of their animal life are being wiped out. These areas can be restored, but we need basic information about biological processes that go on offshore. If we knew enough about the bottom of the ocean, we could calculate the excess of any animal population and then with sound ocean harvesting practices take off that excess for our own uses.

I think of myself as a taut geodesic structure—a structure of paradoxes, of science, politics and business all interrelated, all pulling against each other.

In the ocean the lone individual can be as effective as the largest government agency. In one space shot you use all NASA's organized technology to achieve the right orbit, and everything comes to the eye of that needle in the sky. In the ocean, there are millions of needles. Some are better threaded by individuals working off the end of a pier or in a "skunk shop" back in town or living on the bottom somewhere. And, of course, some other projects will require massive efforts.

What accomplishment can we look for toward the end of the century? Desalination, for one. And food—we have the ability to build pastures out into shallow water, to grub out a mangrove swamp in Southeast Asia, dike it and—with salt water and sun—produce plant crops and fish for a protein source. The tracking and control of marine organisms on the open ocean, producing in effect domesticated fish, are well within possibility by the end of the century.

The human population could turn its attention to things other than survival through work. The next century could be one in which most of our effort could be turned to intellectual or artistic efforts.

Who knows—the development of the oceans may allow us in the next century to pursue that glorious intellectual hobby, the conquering of space.

## DO NOT LET THEM USE DDT

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I am gravely concerned about the increasing pollution of our environment caused by DDT. DDT has enjoyed widespread popularity over the years because it is an inexpensive and effective pesticide.

In recent years, however, a great number of scientific studies have pointed out that DDT is extremely persistent and that it has permeated ecosystems the world over. Scientific evidence is accumulating at a great rate which indicates that DDT is having a very harmful effect on our fish and wildlife.

I am opposed to the widespread, unregulated use of DDT, particularly in those instances where effective, more readily degradable substitutes are available. A good case in point is the Dutch Elm disease problem which is plaguing much of the Midwest. To fight this disease, communities are indiscriminately spraying huge amounts of DDT, yet the spread of the disease has not been slowed. The spraying, however, has succeeded in many areas in driving away or killing most of the songbirds.

Recently, an article appeared in the *Badger Sportsman* by John Franson called "Don't Let Them Use DDT." Mr. Franson is one of Wisconsin's leading conservationists. His article poignantly describes the enormity of the DDT problem.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Franson's article be printed in the *Record* and commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

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

[From the *Chilton (Wis.) Badger Sportsman*, October issue, 1967]

### DO NOT LET THEM USE DDT

(By John L. Franson)

(1) What is DDT? DDT is a chemical compound known as a chlorinated hydrocarbon containing carbon, hydrogen, and chlorine. It was developed during World War II along with other forms of poisons. It was discovered in 1900 by a German chemist in conjunction with research to develop nerve gas.

(2) Why are people becoming alarmed about the use of DDT?

Principally because scientists and technologists feel that the chemical is being misused. Because it was one of the first poisons to be commonly used by the public, we have had an opportunity to study it more than other chemicals and our scientists can identify it and trace it more readily than others.

DDT is a synthetic—a hydrocarbon. For this reason bacteria in living organisms and in the soil cannot readily digest the compound and change its nature as they do other substances and chemicals.

This causes DDT to be known as a "persistent poison" or as what others loosely call "nondegradable." DDT will degrade to DDD or DDE which are two other forms of potent poison.

With successive applications, DDT residue begins to build up in our soils, plants and our bodies. This fact, plus the outright killing of many other life forms other than the "target species" is what is alarming scientists.

(3) Just how poisonous is DDT to wildlife?

This cannot always be readily determined as fatalities may not occur directly or immediately after application. For example, a robin may eat a worm that has accumulated

DDT residue in its body from spraying on the soil many months before and the robin may die.

Fish mortality may be a result of successive applications many miles upstream or a fish-eating bird might die many hundreds of miles away after eating one of these fish. There are facts available which indicate the potency of this chemical.

The community of Shorewood suffered losses of 98 percent of its robins after application of the chemical. The Conservation Department recognizes that robin mortality usually ranges from 70 per cent to 90 per cent where DDT is used in Dutch elm control. Other birds such as woodpeckers, nut-hatchers, brown creepers, chickadees and kinglets are particularly exposed. Reductions in the populations of housewrens, mourning doves, bluejays, catbirds, chirping sparrows, Baltimore orioles, cardinals and scarlet tanagers can also be expected.

Loss of these birds is readily noticed while the mortality in pollinating insects, reptiles, amphibians and predatory insects that prey on other insect pests and the loss of invertebrate animals in the soils and gardens is difficult to determine. It is the unknown loss of these species which makes the common use of DDT the most frightening.

The President's Advisory Committee on Pesticides reports that in New Brunswick an entire year's production of young salmon was nearly eliminated in the Miranicha River after DDT applications of one half pound per acre for control of spruce budworm. Stream insects which furnished the food for the young salmon disappeared for two years. In British Columbia mortality on the coho salmon approach 100 percent in at least four major streams after surrounding forests were sprayed with one pound of DDT for black-headed budworm. This took place despite measures to keep the chemical out of the waters.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Department reports that one part of DDT in a billion parts of water will kill blue crabs in eight days. (One part per billion is about the relationship of one ounce of chocolate syrup to 1000 tank cars of milk.)

Ten parts of DDT in a trillion parts of water are stored in oysters within 40 days to levels 70,000 times greater than that in the surrounding water. In one recorded case, fish started dying three months after DDT was applied and death reached downstream nearly 100 miles from the treatment site.

DDT is a killer of life which acts on a broad spectrum. It acts by attacking the structure of living cells. It is carcinogenic—it may induce cancer. It is mutagenic—it induces inheritable changes in populations of living animals by attacking the genes. The University of Wisconsin in studying the use of DDT on their campus found that it could affect three generations of robins. They no longer use the chemical.

(4) If DDT has these effects on wildlife, what is the chemical's effects on humans?

There has been little experimentation as yet on the effect of DDT on human beings. This is principally because of the life span, tolerance levels allowed by the federal government for our food, and a lack of experimental research into this particular area.

Like wildlife and other living forms, we do know that we are accumulating residues of the chemical in our fatty tissues just as other living forms are. We have not been able to study its effects for cancer or genetic mutations as we have done in other species.

Before tolerance levels were raised, it was found in a study by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare that the DDT residue in mother's milk exceeded that which would be allowed in cow's milk.

A convulsive dose of DDT to a 22 lb. toddler would be about the amount of DDT equal in weight to the glue that remains on your tongue when you lick ten postage stamps.

(5) In what amount is DDT applied for the control of Dutch Elm disease?

The least amount of DDT recommended is two pounds per tree while the most is 4.8 pounds per tree. Remember what was said about the salmon kill in the previous question.

If you had three elm trees per average lot you could then expect a DDT application of 43.5 pounds per acre to 108.6 pounds per acre or 20 to 50 times as great as the highest concentration of DDT recommended for vegetable crops.

(6) Does spraying with DDT eradicate Dutch elm disease?

No, it does not. There is currently no known way of eradicating the disease. DDT can aid in controlling the spread of the disease. It remains on the surface of the elms for long enough periods to kill the bark beetle when it emerges from the tree in spring. But it cannot prevent the spread of the disease from outlying and rural areas.

One of the unusual effects of DDT and other chemicals on insects is that they seem to be capable of building up an immunity to the chemical which is not possible in other species.

Consequently the situation begins to develop where insects more tolerant than birds continue to thrive while birds drop like flies. We have no information whether this is the situation in the case of the elm bark beetle but it seems reasonable to assume that it is.

(7) Can't the wildlife and the community be protected from DDT by restricting its application only to individual elms?

No. Although some methods are better than others for application, it is not possible to concentrate the spray only to the elm. The chemical carries for miles on air currents and, depending upon the number and concentration of elms in your community, the chemical will wash with the rains through the storm sewers and into neighboring lakes and streams.

It is shocking to learn that DDT is now finding its way to the remote corners of the earth. The Wisconsin Conservation Department is appalled by reports of DDT residues in fish in our northern lakes not to mention those in southern Wisconsin. We are told that some of their findings have not even been printed for fear of alarming the tourists.

Residues of DDT have been found in penguins and crab-eater seals in the Antarctica. It has been found in oil of fish that live far from land and those caught off the coast of four continents in concentrations ranging from less than one part of DDT in one million parts of oil to more than 300 PPM. It has been found in virtually every stream in the nation.

(8) Is DDT the only method that can be used in attempting to control the Dutch Elm disease?

No. Alternate methods have been suggested and devised, especially in recent years with the increasing concern over the use of DDT. The Conservation Department and Department of Agriculture have recommended the use of an alternate chemical called Methoxychlor.

After the initial application, this chemical, although nearly as toxic, will "break down" and will not persist in the soil and living organisms. The University of Wisconsin uses Methoxychlor and an injection type poison. They have reduced their losses to less than 2 per cent.

Some communities have reduced Dutch elm disease through a conscientious cleanup program which entails locating diseased trees and immediately destroying them.

(9) Why then do communities persist in using DDT as a method of Dutch Elm disease control?

Communities which are insensitive to the other effects of DDT use it because it is a simple and economic way of combating the disease.

They prefer it to the other chemicals sim-

ply because of its deadly and persistent qualities. It has to be applied less often and is less expensive than a clean-up program.

(10) What then is the recommendation of the Fond Du Lac County Conservation Alliance?

1. Discontinuance of the use of DDT. If chemicals must be used, we recommend the use of the alternate chemical Methoxychlor rather than DDT even if it would be more costly.

2. Even more than the application of other chemicals, we urge the community to begin a cleanup program, taking down diseased elm trees where they are the city's responsibility and aiding citizens with equipment when they are the private landowner's responsibility.

3. We urge the city to provide adequate funds to the Park Commission to begin a tree planting program with diverse, resistant species to take the place of the elms which we feel eventually will be lost to the community.

4. The enlisting of the citizens in a program of education and services necessary in the detection of elm diseases and the encouragement of the private owner to manage his trees with the same consideration for the environment and welfare of the community that we hope the city government will display.

Perhaps the words of Rachel Carson, author of "Silent Spring," best reflect the plight of our civilization and its ecology. . . .

"Who has made the decision that sets in motion these chains of poisonings, this ever-widening wave of death that spreads out, like ripples when a pebble is dropped into a still pond? Who has placed in one pan of the scales the leaves that might have been eaten by the beetles and in the other, pitiful heaps of many-hued feathers, the lifeless remains of the birds that fell before the unselective bludgeon of insecticidal poisons? Who has decided—who has the right to decide—for the countless legions of people who were not consulted that the supreme value is a world without insects, even though it be also a sterile world ungraced by the curving wing of a bird in flight?"

#### CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, during the course of seven sessions of the conferees on congressional redistricting extending from June 22, 1967 to October 18, 1967, it became more and more clear that it was utterly impossible to reach any agreement on the major differences between the House- and Senate-passed congressional redistricting bills.

Every position was stated and restated. Members of the conference committee forcefully and fully explained the reasoning in support of their positions. Compromise after compromise was submitted, discussed and then discarded for lack of agreement. The conferees made every effort to report back to the respective Houses a satisfactory measure. The final version is the one we shall have before us.

The compromise finally agreed upon does not touch upon the issues that separated the conferees. We have left to future days the issue of compactness and contiguity of congressional districts and the issue of permanent standards of population discrepancies between districts.

In view of the efforts that have been made, and the inability to agree upon a solution, it was finally agreed that the best course left open to us was to report a bill, with some provision and language, temporary in nature, which would take

care of the redistricting situation until the next Federal decennial census in 1970.

The language of the conference report is simple and direct. It accomplished its objective very well. In short, no State shall be forced to redistrict prior to the 1970 census; however, a State can voluntarily redistrict at any time. It also prohibits at-large elections except for the States of Hawaii and New Mexico. This and nothing more is the intent of the bill.

Although the bill is not as this Senator would prefer it, it was the best that we could get under the circumstances. I would have liked to have seen permanent standards in this bill. I would have also preferred to prohibit at-large elections in all States, including Hawaii and New Mexico. In regard to this last point, I would remind my colleagues that a long-time member of the Judiciary Committee of the other body made very clear reasoning behind this provision. During debate on H.R. 2508, he stated on this point:

There is a political aspect to this situation. I hate to say this, but there is no doubt about it. I hope that the Democrats will vote against the motion to recommit. The Republicans might as well vote for the motion to recommit, because it has political implications involved there.

To determine whether this measure is needed, let us look at the alternatives. One alternative would be to compel the courts to use 1960 census figures. Such use would constitute and result in distortion. The other alternative is the use of more recent reliable census estimates. However, the courts have generally paid lipservice to this prospect and then determined that the only reliable figures are the 1960 figures.

If a State decides to redistrict voluntarily, this bill does not prevent it from doing so. However, it should not be forced upon them, particularly when one considers that in a few short years we will have a current and sound basis for redistricting in all States. Upon analysis of each of these alternatives, the present conference bill becomes more and more appealing, and is the best solution that could be found at the present time.

#### I. USE OF 1960 CENSUS FIGURES TO REDISTRICT

An illustration of what would happen under this alternative is best exemplified by my own State of Nebraska. In 1961, the Nebraska Legislature established a plan of redistricting which anticipated that the metropolitan area of Omaha would be growing faster than the rest of the State. Six years later this foresightedness was confirmed. Based upon figures prepared by the Bureau of Business Research, College of Business Administration of the University of Nebraska, the population of the second district, which, according to the 1960 census was the smallest district, had increased by over 80,000. On the other hand, the third district lost about 2,000 individuals, and it is now the smallest district.

If Nebraska were required to redistrict upon the basis of the 1960 census, there would be a greater disparity in the so-called one-man, one-vote concept than there exists as the districts are now con-

stituted. The 1960 census reflects a 31.1-percent population deviation between the largest and smallest district, whereas reliable population estimates indicate that the present deviation is only 16.9 percent.

Although Nebraska is only an example, it is well recognized that the 1960 census figures are unreliable, because of massive population shifts. Any reliance upon such figures to now force redistricting at the present time would be a long stride away from the one-man, one-vote principle. Such a situation has been recognized in New York. In *Wells v. Rockefeller*, 66 Civ. 1976 (D.C.S.D.N.Y. 1967), the court specifically pointed out what would happen if 1960 figures were used. It stated:

However, no court should blind itself to the world of today. To use 1960 figures in many areas would be to enforce the disparity of which plaintiffs complain.

THE 1960-67 POPULATION

To lend the specific in terms of people to the foregoing, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, a table showing resident population changes for the period 1960-67 in 16 States in which court proceedings are either pending or imminent.

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

TOTAL RESIDENT POPULATION CHANGES IN SELECTED STATES, 1960-67  
(In millions)

State	1960 census (Apr. 1)	1967 estimate (July 1)	Change, 1960-67	
			Number	Percent
California.....	15.7	19.1	+3.4	+21.9
Colorado.....	1.754	1.975	+ .221	+12.6
Connecticut.....	2.535	2.925	+ .390	+15.4
Florida.....	4.952	5.996	+1.045	+21.1
Georgia.....	3.943	4.511	+ .568	+14.4
Indiana.....	4.662	4.999	+ .337	+7.2
Iowa.....	2.758	2.753	— .005	— .2
Minnesota.....	3.414	3.582	+ .168	+4.9
Missouri.....	4.320	4.605	+ .285	+6.6
Nebraska.....	1.411	1.435	+ .024	+1.7
New Jersey.....	6.067	7.004	+ .937	+15.4
New York.....	16.7	18.3	+1.552	+9.2
Ohio.....	9.706	10.462	+ .756	+7.8
Pennsylvania.....	11.3	11.6	+ .307	+2.7
Washington.....	2.853	3.089	+ .236	+8.3
West Virginia.....	1.860	1.798	— .063	—3.4

Source: Bureau of Census "Population Estimates" Sept. 5 1967.

II. USE OF ESTIMATES TO DETERMINE PRESENT POPULATION

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the courts generally have stated that population statistics, other than the 1960 census, can be used as a basis to redistrict if they are reliable. A recent impression of this doctrine is contained in *Lucas v. Rhodes*, civil action No. C 65-264, May, 1967, a decision by a three-judge court in the northern district of Ohio, eastern division. The court stated:

The use of accurate population data, current at the time of redistricting, is consistent with the equal population requirement, whether the redistricting is done immediately following a federal decennial census or in the interim years as is sought to be done here. However, if such data are to be acceptable, they must substantially approximate in stability and accuracy the data provided by the federal census.

Although reliable estimates of population do exist, for example, in my own

State of Nebraska, an expression of the court's view of such estimates is provided in *Maryland Citizens Committee for Fair Congressional Redistricting, Inc. v. Tawes*, 253 F. Supp. 731 (1966). The three-judge district court, speaking through Judge Sobeloff, stated:

A difficulty encountered by anyone who undertakes in 1966 to draw district lines with a view to achieving substantial population equality, is that the only accurate figures available are those from the 1960 census. The dilemma presents two possible choices: to accept the 1960 census figures which are not up to date, or to attempt to make estimates of changes in population figures since that date. Neither choice is a happy one, but we have concluded that it is better to adhere to the census figures than to engage in speculative estimates or projections which vary widely with the estimators and the manner in which they handle the figures available to them from various sources. The alternative we have rejected would indeed lead into mathematical thicket.

We have, by this bill, solved the dilemma voiced by Judge Sobeloff. We have provided that no State shall be required to redistrict unless the results of a special Federal census are available therein. If an individual or group decides that a particular State should redistrict, then it will be up to them to lay the foundation for such action by providing the court with the results of a special Federal census.

III. SUMMARY

Mr. President, the conference committee's bill is merely legislation to give effect to a contingency, that is, that the court must know the facts before it acts. Such facts must be established by the best and most reliable method, a special Federal census.

It has been stated that Congress cannot delay the enforcement of constitutional rights. This bill, however, does not delay the enforcement of any rights. It only establishes a sound, factual basis for determining such rights.

Mr. President, there comes a time when we should make sure that we are not moving away from the concept of one man, one vote. Although this bill is not as I would have it if I were making the decisions, it is the best we could get. It prevents a move backward by not allowing forced redistricting on the basis of 1960 figures, and it allows voluntary redistricting.

Mr. President, we can go back to conference. However, we will cover the same ground, make the same arguments and come up with the same conclusion if we are there 90 days or 900 days. We have worked diligently to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion. We should not be so unthinking as to turn this bill down and, in effect, say to those States which may be subject to a redistricting effort, "We shall allow the courts to order your redistricting based upon outmoded figures which will result in court-made malapportionment; and then in a few years, when the 1970 census figures are available, and the true statistics are at hand, you will again be subject to another redistricting." Let us not be so unseeing in our headlong dash for one man, one vote, that we run right past it.

THE NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, few Americans are not aware nor appreciative of the wonderful contribution the National Guard has made to the peace, freedom, and security of our country. Throughout our history the citizen-soldiers who comprise the National Guard have answered one call after another—whether to defend freedom on a foreign shore, to safeguard the lives and property of Americans or, most recently, to protect law-abiding citizens from the lawless minority. And they have performed their tasks courageously and well, unhesitatingly and indiscriminately.

What do they receive in return? For the most part we treat their efforts with indifference, as though we had the right to expect the help, which most times goes well beyond the citizen-soldier contractual obligation. Other times we are less kind. We indict the entire organization for the real or imagined excesses of a few. We question their bravery and their loyalty. We hold them up to public scorn and ridicule. Yes, rather than being thankful, we are petulant. But still the National Guard does its job—a job that must be done.

Criticism is nothing new to the Guard, any more than it is new to any organization that tries to uphold the law, to protect society from itself. But few charges directed against the Guard have been more unfair than a recent article by William A. McWhirter published in *Life* magazine. Mr. McWhirter resorted to yellow journalism in his attempt to discredit the Guard, and *Life* magazine, by publishing the article, gave his charges an undeserved measure of respectability. That a professional reporter could have written the article is shameful, but that a highly regarded and influential news magazine would have published it unchallenged is a blight on journalism generally.

I was glad to see that the matter was brought somewhat into perspective by another journalist, Don Dedera, a highly respected columnist of the *Arizona Republic*. Mr. Dedera's column will not, of course, be as widely circulated as the article in *Life*. This I find regrettable, but its influence, because it presents the truth, in time will be far greater. A unique characteristic of a free press is that truth always wins out over mendacity.

Mr. Dedera is uniquely qualified to write about the National Guard, even apart from his reputation as a perceptive and objective reporter. Over the years he has covered the Guard's activities, both in war and peace. He has been with them, reporting their good works, in Vietnam and in countless difficult situations here at home. He has reported the facts as they exist, not as he might want them to be. I suppose that, like most of us, Mr. Dedera knows that the Guard is comprised of both saints and sinners, both heroes and cowards. The men are, after all, a composite of American society, a society that is itself far from perfect. But Mr. Dedera also recognizes, as most fair-minded men do, that there are far more saints and heroes in the National Guard than there are

the other types. This is what he has reported. No more and no less.

The National Guard always has had its problems, as Mr. Dederer rightly concedes it does today. But they are problems not of their own making: lack of money, lack of trained men, lack of modern equipment and, most of all, lack of adequate public support and respect. And if Mr. McWhirter were interested in anything other than discrediting and destroying the Guard, he might have at least mentioned the problems, in the hope that changes could be made. Fortunately, however, Mr. Dederer has. I ask unanimous consent that his column be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Arizona Republic, Oct. 26, 1967] **MCWHIRTER GETS EVEN WITH THAT SERGEANT**

To the journalism schools of Arizona, the current issue of Life Magazine is recommended for close analysis this week.

It contains a clinical specimen of atrocious reporting—an extreme example of misuse of freedom of the press—and sobering evidence that judgment can be blind among the nation's most influential editors.

The case study is an article about the National Guard, by William A. McWhirter.

"Favorite Haven for the Comic Soldier," is the lead-off for McWhirter's piece. And then the diatribe progresses from insulting to worse.

To a man, as far as this article is concerned, guardsmen are cry babies, boobs, bigots, buffoons, boots, and Colonel Blimps.

How quaint! to McWhirter, that the guard traces ancestry to the militiamen who won his freedom to write. How snide! McWhirter's discovery of a "captain-salesman," as if the terms were mutually exclusive. How small! the revelation by McWhirter that some officers are bored, and some sergeants are stupid, and there's a lot of horseplay in the rear ranks.

Unforgivable is McWhirter's sneer in the beginning paragraphs, "The guard . . . has sent contingents to every U.S. action except Vietnam."

This warns what kind of research follows. In truth, the guard has graduated battalions of men to the front lines in Vietnam, and for two years an Arizona squadron has been one of 25 from across the nation regularly airlifting high-priority cargo to the war. Maybe the next time an Arizona C97 with a cargo of hand grenades is, by monsoon weather, forced to make a long, low-level, approach to Da Nang across Vietcong country, McWhirter can hitch a ride in the jump seat, and hoot all the way to touchdown.

Of greatest regret, McWhirter might have raised legitimate criticism of the guard.

The outfit is not perfect, and by definition, is unprofessional. It is, at a time when this country has extended its elite forces around the world, the only guard we've got. A system that combines federal bureaucracy with local option and coercive recruitment is open for improvement. The guard was not the only organ of government caught unprepared for this summer's searing riots. Who wasn't?

To be fair, McWhirter might have mentioned some of the guard's current problems, not of its own making: its best equipment recalled for active duty; its recruits for long shut out of basic training centers because regulars have higher priority; the bad public relations inherent in any form of authority in a free, all-but-permissive society.

But no. Like 007 disguised as Pvt. Hargrove, McWhirter manages to infiltrate a few guard arsenals.

Guardsmen hate Negroes. Guardsmen are cowards avoiding battle. Guardsmen are ser-

geants with bad grammar, and privates who throw obscene gestures, and officers who begin the drill sessions, "This is nonsense."

And of course, the damaging quote almost always is anonymous, like the unidentified but incisive London cabbie that Time magazine uses to bridge awkward transitions.

The commanding general of the guard himself is assassinated by the description, "has the beefy shoulders and sandy-colored handlebar mustache that gives him the period look of a bather bouncing from the surf at Atlantic City to wink at the girls on the boardwalk. The general is careful about his image and seems the sort of man who never bypasses a mirror. Are my jaws like iron? Are my eyes like blue ice? Do I look like a major general to you?"

McWhirter might have told us something important, and helpful. But what comes through is his subconscious revulsion to all things military, and the self-exposed is not pretty to behold.

At a time of multiple national crises, the editors of Life have allowed a grown man to smear an entire service in getting even for that day, long, long ago, when the sergeant made him scrub the floor with a toothbrush.

#### **NORTHERN STATES POWER CO. WORKS TO PRESERVE THE ST. CROIX RIVER**

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, a most interesting and thought-provoking advertisement appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune on September 24. Entitled "This Land Is Your Land," it tells in words and pictures the story of how Northern States Power Co. has preserved in a natural state some 70 miles of the beautiful St. Croix River.

In this day and age when our beautiful scenic and wild rivers are rapidly dwindling in number, the highly commendable efforts of Northern States to preserve the St. Croix are indeed unique. For over 50 years Northern States has maintained this stretch of the upper St. Croix in a primitive condition and has worked hard to keep the area open and accessible to canoeists and outdoorsmen who want to enjoy this spectacular, unspoiled river.

There are only a few areas left in this country equal to that which Northern States has worked so hard to preserve. For their efforts, they deserve the praise of every American who is concerned with the preservation of our vanishing natural resources.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Northern States advertisement be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

#### **THIS LAND IS YOUR LAND**

For 50 years NSP has saved 70 miles of Upper St. Croix wilderness for you. Here's how you can enjoy it.

If you board a canoe at Riverside, Wis., you can paddle down 70 miles of one of America's most perfectly preserved wilderness rivers . . . the Upper St. Croix.

You may see a deer or a black bear. Watch an otter, muskrat or a beaver go for a swim. Or take one yourself. Catch a sturgeon or smallmouth bass. Camp in the cradle of virgin pines. If you're lucky you'll see a bald eagle.

For 50 years NSP has owned most of the land on either side of the Upper St. Croix River and has maintained the area in its wild state.

#### **AN OPEN INVITATION**

We encourage campers, hunters, fishermen, canoeists and nature lovers to come and enjoy its beauty. If you would like information, write to NSP Conservation Dept., 414 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401.

Numerous public accesses to the river have been made available by NSP. We've even leased 7,000 acres on the Minnesota side without charge to the U.S. Government, which has assigned its lease to the state of Minnesota. This land is now part of St. Croix State Park.

#### **OUR SURROUNDINGS ARE OUR CONCERN**

We at NSP have maintained and will continue to preserve the natural wilderness of this area because we're concerned about the beauty of our surroundings. After all, we live here too.

#### **THE INCREASE IN NUMBER OF BANKRUPTCIES**

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, in these times of generally unprecedented prosperity it is disturbing to note the incredible rate at which bankruptcies have been increasing. A recent Newsweek article reported that in the past decade bankruptcy filings have increased more than 200 percent, to 210,000 in fiscal 1967.

Fortunately, this alarming trend has received considerable congressional attention, notably from the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK]. Our colleague has been in the forefront of a drive to throw new light on the entire problem by proposing in Senate Joint Resolution 100 the establishment of a commission to study our bankruptcy institutions. Most of our present bankruptcy laws were written during the financial crisis of the 1930's. Certainly it is time for us to examine their effectiveness to cope with the financial realities of today.

In his efforts to update the bankruptcy laws our colleague has received the excellent counsel and cooperation of a public minded group of lawyers and businessmen from his hometown of Fargo and throughout the State of North Dakota. These activities were recently recounted in a Fargo Forum article which, along with the Newsweek article, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

#### **BANKRUPTCY LAW CHANGES HAVE IMPETUS IN FARGO**

(By Gifford Herron)

An idea born a little more than two years ago among a small group of Fargoans has grown to national significance.

The idea concerns bankruptcy. The increasing number of bankruptcies is causing concern in the field of sociology and economics.

One example of how Fargo is being recognized for the ideas in bankruptcy came in an aside remark during his talk before the National Conference of Referees in Bankruptcy in Washington, when Referee Asa S. Herzog of New York City said:

"I have a strong belief that a humane and workable new federal bankruptcy law is in the not too distant future and it will be known as the Burdick Act."

Sitting in the same banquet room was U.S. Sen. Quentin N. Burdick, D-N. D., a Fargoan to whom Herzog referred.

Burdick addressed the same group that evening, saying among other things, "I know it comes as no surprise to you when I say it appears we are today in the midst of a bankruptcy epidemic."

What is being published in financial periodicals plus a check in the office of Gordon Thompson of Fargo, bankruptcy referee for North Dakota and northwestern Minnesota, indications certainly point to a "bankruptcy epidemic."

From every section of the nation comes the same report: Filings of petitions in bankruptcies are on the increase.

Records in Thompson's office in the federal building show a steady increase in bankruptcy petitions for the last several years. Last year's total already is topped in 1967 with three months to go. From Jan. 1, 1966, to Oct. 1 that year 179 bankruptcies were filed.

From Jan. 1, 1967, until Oct. 1 this year 226 bankruptcies have been filed with Thompson or slightly more than a 26 per cent increase so far this year.

A national periodical by The Associated Press reported that a militant Civil Rights organization has been planning and is about ready to stage a mass march to file petitions for bankruptcy in an attempt to disrupt the economies of larger cities over the nation.

After the banquet in Washington, The Forum called Herzog at his office in New York, where he is one of 14 bankruptcy referees for that city.

Asked his opinion as to whether the North Dakota senator is making progress in overhauling the bankruptcy act in the U.S. Senate, where he is chairman of the bankruptcy subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Herzog snapped:

"You're darn right he is."

"He is a legislator who has made it his business to find out all he can about bankruptcy. He has done his homework well," said Herzog.

"A man who is as interested and as knowledgeable as Burdick and since we are long overdue for some extensive changes in the bankruptcy law, we are going to get them."

"Bankruptcy is in the field of sociology and economics, it is not in the political field that I can see," concluded Herzog.

Herzog is considered among the top bankruptcy referees in the nation.

One of Burdick's principal bills on bankruptcy, which should reach the Senate floor soon, has to do with discharge of debts of a bankrupt.

At present a creditor can charge fraud and bring a bankrupt into a costly action in a state court to prove he did not act fraudulently in his bankruptcy petition.

Under Burdick's proposal, any question on the discharge of debts would be brought back to the bankruptcy referee, who would be acquainted with the case.

Burdick also has introduced a Senate joint resolution, on which the House must act, to create a commission to study the bankruptcy laws of the United States, on which there would be senators, congressmen, bankruptcy referees and others interested.

Then, too, Burdick has proposals designed to upgrade bankruptcy courts.

There are more proposals in Burdick's mind now and in the minds of persons he confers with which haven't come to a head yet.

Burdick said that since he began working on bankruptcy laws, his office in Washington has become something of "a crossroad" stopping place for referees and others interested in bankruptcy proceedings.

The present law is called the Bankruptcy Act of 1898, as amended in 1938 by the Chandler amendment, sponsored by Rep. Walter Chandler of Tennessee.

Since 1938, the United States has gone through World War II, the Korean conflict and now the current war in Vietnam, all leaving effects on the economy.

In addition, Burdick cites the change in living standards, extension of credit—some to the point of "foolishness"—and many other changes which put the bankruptcy act in the "horse and buggy" classification.

Burdick gives much credit to a group of his acquaintances in Cass County for the work they have done in aiding his attempt to bring changes in the law.

"He was on the firing line," said Burdick about R. H. Barry, Fargo business consultant who has been the court-appointed trustee in the Dalco American Enterprises Inc. bankruptcy since June 1965.

In June of 1966, Barry also was named chief executive officer for Smith, Inc. of Fargo which filed under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Act for a reorganization with the debtor-in-possession. Barry since has been elected president of Smith, Inc.

Shortly after Barry took over as trustee in the Dalco bankruptcy, he explained to Burdick the difficulties he was having and difficulties referees in bankruptcy were encountering under the current law.

As a result Burdick wrote to some 200 referees across the nation, receiving replies from about 25 per cent.

In nearly all the replies were complaints from referees that the bankruptcy law is far outdated, that the economy of the nation has changed and the bankruptcy law should be changed in accordance. There were many suggestions of what should be done to come up with a workable law.

Many suggested that inasmuch as referees have many of the powers of a federal judge, or that the jurisdiction of the bankruptcy court be increased and not be as now, an appendage of the U.S. District Courts.

Referee Thompson says Burdick is doing outstanding work in Washington, particularly in guiding bankruptcy matters through the ponderously slow field of legislation.

Thompson, who was appointed referee in bankruptcy in November 1965, realizes the work connected with becoming acquainted with the various facets of the Bankruptcy Act.

"I know of the deep gratitude Burdick holds for a group of Fargoans who have done considerable spade-work on potential changes in the bankruptcy law."

A catalyst for the action in attempting to overhaul federal bankruptcy statutes came when Barry was appointed trustee for the Dalco American Enterprises, Inc., bankruptcy. Barry generated interest through a local group of attorneys interested in bankruptcy proceedings.

In March 1965 the bankruptcy committee of the Cass County Bar Association was named at a Fargo meeting.

On the committee are George Soule, Fargo attorney who came to Fargo from Towner, N.D., in 1931 and has worked since with many bankruptcy matters, and attorneys Hermar F. Wegner and David D. DeMars of Fargo.

The Cass County Bar subcommittee met later with Burdick, U.S. District Judge Renald N. Davies of Fargo and with Referee Thompson.

Suggestions coming out of that meeting were to establish bankruptcy court with the same territorial jurisdiction as the present referee, change the name of referee to bankruptcy judge and give the new courts and judges the power of adjudicating all matters pertaining to bankruptcy, such as liens, preferences and the right to punish by contempt.

On June 23, 1966, the North Dakota Bar Association, meeting in Jamestown, adopted a resolution offered by the Cass Bar Association subcommittee on bankruptcy which says, in part:

The number of bankruptcies are increasing more than 1,000 per cent annually in the last 20 years.

That 25 per cent of the referees in bankruptcy have expressed in writing to Burdick a need for changing the Bankruptcy Act.

That there appears to be little understand-

ing by the federal government and the commercial community of the nation in evaluating the need to update the technical aspects of the Bankruptcy Act.

The North Dakota Bar Association recommends that the President of the United States appoint an advisory committee to study the problem of bankruptcy and make recommendations on that matter.

Much of the same language is contained in the Senate Joint Resolution introduced by Sen. Burdick and which has been referred to the Judiciary Committee. The resolution provides an appropriation for a commission to study bankruptcy laws.

[From Newsweek, Sept. 25, 1967]

#### THE BANKRUPTCY BOOM

Ranking congressmen, alarmed by a steep rise in bankruptcies, are campaigning for a thorough overhaul of the nation's bankruptcy laws.

In the past decade, the number of bankruptcies has soared 200 per cent to 210,000 a year. Democratic Sen. Quentin Burdick of North Dakota, for one, calls it "an epidemic."

What particularly worries congressmen and government experts is that bankruptcies of individuals are climbing much faster than those of business firms. (According to one unpublished study, the average bankrupt is in his early 30s and married, with four children.)

Officials hope that passage of the truth-lending bill will help remove two root causes—overly easy credit and high-pressure sales tactics.

But what some Congressional leaders want is to revise current bankruptcy laws.

Among the reforms suggested: stronger authority for the courts and a system for preventing bankruptcies by voluntary repayment plans before the cases reach the courts.

#### MEMBERSHIP PROBLEMS OF LABOR UNIONS

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, a recent article by columnist Richard Wilson which appeared in the Washington Star, carried some very pertinent and enlightening information regarding the membership problems of the union movement in this country, pointing out the unconscionable collaboration they are receiving from the NLRB. Because the article places this whole problem in such clear perspective, I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the RECORD.

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

#### UNIONS FIND SOME BASTIONS HARD TO CRACK (By Richard Wilson)

We tend to think of the country as totally unionized. Auto negotiations dominate the headlines. Teachers strike. We are told that next year will be the worst of all in major labor stoppages.

But when the facts are examined more carefully it is seen that the percentage of the non-agricultural work force in unions has been declining steadily since 1956, and in 1966 reached a low of 28 percent. Something a little less than three out of every four non-agricultural workers are thus outside unions.

This is misleading in that the major industries and many of the services are unionized, and acting in concert, or even in part, these unions could paralyze the major productive facilities of the country. The unions also have political influence disproportionate to their numbers.

But the growing percentage of workers who are outside unions is a matter of the gravest concern in the union movement. There is nothing statistically tricky in this. We have a total work force of about 80 million and about 20 million of them are unionized.

Moreover the political climate is growing increasingly hard for unions. This was reflected in the 1966 congressional election. Union leadership may like the 1968 outcome even less. Organized labor can't get what it wants from Congress, such as repeal of Section 14(B) of the Taft-Hartley Act. The congressional trend is the other way, toward abolishing the National Labor Relations Board and replacing it with a judicial labor court.

The whole problem comes into focus in the J. P. Stevens & Company cases, which are before the U.S. Supreme Court and due soon for some kind of action or non-action. The Stevens textile company is headed by Robert T. Stevens, former secretary of the army, who in that capacity clashed with the late Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy and brought him to political ruin. The mild-mannered Stevens is thus no mean antagonist.

The Stevens cases, highly complicated, boil down to the fact that the textile workers couldn't win elections in Stevens plants and blamed their failure on coercive actions by management against employes. These employes, exceptionally stubborn about unions, stand as a symbol of the inability of the big unions to make a big breakthrough in the new industrial south.

There have been many unbelievably ludicrous developments in this fight which has been going on for several years. At one stage the NLRB solemnly proclaimed that hundreds of witnesses, en masse, were separately and collectively lying on behalf of the Stevens company and all the union witnesses were telling the truth. This conclusion was so obviously open to question that one examiner, Boyd Leedom, tried to justify it in what must go down as a psychological confession of a very confused mind.

The NLRB ordered Stevens company representatives to stand before their assembled employes and shamefacedly admit guilt of violating laws they are morally certain they did not violate, and to declare that they would sin no more. Even the language of the confession was dictated by NLRB in such humiliating terms as to gag Uriah Heep.

Since then, the NLRB, in another case, has backtracked on an even more ignominious requirement, obviously sensing that the Supreme Court would take a dim view of compelling anyone to confess guilt in this manner.

All this has reinforced the growing view in Congress that the NLRB has exceeded all bounds of quasijudicial behavior in so many cases that the courts cannot conceivably correct all the errors and injustices.

One cannot read the record of the Stevens cases without being led toward the conclusion that the NLRB is indulging in far more coercive actions to force unionization than employers are using to avoid it.

But this is not all. Unions and their tame representatives in Congress are trying to get canceled the government contracts of the Stevens company which ran around \$70 million in fiscal 1966. The Department of Labor terminated one contract with Stevens for training employes on the job after William Pollock, president of the Textile Workers Union of America, protested the department's allocation of funds to Stevens.

All this because the employes in Stevens plants would not vote in favor of the union—not just once, but in four elections in eight plants.

The record is unbelievable, but then the unions are pretty panicky about the steadily increasing percentage of employes who are staying outside the unions.

**CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT**

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today the Joint Committee on Re-

duction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures releases its monthly report on Federal employment for September 1967.

I am glad to note that this report shows a reduction in civilian employment by the Federal Government of 78,188 during the month of September.

In July 32,215 employees had been added while in August there was a reduction of 10,545. This gives us a net reduction during the current fiscal year of 56,518.

On September 20, 1966, President Johnson issued an Executive order freezing Federal employment at the July 1, 1966 level; however, instead of complying with that freeze order a total of 206,432 employees were added between September 1966 and June 30, 1967. The reduction of 56,518 employees since July 1, as outlined above, reduces to 149,914 the number of employees now on the payroll in violation of the President's Executive order of September 1966.

I congratulate the administration on the progress it has made in the last 2 months and strongly recommend that it continue this trend until the additional 150,000 employees, which the President himself has stated he does not need, are removed from the taxpayers' backs.

At this point I ask unanimous consent that the report as being released today by Congressman MAHON, chairman of the committee, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of September totaling 2,923,641. This was a net decrease of 78,188 as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of August, reflecting reduction in regular seasonal employment and temporary summer employment under the President's youth opportunity program.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1968, which began July 1, 1967, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July 1967.....	3,012,374	32,215	.....
August.....	3,001,829	.....	10,545
September.....	2,923,641	.....	78,188

Total federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of September was 1,649,446, a decrease of 45,837 as compared with the August total of 1,695,283. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in September was 1,274,195, a decrease of 32,351 as compared with 1,306,546 in August.

Civilian agencies reporting the larger decreases were Post Office Department with 13,809, Agriculture Department with 9,341, Interior Department with 5,124, Treasury Department with 3,729, Commerce Department with 2,891, Veterans Administration with 2,719, HEW Department with 1,759, Transportation Department with 1,403, NASA with 1,315, and General Services Administration with 1,030.

In the Department of Defense the larger decreases in civilian employment were reported by the Army with 14,997, Navy with 8,008, Air Force with 4,842, and Defense Supply Agency with 4,163.

Total employment inside the United States in September was 2,685,174, a decrease of 76,552 as compared with August. Total em-

ployment outside the United States in September was 238,467, a decrease of 1,636 as compared with August. Industrial employment by the agencies in September was 597,672, a decrease of 14,880 as compared with August.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

**FOREIGN NATIONALS**

The total of 2,923,641 civilian employees certified to the Committee by federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 120,752 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during September who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in August was 119,630.

**REPRESSION IN SOUTH AFRICA**

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, the Government of the Republic of South Africa has recently performed another repressive act designed to stifle dissent and freedom of expression within that country. It has served a notice of deportation on Mr. John Sprack, a native-born citizen of South Africa and the president-elect of NUSAS, the National Union of South Africa Students. Mr. Sprack thus follows a long list of distinguished spokesmen for the best in South African life and tradition, who have been subjected to similar denials of their personal freedom in recent years.

Chief Albert Luthuli, winner of the Nobel Peace prize for his work toward peaceful accommodation of the races in Africa, lived out his last years as an exile within his own country—his countrymen forbidden even to repeat his words.

Alan Paton, winner of the Nobel Prize for Literature, has effectively been banned from participation in political life.

Just in the last year, the president of NUSAS for 1965-66 was banned from public life for inviting me to address the student group; his successor was refused permission to accept a scholarship in the United States, except on pain of forfeiting his citizenship; and the Chairman of the NUSAS Advisory Panel, a renowned teacher of medicine, was removed from his post and banned from public life, despite the strong protests of Mr. Harry Oppenheimer, chancellor of the University of Cape Town.

One of the most serious and shocking examples of this practice was the deportation from South Africa of the Right Reverend Dr. Edward Crowther, until this summer the Anglican bishop of Kimberley and Kuruman. Dr. Crowther, an American citizen, was an outstanding representative of his church and of the United States. In his 3 years as bishop, and now as "bishop-in-exile," of a diocese having 1 million inhabitants, Dr. Crowther has attempted to give succor and hope to the African population of South Africa. Fearlessly and tirelessly, he has worked to better their lives—and also to bring about some first steps toward understanding and cooperation between the races in South Africa.

Massive American business investment in South Africa has heavily identified the United States with the status quo there:

with a government and system in which 3 million white people suppress and exploit 12 million nonwhites, and where even those white people who question the Government are harassed, banned, jailed, and deported. Bishop Crowther has stood for another kind of American identification. In everything he has done—whether by words, or his deeds in behalf of the many poor and starving Africans—he has exemplified the America of justice, compassion, and courage.

Bishop Crowther has now returned to the United States, where we can expect him to resume the contributions he was making to a better America before his departure for South Africa. But our gain is South Africa's loss.

Finally, Bishop Crowther brings us a warning: that if we do not change our one-sided identification with the forces of repression in South Africa, "we will have bought ourselves a vested inflexibility" which will leave us "on the wrong side" of the future. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of an interview with Bishop Crowther shortly after his return to the United States, an article by him on "The Church's Task in South Africa," and a New York Times report of one of his numerous good works and the Government's response to it.

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

[From the New York Times, July 15, 1967]

**OUSTED BISHOP FORESEES SOUTH AFRICAN UPHOUL—CLERIC ASSERTS RACIST POLICIES WILL SOON IGNITE VIOLENCE—BELIEVES INVESTMENTS WILL PUT UNITED STATES ON THE WRONG SIDE**

(By Nan Robertson)

WASHINGTON, July 14.—The recently-expelled Bishop of the biggest Anglican diocese in South Africa warned today that because of the Government's repressive racist policies, South Africa "will be the next to blow" after Vietnam.

The Right Rev. Clarence Edward Crowther said he was telling officials at the State Department and on Capitol Hill that the "massive conflagration," once ignited, "will make Vietnam look like a kindergarten war."

Moreover, the British-born, naturalized American clergyman expressed his belief that if and when war erupts in South Africa, the United States will find itself "on the wrong side" because of heavy private investment there.

Among those with whom Bishop Crowther has conferred are the Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, Joseph Palmer 2d, and Senator Robert F. Kennedy, Democrat of New York, who made a special side-trip to see him while visiting South Africa last year.

In an interview today, the Bishop said that if American investments increase, "we will have bought ourselves a vested inflexibility" in South Africa.

Commerce Department figures show that direct investment by private American companies in South Africa was \$528 million at the end of 1965, the last year for which statistics are available. United States investments in that country are bigger than in any African nation and have increased steadily in recent years.

The United States Government has no control over private American investment abroad, except in Communist countries.

Bishop Crowther, now "bishop-in-exile" because he refused to resign after his deportation on June 30, said the 15 million South Africans were aware that "storm clouds are

gathering." He added that the South African Government had incurred the hostility of the rest of the African continent because of its policy of apartheid, strict separation of races.

The Bishop, who is 38 years old, presided for three years over the Diocese of Kimberley and Kuruman. The population of one million, spread over an area of 200,000 square miles, is overwhelmingly nonwhite. So are the 65,000 Anglican communicants. Bishop Crowther said religion was the only non-segregated formal activity left in South Africa.

He has denounced apartheid in speeches inside and outside South Africa and has raised thousands of dollars to finance welfare programs for black Africans uprooted and arbitrarily relocated by the Government.

The Bishop described the plight of black South Africans as "totally, absolutely pitiful."

Bishop Crowther said he first came to the United States with his wife and children in 1957. From 1958 to 1964 he was Episcopal chaplain at the University of California at Los Angeles, and was active in a fair housing group. He became a naturalized citizen in 1964. While in Los Angeles, he met the visiting Archbishop of Capetown, Robert Selby, which led to his involvement in South Africa.

[From the Christian Century, July 27, 1966]

#### THE CHURCH'S TASK IN SOUTH AFRICA

*Only when the Body of Christ in apartheid land faces up to the biblical doctrine of man will injustice be ended.*

(By Edward Crowther)

Africa's southern tip is somewhat like a ballpoint pen; it rolls out what comes to it from the top. The whole continent is seething, and reaction at the lower end reflects the turmoil. Today it is Nigeria that is in ferment, tomorrow maybe it will be Zambia, always it is the Congo—while Angola hangs like a sword of Damocles over the land of Prime Minister H. F. Verwoerd. Here what the world interprets as initiative is in fact reaction to the many ingredients that make up the melting pot of South African policy, as well as to the struggle going on throughout that part of Africa which lies to the north.

Coming from the United States to serve the church in South Africa, I have found this country a strange half-world. One tends to be riddled with an uncreative nostalgia that is dangerous to the living out of the Sacrament of the Present Moment.

#### WHERE PHYSICAL PROSPECTS DECEIVE

The first impression of South Africa is of a prosperous, well ordered society. You sense among the people an outgoing hospitality that falls between the stools of English insularity and accelerated American friendship. As you look at Cape Town, so like San Francisco in appearance, or see the rising skyline of Johannesburg—the city which claims "a heart of gold"—you can hardly believe that this is part of the "dark continent." This country is booming; new buildings are going up everywhere; if you know where to find them, restaurants and shops compare favorably with those in Britain or the United States. On the surface, everything is just fine. But then you discover that a great "ostrich act" is being performed here; the nonwhite South Africans are not in this splendid picture. And you must fit them in somehow, for they make up over 13 million of the total population of 17 million. Of the 13 million nonwhites, 2 million are the so-called coloreds—the part-whites, hapless products of earlier integration.

The average nonwhite South African's vision of the world is the mere reflection of it that he sees in the shining floor of store and *stoep*, the polishing of which is his daily task. The Group Areas act dictates where he shall live. The Job Reservation act decrees where and how he shall labor. The Immo-

rality act determines not only what its title implies but forbids behavior that would seem inoffensive—for example, a woman's accepting a late night car ride to her home from the white man in whose house she has spent the evening as a baby sitter.

The Immorality Act applies to visitors to the country as well. Americans Dusty Springfield and Adam Faith had their entry permits canceled because they refused to perform for segregated audiences. Even home-produced golf has suffered. Recently a noted South African of East Indian descent, golfer "Papwa" Sewsunker Sewgolum, was refused the permit needed to play in a tournament. There was a protest at that time from his fellow professionals, but not because of the ban on "Papwa"; no, they protested because the financial stakes in the tournament were not high enough.

#### THE HEART OF THE MATTER

"When you've been here long enough, man, you'll understand." Shades of the U.S. south! When you've been here long enough, man, just what will you understand?

For one thing, you will understand that the Christian church is practically the one voice of organized opposition that remains to challenge the principles of apartheid. This opposition *must* be Christian; otherwise the whole shallow doctrine of expediency will be buttressed for good and all. Here is a tremendous danger for the church. To be sure, at the present time the same danger is imminent in the U.S. and Britain. It is easy—as it is in many cases right—for the church to ally itself with secular organizations headed in the same direction as it is so far as civil rights are concerned. At home—in the U.S.—the thought often struck me that we must realize that the ticket in the civil rights movement won't take us to the end of the line; if the miracle should happen and racial injustice were to vanish overnight, the church's job would be far from finished. Preoccupation with man to the neglect of the doctrine of God tends to drown out the passionate cry for justice. For that doctrine is the heart of the matter.

What can the church do in South Africa? Many of us are acutely conscious of the fact that the world's attention is being increasingly concentrated on this continent. The United Nations constantly holds the Republic of South Africa up to the light of world opinion; as on an X-ray film, the world sees the racist disease spreading. Deep down in the conscience of all of us who are called to work in this portion of the vineyard there are groaning and travelling. We talk, talk, talk—always with an eye on the effect our words will have on the big pledgers, most of whom of course are white. We look at our beautiful cathedrals and parish churches and are often prompted to speak half-truths, for surely the way of life which produced our stately edifices is worth preserving. The Cathedral of St. Cyprian in Kimberley seems to give an affirmative answer to my questions: "Am I doing enough? Is what must be said being said? Is what should be done being done?" The cathedral, lovely lady that she is, gives assent because she survives in all her beauty in the life to which she has become accustomed.

#### THE EASY WAY: DO NOTHING

What is this way of life to which the cathedral along with the rest of white South Africa, has become accustomed? How dare we assent to the grotesque blasphemy of man's separation from his brother? Whether in South Africa or in the U.S., this separation is wrong—thoroughly, completely wicked. The trouble is, of course, that we are so caught in the crucifixion that we can't experience the resurrection. We put ourselves on the cross and gazing at ourselves, become masochists. "When you've been here long enough, man, you'll understand." You'll understand all right! You'll understand that all you have to do to lose

Christ in any situation is to do nothing. Just sit there wallowing in those pious pronouncements which you hope will pay this year's premium on your policy insuring favorable world opinion, praying that the check doesn't bounce, that the insurance policy will still be honored.

But then you go out into the "locations" where the Africans live and take a long hard look at the children playing in the dust, at the deformed little bodies that if they grow at all will grow into tortured shapes. You see the women who walk to their hard day's work and all the way back to eat their "mealies" in the squalor produced by below-subsistence wages. You look into the eyes of African schoolteachers—many of them well educated, refined—and you realize what it is to be without hope. Eyes that can see no hope, discern no visions—these are the saddest eyes in the world.

#### THE WAY THAT DEMANDS SACRIFICE

Yes, if you are around long enough you will understand, all right. What you begin to understand is that (as James Baldwin has said) when you treat people like things you become a thing yourself. You look at your hands, the hands Christ longs for you to use. You touch your lips, the lips through which Christ must speak. You look at your feet, the feet that should go where Christ would have them go. Then suddenly you are filled with the joy of being a person in whom Christ dwells. The people around you are people like yourself: they don't like walking without shoes, they sweat in the heat and they cry when they are hungry.

If I read the signs clearly, people in and out of Africa are becoming impatient with high-sounding utterances. They would have the church walk as well as talk. But where do we go? The church's participation in the civil rights movement in the U.S.—although it came late, at least it has come—has a great deal to teach us in South Africa about direct confrontation of wrong, about standing up and being counted. There are of course, fundamental differences between the situation here and that in the U.S. We are many years behind in acceptance of the nonwhite as a person. Until the majority of white South Africans arrive at that basic recognition, any sort of civil rights bill is impossible. A peaceful solution to the enormous problems here—and peaceful the solution must be if the church is to be involved—must begin with a sound theological foundation, with recognition of who Christ is and therefore who man is—a foundation that will not crumble under the demands for self-sacrifice rising out of it. Since South Africa is in the position, perhaps unique in this continent, of having achieved an extremely efficient and Western-like economic stability, there are certainly areas where the pinch of sacrifice would be felt.

Understandably, recent unhappy events in Nigeria, the Congo and elsewhere in Africa have terrified many people here who hitherto had shown liberal inclinations. Is this, they ask, what happens when the black man gains power? Will not this country's industries, its people's material comforts, the "South African way of life" vanish overnight if the one-man-one-vote principle swamps the white man, ends his precariously held power? These sentiments proceed out of the old Boer *lager* (encampment) mentality, the kind of mentality that would deal with the global movement toward freedom as the pioneer Boers met the dangers on their trek into the unsettled wilderness; by drawing their wagons into a circle impregnable to the hostile people outside.

But we can't fight ideas this way. The church's responsibility is to proclaim the doctrine of man made in the image of God, to point out to the frightened that the turmoil in the Congo is the result of the white man's subjecting the native to a tyranny which left him no room to breathe and grow in and which chained him to the earth, so that when

the chance came he acted as might reasonably have been anticipated, human nature being what it is.

It would seem that there is only one possible peaceful solution for South Africa: a crash educational program offering equal opportunity for every individual to develop his talents fully. Prerequisite to this solution is a moral revolution. A minimum educational standard applying to both white and non-white would enfranchise many nonwhites and exclude many whites from the polls. Such a step would create hope where there is now despair. And the evolution of hope is the only antidote to the violence generated by despair. The Christian doctrine of hope has been long neglected, but perhaps here more than elsewhere the opportunity for its renaissance is at hand. South Africa is a far, far cry from the U.S., where despite the many cracks in its fabric the federal power, defined by the Constitution, stands solidly behind justice to all. Here unjust laws, the taking by Caesar of the things we can never hand over to him, form the conditions under which we live.

Yes, the movement toward justice is going to cause much pain in the Body of Christ in South Africa. Perhaps the biblical concept of Christ as the Suffering Servant is the one which we in this land must take to heart. The problem we face is age-old in the history of the church: What is to be the role of the Body of Christ, the people of God, when all channels for redress of grievances seem to be closing fast? It would indeed be a joyful thing for all Christians to dwell together in unity. But until we can show who our brethren are, that is a joy we in South Africa can never know.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 1, 1966]

**SOUTH AFRICANS ASSAIL A BISHOP—SAY HE TRIED TO EMBARRASS REGIME BY FEEDING BLACKS**

(By Joseph Lelyveld)

**KIMBERLEY, SOUTH AFRICA, December 31.**—A young Anglican bishop here, with a record in the civil rights movement in the United States, is being accused of trying to embarrass the Government by distributing food to 1,000 hungry, dispossessed black South Africans.

"It is all so simple," Bishop C. Edward Crowther, a former chaplain at the University of California in Los Angeles, said today. "As a bishop of the church I must seek to feed the hungry and assist the homeless. I am astonished that this could be construed as an attack on South Africa."

The Bishop's conflict with the authorities started two weeks ago when all the residents of a black squatters' settlement called Holpan, 40 miles north of this diamond-mining center, were turned out of the shanties in which many had lived their entire lives and loaded on Government trucks with their possessions.

#### BACKGROUND OF EXPULSION

The authorities had been trying to get the squatters, most of whom found work as casual labor on nearby farms and diamond diggings, to move to a "location" where housing had been provided for them.

The squatters had resisted because the rent of the Government houses—the equivalent of only \$5.60 a month—would take at least a third of what they were able to earn in the best of months.

So the trucks came and carried them 25 miles into the barren veld, where they were dumped at a site devoid of facilities for human habitation.

The site, known as the Mamuthla Reserve, is what the Government euphemistically calls "a Bantu homeland."

But, says a woman who accompanied Bishop Crowther on one of his visits there, "it's right in the middle of absolutely nothing—no houses, no schools, no jobs, no food—nothing!"

When the bishop went to Mamuthla, he found the people living in improvised lean-tos that could not even be described as shanties. Many told him they had been without food for five days.

"I decided then and there that I must start an emergency relief scheme," he said.

On his way back to Kimberley he stopped at a general store on the border of the reserve and ordered a first shipment of maize.

Announcing his fund that same day, he said: "I feel ashamed to be associated by the accident of race with those responsible for this disregard for humanity and ordinary human wants of food and shelter."

The bishop's statement raised a furor. Officials in the Bantu Affairs Department in Pretoria, pressed for comment were reported to have declared that the squatters had "forfeited their right for sympathy" by refusing to be relocated.

"Can you tell me," the Bishop asks, "how old people and children can forfeit their right for sympathy—especially at the Christmas season?"

When the keeper of the general store brought the maize to Mamuthla the next day he was unable to distribute it because, he said, an official told him he had "no right to feed the natives." The Bishop immediately announced that he would return to Mamuthla to distribute the maize himself.

Two carloads of officials were waiting for him when he arrived. The local Bantu Commissioner told him that he had no right to enter the reserve, and that, anyway, no one there needed or wanted food. He offered to let the Bishop come along and satisfy himself that this was so.

#### BISHOP ADDRESSED CROWD

Two men approached a crowd of about 100. The Bishop spoke.

"I told them I came as their Bishop and they need not be afraid of telling the truth," he recounted. "I asked all those who were without food for themselves or their children to stand. The whole crowd stood."

On Christmas Eve Bishop Crowther returned with three truckloads of food, the result of contributions, many of them anonymous, now amounting to more than \$2,500.

"Every family there had a decent Christmas meal," the Bishop says. "By decent, I mean some maize, some biscuits, some candy and some tinned fish."

But by this time the Government and its supporters were expressing their resentment of the publicity the bishop's fund drive had attracted.

"The nasty suspicion arises that the promotion of Christmas goodwill is not his only motive," an Afrikaans newspaper said.

Because the English-born bishop holds a United States passport, he was told that the ordinary exemption clergymen get from the requirement that all white visitors to black reserves must carry permits did not apply to him.

A Government official was reported to have said that he would not get one when he applied. Another official in Pretoria said the bishop's only aim was "to embarrass the Government."

While at the University of California, Bishop Crowther, a husky man of 36, with a jaw that juts impressively, took part in fair housing campaigns.

He came to South Africa to serve as deacon here in September, 1964. It was only last month that he was installed as Bishop of Kimberley and Kuruman.

#### LARRY SULLIVAN'S JOB IS ABOLISHED

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, after 41 years of working on Capitol Hill in various capacities, Larry Sullivan is retiring, all because Congress, in one of its economy moves, abolished the Office of the

Coordinator of Information in the legislative appropriation bill. However, as Larry states so well in the article he wrote for Roll Call:

But 41 years is a long time on Capitol Hill. Doubtless it is proper to move along.

Larry came to Capitol Hill on November 7, 1926, with Associated Press, where he stayed until 1947, when he joined the House Committee on Government Operations. In 1948 he was appointed to the staff of the Coordinator of Information, and in January of 1953, he was named Coordinator.

I think I can speak for Larry's many friends in the Senate in saying that we shall certainly miss him. He probably knows and calls more of us by our first names than almost anyone else. I have considered him one of my good friends since 1935, when I first came to the House of Representatives. I wish for him many years of well-earned and well-deserved rest.

I ask unanimous consent that the article published in Roll Call be printed in the RECORD.

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

COORDINATOR SULLIVAN: CAPITOL  
REMINISCENCES

(By Lawrence Sullivan)

It's a funny feeling, being abolished by Act of Congress!

But 41 years is a long time on Capitol Hill. Doubtless it is proper to move along.

Only two Members of the present Congress were in service when I first marched up the Hill, November 7, 1926, to take my new assignment for the Associated Press in the Senate gallery.

On that day, the Honorable Carl Hayden, of Phoenix, was the House Member from Arizona, since 1912; and the Honorable Emanuel Celler was in the House from the 10th New York since 1922.

Babe Ruth was the King of Swat, and Jack Dempsey was the feared Manassa Mauler; Gertrude Ederle had just conquered the English channel in the name of American womanhood; and William Jennings Bryan had lost spectacularly to Clarence Darrow in the historic Tennessee Monkey Trial!

President Cal Coolidge was thinking of running again, but finally decided, in late 1927, to step out of the way of a whirlwind young comer, Herbert Hoover, of California, the great food and hunger genius of WWI.

Charles Gates Dawes of Illinois—"Hell 'n Maria Dawes," as we used to say—was Vice-president, and Albert B. Cummins, of Iowa, a raging liberal of the day, was president pro tem of the Senate.

In those days the bulbous and flamboyant Tom Heflin of Alabama was wont to enter the Senate lounge about 11:50 A.M. singing in robust gusto, "Alabama casts twenty-four votes for Oscar W. Underwood." (We still hear the melodious echo of those 103 roll calls in the 1924 convention in old Madison Square Garden).

A BUDGET SURPLUS

Cal Coolidge's budget for fiscal 1927 stood at \$2.8-billion and showed a cash surplus of \$1.1-billion. The defense budget was \$792-million for the year.

The Federal debt stood at \$18.5 billion and our esteemed Allies owed us \$15 billion on war debts. No wonder Silent Cal could enjoy an hour's nap in the office every afternoon. The Federal income tax rate on corporate profits was 12%, against today's 52%, and even prohibition was a debatable success, save possibly in New York, Chicago, Boston, New Orleans, San Francisco, Palm Beach, and Prairie du Chien, Wisconsin.

Indeed, it was a bright and confident world. Eight years ago we had won triumphantly the war to end all wars; and the world now was safe for democracy, perhaps for ever. What's to worry? Our international balance of payments was more than \$150-million in our favor for the year.

Speaker Nicholas Longworth of Ohio ruled the House with an iron hand, with a majority of 70 on the roll call. Sam Rayburn of Texas was ranking minority Member of the Interstate Commerce Committee, and John Nance Garner, of Uvalde, now serving his twelfth term in the House was assistant floor leader.

WHO IS STALIN?

There was something moving in Russia vaguely known as Communism. A Little Red Wagon had exploded in Wall Street in September 1919. But Moscow was still quite a mythical city, much like something out of the Arabian Nights. Lenin had expired mysteriously in 1924, and the new head man, Stalin, still was a prime world nobody.

In short, everything was just dandy until October 29, 1929, when the bottom fell out of Wall Street and the Dow Jones Industrial averages started down from \$381.7, and never stopped until June 1932, at \$41.22, or some 13 points below January 1915.

During the crash week of October 1929, the New York Stock Exchange list lost more than \$20-billion in total value, and the decline continued in every market until the total loss on the big-board list, alone, was something like \$55-billion.

Never in human history had there been a financial hurricane of such violent sweep and intensity. Thousands simply went nuts.

In November 1928 a special election in Massachusetts sent to Washington the Democratic floor leader of the Commonwealth Senate, John W. McCormack, an energetic genial young lawyer from Dorchester. He was full of lively chit-chat about Calvin Coolidge in the Massachusetts State House in the days of the Boston Police Strike. And across the aisle sat an ambitious young publisher from North Attleboro, Joseph W. Martin, Jr., elected to the House in 1924, and by now a tested Congressional veteran. Martin and McCormack became warm friends.

William Tyler Page of Maryland, author of the immortal American's Creed, was Clerk of the House.

Leaving journalism in November, 1947, I joined the staff of the House Committee on Government Operations. Next year I was appointed to the Coordinator's staff, and in January 1953, named Coordinator. The office was abolished by PL 90-57, effective October 1, 1967.

CONGRESS IN AMERICA

Over the span of 20 successive Congresses, I have known personally some 3,500 Members of the House and Senate. And everyone of them had something to contribute—scholarship, oratory, gaiety, dogged plugging, a wholesome skepticism, even in a few cases, an almost eccentric patriotism.

No one ever can hope to know and understand our American Constitutional system until he knows Capitol Hill for at least a quarter-century.

Capitol Hill makes America tick. As the poet once said—

"Long may our land be bright  
With freedom's holy light!"

God save the Hill!

VIETNAM: A STRAIN ON THE  
CONSCIENCE OF MANKIND

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, W. Somerset Maugham has written:

Conscience is the guardian in the individual of the rules which the community has evolved for its own preservation.

The conscience of all mankind is, today, being sorely strained by the ever-increasing U.S. military involvement in Vietnam.

Many of the youths of the United States are under a particular strain. For they are convinced that U.S. military involvement in Vietnam is morally and legally unjustifiable. While perfectly willing to fight and, if need be, to protect the security of their Nation, they are in agreement with so many eminent military leaders of the Nation that the security of the United States is in nowise threatened by the conflict in Vietnam—essentially a civil war into which the United States blundered with a massive, military effort, and which indeed its actions helped to precipitate.

There are also many youths, safely deferred because of their full-time attendance at college, who feel they must do more to bring about an end to the horrible fighting in Vietnam. They protest and demonstrate—the vast majority of them peacefully—they write letters and sign petitions to their elected representatives—but to their complete frustration they see the military involvement of the United States in Vietnam steadily escalated.

Those who must counsel these youths are also very sorely troubled.

What shall they advise those youths who face draft calls but who do not believe that the cause of the United States in Southeast Asia is either legally or morally just?

Faced with such a choice, Stanford religion professor, Robert McAfee Brown, has come to the conclusion that:

Because of Vietnam . . . in conscience, I must break the law . . . one has to oppose evil even if one cannot prevent it.

Writing in the October 31, 1967, issue of Look, Professor Brown states:

This escalation of military power demands the escalation of moral protest. Those of us who condemn this war, who are repulsed by it and who realize that history is going to judge our nation very harshly for its part in it, must see more and more clearly that it is not enough any longer to sign another advertisement or send another telegram or give another speech—or write another article. The ways of genteel, legal protest have shown themselves to be ineffective.

Professor Brown raises a most crucial point. In our democratic society, the citizen is given recourse to his elected officials to change the course of action of the Federal Government. Appealing to the President and to his elected representatives in the Congress, the citizen sees his protests against the course of action in Vietnam falling upon deaf ears—even though those espousing his point of view grow in numbers daily. What is the citizen to do about a government grown unresponsive to his wishes?

Where can he turn?

I ask unanimous consent that Professor Brown's moving article entitled "Because of Vietnam: In conscience, I must break the law," published in the October 31, 1967, issue of Look, be printed in the RECORD.

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

BECAUSE OF VIETNAM: "IN CONSCIENCE, I MUST BREAK THE LAW"

(By Robert McAfee Brown)

"Vietnam? I've got other things to worry about." There was a time when it was easy for me to say that. I was worried about the California battle over Proposition 13, in which the real estate interests were trying to palm off on the California voters legislation designed to discriminate against minority groups, a measure later declared unconstitutional by the United States Supreme Court. I was worried about the plight of the migrant workers in the San Joaquin Valley, who were striking for the right to bargain collectively. I was also, if truth be told, worried about other things as well: getting tomorrow's lecture finished, scrounging up the extra dollars I was going to need when state-income-tax time rolled around, finding time to get acquainted with my kids, recouping some of the losses on the writing project on which I was currently so far behind.

In this, I was like many millions of Americans. In addition, also like many millions of Americans, I was probably afraid to face the issue of Vietnam, afraid that if I learned enough about it, I would have to join those radical, far-out types who two or three years ago were saying in such lonely fashion what many middle-class people are saying now: that our policy in Vietnam is wrong, that it is callous and brutalizing to those who must implement it, that it cannot be supported by thinking of humane people and that if one comes to feel this way, he has to engage in the uncomfortable and annoying and possibly threatening posture of putting his body where his words are.

In the interval since I discovered that I couldn't duck Vietnam any longer, I have tried to do my homework, read some history, examine the Administration's position, listen to its critics and come to a stand of my own. I've come to a stand, all right. And I only regret, not just for the sake of my own conscience, but for the sake of the thousands of Americans and the hundreds of thousands of Asians who have died in Vietnam, that I did not come to it with much greater speed. For I have now gone the full route—from unconcern to curiosity, to study, to mild concern, to deep concern, to signing statements, to genteel protest, to marching, to moral outrage, to increasingly vigorous protest, to . . . civil disobedience.

The last step, of course, is the crucial one, the one where I part company with most of my friends in the liberal groups where I politic, with most of my friends in the academic community where I work and with most of my friends in the church where I worship. And since I am a reasonable man, not given to emotive decisions, one who by no stretch of the imagination could be called far-out, one who is not active in the New Left, one who still shaves and wears a necktie—a typical Establishment-type middle-class American wasp—I feel it important to record why it is that such a person as myself finds it impossible to stop merely at the level of vigorous protest of our policy in Vietnam and feels compelled to step over the line into civil disobedience.

My basic reason is also my most judgmental: I have utterly lost confidence in the Johnson Administration. Those who do not share that premise may shrink from the consequences I draw from it. All I can say by way of reply is that I tried for many months to work from the presupposition that the Administration was genuinely seeking peace and that it was trying to conduct foreign policy in honorable terms. But the record now makes patently clear to me that our Government is not willing to negotiate seriously save on terms overwhelmingly favorable to it and that it has refused to respond to many feelers that have come from the other side. I can no longer trust the spokesmen for the Administration when they engage in their customary platitudes

about a desire to negotiate. What they do believe what they say, and at the moment they express willingness to talk with Hanoi, they engage in further frantic acts of escalation that bring us closer to the brink of World War III and a nuclear holocaust. I do not believe that they are any longer reachable in terms of modifying their senseless policy of systematically destroying a small nation of dark-skinned people so that American prestige can emerge unscathed. All of us who have written, spoken, marched, petitioned, reasoned and organized must surely see that in the moments when Mr. Johnson is not calling us unpatriotic, he is simply ignoring a mounting chorus of moral horror with benign disdain and proceeding day by day, week by week, month by month, to escalate the war far past the point of no return.

This means that if one believes that what we are doing in Southeast Asia is immoral, he has no effective way of seeking to change such a policy, for the policy, in the face of two or three years of increasing criticism, is only becoming more hard-nosed, more irrational, more insane. The procedures through which change can normally be brought about in a democracy are increasingly futile. Mr. Johnson emasculated Congress in August 1964 with the Gulf of Tonkin agreement, which he now uses to justify air war over China. Public protests are written off as examples of lack of patriotism or lack of fidelity to the Americans now in Vietnam or even, by members of the House Armed Services Committee, as reasonable. With each act of military escalation, the moral horror of the war is escalated. We have been killing women and children all along; now, we kill more of them. We have been destroying the villages of civilians all along; now, we destroy more of them. We have been breaking almost every one of the rules that civilized men have agreed constitute the minimal standards of decency men must maintain even in the indecency of war; now, we break them more often.

This escalation of military power demands the escalation of moral protest. Those of us who condemn this war, who are repulsed by it and who realize that history is going to judge our nation very harshly for its part in it, must see more and more clearly that it is not enough any longer to sign another advertisement or send another telegram or give another speech—or write another article. The ways of genteel, legal protest have shown themselves to be ineffective. During the time of their impact, escalation has not lessened, it has increased. (I leave as a purely academic matter the question of whether escalation would have been worse without the genteel protests. Undoubtedly, it would have been. But it is too easy a rationalization to argue that we might have killed 500,000 Vietnamese, whereas, thanks to the protests, we may have only killed 100,000. Howard Zinn has remarked that World War II furnished us with a very convenient moral calculus: it is not permitted to kill 6,000,000 Jews, but anything short of that number can be justified in comparison.)

Military escalation has become our Government's stock response to every problem, and in its exercise, our leaders have demonstrated themselves incapable of change. Their only response, now no more than a conditioned reflex, is to hit a little harder. They have become prisoners of their own propaganda. Their rationalizations of their policy become more frantic, their attacks on their critics more strident, their defense of their actions more removed from the realm of reality. In justifying the decision to bomb within ten miles of the China border, Mr. Johnson, in a not-untypical burst of omniscience, assured us that he knew the mind of the Peking government and that the Peking government would not interpret our action as a widening of the war. But who, even in Peking, can predict how that government

will respond? Such acts and gestures and declarations on our part indicate the awful temptation of using power irresponsibly and the way in which our blithe self-confidence may sow the seeds of our own—and everybody else's—destruction. I do not know which is more terrifying to contemplate: the possibility that Administration leaders really believe the reasons they give to defend their policy or the possibility that behind their public reasons, there lies another set of motivations and justifications that they dare not share with the rest of us. On either count, their right to lead the most powerful nation on earth is faulted.

I have already suggested that history will judge them harshly. But such a statement is a little too smug, however true it may be. History will judge us harshly, that is to say, those of us who continue to support our present policy makers, either overtly by echoing their tattered clichés or covertly by our silence. He who is not against them is for them.

In the face of such conclusions, one is counseled, "Work for '68. Wait for '68." I will, of course, work for '68, just as, inevitably, being a child of time, I must wait for it. But I am no longer content to throw all my energies in that direction, and for the following reasons: (1) It seems clear that no Democrat will have either the courage or the power to challenge Mr. Johnson. In the face of his virtually certain nomination, it is important that millions of persons like myself get on record as indicating that under no circumstances whatsoever would we vote for him. (2) There is little indication that the Republican party will offer a real choice. Nixon and Reagan are more hawkish than Johnson, and Romney has displayed an indecisiveness about Vietnam seldom matched in the history of American politics. (3) The vacuum within the two major parties leaves voters opposed to our Vietnam policy with rather bleak alternatives. The decision to cast no vote at all cannot be justified by those who believe in the democratic process. All that is left, then, is to vote for a protest candidate who will not win. Several million voters so acting might serve notice on whoever wins that there is a body of opposition that cannot be discounted. But serving notice is a far cry from influencing policy. (4) All of this remains desperately abstract, however, because 1968 is a full year off. What is not in the least abstract is that in the meantime, men and women and children are dying. They are dying horrible deaths, inflicted not only by the Vietcong but also by our own soldiers. As our casualty rate increases in the next 12 months, the casualty rate of the enemy will increase perhaps ten times as fast. Meanwhile, our escalation will be bringing us closer and closer to war with China and possibly with Russia.

In the face of such facts, an informed conscience does not have the luxury of waiting 12 months to see what the political machinery may or may not produce. Therefore, I find myself forced, by the exclusion of alternatives as well as by an increasing sense of moral imperative, to escalate my own protest to the level of civil disobedience. The war is so wrong, and ways of registering concern about it have become so limited, that civil disobedience seems to me the only honorable route left.

I make this judgment, foreseeing two possible consequences.

First, there is always the remote possibility (on which it is not wise to count too heavily) that civil disobedience might make a significant enough impact on the nation as a whole that the policy makers could not any longer ignore the voice and act of protest. If engaged in by significant enough numbers of people (and significant enough people), it could conceivably shock the nation and the world into a recognition that our actions in Vietnam are so intolerable that a drastic shift in our policy could no longer

be avoided. There is the further remote possibility that others, not yet ready to escalate their protest to civil disobedience, might at least escalate somewhere in the spectrum and thus produce a total yield noticeably higher than in the past.

I would like to believe that such things might happen. I see little likelihood that they will. Why, then, protest by breaking the law, if such protest is not going to do any discernible good? Because there comes a time when the issues are so clear and so crucial that a man does not have the choice of waiting until all the possible consequences can be charted. There comes a time when a man must simply say, "Here I stand, I can do no other, God help me." There comes a time when it is important for the future of a nation that it be recorded that in an era of great folly, there were at least some within that nation who recognized the folly for what it was and were willing, at personal cost, to stand against it. There comes a time when, in the words of Father Plus-Raymond Régamey, one has to oppose evil even if one cannot prevent it, when one has to choose to be a victim rather than an accomplice. There comes a time when thinking people must give some indication for their children and their children's children that the national conscience was not totally numbed by Washington rhetoric into supporting a policy that is evil, vicious and morally intolerable.

If such language sounds harsh and judgmental, it is meant precisely to be such. The time is past for gentility, pretty speeches, and coy evasions of blunt truths. Evil deeds must be called evil. Deliberate killing of civilians—by the tens of thousands—must be called murder. Forcible removal of people from their homes must be called inhumane and brutal. A country that permits such things to be done in its name deserves to be condemned, not only by the decent people of other countries but particularly by the decent people who are its citizens, who will call things what they are and who recognize finally and irrevocably that the most evil deed of all is not to do bestial things but to do bestial things and call them humane.

In light of this, I no longer have any choice but to defy those laws of our land that produce such rotten fruits. I believe with Martin Luther King that such civil disobedience as I engage in must be done nonviolently, and that it must be done with a willingness to pay the penalties that society may impose upon me. I recognize the majesty of Law and its impregnable quality as a bulwark of a free society, and it is in the name of Law that I must defy given laws that are an offense against morality, making this witness wherever need be—in the churches, on the streets, in the assembly halls, in the courts, in jails.

Each person who takes this route must find the level at which his own conscience comes into conflict with laws relating to American presence in Vietnam, and the cardinal rule for those engaging in civil disobedience must be a respect for the consciences of those who choose a different point along the spectrum at which to make their witness; words like "chicken" or "rash" must have no place in their lexicon. Some will refuse to pay that portion of their Federal income tax directly supporting the war. Others will engage in "unlawful assembly" in front of induction centers. For myself, it is clear what civil disobedience will involve. I teach. I spend my professional life with American youth of draft age. And while I will not use the classroom for such purposes, I will make clear that from now on my concerns about Vietnam will be explicitly focused on counseling, aiding and abetting all students who declare that out of moral conviction they will not fight in Vietnam. I will "counsel, aid and abet" such students to find whatever level of moral protest is consonant with their consciences, and when

for them this means refusing service in the armed forces, I will support them in that stand. In doing so, I am committing a Federal offense, for the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 specifically states that anyone who "knowingly counsels, aids or abets another to refuse or evade registration or service in the armed forces" opens himself to the same penalties as are visited upon the one he so counsels, aids and abets, namely up to five years in jail or up to \$10,000 in fines, or both.

I will continue to do this until I am arrested. As long as I am not arrested, I will do it with increasing intensity, for I am no longer willing that 18- or 19-year-old boys should pay with their lives for the initially bumbling but now deliberate folly of our national leaders. Nor am I willing to support them in action that may lead them to jail, from a safe preserve of legal inviolability for myself. I must run the same risks as they, and therefore I break the law on their behalf, so that if they are arrested, I too must be arrested. If this means jail, I am willing to go with them, and perhaps we can continue there to think and learn and teach and reflect and emerge with a new set of priorities for American life. If, as is far more likely, this means merely public abuse or ridicule, then perhaps a minority of us can be disciplined, chastened and strengthened by that kind of adversity.

But whatever it means, the time has come when some of us can no longer afford the luxury of gentility or the luxury of holding "moderate" positions. The issue must be joined. Our country is committing crimes so monstrous that the only thing more monstrous would be continuing silence or inaction in the face of them. END

#### GROWTH OF DIRECT OVERSEAS FLIGHTS FROM DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, the Washington Evening Star this afternoon has published an editorial on the encouraging growth of direct overseas flights from Dulles International Airport. The Star describes the anticipated 38-percent gain in such flights next year as "a welcome development," and all of us who are interested in seeing Dulles put to greater use agree.

I believe that Dulles should be recognized as a major international gateway. It has the modern facilities capable of handling the largest available aircraft, and, from a geographic point of view, it is the logical entry and exit point for overseas travelers from many parts of this country.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### COMING OF AGE

The news that Dulles International Airport will be substantially increasing its direct overseas flights next year, helping travelers avoid the nightmare of stops at John F. Kennedy Airport in New York, is a welcome development.

JFK for too long has enjoyed a near-monopoly as a transit point for airline flights to Europe. The average takeoff and landing delay there is now about 20 minutes, and at peak traffic periods is much longer. Federal Aviation Agency officials say the average delay will double next year.

There is no earthly reason why Dulles, a magnificently designed facility, should not serve as an entry and exit point for many more international voyagers. The airport in fact is frequently used now on an emergency

basis by Kennedy-bound planes that must refuel due to bad weather over New York.

According to published reports the number of overseas flights planned for the peak season next year at Dulles will show a 38 percent gain over the 1967 figure. At least one airline is also considering routing its overseas freight direct to Dulles to avoid the mess at Kennedy.

Just this month, airlines increased the total of non-stop and direct flights between Dulles and Europe from 34 to 40, and more will be added next April. It's a trend that ought to be encouraged. Not only will this result in greater comfort for international travelers but it will cut down the risk of air collisions over the saturated Kennedy area.

#### THE STAKE IN VIETNAM—AN ASIAN VIEW

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, the November issue of Reader's Digest contains an interview by the noted journalist, Mr. Carl T. Rowan, with His Excellency Tan Sri Ong Yoke-Lin, one of the world's most distinguished diplomats and the Malaysian Ambassador to the United States. This article, entitled "What Is at Stake in Vietnam: An Asian View," offers a rare insight into the thinking of the pro-Western nations of Asia with regard to Vietnam. In the interview, the Ambassador makes it perfectly plain that in the eyes of our Asian allies our stand in Vietnam is essential to their continuing freedom. He also firmly asserts that the Vietnam war is not an American war but one being supported by many Asian nations. In answer to the question, "Just what is at stake in Vietnam?" the Ambassador replied:

The independence of more than 200 million people in Southeast Asia; the rice bowl of the world; vast supplies of rubber, tin and oil; strategic control of critical sea lanes; the possibility of a wider war; and the integrity of a great nation, the United States—all are at stake. And much more—not the least of which is the simple desire of small, weak countries like mine to live free of harassment and aggression by the great powers, free of foreign coercion and subversion. That is what is at stake.

I commend this article to every Member of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### WHAT IS AT STAKE IN VIETNAM: AN ASIAN VIEW

(Tan Sri Ong Yoke-Lin, Malaysian Ambassador to the United States, interviewed by Carl T. Rowan)

(NOTE.—Tan Sri Ong Yoke-Lin was a top political leader in Malaya when it was still a British protectorate and a member of the mission to London that won Malaysian independence in 1957. Still a member of the Cabinet in Malaysia, he has also served as his nation's Ambassador to the United States since 1962.)

(Carl T. Rowan, director of the U.S. Information Agency 1964-65, is today a widely syndicated columnist, also a radio and TV commentator.)

Q. Mr. Ambassador, the United States has almost 500,000 troops in Vietnam. We have suffered 13,000 killed and 80,000 wounded there. Is Vietnam becoming too much an American war?

A. No. The South Vietnamese have over 700,000 troops, and have suffered more than 70,000 military and civilian dead since 1961.

Many nations are aiding them. South Korea has sent some 45,000 troops. The Philippines, Australia, New Zealand and Thailand have all contributed troops. Other countries have supplied specialized training and material support. All of us in Asia have a lot at stake there.

Q. Critics hold that, except for the Korean troops, Asian contributions have been of a token nature—that we are fighting for a group of nations that won't fight for themselves. Why, for example, hasn't your country sent troops?

A. Because of our own serious problem of communist subversion. Though we won the 12-year war against them seven years ago, some 1600 armed, fanatical, hardcore communists still lurk along our northern border with Thailand and in the jungles of Sarawak. These terrorists, many of them trained in Indonesia during Sukarno's "Crush Malaysia" campaign, now get their orders from Communist China. Our small armed force is barely sufficient for our own defense.

Q. Malaysia, then, can provide only moral support?

A. We have given considerably more than moral support. As early as 1958, our prime minister, Tunku Abdul Rahman, saw that the communists would try to take South Vietnam through terrorism just as they were trying to take Malaysia, and he called upon the free world to help South Vietnam. Though hard-pressed ourselves, we began to train South Vietnamese in counter-insurgency techniques we had found successful. Several thousand officers have now completed this continuing program. And when we won our victory over the communists, in 1960, we gave most of our military equipment to South Vietnam.

Q. You won your war against the communists yourselves. Why can't the South Vietnamese?

A. There has been a far more massive infiltration of communist men and material into South Vietnam than there was in Malaysia. The South Vietnamese need more help.

Q. You believe that U.S. involvement is vital, then?

A. You recall the political manifesto which Lin Piao, the Communist Chinese Vice Premier and Minister of National Defense, expounded in 1965—that Asia, Africa and Latin America are the rural areas of the world, and that if you take the rural areas the cities eventually will fall. U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam under present circumstances would put Communist China well on the way to achieving Phase 1 of Lin Piao's master plan: domination of Asia. We in Malaysia, for example, would be in deep trouble. Not only would the armed bands of communists be encouraged, but the underground subversives would re-emerge.

Let's face it. Your country carries a terrible burden today because no other country in the world has the will and the power to stop Red China's expansionist march. Your stand has achieved more than most Americans seem to realize. You have given confidence and hope to millions of Asians who would otherwise have submitted to the communist juggernaut. In Indonesia which Sukarno had all but delivered to Peking, the army and the people rose up and crushed the communist coup attempt of 1965, later ousting Sukarno. I doubt they would have moved so confidently if your strong stand in Vietnam had not made it clear that you are not going to abandon Asia to communist tyranny.

Beyond this, Asians have been inspired toward economic and social cooperation as never before. They have formed the Asian Development Bank, created ASPAC (Asian and Pacific Council), reactivated the Association of Southeast Asia. All this has been made possible by the stabilizing presence—the security shield—of the U.S. military.

Q. Some Americans say that we have no vital interests so far from home, that we have no right to be there.

A. The United States has every right to be there, helping South Vietnam to repel aggression and meet the needs of her people. You also have a "selfish" interest. Red China has openly and brazenly declared her aggressive intentions. If you don't make a stand in Vietnam, you risk a much bigger war in years to come.

No fair-minded Asian believes that the United States has any ulterior economic or territorial motives. We are aware that, instead of keeping territories that you occupied in World War II, you returned them and spent vast amounts of money to rebuild them. You helped Japan to become one of the most prosperous countries of the World. You sent your young men to save Korea from communist domination. You willingly gave independence to the Philippines. This is a record that no amount of propaganda can distort.

Q. But some eminent critics say that in Vietnam the United States is opposing nationalism, not communism—that we are warring against the same kind of revolution that gained us our independence.

A. I know that it wasn't "nationalism" that caused communist terrorists to kill Malaysians for 12 years. It was an international communist conspiracy. A fanatical wing of these same conspirators is operating in Vietnam today.

Q. Critics have said that the United States will be hated in Asia for generations because it has sent soldiers to kill young Asians. What are the racial implications of this war?

A. In my country, the communist terrorists were mainly of Chinese origin—but so were 90 percent of the innocent and helpless Malaysians they assassinated. It was no race war; it was a conflict between murderers and a people who wished only to live in peace. Likewise in Vietnam. Asians recognize that this is just another of the many struggles of freedom against tyranny and coercion. Asian nations have themselves sent troops to Vietnam, remember. Race is not a factor.

Q. Some critics say that the Saigon government is a dictatorship, unworthy of support under a pretense of defending freedom and democracy.

A. You cannot ignore the fact that, for years, South Vietnam has been under vicious attack. What the South Vietnamese have is a war government. Even in a democratic country, the government necessarily takes on extra power during periods of national emergency. Some of your President's powers during World War II might be considered "dictatorial" when viewed from peacetime. South Vietnam must move toward democracy, but first it must have a period of peace—of freedom from aggression.

One more point about this: Don't forget that the Hanoi regime in North Vietnam is a dictatorship *beyond any doubt*. It is easy to criticize the harassed leaders in Saigon, but does any critic maintain that the group in Hanoi is preferable?

Q. Do you think a negotiated settlement in Vietnam is possible?

A. We should be very wary about any such proposal. The communists will come to the conference table only when they think that by doing so they can still take over South Vietnam. We have seen the work of the communists who went to Geneva to negotiate. Before the ink was dry on the agreement they signed in 1962, they started a campaign to subvert and take over the government of Laos from the neutralist premier Souvanna Phouma—one of the things they had pledged not to do.

In my country, when we had thoroughly whipped the communists both militarily and politically, there were no negotiations. Our government simply declared an end to "the emergency." It could well be that, if the

American people show determination to last out the struggle in Vietnam, there will be a quiet, unannounced de-escalation, and eventually the war will fizzle out—but only after the communists are convinced that they have no hope of gaining their objectives.

Q. Mr. Ambassador, many Americans and some Asians fear that Communist China will enter the war and involve all Asia in a brutal conflict. Do you share this fear?

A. Before the United States bombed North Vietnam in 1965, the fear was widely expressed that such action would bring on Red Chinese intervention. But this has not happened. The Red Chinese leaders have been quite cautious.

Q. To sum up, just what is at stake in Vietnam?

A. The independence of more than 200 million people in Southeast Asia; the rice bowl of the world; vast supplies of rubber, tin and oil; strategic control of critical sea lanes; the possibility of a wider war; and the integrity of a great nation, the United States—all are at stake. And much more—not the least of which is the simple desire of small, weak countries like mine to live free of harassment and aggression by the great powers, free of foreign coercion and subversion. That is what is at stake.

## CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is morning business concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

## REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the clerk will state.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2515) to authorize the establishment of the Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

## ESTATE TAX BILL

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the Chair. Mr. President, for myself, the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], I introduce a bill and ask that it be received and appropriately referred.

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

The bill (S. 2600) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the valuation of a decedent's interest in a closely held business for estate tax purposes, introduced by Mr. HARRIS (for himself, Mr. CARLSON and Mr. CURTIS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the devastating impact of Federal estate taxes on the families of ranchers and farmers and some small businesses has become a

problem of grave concern to the livestock industry. In recent years, an upward trend in the sales prices of farm and ranch properties, primarily caused by speculators investing in land, has produced higher and higher taxes at the death of the farmer or rancher. Often the heirs have little or no cash with which to pay these death taxes. This has already forced the liquidation of many family livestock operations, and could force the sale of countless other ranches and farms on the death of present owners.

The effect of this trend is to threaten the continuation of the traditional family ranch or farm which is passed on from one generation to the next. Small businesses involving real estate also are similarly affected.

In contrast to farms and ranches, the valuation of publicly traded stocks and securities generally reflects their earning power, and such stocks and securities can be sold on death without destroying a family business. Thus, decedents whose estates consist of farms or ranches or small businesses are discriminated against in comparison with those whose estates consist of marketable securities.

Along with the National Livestock Tax Committee, I have been exploring possible changes in the existing laws and regulations which might achieve estate tax equity for the livestock industry. The distinguished senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], has been making a similar personal study.

The prime reason for the upward trend in valuation is the Internal Revenue Service's interpretation of the requirement in the Federal estate tax regulations that the estate tax be imposed on the "market value" of the property held by the decedent at the time of his death. Today the price for which farm or grazing land might sell to speculators is out of all proportion to what it will earn for farm or grazing purposes. Unfortunately, however, many revenue agents refuse to give any consideration whatsoever to the earning capacity of a ranch or farm in determining its value for estate tax purposes. To the contrary, they rely only on inflated sales prices of similar farms which have been gobbled up by land speculators. Thus, the family which does not have substantial outside assets cannot pay the estate taxes. So, the property has to be sold and cannot be passed on to the next generation.

Congress should begin now to find a satisfactory solution to this problem. With the thought in mind that whatever we do would involve the passage of remedial legislation, together with the distinguished senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], I have drafted a bill offering what I believe is a sound approach. In general, since other small businesses have a similar problem, it would apply in any case where a decedent owned an interest in a closely held business whether in proprietorship, partnership, or corporate form.

In such a case, the estate's representatives would have the option of having the decedent's interest in the business valued either at its market value, as at

present, or the higher of the decedent's cost basis or a value based on the reasonable earning power of the business. In order to qualify for this option, my bill provides that the decedent must have been in the business for at least 10 years prior to his death, and his heirs would have to continue the business for at least 5 years after his death. In addition, this bill would provide that under the market value alternative all relevant factors should be considered in valuing a business interest, including the earning capacity of the business and the degree of control represented by the interest being valued.

I believe that this proposal represents a fair solution to the problem, and I hope the bill will be carefully and thoughtfully studied by the Treasury Department experts and others so that any shortcomings that may be found can be dealt with before I offer it as an amendment to an appropriate House-passed tax bill.

Mr. President, I am pleased now to yield to the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I am happy to associate myself with the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] in regard to the introduction of this bill.

#### ESTATE TAX RELIEF FOR FAMILY BUSINESS

Mr. President, for the past several years, our Nation has seen a period of spectacular growth and expansion in our economy. Income and production have been booming.

One very important group within our society, however, has not shared this prosperity. I am speaking of the family-owned enterprise, whether it be a farm, ranch, or small main street business. The family farmer and the small businessman, while getting much lipservice, are now being discriminated against by our tax laws.

Specifically, I am talking about the Federal estate tax or what some refer to as the "death tax." Too often today, the "death tax" has meant the death of the family business; a death caused by tax discrimination.

On the one hand, we express alarm about the disappearance of the family farm, ranch or community business and the stability and proven worth of this kind of life. On the other hand, we place a discriminatory tax based on unrealistic, inflated land values and thereby make it virtually impossible for young people of today to carry on the family operation.

For over 200 years, the family farm has contributed strong and stable young men and women who formed the very backbone of our society. The family farm has given us plentiful production of food available at an ever decreasing share of our take-home pay. Today, the rest of the world looks to the success of the American farmer with envy, admiration, and hope. If these families are continually forced from rural America, where they lead productive and happy lives, we not only hasten the death of the traditional American farm but also speed up the mass migration to the cities where

desperate conditions there already need our urgent attention.

The small, family-owned business has played an equally important role in building America. Such businesses provide the goods and services which we all expect and demand in our neighborhood homes, areas where the big corporations cannot serve because "it doesn't pay." The small businessman not only serves America but, in the eyes of many, he is America.

Yet with all of this lipservice and praise, there is continued discrimination against the family-owned enterprise.

My colleague, Senator HARRIS from Oklahoma, and I are today offering legislation to strike at one area of discrimination against the family-owned enterprise.

The prime problem centers on the requirement in the Federal estate tax regulations that the estate tax be imposed on the "fair market value" of the assets at the time of the owner's death. In the case of real estate, the fair market value is usually established by comparing land in the estate with prices recently paid for other land in the area.

More often than not, these prices are vastly inflated and are in no way comparable to the value of the decedent's ranch, farm, or business based on its ability to earn. The economic fact today is that ranch and farm land being sold is based on these inflated property values to speculators who may intend the land for purposes other than to produce food and fiber.

Unfortunately, even in light of this economic fact, no consideration is given to the earning capacity of the property in calculating estate taxes. Yet these taxes must be paid out of the earnings of the ranch, farm, or business unless the family has substantial outside interests or cash.

When shares of corporate stock in an estate are taxed, the earning power of the shares is generally considered the most important factor in determining value. It then becomes proper to argue that earning power should be considered in the valuation of a farm or ranch for estate tax purposes.

Let us take a case in point: Farmer Jones dies, leaving his 10,000-acre cattle ranch to his son. Assume the ranch is valued at \$30 per acre, is paid for, and the cattle and supplies would sell at an auction for \$150,000. Farmer Jones has no prior debts.

This ranch is now valued for estate tax purposes at \$300,000. The personality is valued at \$150,000, bringing the total estate to \$450,000. After the \$60,000 exemption, Farmer Jones' taxable estate comes to \$390,000. The estate would have to pay an astounding \$110,500 in Federal estate taxes.

On the other hand, computing Farmer Jones' tax based upon the property's earning power is quite a different story. Jones had an average annual income of \$7,500, a profit that is slightly above the average 1.5-percent value of his total earnings earned by most cattlemen. Taking a capitalization factor of 4½ percent increased value per year, Farmer

Jones' capitalized earning value comes to \$165,000. With the \$60,000 exemption, the taxable estate is now \$105,000 and the estate tax would be a much more reasonable \$22,200.

This same problem applies to the small businessman, who finds that high estate taxes make it impossible for the family business to be carried on from one generation to the next. The business is purchased by those who can pay the price, and what used to be a traditional and proud community service becomes a speculative investment for those who can afford it.

Mr. President, we must change these tax regulations that discriminate so blatantly against the family-owned enterprise. Up to now, ranchers, farmers, and small businessmen could only seek relief through lifetime planning and making sure they had enough liquid assets in case of emergency. These stop-gap remedies do not offer any real guarantee and are available only to those who can afford to hire expensive tax consultant advice.

I believe this bill can bring some relief to the estate of small businessmen, ranchers, and farmers caught in the stranglehold of the estate or "death tax." The bill, simply put, would allow the estate's representatives to have the option of having the decedent's interest in the business valued at either its market value—the present system—or the higher of first, the decedent's cost basis; or, second, value based on the reasonable earning power of the business.

The bill additionally provides the decedent must have been in the business 10 years prior to his death and that his heirs would have to continue the business for at least 5 years after his death.

Mr. President, I join with the Senator from Oklahoma in expressing concern over this matter and am pleased to sponsor this proposal which I think represents a fair solution to the problem.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Kansas. I am pleased that he and I are joint authors of this bill, which we today propose.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS— ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF AMENDMENTS NOS. 400 AND 401

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I am pleased to announce that amendments Nos. 400 and 401, which I have had inserted in the RECORD, intended to be proposed by me to H.R. 12080, the social security bill now pending in the Senate Finance Committee, continues to gain additional support.

Amendment No. 400 requires, in each State plan for welfare programs of various types, that the State provide for the recruitment, training, and effective use of paid subprofessional staff and employment of recipients to carry out the welfare program, and it also requires, in each State plan, for the recruitment, training, and effective use of social service volunteers for the same purpose.

That amendment has been endorsed by the National Association for Social

Work and the National Association of Counties.

Amendment No. 401 is an amendment which directs that a study be made by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, with recommendations to the Congress concerning the ways by which the welfare systems in each of the States may become activists on behalf of the welfare recipients in serving, assisting, and advising them in securing their full rights under welfare, housing, and other related laws.

That amendment has also been endorsed by the National Association of Social Work.

I have had previously inserted in the RECORD letters substantiating that support. In addition, both amendments have received the added cosponsorship of numerous Members of the Senate.

Today I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be added as a cosponsor of both amendments at their next printing.

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

#### A NEW LOOK AT MAKING AMERICA GROW

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, last Friday, as Members of the Senate will recall, the Senate gave its approval to Senate Joint Resolution 64, the measure which I introduced to establish a special Presidential Commission on Balanced Economic Development. Prior to the passage of this measure, the Senate had already expressed its unlimited approval of the approach which I suggested by virtue of the fact that more than one-fifth of the membership of the Senate had joined as cosponsors.

Subsequently, our Senate Government Operations Committee, of which I am privileged to serve as the ranking minority member, brought out a unanimous report in support of the measure.

I would like to point out that an equally high degree of interest is developing in favor of this proposal in the House of Representatives, where some 22 Members are sponsors of the companion bill.

Prior to Senate passage, the Huntington Advertiser, a fine newspaper published in Huntington, W. Va., discussed the need for this development program. I want to quote a portion of that editorial. The Huntington Advertiser stated:

If it is enacted and its purposes are effectively carried out, the resolution could become one of the most important pieces of legislation in many years.

I share the conviction of the Huntington Advertiser editor as to the importance of this measure.

If this country is to continue to forge ahead as a land of opportunity which provides success opportunities for its own citizens and hope for the free world, we cannot ignore the fact any longer that a good many of the rural and urban problems confronting us here at home find their origin in a common relationship of economic and population imbalances.

The approach we have been taking up to now, however, has been a piecemeal attack on these problems that we find both in rural America and in the urban areas. We discover some serious local problem and enact legislation to try to deal with it on an isolated basis, sometimes successfully so far as that particular local problem is concerned, but, more frequently, unsuccessfully, because the problems are wrapped up in interrelated situations in both urban and rural America.

The Advertiser editorial provides an excellent summation of the need for a Commission for Balanced Economic Development. I request permission to include it in the RECORD at this point because of the fact that this legislation is now in the House. After our favorable action of last Friday, it is now before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and I might add, incidentally, that that committee is chaired by a distinguished Representative from the home State of that newspaper, Representative HARLEY O. STAGGERS. I should like to add that both distinguished Senators from West Virginia are included as cosponsors of the legislation.

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

[From the Huntington (W. Va.) Advertiser,  
Oct. 27, 1967]

#### RESOLUTION FOR BALANCING U.S. GROWTH GAINS SUPPORT

A resolution to open the way for a study to find means for bringing about a better balance in national development is gaining support in both houses of Congress.

It has won the approval of the Senate Government Operations Committee and after the elimination of some difficulties regarding the language of the report, is expected to reach the floor this week.

The measure would authorize the President to appoint a 20-member bipartisan commission to study and recommend means of improving the balance in the nation's economic and population growth.

The report would have to be made within two years after the effectiveness date of the resolution.

The legislation was sponsored in the Senate by Sen. Karl E. Mundt, R-S.D., with about twoscore cosponsors, including Sen. Jennings Randolph, D-W. Va.

A companion resolution has also been reintroduced in the House of Representatives by Rep. Phillip E. Ruppe, R-Mich., with 21 cosponsors, one of whom is Rep. Ken Hechler, Democrat of Huntington.

The House measure was referred to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee headed by Rep. Harley O. Staggers, D-W. Va.

If it is enacted and its purposes are effectively carried out, the resolution could become one of the most important pieces of legislation in many years.

The recommendations of the commission would be expected to present remedies both for the deterioration of rural areas and the growing congestion of the big cities.

The migration from farms and small towns to the cities has created critical problems. The number of migrants now is estimated at almost 600,000 a year. There is no indication that the trend will soon decline significantly without action to encourage people to stay in the rural areas.

In reintroducing his resolution, Rep. Ruppe said Census Bureau reports show that the

average rate of population increase in the 38 largest metropolitan areas is about 2.06 per cent a year—more than 20 per cent in 10 years.

This, he said, compares with the 0.7 per cent average rate of increase outside metropolitan areas and the 1.9 per cent average rate of increase for all the 224 metropolitan areas identified by the Census Bureau in 1965.

"The result of this economic imbalance in the cities," he said, "has been substandard housing, polluted air, uncontrolled crime in the streets, congested highways, rundown schools, and growing discontent and upheaval among the already deprived minority groups. Economic imbalance in the countryside has resulted in declining economies, poverty-level incomes, limited job opportunities, and a forced exodus of the population into already congested areas."

The needs of the cities and the rural areas are already being attacked with separate programs, but Rep. Ruppe emphasized the major purpose of the resolution when he said, "The problem needs to be approached in its totality."

He summarized the commission's field of study as:

"A thorough analysis of geographic trends in the United States relating to economic development; the causative factors influencing trends; the implications in terms of distribution of population; the effect of governmental actions in shaping such trends; and the factors, both public and private, which influence the geographic location of industry and commerce."

Rep. Ruppe was followed in House discussion of the measure by Rep. John B. Anderson, R-Ill., and Rep. William D. Hathaway, D-Maine, both of whom strongly supported it. Rep. Hathaway also inserted a number of editorials and news stories on it in the Congressional Record.

Establishing the commission through the resolution would be only the first step toward finding remedies for the double problem that Rep. Ruppe called "a fast-approaching national crisis."

For several years The Advertiser has been advocating an attack on the problem through the appointment of a national planning agency that would make studies and recommendations for the location of federal bases, installations and contracts.

The agency would also make recommendations for the location of private business and industry in the most suitable areas.

Inducements to locate in the recommended areas could be offered through tax incentives.

A measure is pending in Congress now to authorize tax incentives for the location of enterprises in depressed areas. Among its cosponsors are Sen. Randolph and Sen. Robert C. Byrd, D-W.Va.

The commission established by the resolution might find means of attacking the problem that would supplement the work of a national planning agency.

But certainly it should consider the advisability of locating new government bases and facilities in the most advantageous places for their operation, for the national defense and for their effect upon the economy.

And beyond that the study should take into consideration fundamental problems affecting not only the nation's growth but the welfare of its people, particularly its disadvantaged.

These problems include civil rights, welfare programs, educational opportunities, vocational training for adults as well as the young, pay scales and cultural attractions for the talented and educated in the towns and small cities.

The less strenuous life of the rural areas and smaller communities could be made more attractive also by the availability of regional airports and fast railway passenger service to and from the bigger cities for business or pleasure.

Also essential for the future welfare of the nation is the problem of dispersing the people for more adequate use of natural resources such as land and water and for more effective protection against nuclear attack.

Planning too long neglected on a national level while its benefits have been demonstrated in cities and areas is becoming increasingly important as the population grows and the complexities of modern life multiply.

While advancements in science are heading us toward the moon, we urgently need to rebuild a large part of our share of the earth.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I take the floor simply to encourage the House to move forward expeditiously, to hold early hearings, if time permits, before adjournment, to get this important piece of legislation passed and on the President's desk for signature before adjournment; and, if not, to prepare the ground, to get ready to consider it expeditiously when we convene in January, so this can be one of the first items of business to be considered.

Certainly, there are no problems of more serious concern to this country than why it is that while the cities, with too many people, are finding themselves upset by riots and upset by serious conditions of education, sanitation, and crime, at the same time people from the smaller communities of this country and from rural America are leaving the places of their birth and are going to the cities, searching for the opportunities about which they dream, but which they cannot find in the big metropolitan fleshpots of this country.

We need an overall look at all the related problems. We need to find ways to stop this influx into the cities by people who cannot be employed now in the big cities, and provide a magnet in rural America which will hold people there who belong there and encourage those who are disillusioned with the big cities to go out to the rural part of this country where they can once again achieve opportunity unlimited.

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. SPONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Byrd of West Virginia in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### INCREASE OF ANNUAL FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8718) to increase the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia and to provide a method for computing the annual borrowing authority for the general fund of the District of Columbia. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 871)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8718) to increase the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia and to provide a method for computing the annual borrowing authority for the general fund of the District of Columbia, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses that the Senate recede from its amendments.

W. B. SPONG,  
WAYNE MORSE,  
THRUSTON B. MORTON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

DON FUQUA,  
JOHN L. McMILLAN,  
THOS. ABERNETHY,  
BASIL WHITENER,  
ANCHER NELSEN,  
JOEL T. BROYHILL,  
WILLIAM H. HARSHA,

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.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief explanation as to the end result of this conference. Additional revenue authorization for the District of Columbia for fiscal year 1968 of \$53.8 million is provided in this bill as agreed to by the conference.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a summary of the conference agreement.

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

SUMMARY OF SENATE-HOUSE CONFERENCE ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REVENUE BILL (H.R. 8718)—TOTAL ESTIMATED NEW REVENUE, \$10 MILLION INCREASE IN ANNUAL FEDERAL PAYMENT AUTHORIZATION, \$43.8 MILLION INCREASE IN BORROWING AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1968, AND

#### SUBSEQUENT INCREASES

##### HOUSE VERSION

Increases same by \$10 million (from \$60 million to \$70 million).

##### SENATE VERSION

Provides Federal payment authorization shall be by formula, viz 25% of D.C. revenues from taxes.

##### CONFERENCE AGREEMENT

Accepted House version.

**SUMMARY OF SENATE-HOUSE CONFERENCE ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REVENUE BILL (H.R. 8718)—TOTAL ESTIMATED NEW REVENUE, \$10 MILLION INCREASE IN ANNUAL FEDERAL PAYMENT AUTHORIZATION, \$43.8 MILLION INCREASE IN BORROWING AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1968, AND SUBSEQUENT INCREASES—Continued**

**HOUSE VERSION**

**SENATE VERSION**

**CONFERENCE AGREEMENT**

**TITLE II—AUTHORIZED BORROWING AUTHORITY**

Increases same by a formula—for 3 years—based on 6% debt service maximum of estimated general fund tax revenues and Federal payment to provide estimated ceiling of \$333.8 in 1968, \$363.9 (1969) and \$392.3 (1970).

Present D.C. debt ceiling is \$290 million (\$200 million for general fund, \$50 million for rapid transit, and \$40 million for higher education).

Increases by same formula, but without the 3-year limitation.

Accepted House version.

**TITLE III—D.C. GOVERNMENT HIRING PRACTICES**

(Not before conference because Senate and House versions identical.)

Employment in D.C. Government—a new title to prohibit discrimination on grounds of residence, religion, race, color in recruiting and hiring of D.C. employees.

Mr. SPONG. In summary, title I provides an increase in the annual Federal payment authorization from the present \$60 million to \$70 million per year.

Likewise, title II provides an increase in the borrowing authorization which would make \$43.8 million more available for capital construction for fiscal 1968, as the formula applies.

Title III, not before the conference because both the Senate and House bills were identical, directs the District of Columbia government not to exclude or give preference to residents of the District or any State in recruiting or hiring employees of the District government.

The overall purpose of this bill is to provide additional revenue urgently needed for financing District government activities that are supported from the District of Columbia general fund, including the cost of police, fire protection, education, health, welfare, courts, and other normal, general municipal government functions.

Your Senate conferees felt keenly that a formula approach for the Federal payment authorization should be adopted. Such would permit more orderly planning by the District government of this 15 percent of the District's annual budget and a more orderly utilization of the funds made available by this Federal payment. However, your Senate conferees conferred on three separate occasions with the conferees of the other body and were unsuccessful in our efforts.

In the interest of meeting our responsibilities to this body and to the Nation's Capital, we felt that a continuing deadlock would accomplish nothing constructive. Therefore, the Senate conferees receded on the Federal payment formula, agreeing to an increase of a flat \$10 million fixed amount from the present \$60 million annual Federal payment authorization to \$70 million.

For the last two Congresses, the Senate has approved overwhelmingly the viewpoint that a formula method of establishing the level of the annual Federal payment authorization at 25 percent of District local tax revenues would be more equitable than the flat-sum approach. Under the formula, the amount of Federal payment would be tied directly to the level of local tax revenues.

Your Senate conferees are hopeful that the other body will in the next Congress

consider an increase in the Federal payment authorization and bring that amount closer to what we believe to be a more equitable Federal share, as concurred in by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], whose knowledge of this matter as chairman of the District of Columbia Appropriations Subcommittee prompted him to remark on this floor on July 27, 1967, that the Federal payment should more appropriately be \$80, \$85, or \$90 million.

Mr. President, additional expenditures, which may well come this year as a burden on the present budget, will in all probability include a request for some \$5½ to \$6 million for operating expenses to accept students at the Federal City College and the Washington Technical Institute, both authorized by the Congress 1 year ago and provided a \$40 million capital construction authorization.

Pay increases for policemen and firemen are presently before the Congress, and administration sources have stated that teacher pay increases may well be proposed this year to bring the local school system pay level closer to that of the surrounding suburban school systems.

Mr. President, your Senate conferees agreed on a formula method for determining the maximum amount the District is authorized to borrow from the U.S. Treasury for general fund capital projects. The amount of revenue the District would be authorized to use for long-term debt retirement annually under the conference agreement would be limited to 6 percent of the sum of estimated annual general fund revenues from local taxes plus the Federal payment for the fiscal year involved.

The Senate version would have provided a continuing form of authorization over the years. The House-passed version, to which the Senate conferees receded, utilizes the same formula but limits it to a 3-year trial period, permitting the borrowing ceiling to remain at the 1970 fiscal year level unless changed by Congress.

The borrowing authorization formula, as adopted, has been estimated to increase the present \$290 million borrowing authority to \$333.8 million for fiscal year 1968, \$363.9 million for 1969, and \$392.3 million for 1970. Of this total amount, \$50 million is earmarked for rail rapid transit construction only, and \$40 million

for construction purposes only for the Federal City College and the Washington Technical Institute.

Mr. President, the formula approach both to the annual Federal payment authorization and to the borrowing authority, as espoused by the Senate for several years now, has seen definite progress this year. One year ago, your Senate conferees on the District of Columbia revenue bill were unable to secure agreement of our counterparts in the other body on a formula approach for annual Federal payment or borrowing authority. This year, because the great advantages of the formula approach were pressed by this body and by supporters of this concept in the other body, we feel that definite headway has been made in reaching a more realistic and businesslike approach to the Federal participation in the expenses of operating this Federal Capital City and the unquestioned obligation that the Federal Government owes to the District of Columbia government. It must be remembered that some 53 percent of the Federal land area of this city is nontaxable because of its Federal status. Likewise, it should further be remembered that out of the District's \$451 million budget this year, 85 cents of every dollar is paid for by local District of Columbia taxes or is a borrowing obligation against District of Columbia taxpayers.

Mr. President, your Senate conferees feel certain that this District of Columbia revenue bill will prove beneficial in permitting this city to move ahead and to provide a greater impetus to our reorganized government, and its official family to deal more effectively with the many problems at hand.

**REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK**

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2515) to authorize the establishment of the Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes.

**AMENDMENT NO. 426**

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, under date of October 27, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] presented an amendment to the pending measure on behalf of himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. STENNIS, and myself.

I send that amendment (No. 426) to the desk for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 3, line 19, change the comma to a period and strike the remainder of the sentence through the period in line 21, as follows: "or any federally owned property he may designate within the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit in Del Norte County, California."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am hopeful that no action will be taken on amendment No. 426 in the immediate future. I am engaged in a conference scheduled to meet at 1:30, and another scheduled to meet at 2:30. I am hopeful we can finish with those two conferences early in the afternoon, so that this amendment can be fully discussed.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will my able friend yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. KUCHEL. First, I wish to say, as my able friend knows, that I am deeply grieved that a Senator of his stature and capability would join in such an amendment. But I am sure the authors of the bill will wish to argue for a reasonable period of time against the amendment, and then would be prepared to vote whenever the Senate desires. But as far as my friend from Louisiana is concerned, I would, of course, accommodate him with respect to his other responsibilities.

Does the Senator know whether any other amendments will be offered?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know of any.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Oregon has two amendments, I believe.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am sure my able friend would not object, then, in the interests of time, if there are other amendments, that his amendment be put aside.

Mr. ELLENDER. I would not object to that.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, it is also fair to state that it is the desire of the minority leadership that final action on the pending bill not take place before tomorrow at or about the hour of 2:30.

I do not want to ask for a unanimous-consent agreement in that regard. I do not believe I should do so at this time. However, that fact should be spread on the RECORD. I believe it is correct.

#### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent—with the stipulation in mind regarding the amendment offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] that he must attend very important conference meetings—that after the opening remarks of the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and the distinguished ranking minority member, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], there be a time limitation of 1 hour on each amendment and that there be a limitation of 1 hour on the bill, and that the vote on final passage take place at 2:30 p.m. Wednesday.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I would have to object to that request. I

want to consult with other Senators who are cosponsoring the amendment.

I think the bill ought to be thoroughly discussed. It involves a future appropriation of \$100 million, as authorized; and whether that amount of time will be sufficient, I do not know.

My amendment seeks to strike from the pending bill the authority to exchange federally owned lands for privately owned lands to constitute a park. It is a great departure from what we have done in the past.

I hope that the pending bill, together with the amendment, will be thoroughly discussed before we vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, with the exception of the pending amendment, which will be considered later today or possibly tomorrow afternoon, there be a time limitation of 1 hour on each amendment and 1 hour on the bill, and that if at all possible, with the usual rules being waived, the vote take place at 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am in a position now to urge the majority leader to make a unanimous-consent request that we vote at 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I know, but the acting minority leader must allow the majority leader a little leeway as a protection for the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand it, the amendment at the desk is the pending business and permission will be granted to set it aside if other amendments are offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the time limitation not start until after the opening statements of the two managers of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the majority leader make the unanimous-consent request in the usual form?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; indeed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? Without objection, the unanimous-consent request is agreed to.

The unanimous-consent agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

*Ordered*, That after the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] conclude their opening statements, during the further consideration of the bill (S. 2515) to authorize the establishment of the Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes, debate on any amendment, except the pending amendment No. 426, offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] on which there is no limit, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader or his designee: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any

such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

*Ordered further*, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

*Provided further*, That the Senate proceed to vote on the question of final passage of the said bill at 2:30 p.m. on Wednesday, November 1, 1967.

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. 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.

#### TRIBUTE TO SENATOR SPONG

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I compliment the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SPONG], who is presently presiding over the Senate, on the very capable manner in which he conducted the conference on the part of the Senate conferees, and on his handling of the District of Columbia revenue measure.

I think that his competency, of which I speak, was very much in evidence throughout his presentation of the revenue bill on the Senate floor, when the Senate originally considered the matter, and also in his presentation of the conference report today.

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on District of Columbia Appropriations, I have naturally followed with great interest the developments during the conference between the Senate and the House on the revenue bill.

The distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. SPONG] and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia [Mr. BIBLE] have, in view of the existing budget crisis, kept me informed of the developments. I believe that the Senate conferees did the very best they could in their effort to sustain the Senate position. I know that their task was very difficult. I am constrained to believe, without any question in my own mind, that, under the circumstances, the position finally taken by the Senate conferees in conference was the only position which could have been taken.

The District of Columbia government is faced with a financial crisis. It is of the utmost importance that the fiscal year 1968 appropriation bill be passed at the earliest possible date and placed on the President's desk for his signature. This fact, I think, was overriding in the decision of the Senate conferees to recede, as they did, in conference. I do not

believe they had any alternative, under the circumstances.

So I have taken the floor at this time to commend the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia and the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada, and other Senate conferees, on the determined fight that they made in the conference. While they did not succeed, as they had hoped to, in upholding the Senate position, I feel that the proposed Federal payment of \$70 million is a considerable improvement over the present authorized payment of \$60 million. I only hope that the Subcommittee on District of Columbia Appropriations, of which I am the chairman, can now be successful in bringing about the enactment of an appropriation which will come up to the authorized amount of \$70 million.

I thank the Senator from Virginia for the efforts he has made and for his able leadership in this matter. I say again that I think he has done a very good job. And so have his fellow conferees.

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. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2515) to authorize the establishment of the Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the bill S. 2515 will authorize creation of a Redwood National Park for the appreciation and enjoyment of this and future generations.

The Redwood National Park, preserving in their natural splendor the tallest of all living things, will be a unique addition to our national park system. Within the boundaries of the park proposed in S. 2515 are all of the most magnificent groves of redwood presently in private ownership. Also within the boundaries are three California State parks which contain some of the most impressive groves of redwood in existence.

In keeping with the highest purposes of our national park system, the Redwood National Park will offer abundant opportunities for a variety of recreational, educational, and scientific pursuits. Foremost is the redwood itself, displayed in profusion and variety from bottom land to ridgetop in a number of individual, untouched watersheds and climaxed in a grove of the tallest of the tall. Complementing the redwood groves will be crystal streams, quiet meadows, beautiful Fern Canyon, a herd of Roosevelt elk, and miles of unspoiled beaches defining the western perimeter of the park. Mr. President, this is an area worthy of addition to our national park system.

The proposal for creation of a Redwood National Park has been steeped in controversy. Perhaps no issue to come be-

fore the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has been the focus of such national attention and concern. Millions of Americans feel a very personal involvement in the Redwood Park issue. The many who have not seen and may never see these ancient specimens are awed and inspired by the knowledge of their existence. There has developed an insistent public demand that these giants of the forest be given the protection of the Nation.

In considering the proposed legislation, the committee has been conscious of the need for timely action. The remaining north coast redwoods outside of State parks are committed to cutting. While the redwood industry, for the most part, has acted with magnanimity in maintaining a moratorium on cutting within key areas advocated for park status, they cannot afford to stay the saw for long while we fail to make a decision. The committee has been conscious of the fact that until we achieve a resolution of this issue, a cloud of uncertainty hangs over local industry and local communities.

S. 2515 was introduced as a clean bill, incorporating the final results of deliberations in committee which attempted to fairly consider and weigh the competing and conflicting interests at stake. In my view, the bill approved in committee combines the best features of the several measures which were before the committee.

S. 1370, the administration bill, was introduced by the senior Senator from California and ranking minority member of the Interior Committee [Mr. KUCHEL] and was supported by the Save-the-Redwoods League. The bill proposed a park of close to 42,000 acres in the Mill Creek watershed of Del Norte County, including two State parks, plus a 1,600-acre separate unit comprising a corridor to and including the "tall trees" grove on Redwood Creek in Humboldt County.

S. 514, the bill introduced by the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] and supported by the Sierra Club and a number of other conservation organizations, proposed a 90,000-acre park in the Redwood Creek watershed of Humboldt County.

S. 1526, introduced by the junior Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] and supported by a number of organizations representing industry and local communities, proposed a 25,000-acre park comprised primarily of three existing State parks.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs recommends enactment of S. 2515, authorizing a Redwood National Park of not to exceed 64,000 acres exclusive of submerged lands. The park will be in two units, including the cream of the redwood country in both the Mill Creek and Redwood Creek drainages.

The north unit, in the Mill Creek watershed of Del Norte County, comprises 25,970 acres, of which 13,577 acres is old-growth redwood. Included in the north unit are the Jedediah Smith and Del Norte Coast Redwood State Parks, totaling 14,820 acres.

The south unit, in the Redwood Creek watershed of Humboldt County, com-

prises 35,684 acres of which 19,753 acres are old-growth redwood. Included in the south unit is the Prairie Creek Redwood State Park of 13,210 acres.

The committee-approved bill includes the best of both areas. I am pleased that the major conservation organizations advocating establishment of a park in one or the other watershed have now indicated their support for the park boundaries proposed in this bill. The committee bill preserves more old growth Redwood—some 13,000 acres more—than the administration bill. S. 2515 includes the three State parks recommended in the Murphy bill. However, the committee does not believe a national park can be created from the State parks alone. The addition of some 28,000 acres of private and Federal lands creates a Redwood National Park worthy of the name.

The committee does believe that the Redwood National Park will reach its ultimate fruition only when the Jed Smith, Del Norte Coast, and Prairie Creek State Parks are donated by the State of California and become part of the national park. Donation of the State parks is a matter for determination by the State of California, and the committee has not made this a condition precedent to the creation of a Redwood National Park. Should the State not act, the national park should, nonetheless, be created to assure preservation of the additional redwood groves. In such event, cooperative management agreements should be worked out with the State of California so that the National and State parks can coexist with the maximum shared contribution to the public interest.

The creation of a Redwood National Park requires the acquisition of a substantial acreage of privately owned lands now devoted to timber harvest. The committee is cognizant of the problems this creates in the disruption of industrial operations and impact on the local economy. These difficulties could be magnified by any undue delay in the acquisition process and could impede the establishment of the park.

With these problems in mind, the committee has approved language in the bill authorizing an exchange of lands within the northern redwood purchase unit which is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture for privately owned lands within the park boundaries on a value-for-value basis. In approving this provision, the committee has stated specifically that a general policy of exchanging national forest lands for park acquisition is not proposed or advocated.

To the contrary, this provision is proposed as an honorable exception to a general policy, not the establishment of a new one. This provision must be strictly interpreted in the light of the unique circumstances affecting the Redwood National Park authorization. We face these alternatives: on the one hand, make a choice between establishing a Redwood National Park devoted to preserving the redwood or maintaining a northern redwood purchase unit devoted to harvesting the redwood; on the other hand, make a decision to both establish the Redwood National Park and

also continue to sell redwood from the purchase unit on a public bid basis.

In this connection, I believe we have an obligation to examine and weigh the public purposes to which the purchase unit is devoted. The history and purposes of the purchase unit are summarized in a letter of April 27, 1967, from Mr. A. W. Greeley, Associate Chief of the Forest Service, which appears on page 204 of the printed record of the hearing conducted by the Parks and Recreation Subcommittee in April of this year.

Mr. Greeley states:

In 1934 the National Forest Reservation Commission approved the acquisition of National Forest lands in the coast area of California. In 1935 it approved the establishment of specific purchase units—in Del Norte and Humboldt Counties and in Mendocino and Sonoma Counties. There were later designated the Northern and Southern Redwood Purchase Units, respectively. The present Northern Redwood National Forest Purchase Unit is a portion of the one originally approved in Del Norte and Humboldt Counties in the vicinity of the Klamath River. At that time purchase of about 130,000 acres in this area was contemplated. No lands were bought in the southern unit and it has been dropped from our records.

The purpose of these purchase units very clearly was to promote sustained yield timber growing and utilization in the redwood forest areas, demonstrate conservative logging practices, and manage the lands under the multiple use programs which characterize the National Forests.

Mr. President, the lands actually acquired within the target of 130,000 acres mentioned by Mr. Greeley amount to some 14,500 acres. Further light is shed on the current status of the purchase unit in the report on redwoods of the American Forestry Association, dated February 25, 1965. I will quote from this report at this point but I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the report headed "Coast Redwood Purchase Unit" appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, here is what the American Forestry Association report says about the present status of the northern redwood purchase unit:

Lack of funds, acquisition of sizable areas by large timber companies, and improved logging practices by private owners combined to put a stop to the acquisition program. This situation led the National Forest Reservation Commission in 1957 to drop the entire Southern Redwood Purchase Unit and to reduce the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit to a gross area of 147,180 acres, of which 36,184 acres is in Del Norte County and 90,996 acres in Humboldt County.

With less than 10 percent of the reduced area in federal ownership, and with further substantial additions unlikely, the forest supervisors in charge of the unit recommended on November 1, 1963, that the gross area of the unit be decreased to the 32,409 acres north of the Klamath River, and that the area be known as the Redwood National Forest. This step would leave 931 acres in scattered tracts south of the Klamath River, which could be used as trading stock. The proposal was approved by the supervisors of Del Norte and Humboldt Counties and by the Stimpson Timber Company (the largest private owner in the unit) but has not been acted upon by the Forest Service.

Mr. President, the northern Redwood purchase unit involves a program conceived in depression days to help stabilize the local economy. The laudable objectives of the program were thwarted by World War II and made less important by a change in the pattern of operations in the industry. I think it is entirely within the purview of the Congress to determine whether retention of this activity should enjoy an overriding priority in light of the public purposes we are trying to achieve. Utilization of Federal lands within the purchase unit will lessen the cash appropriations required to establish the Redwood National Park, will expedite the land acquisition program necessary to establish the national park before redwood groves are cut within the park boundaries, and will help stabilize the local economy during the period of transition.

The committee has made clear in our report that we believe plans to increase the allowable cut on the Six Rivers National Forest in keeping with sound forest management practices should go forward. The additional allowable cut will more than offset any loss in opportunities for timber purchases through public bidding resulting from a change in the status of the northern redwood purchase unit.

Mr. President, under the terms of S. 2515, in contrast to other measures considered by the committee, the temporary economic impact of a reduction in lumbering operations is shared by more than one county and is therefore less on each county. Similarly, the impact is spread over more than one redwood lumber company. Because of the readjustment of the economic impact, the committee has eliminated the provision of the administration bill which called for economic adjustment payments to local governmental bodies.

The committee has also eliminated those provisions of the administration bill which called for a transfer of the Muir Woods National Monument and King Range lands to the State of California. The State of California has indicated interest in certain Federal properties, largely beach areas, which the State believes should be available for public use and enjoyment under the management of the State park system. The committee has made clear in our report that we believe negotiations should go forward between the responsible Federal and State authorities. This is in accordance with a national policy of reviewing Federal properties to determine where lands suitable for recreation purposes can be made available for public use.

Mr. President, the bill before the Senate will create a Redwood National Park superior in location, natural beauty, and the proportion of old growth redwood preserved. The park described in this bill enjoys united support from public-spirited individuals and organizations that have long advocated a Redwood National Park.

Mr. President, before I conclude my remarks I wish to pay high tribute to the ranking minority member of the committee [Mr. KUCHEL], and the chair-

man of the subcommittee [Mr. BIBLE]. The compromise bill, S. 2515, which is now before the Senate, is the result of the work of the ranking minority member of the committee and the able chairman of the subcommittee. Their work has made possible the legislation that is now before the Senate. We who serve on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs feel this is a good bill.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to approve S. 2515, as recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### EXHIBIT 1

[From report on redwoods of the American Forestry Association, Feb. 25, 1965]

#### COAST REDWOOD PURCHASE UNIT

Proposals for the acquisition by the Forest Service of coast redwood lands began early in 1934 with letters from private citizens and a recommendation by the Mendocino County Chamber of Commerce. The National Forest Reservation Commission responded promptly by approving in principle of the establishment of a redwood national forest with a tentative area of 200,000 acres. Regional Forester S. B. Show immediately issued a news release stating that the land would be handled as an economic unit for the production of timber, not as a park, but that provision would be made for recreation and that no timber would be cut in scenic strips along roads and streams; grazing would be maintained.

Some weeks later the Regional Forester reiterated these points in a letter to Governor Frank F. Merriam, with emphasis on the fact that the Forest Service would practice sustained yield forestry and would work out better methods of logging redwood than those currently in use by private owners. Assurance was given that recreation values would be fully developed and that roads would be constructed to make the land available for public use.

On September 14, 1934, the California Legislature, acting upon a special request from Governor Merriam, passed the following enabling act:

"The Legislature of the State of California hereby consents to the acquisition by the United States by purchase, gift or condemnation with adequate compensation of such lands in the State of California as in the opinion of the government of the United States may be needed for the establishment, consolidation and extension of National forests in this State under the provisions of the act of Congress approved March 1, 1911."

It will be noted that the act applied to the entire state and not specifically to the coast redwood region. Three days later the supervisors of Humboldt County and Del Norte County, at separate meetings, approved plans for federal acquisition of redwood lands for a national forest. If this approval of the expansion of federal holdings now seems surprising, it must be remembered that the Great Depression had led many to regard private ownership of large holdings of mature timber that could not be harvested for many years as a liability rather than an asset. Some large landowners found it difficult even to pay their taxes.

On August 29, 1935, the National Forest Reservation Commission established a Southern Redwood Purchase Unit of 600,000 acres in Sonoma County and Mendocino County, and a Northern Redwood Purchase Unit of 863,000 acres in Humboldt County and Del Norte County. The total area of 863,000 acres was much larger than that first proposed.

The Forest Service obtained options on 63,000 acres in Del Norte County, which were to be acquired as funds became available. The first purchase of 4,336 acres was completed in 1939. Subsequent purchases

brought the total to 14,491 acres (the present area) by 1945. The cost was \$444,415.72, an average of \$30.67 per acre, with most of the redwood bringing a stumpage price of about 50 cents per M board feet.

Lack of funds, acquisition of sizeable areas by large timber companies, and improved logging practices by private owners combined to put a stop to the acquisition program. This situation led the National Forest Reservation Commission in 1957 to drop the entire Southern Redwood Purchase Unit and to reduce the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit to a gross area of 147,180 acres, of which 36,184 acres is in Del Norte County and 90,996 acres in Humboldt County.

With less than 10 percent of the reduced area in federal ownership, and with further substantial additions unlikely, the forest supervisor in charge of the unit recommended on November 1, 1963, that the gross area of the unit be decreased to the 32,409 acres north of the Klamath River, and that the area be known as the Redwood National Forest. This step would leave 931 acres in scattered tracts south of the Klamath River, which could be used as trading stock. The proposal was approved by the supervisors of Del Norte and Humboldt counties and by the Simpson Timber Company (the largest private owner in the unit) but has not been acted upon by the Forest Service.

Practically all of the federal land in the present unit is classified as commercial forest land, of which 935 acres have been set aside as an experimental forest, and 491 acres are nonstocked. Timber volumes total 1,238 million board feet, of which about 60 percent is redwood and 40 percent Douglas-fir, with a scattering of other species.

Timber harvesting started on a small scale in 1954. The average annual cut during the 11 years ending June 30, 1964, has been about 19 million board feet. Payments to Del Norte County in lieu of taxes have totaled \$1,083,407 during the last ten years—an average of about \$108,341 per year.

Timber on the purchase unit is managed under a comprehensive and detailed plan, the primary objective of which is "conversion of the present over-mature forest to a regulated forest of proper age—class distribution and stocking which will support a sustained yield of forest products." The average allowable annual cut during the 30 years required for the conversion is estimated at 30 million board feet. Development of other multiple-use values is also sought, with emphasis on watershed protection and recreation. The latter has not yet reached a level requiring the development of camp sites.

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

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from California.

(At this point, Mr. HARTKE assumed the chair.)

Mr. KUCHEL. If, as I very much hope and believe it will, the Senate approves the pending legislation, much of the credit for that action will go to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. I am grateful for his kind words. I do have an honest interest in the establishment by Congress of a Redwood National Park in the State from which I come. But I want Senators to know that there never would have been the opportunity now presented to the Senate to approve this kind of bill had it not been for the leadership of the Senator from Washington. I have been very glad to work with him and to work with the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], and others,

to bring about, at long last, a piece of legislation which not only bears the stamp of approval of the Senator's committee, but also has its vigorous sponsors the Save the Redwoods League, the great Sierra Club, and others, all across the country, who are interested in the creation of a Redwood National Park.

The Senator's speech should be read by those who have not been able to listen to it. I think it spells out the indispensable necessity for speedy approval by the Senate of the bill which he has introduced.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I certainly want to thank my able colleague from California for his generous remarks, but I do want to emphasize the wonderful spirit of cooperation which has existed between the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], in working out this final solution.

We in the Senate understand that we would not be able to do many of these things without the assistance of others. This is especially true of our staff. We are fortunate in the committee to have had the outstanding staff assistance of Sterling Munro, my administrative assistant. He did special work on this particular compromise proposal. He was ably assisted and worked closely with Lew Reid, who is on the staff of the Senator from California and is his minority counsel on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee; likewise, the staff director, Jerry Verkler, who participated actively in the formulation of a bill on which we hope to obtain Senate approval.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, 200 years ago there were 2 million acres of virgin redwoods stretching along the California coastline from Santa Cruz to the Oregon border. They were discovered by the expedition of Don Gaspar de Portola in 1769. Many of the *Sequoia sempervirens* are 500 years old. Some date back to the time of Christ. A few grow to nearly 400 feet in height.

In the two centuries since he discovered the great redwood forests, man has laid waste to all but about 300,000 acres of the ancient trees. Working over the past 50 years, the State of California and the Save the Redwoods League have preserved 50,000 acres of old-growth trees within State parks.

At the present rate of cutting, every single one of the primeval giants outside State parks will be cut within the next few decades. Long before that, the remaining untouched expanses of redwoods will be crisscrossed with logging roads and spotted with patches of cutting.

True, the redwoods regenerate. They grow again. But the second-growth forests will never be allowed to grow to the age of 100 years.

The redwoods are a national treasure which must be preserved. We, who are living when the last great primeval redwood forests are diminishing, have an obligation to preserve an area of national park stature where all Americans, for now and for the future, can experi-

ence the wonder of walking among these living remnants of past centuries.

Last year, and again this year, I introduced legislation to create such a park. Others have introduced bills to create a park of a different size or in different locations. This has been the most difficult, complex, and perplexing conservation legislation to come before our Senate Interior Committee during my tenure in the U.S. Senate.

Fortunately, the companies which own the land that we propose to make into a park have acted with high regard for the public interest. During the last year, they have tried to restrict their logging operations to areas where cutting would not be severely damaging to a park. They have not stayed completely outside the boundaries of the various park proposals, but they have—and I congratulate them for it—refrained from cutting which would jeopardize the opportunity for the American people to have a meaningful park.

The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has reported S. 2515. The chairman of our committee [Mr. JACKSON]—as I indicated to him earlier today—deserves the thanks of all Americans, and particularly those from my State of California, for bringing a redwood national park bill to the Senate floor. He has labored tirelessly for months, discussing, negotiating, and pondering, all with the unswerving goal of creating a Redwood National Park of majesty and distinction.

The chairman of the Parks and Recreation Subcommittee [Mr. BIBLE] also deserves great commendation and thanks for leading us through the fruitful hearings and constructive debate in committee that made it possible to present a bill to the Senate which, in my view, is a sound adjustment of the many conflicting views presented to the committee.

I am proud of the bill which the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], and I have introduced. It is superior to any of the other bills which were pending before our committee. It saves a truly significant number of the ancient and endangered trees. It spreads the impact of land acquisition over the tax base of two counties, rather than only one. It will preserve redwoods now owned by four major companies. It makes available federally owned commercial redwood timberland for exchanges with private companies, in order to assist the companies to stay in business and to reduce the number of Federal dollars which must be appropriated to purchase property for the park.

Three magnificent State parks are included within the boundaries of the proposed Redwood National Park. The goal of preserving redwoods for the future is well served by public ownership of these lands, whether it be State or Federal ownership. Should the State of California desire to transfer these State parks to the Federal Government, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept their donation. However, Federal acquisition of these State parks is not a condition precedent to the establishment of the Redwood National Park.

I am pleased to say that S. 2515 has healed a regrettable breach, which has existed in conservation ranks, over where the park should be.

Some questions have been raised about the size of the park authorized by S. 2515. Some people feel that a 64,000-acre park is too small. Others feel that it is too big. Mr. President, it is absolutely essential that the Senate pass this bill in order to continue the voluntary moratorium on cutting, pending enactment of the Redwood National Park legislation.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the other body, which will consider this legislation next spring is, in my view, a far better forum before which to test the wisdom of the size of the park which we propose in this bill, than is the floor of the Senate or the floor of the other body.

I am pleased to join with my friend the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] in recommending this bill to the Senate, and in urging its speedy passage so that it might move, with the blessing of the Senate, to the House of Representatives for action next year.

I think, because Senators who will not be present during every moment of the debate today will have an opportunity to read this RECORD before casting their votes tomorrow, I should like to add some additional comments now, including statements in support of this legislation from outstanding conservationists across the land.

Mr. President, the original proposal for a national redwoods park came from the Save-the-Redwoods League, a splendid conservation organization which has done so much to preserve the old-growth redwoods of California. It has now publicly urged support of the bill pending before us, and I ask consent that the text of the public statement by the Save-the-Redwoods League be incorporated at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. President, because of the preeminence of those who are officers and members of the council of the Save-the-Redwoods League, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the officers and of the council, as well as the objectives of the Save-the-Redwoods League which accompanied this news release, also be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

#### REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK

The Save-the-Redwoods League is of the opinion that the revised proposal for a Redwood National Park presented as a "compromise" by Senators Jackson, Kuchel and Bible on October 10 would provide for a commendable first step in the direction of realizing the recommendations of the National Park Service and the Department of the Interior for saving Redwoods.

Accordingly, the Board of Directors of the League, by unanimous vote on October 11 passed the following resolution of support:

"Historically the Save-the-Redwoods League for 48 years has advocated a Redwood National Park. On the basis of many years of study, the League, when asked by the National Park Service for its recommendation, indicated its support of the complete watershed of Mill Creek together with coastal and other lands as, in its opinion, the top prior-

ity for this purpose. The Administration plan followed along the lines of this recommendation.

"In December 1966, prior to the present session of Congress, the Board of Directors of the League agreed that Prairie Creek Redwoods State Park, as well as Lost Man, Little Lost Man and Skunk Cabbage Creeks in the Prairie Creek watershed are of National Park quality, and might well be added to the plan.

"Therefore, since the revised Senate Committee Bill provides for a commendable first step in the direction of realizing the recommendations of the National Park Service and the Department of the Interior as well as including other lands that the League considers of national park quality, we support this program for saving Redwoods. We hope for the ultimate rounding out of these areas within logical boundaries, either by government or private aid."

#### SAVE-THE-REDWOODS LEAGUE

##### OFFICERS

Ralph W. Chaney, *President*.  
Richard M. Leonard, *Vice President*.  
Robert G. Sproul, *Treasurer*.  
Newton B. Drury, *Secretary*.  
John B. Dewitt, *Assistant Secretary*.

##### COUNCIL

Horace M. Albright, Albert W. Atwood, John H. Baker, Mrs. Harmon C. Bell, Earl B. Birmingham, Harold C. Bryant, Selah Chamberlain, Jr., Ralph W. Chaney,<sup>1</sup> Pearl Chase, Allen L. Chickering, Jr.

Norman M. Christensen, Mrs. Arthur E. Connick, Charles F. Daly, Amos W. Elliott, Francis P. Farquhar,<sup>2</sup> Mrs. Marshal H. Fisher, Emanuel Fritz, John Jewett Garland, James P. Gilligan, T. A. Greig.

Melville Bell Grosvenor, D. Hanson Grubb, Falter A. Haas,<sup>3</sup> Charles C. Haines, Daryl P. Haskins, Arthur W. Hooper, Bruce S. Howard,<sup>4</sup> Charles P. Howard, Phelps Stokes Hunter, Roger Kent.

Alfred A. Knopf, Mrs. Joseph R. Knowland, Richard M. Leonard,<sup>5</sup> Martin Litton, Mrs. Norman B. Livermore, Harvey B. Lyon, Mrs. J. W. Maillard, Jr., Mrs. Selby McCreery, Donald H. McLaughlin, R. A. L. Menzies,<sup>6</sup> G. W. Merck, Lawrence C. Merriam, Robert C. Miller, Mrs. Dorothy Liebes Morin, Mrs. Elizabeth J. Morrison, Mrs. Alyce Moseley, Stuart O'Melveny, Fairfield Osborn, Mrs. Nathaniel A. Owings.

Herman Phleger, Nicholas Roosevelt, Mrs. Melvin E. Sawin, Robert G. Sproul,<sup>7</sup> Walter A. Starr, Mrs. William W. Stout, George Waldner, J. Roy Wittwer.

##### OBJECTS

1. To rescue from destruction representative areas of our primeval forests.

2. To co-operate with the California State Park Commission, the National Park Service, and other agencies, in establishing Redwood parks and other parks and reservations.

3. To purchase Redwood grooves by private subscription.

4. To co-operate with the California State Highway Commission, and other agencies in assuring the preservation of trees and roadside beauty along highways.

5. To support reforestation and conservation of our forest areas.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the Sierra Club is an excellent conservation organization whose more than 50,000 members come from almost every State in the Union and beyond our borders. From the very beginning, it has been earnestly interested in congressional approval of a redwood national park. On October 30, the Sierra Club issued a news release supporting the redwood land ex-

change. That, of course, is the proposal in our bill, regrettably being attacked by the pending amendment.

In part, the news release of the Sierra Club states:

A spokesman for the Sierra Club said today that an exchange of Forest Service redwood lands is the key to financing an adequate Redwood National Park. "The simple truth is that no one really believes that Congress will provide the total financing for the \$100 million park solely out of appropriations," declared Michael McCloskey, Conservation Director for the 56,000 member Sierra Club. "Only if more than half of the cost is met through land trades will we have a \$100 million Redwood Park. If land exchanges are stripped from the bill, the ultimate effect will be to shrink the size of the park to a scraggly apology for failure."

I hope very much that Senators will heed the words of an able conservationist, the spokesman for the Sierra Club, which I have just read in part.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire release of the Sierra Club be put in the RECORD at this point.

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

#### SIERRA CLUB SUPPORTS REDWOOD LAND EXCHANGE

WASHINGTON.—A spokesman for the Sierra Club said today that an exchange of Forest Service redwood lands is the key to financing an adequate Redwood National Park. "The simple truth is that no one really believes that Congress will provide the total financing for the \$100 million park solely out of appropriations," declared Michael McCloskey, Conservation Director for the 56,000 member Sierra Club. "Only if more than half of the cost is met through land trades will we have a \$100 million Redwood Park. If land exchanges are stripped from the bill, the ultimate effect will be to shrink the size of the park to a scraggly apology for failure."

"Senator Thomas Kuchel and Senator Henry Jackson have worked too long putting together a viable Redwood park plan to have it undermined now," McCloskey said. "This is the time for all conservation groups truly interested in helping to achieve a worthwhile Redwood National Park to join in supporting the plan reported out of the Senate's Interior Committee. The Sierra Club has compromised a great deal in backing a 64,000 acre park, in place of the 90,000 acre one we wanted so badly. It is time for other groups to face realities too and lend a helping hand," McCloskey stated.

Some hunting groups have joined with the Forest Service in opposing the land exchange feature of the Committee's plan.

These groups, which usually oppose efforts to transfer forest lands to parks where hunting is not allowed, have charged that the exchanges would set a bad precedent. "Precedent is really not the issue," McCloskey replied. "If only land exchanges between the Forest Service and lumber companies were involved, there would be no controversy. The Forest Service makes such exchanges all the time. What excites the opposition of the Forest Service and the hunting groups is simply that the land the government gets will be turned over to another agency, the National Park Service. There is ample precedent for this. Thus, the issue is no more than that the Forest Service wants to hang on to what it has, regardless of the greater public need for parkland."

"We have no desire to see established National Forests bartered away," McCloskey said. "But there is no established National Forest in the case of the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit. It is a remnant of a defunct

<sup>1</sup> Directors.

program to purchase 60 times more land for a national forest. That purchase program failed long ago. All that is proposed is to re-allocate the residue of a defunct program to enable an important new one to succeed."

McCloskey pointed out that the redwoods in the Forest Service unit are not in any sense preserved. "The Forest Service plans to log these redwoods in any event. What we are really doing is to trade what will be future stumpland to obtain redwoods that we can save forever in a great national park. The Nation could obtain no better bargain," the club spokesman concluded.

**Mr. KUCHEL.** Mr. President, listen to the words of Dr. Edgar Wayburn, president of the Sierra Club:

The key to the financing of the compromise bill of the Committee is use of the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit which the Federal government now owns, on an exchange basis to acquire needed parkland. . . . This unit itself does not lend itself to park management. The Committee felt, and we agree, that it makes good sense to phase out this abortive redwood program to enable the National Park program to succeed. No adverse precedent is intended as these lands are not regular national forest lands and have never served their intended purpose.

That is precisely what the chairman of our committee said earlier—that the lands involved in the purchase unit are not part of an established national forest, Mr. President. Logging under contract with the Government has been carried on by private operators for over a decade on these lands. There ought not to be anything sacrosanct in the mind of any Senator with regard to this land. It was originally acquired by purchase, and now we propose to make it available to be utilized to acquire old-growth redwood suitable for park purposes.

Listen to the words of the Governor of California, Ronald Reagan:

I highly commend the acceptance of the concept of including the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit, for the purpose of exchange with private land, in Redwood National Park legislation, S. 2515.

Mr. President, the Governor of California is interested in the problem of employment in our State. The Governor many months ago, in a statement to our committee, said that he approved of a national redwood park, but that he had certain things in mind that he wanted included in any legislation. One of those things was the purchase unit exchange.

Mr. President, if the purchase unit is used in partial compensation for the acquisition from private companies of sterling old-growth redwoods for park purposes, the property tax base in Del Norte County will not shrink; it will expand. The companies now operating in that area to be made a park will have an opportunity, by using some of the purchase unit land, to continue in business. Also, as the chairman has said, the amounts of dollars necessary to be appropriated from the public treasury to accomplish the objective of the national redwood park will be lessened.

Earlier our very able friend and fellow Senator from Montana, the distinguished junior Senator from that State [Mr. METCALF] made a statement which I wish to place in the RECORD, because I think it is vitally important that Senators understand his position. The dis-

tinguished Senator from Montana is a recognized leader in conservation. This is what Senator METCALF said:

The purchase unit is the residue of a defunct program to purchase 860,000 acres for a redwood national forest. While this program authorized in the 1930's failed to be achieved, the unit remains the largest Federal property supporting redwood growth. Ironically, the Forest Service's management consists mainly of selling the huge trees to loggers and remitting the proceeds to the Federal treasury. If ever there was a program that might be dispensable, this is it. Yet the suggestion now is that it is sacrosanct.

Three cheers for the comment of the able Senator from Montana who, as I say, is one of the leaders in Congress in the effort for sound conservation.

I think it quite relevant to this debate for me to observe that the chairman of the California State Assembly Committee on Natural Resources, Planning, and Public Works, has likewise endorsed this legislation; and I ask unanimous consent that portions of a statement from the office of Hon. Edward L. Z'berg endorsing our legislation be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Assemblyman Edwin L. Z'berg (D-Sacramento and Yolo Counties), Chairman of the Assembly Committee on Natural Resources, Planning, and Public Works, today praised the action of the United States Senate Recreation and Parks Subcommittee for their compromise plan recommending a redwoods national park in Humboldt and Del Norte Counties.

Z'berg stated, "while details of the plan are yet to be received it would appear that the United States Senate Subcommittee's recommendation has attempted to bring together both the plans of the Sierra Club and the Save-the-Redwoods League, the two principal conservation organizations supporting a redwoods national park. Our Committee recently issued its report supporting a park in the prairie Creek-Redwood Creek area and I am extremely pleased that the Subcommittee did recommend 36,000 acres in Humboldt County, including in it Prairie Creek Redwoods State Park, and some 22,000 acres of private redwood acreage. While all concerned will obviously now go on to study the Subcommittee's recommendation, the important thing is that this is a significant step forward and can unite conservation support behind a single plan."

Z'berg particularly praised Senators Thomas Kuchel, Henry Jackson, and Lee Metcalf for their efforts in promoting the plan and hopes that the Senate leadership and the House leadership, including the efforts of Representative Jeffery Cohelan, can now be combined to move on a united front.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the people who live in the northern California counties of Del Norte and Humboldt are understandably concerned with continuing their employment rate at the highest possible figure. I have telegrams here from the city council of the city of Eureka, from the mayor of Crescent City speaking for the city council of the city of Crescent City, and from the president of the Rellim Redwood Co., located in Del Norte County, Mr. Harold A. Miller.

I read from the telegram sent by the city of Eureka:

It is vital to the economy of Eureka and Humboldt County that Redwood purchase unit be left in SB2515 for the exchange to private property and that the proposed increase in allowable cut in Six Rivers National Forest be permitted.

I read from the telegram sent by the mayor of Crescent City, the Honorable William G. Peepe, speaking for the city council of his community:

Vital to Crescent City that purchase unit remain in SB2515 for exchange with private land in formation of Redwood National Park. Acceleration of 37 million 500 thousand extra annual cut in Six Rivers National Forest would greatly help local economy during formative years of park.

As to the telegram from Mr. Miller earnestly urging that the exchange remain in the bill, I simply observe that it represents the concern of private industry for the type of legislation we have introduced.

The executive vice president of the California Redwood Association, Mr. Philip T. Farnsworth, has sent the distinguished chairman of our committee and me a telegram under date of October 29, taking the same position.

I ask unanimous consent that the texts of the telegrams to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

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

EUREKA, CALIF.,  
October 27, 1967.

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.:

It is vital to the economy of Eureka and Humboldt County that redwood purchase unit be left SB2515 for the exchange to private property and that the proposed increase in allowable cut in Six Rivers National Forest be permitted.

CITY OF EUREKA, CALIF.,  
GILBERT S. TROOD,  
Mayor.

ORVIL R. WILSON,  
Councilman.

ALLAN A. McVICAR,  
Council President.

CHESLEY N. GAYLORD,  
D.P. Councilman.

WM. R. HOGARTY,  
Councilman.

LAWRENCE R. DAWSON,  
Councilman.

CRESCENT CITY, CALIF.,  
October 24, 1967.

Senator HENRY JACKSON,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Vital to Crescent City that purchase unit remain in SB2515 to exchange with private land in formation of Redwood National Park. Acceleration of 37 million 5 hundred thousand extra annual cut in Six Rivers National Forest would greatly help local economy during formative years of park.

WILLIAM G. PEEPE,  
Mayor for the City Council of the City  
of Crescent City.

OCTOBER 29.

DEAR SENATORS JACKSON AND KUCHEL: For your information, the redwood forest land owning companies whose lands would be taken under the Senate redwood national park legislation, all of whom are members of this association, and upon consultation with me strongly agree with the exchange concept in this particular instance. S. 2515 provides for the exchange of certain federal lands for

certain private lands to be included in the park.

In this instance, exchange is essential to the maintenance of an important part of the region's economy.

Concurrent with the exchange and as an integral part of the companies' support for the exchange principles is the necessity to carry out the proposed increase in the annual allowable cut on the Six Rivers National Forest. This should be handled so as to provide the timber buying companies, who now receive a portion of their log supply from the Purchase Unit, with an alternate timber supply.

This wire is intended to respond to the exchange issue only and does not intend to endorse any National Park legislation.

PHILIP T. FARNSWORTH,  
Executive Vice President,  
California Redwood Association.

CRESCENT CITY, CALIF.,  
October 12, 1967.

HENRY M. JACKSON,  
U.S. Senate,  
Old Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

For your information, the following wire was sent to W. Marvin Watson and Philip S. Hughes today:

"We are wiring you because of your particular interest in the establishment of a Redwood National Park. We wish to advise that the park bill as introduced by Senators Jackson, Kuchel, and Bible, while taking more private land we feel necessary, makes the availability of the northern purchase unit for exchange and will make it possible for us with a reasonable exchange to continue the \$30 million dollar privately financed forest complex in Del Norte County, Calif. As you know we are the largest employer in the county, a depressed area, and with our complex completed our employment will be more than double.

"We hope you will make every effort to maintain the exchange provision in the bill so that we may continue the program. I can assure you without an exchange, our program must come to a prompt halt."

HAROLD A. MILLER,  
President, Rellim Redwood Co.

Mr. KUCHEL. Surely it ought to be of interest to Senators to read what the free press in America feels with respect to the proposed legislation. I ask unanimous consent that sundry editorials published in the newspapers of California and of other States be printed at this point in the RECORD:

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

[From the North Coast Outdoors,  
Oct. 20, 1967]

AN EDITORIAL

We are running the Senate Park Bill, and Map this issue. And it does indeed look like a compromise. In it are elements from Clausen's plan to include the seashore and connect existing parks in an effort to reduce the number of acres to be removed from tax rolls.

There is a recognition of the Sierra Club's desire to include the tall tree area in the Redwood Creek. The Administration's original park plan and the Save the Redwoods League's interest in the Mill Creek drainage was acknowledged. And the trade of lands from the Northern Purchase Unit recognized the necessity of the Rellim-Miller Company to Del Norte County's economic base.

This plan seems to have been designed after a study of our timber-based economy and yet provides a national redwood park of significance. Something that will be here long after we've run out of breath fighting about it. Something that will be here long after we've run out of breath—period.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle,  
Oct. 16, 1967]

REDWOOD COMPROMISE

Drawn-out efforts to create a Redwood National Park in California moved toward a happy solution in the United States Senate last week. The Senate Interior Committee selected the best features of two contending park plans and combined them into a proposed two-unit park of about 61,000 acres.

For more than a year, conservationists have been split between the Administration's 43,000-acre proposal for the Mill Creek area in Del Norte county, and the Sierra Club's 90,000-acre proposal for Humboldt county.

The compromise that emerged last week followed a somewhat similar concept suggested this summer by Representative Jeffrey Cohelan, Berkeley Democrat. It was worked out in the Senate Recreation and Parks subcommittee by Senators Thomas Kuchel (Rep.-Calif.) and Henry Jackson (Dem.-Wash.).

The new plan includes the California State Redwood Parks of Jedediah Smith, Prairie Creek and Del Norte Coast—in Del Norte and Humboldt counties. It will cost an estimated \$99.8 million, compared with \$64 million for the Mill Creek plan and \$145 million for the 90,000-acre proposal. Significantly, the compromise, besides saving more old growth trees, will spread the impact over two counties and four timber companies instead of one county and one company.

The existing State parks could be federally administered without an outright transfer of title. And the proposal provides specifically that the Forest Service's 14,600-acre Northern Redwood Purchase Unit will be traded to private firms for their lands to help keep them in business.

The House of Representatives has not yet scheduled field hearings on any Redwood Park plan. But in view of the compromise developments last week, it is hoped that the House Interior Committee will now agree to forego field hearings, thus speeding final legislative action.

Because the moratorium on cutting these virgin redwoods by private companies is scheduled to expire at the end of this session of Congress, final action cannot be delayed.

The compromise proposal offers a practical way out of a protracted dispute. It is an encouraging step taken in the public interest and deserves wide support. Without the united backing of the various conservation organizations, it is unlikely that any Redwood Park plan can be approved.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 10, 1967]  
A VICTORY FOR THE REDWOODS

The decision of the Senate Interior subcommittee to recommend creation of a two-unit national park to preserve a fraction of the nation's dwindling heritage of virgin redwoods is a major victory for the public interest.

Under the bipartisan leadership of Senators Jackson, Democrat of Washington, and Kuchel, Republican of California, the subcommittee has agreed upon an intelligent compromise of the original Administration bill, which provided for a park in the Mill Creek area only, and the Metcalf-Cohelan bill, which provided for a larger and far superior park in the Redwood Creek Valley. This newspaper, as well as many conservationists, had supported the latter bill because the largest stands of ancient redwoods are in Redwood Creek Valley. Senator Metcalf, Democrat of Montana, and Representative Cohelan, Democrat of California, have performed an outstanding service by their tenacious fight for this area.

The compromise worked out by Senators Jackson and Kuchel saves the best of both plans and lays the basis for necessary expansion in the future. However, there remains an immediate danger under the new

proposal, arising from the fact that a large portion of the watershed of Redwood Creek, southern unit of the proposed park, will still be outside Federal control. Its indiscriminate logging could lead to flooding and siltation, with serious damage resulting to the park area downstream. But pending a later decision by Congress to buy additional Redwood Creek acreage, private citizens could acquire land in this strategic watershed and contribute it to the park. The bill wisely provides that the existing state parks can be donated to the national park but offers none of the unprecedented concessions originally requested by the state of California.

Since the Senate is expected to act fairly soon on the pending compromise bill, the House Interior Committee could usefully hasten Congressional action by foregoing its proposed field hearings. With the moratorium on cutting by the private companies due to expire at the end of this session of Congress, definitive action is essential to save the redwoods now.

[From the San Jose (Calif.) Mercury,  
Oct. 11, 1967]

PARK PACT ACCEPTABLE

The Redwood National Park compromise bill now shaping in the Senate Interior Committee is probably the best that can be obtained under the circumstances. It should be accepted by all parties.

Essentially, the bill would create a 66,384-acre park from three existing state parks and surrounding lands. It would preserve some of the watersheds championed by the conservationist Sierra Club and some of the acreage contained in the so-called Kuchel plan.

In addition, it provides that private lumber companies now holding land within the proposed national park may swap that land for acreage now under jurisdiction of the U.S. Forest Service.

Finally, the proposal carries a \$100 million pricetag, as compared with the estimated \$60 million for the smaller Kuchel park; however, the total would be shaved considerably if lumber companies accepted the land swap and if private foundation funds were channeled into land purchase. The latter is considered an excellent possibility.

In point of fact, if the proposal is to be shepherded through an economy-minded Congress, great efforts will have to be made to keep total costs to a minimum. The Senate Interior Committee compromise bill offers the best chance of accomplishing this.

As Sen. Thomas H. Kuchel (R-Calif.), a moving force behind the efforts to preserve as many ancient redwoods as possible for posterity, expressed it:

"This plan provides for the maximum acquisition of old-growth redwoods. It would create a Redwood National Park—that's all it seeks to do and that's all it accomplishes."

That, however, is plenty.

The Sequoia Sempervirens, or Coast Redwoods, once extended from south of Monterey in an unbroken band to the Oregon border. They have been logged indiscriminately and unmercifully until only isolated patches of them remain.

The proposed Redwood National Park would preserve one of the last and largest of these Northern California patches in perpetuity. The several lumber companies owning strategic portions of this acreage have agreed to a moratorium on cutting while Congress debates the details of a Redwood National Park bill. These firms have shown an appreciation of the public interest, and they deserve not only a word of thanks but prompt action by Congress—so that their economic interests are not damaged unduly.

Take it all in all, the new compromise park bill offers something, though not everything, for everyone. It should meet most, if not all, of the objections raised to both earlier park plans.

Congress should push ahead with this bill as rapidly as possible.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 18, 1967]

#### THE LESSON OF THE REDWOODS

In approving a bill to establish a two-unit Redwood National Park the Senate Interior Committee has greatly enhanced the prospect of preserving these magnificent ancient trees from destruction.

But the committee also departed from usual practice by providing that the timber companies would be partially compensated by the exchange of their holdings for Federally owned land of similar value in a 14,000-acre tract now managed by the Forest Service. As Secretary of Agriculture Freeman pointed out in his memorandum to the committee, the saving to the Federal Government is purely nominal. However, an exchange of land reduces the cash outlay by the Government, and this is an important consideration in easing the bill through this economy-minded Congress.

These disputed acres have another and a larger significance. They were acquired by the Government between 1939 and 1945 at a cost of \$444,000. Their value today is estimated at between \$40 million and \$60 million. In this comparatively brief time their value has increased by one hundredfold. The national park now going to cost \$100 million could have been acquired in 1945 for a tiny fraction of that sum.

What has happened so spectacularly in the redwoods is happening in varying degrees across the country. Land prices generally are rising 5 to 10 per cent a year. Specific parcels of land that have timber or minerals, or that lie along bodies of water or in scenic locations, are rising in price at a far faster rate.

If conservation projects are not to become astronomically expensive, action has to be taken now to save wilderness, open space and future park and recreation lands. The Nature Conservancy, a private foundation headquartered in Washington, D.C., works with private individuals in acquiring land now that may be needed by public agencies later. Congress needs to develop an over-all public policy on land acquisition. The future cannot be left to the mercy of the private speculator.

[From the Kansas City Times, Oct. 11, 1967]

#### AT LAST, SOME ACTION ON THE REDWOOD PARK

Favorable action in a Senate committee does not a Redwood National park create, but it's a start—a start too long delayed. As cleared by the interior and insular affairs committee and sent to the Senate floor, the bill is a compromise both in terms of the park's size and the money required to establish it.

Last spring and early summer, working under the deadline imposed by an imminent end to the timber companies' reluctant moratorium on cutting in the prospective park areas, Congress had before it two proposals. The first, favored by the administration, was for a 43,000-acre, 60-million-dollar preserve in California's Del Norte County. The Sierra club, backed by other conservation groups, was pitching for a park more than twice that size—90,000 acres farther south in Humboldt County, costing up to 200 million dollars.

The debate was characterized by a regrettable lack of give and take, and the result was inaction. Now, with the lumbermen having agreed to extend the grace period, Congress may have awakened to the urgency for action. The bill before the Senate calls for a park of 64,000 acres, costing 190 million dollars, with tracts in Humboldt and Del Norte Counties.

One major objection from California interests has been that creation of a park would destroy timber-based local economies in the areas affected. The current bill would

authorize a trade of nearby federally-owned timberlands to companies that lose trees to the park—a provision opposed by some agencies as a bad precedent, but one apparently deemed necessary to silence the wounded cries of the Californians.

We doubt that the proposed legislation satisfies all parties completely. In all likelihood, the timber companies still feel aggrieved, the administration wishes the park weren't so costly and the Sierra club believes it is still too small. But the question from the standpoint of public interest is whether, in fact, an aesthetically significant stand of these irreplaceable forest giants will be preserved for future generations to enjoy at a price this generation can reasonably afford to pay. If the answer is found to be "yes," there can be no further excuse for dallying.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Oct. 20, 1967]

#### AGREEMENT ON REDWOOD PARK PLAN

To major conservation groups which had been at odds over the size and location of a proposed Redwood National Park announced yesterday they have united behind a new compromise plan.

The endorsements came from the Save-the-Redwoods League, which had backed the Administration's plan for a 43,000-acre park on Mill Creek in Del Norte county, and the Sierra Club, which had urged a 90,000-acre park on Redwood Creek in Humboldt county.

Directors of both organizations said they will back legislation for a two-unit, 62,000-acre park which is said to include "the best" of the two previously contending plans.

#### ESSENTIAL

United conservationist backing is considered essential to the creation of any redwood park. The compromise plan has been approved by the Senate Interior Committee and now awaits floor action.

Both the Sierra Club and the Save-the-Redwoods League indicated they would prefer a larger park than that outlined in the compromise plan, and would support efforts—governmental or private—to enlarge the proposed park.

The compromise was rejected as over-large and unacceptable yesterday in a statement on behalf of the five timber companies which would be affected.

#### STATEMENT

A statement by the Redwood Industry Land Committee added, however, that the companies will "make every effort to withhold logging within the boundaries" of the proposed park until the issue is settled.

The affected companies are Arcata National Corporation, Georgia-Pacific Corporation, Miller Redwood company, Pacific Lumber company and Simpson Timber company.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Oct. 15, 1967]

#### THE COMPROMISE

What nature had spent over 2000 years creating, Senator Thomas J. Kuchel (R-Calif.) and many others did not want destroyed overnight by the lumberman's saw.

Last week he and Senator Henry M. Jackson (D-Wash.) came up with a compromise Redwoods National Park plan which, hopefully, would end the long and bitter fight between lumbermen and conservationists over size, location and cost of such a park.

Conservationists had demanded a 90,000-acre park costing between \$150 and \$200 million. The Administration had come up with a proposal for a 39,000-acre park costing about \$50 million.

#### LAND TRADE

The Kuchel-Jackson compromise park would consist of 61,000 acres and by trading redwood land (14,491 acres) held by the Forest Service in Del Norte County for pri-

vate timber lands in the new park area the cost would be held to about \$60 million.

The 61,000 acres would include 36,000 acres in Humboldt county (Prairie Creek Redwoods State Park plus 22,000 acres of private land) and about 25,000 acres in Del Norte county (Jedediah Smith and Del Norte Redwoods State Park plus 10,600 acres of private land). It would also buy up a large chunk of the coast to link the two redwood areas into one big park.

It was a compromise that met California Governor Ronald Reagan's demands that private lumber interests get Federal land in exchange for their holdings so that the lumber-oriented northern counties would not become an economic disaster area.

Representatives of both the Sierra Club and Save-the-Redwoods League appeared favorably impressed by the compromise. But there remained one uncertainty in the deal: The Forest Service had long and valiantly fought against using its lands as "trading stamps" in deals such as this and Congress had always backed this policy.

#### HONORABLE EXCEPTION

But, reasoned Kuchel, this should be "an honorable exception" or the redwoods would be ruined forever.

At midweek the Senate Interior Committee quickly approved the compromise and the Senate was expected to act on it by November. Senator Jackson said he had been assured by House Interior Committee members they would take the measure under consideration in January—after previously having indicated they would stall maybe another half year.

Opposition, however, was far from dead. The Forest Service was openly unhappy, and that private lumber interests would try to have reduced the number of acres taken for the park was hinted by Governor Reagan.

Reagan, who had long appeared cool, even downright cold, toward tying up more redwoods in public parks, said he would ask the amount of private acreage taken be "substantially reduced" to prevent "serious damage to the lumber industry in the area."

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], chairman of the Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation, is unable to be present for the debate today. I wish to commend and thank the able chairman of our subcommittee for his devoted and skillful work in conducting the hearings and guiding the consideration of this measure. He devoted long hours to the task, and the bill reported by the committee reflects, in large measure, his personal contribution. I ask unanimous consent that a statement by the senior Senator from Nevada in support of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR BIBLE

Mr. President, it has been my pleasure to serve as Chairman of the Parks and Recreation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for a number of years. During this time, we have considered legislation affecting areas from one coastline to the other. Some of these acts have had a remarkable degree of unanimity, while others have been highly controversial. But each concerned areas which the Committee believed would best serve the Americans of today and tomorrow as units of our great National Park System.

Today we are considering a bill which would create a Redwood National Park. To say this proposal has been controversial would be an

understatement. Depending upon whom you listen to, you are told that "the last redwood is being cut," or that "the redwood is not an endangered species."

I don't think either of these points is at issue here today.

Instead, we must consider just what is intended by the bill before us. The redwoods on the coast of California are unique in the world. The coastal redwoods are among the tallest living things to be found, with many specimen stretching higher than a thirty-story building. In the old-growth stands you may see trees over fourteen feet in diameter whose age may be anywhere from 1000 to 2000 years.

Some say there are adequate numbers of these magnificent trees preserved in the numerous state parks of California. Others believe that to properly protect and display the redwoods, we must have a national park of significant size; one in which there are complete watersheds and ample lands to accommodate great numbers of visitors without endangering the groves of redwood. The problem is further complicated by timber industries operating in the redwood forests which have just recently entered the final stage of their plan to partially harvest the old growth stands on their lands.

If a park of significant size is to be established, it must be soon. And if it is created, there is no doubt in my mind it will have some adverse effect on the industries using the trees as raw material.

So it should be quite evident the Committee was faced with a perplexing set of circumstances. Long months were spent considering alternatives. Different combinations of land ownerships were pieced together like jig-saw puzzles, taken apart and refitted, to arrive at the final recommendation. As a result, I believe that the park boundaries recommended represent the best combination which can be practically achieved.

To acquire the private lands needed to make up the park it appears we might spend more than we have ever considered for a unit of the National Park System. The estimated acquisition price is extremely high.

I have become increasingly concerned about the high cost of lands to be included in our parks and recreation areas. With other substantial burdens on our Nation's economic resources, I feel we must sometimes take unusual steps to achieve a desired goal. In the bill before us, we have taken a most unusual step by providing for lands in the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit to be exchanged for timberlands within the park boundaries.

A third of a century ago, the decision was made to establish a Redwood National Forest, and the proper steps for creating purchase units were taken. But economic conditions changed. We moved from a deep depression to a war-stimulated economy, and finally to an era of continued prosperity and industrial growth. This is one reason why only 14,567 acres have been acquired of the original 860,000 acres in the two purchase units established. With the lumber industry firmly settled in the region, it is doubtful much additional progress can be expected toward creating a significant Redwood National Forest. Although we applaud the Forest Service in its management of this small unit, the Committee believes the greatest public benefit to be realized from this land is its exchange for private timberlands within the boundary of the park.

This also will have the secondary benefit of lessening the adverse impact on the local lumber industries, permitting them to operate for a longer period of time or on a larger scale than might otherwise be possible.

I have heard widely-conflicting Committee testimony on the value of this Northern Redwood Purchase Unit. I personally don't know what figure is accurate, but one thing

is certain—use of the lands for exchange purposes could be significant in holding the ultimate price of a Redwood National Park far below the authorized purchase price.

I wish to express my appreciation for the many hours devoted to this legislation by the Senior Senator from California, Mr. Kuchel, and the Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Jackson.

I believe the so-called "compromise bill" which has evolved is worthy, and I recommend it to you for passage.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, a typographical error appears in the last paragraph of page 3 of the report which accompanies S. 2515. The sentence as it appears in the report reads, in part, as follows:

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs met in executive session on August 10, 1967 \* \* \*.

The date should be corrected to read: October 10, 1967.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The RECORD will be corrected accordingly.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I yield to the able junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous-consent agreement provides that when the opening statements have been made by the Senator from Washington and the Senator from California, the time on amendments shall be controlled, except that on the pending amendment there is no time limitation.

Mr. JACKSON. We are not speaking on the amendment; we are speaking on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for himself, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] is the pending question.

Mr. JACKSON. The amendment is now the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement on the bill.

I shall make a subsequent statement on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is pending. So long as the amendment is pending, the Senator may speak as long as he wishes to do so.

Mr. METCALF. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] for his skill in developing a plan for a Redwood National Park whose boundaries have drawn such widespread support. All conservation groups known to me have indicated general support for the shape of the park that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is now proposing.

The committee's achievement in resolving wide disagreement—and I have been a part of that wide disagreement—over how boundaries should be drawn is a major one. But its success is also due to the willingness of conservation groups to "give some" with respect to some of their most cherished hopes. They have done so in a spirit of compromise to secure action on this urgent effort.

In backing the committee's bill, never-

theless, we should not lose sight of the conservation opportunities in the redwoods that these groups have brought to our attention. It was my privilege to sponsor a plan, along with 19 other Senators, for a 90,000-acre Redwood National Park which many of these groups, led by the Sierra Club, recommended.

In regrouping now behind this 64,000-acre plan, let us realize what we are leaving to the lumbermen of what should have been saved. Most notable is the Emerald Mile, actually a 3-mile reach of magnificent redwood forest along Redwood Creek just upstream from the mouth of Bridge Creek. Here the trees stand in a procession at heights of 300 feet or more, with forest edges reminiscent of Bull Creek flat. No roads now enter this place. Only a handful of parties who run the river on spring freshets have seen what we are casting aside in this place.

Nowhere else do redwoods reach the elevations in such grandeur as they do along the slopes above Redwood Creek on the east below the Bald Hills Road. Here they rise to 2,500 feet in giant form, at the inner limit of the fog belt. The redwood expert knows he is seeing something special here. Most of these great slope forests are now being forgotten.

So also is the great hillmass of redwoods between Bridge Creek and Redwood Creek, and the scenic backdrop above Elam Creek and along MacArthur Creek. Tragically, in the 3 years since the National Park Service issued its report on the redwoods, much of the best of the North Fork of Lost Man Creek has already been lost. What we do not save in this bill will probably be lost to the saw within a very few years.

It was with this thought in mind that I attempted to persuade the committee to raise the ceiling on size from 64,000 to 70,000 acres. This small increase would be enough to rescue most of the threatened areas I have just mentioned. I believe that there is enough leeway within the cost estimates for the entire project to allow the increase to be made without raising the ceiling on appropriations.

I hope Congress will continue to explore the possibilities of extending this proposal to cover the magnificent areas of redwood forest in Redwood Creek, which are too good to lose. The opportunities we now have will never return.

It is easy for all of us here to become so engrossed with dollars, budgets, boundaries, and exchanges, that we tend to push into the background the real reason why we are today at a crucial point in a historic undertaking, creation of a redwood national park, a park commensurate with the character of these truly unique and awesome forests.

Last night I was reading an old account of one man's first visit to the redwoods. Morley Roberts told his story in "The Western Avernus: Toil and Travel in Further North America," first published in 1887:

My road ran still through the redwoods, and if they were solemn and weird at night they were more beautiful in the daytime. Under them at times was thick brush, from which they rose like towers or great light-houses from the breaking of little waves, and in other places they stood by themselves,

springing straight from the bare ground, or moss, or scanty turf. These had grown for so many centuries, and had such great life in them, they were so grand and solemn and king-like, that I felt they had personality. It seemed nothing short of murder to hew and saw them down for planks and post-making, for house-building, and shelter for little men, who lusted to destroy in an hour the slow, sweet growth of their unnumbered years. We come with our quick and furious flood of life to a quick conclusion, they, with the slow sap under bark and in the wood, rise imperceptibly to majesty, and fall at the end of their long term by overgrowth of summit and crown; they sink at last under the burden of natural honours, and mingle slowly in long decay with the soil in which they were rooted. But men come and destroy them, as barbarians in the pathetic, silent senate-house, and nature lies wounded and bleeding.

I came out on the banks of the Smith River again and was ferried over, and was asked no fee. I was astonished at the lack of greed, and the natural sweet kindness of the man, a Charon fair and young, which are so rare in all countries, and alas! much too rare in America. I thanked him courteously, and he bowed and wished me well most knightlike, pushing back across the stream, and I passed again into the redwoods, climbing up through a sweet tangle of thick brush with the great god-trees rising from it, and then descended and came on a flat, more bare, with willow and birch, and no more redwoods. And I began to hear a faint roar, like a singing in my ears. But it grew and grew till I recognized the sound of the sea, the roar of breakers, the eternal ocean voice. It put new life into me; I walked faster, though I was faint, until I came where I could hear the separate roar of separate waves—distinct thunders. I sat under a tree by the roadside and lighted my pipe, and, to save myself from vain imaginings of possible things, I took my Virgil and again read part of the Sixth Book. And when I came to the middle I thought, "I am not yet out of Avernus, and who knows if I shall return to the lucid stars and lucid earth, for there is much to be passed through before my time is at hand."

When we are talking about conservation and the challenge of meeting the outdoor recreation demands of a growing nation, one man stands at the top in terms of accomplishment. I doubt that enough attention has ever been directed to the man and his work—the senior Senator from Nevada [ALAN BIBLE]. During more than a decade in the U.S. Senate, ALAN BIBLE has clearly established himself as a leading conservation figure. Certainly, his record in the area of parks and recreation is unmatched.

As chairman of the Parks and Recreation Subcommittee and, before that, the Public Lands Subcommittee, Senator BIBLE has been instrumental in passing legislation that has added no less than 47 new areas to the National Park System. And that record, I believe, is about to be greatly extended with the passage in the 90th Congress of bills creating two new landmark national parks—the Redwoods National Park bill we are considering today and the North Cascades National Park and related recreation and wilderness areas. This is a record unequalled by any other Senator in his position in the history of Congress. I submit it is a record that represents the greatest period of recreation development ever witnessed by our Nation.

Senator BIBLE's calm guiding hand was

largely responsible for solving the complex problems that had thwarted progress on the Redwood National Park bill. It was the same effective capacity for overcoming obstacles that made his record of achievement possible.

Under Senator BIBLE's leadership we have seen the long-overdue resurgence of national recreation areas, national seashores, and national lakeshores designed to provide for the badly neglected recreation needs of those in crowded urban areas. We have seen two new national parks—Canyonlands and Guadalupe Mountains. And we have seen many historical parks and national monuments established. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of the National Park Service additions that have been authorized during Senator BIBLE's chairmanship of the responsible subcommittee up to this year.

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

#### EIGHTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

St. Thomas National Historical Site.  
 Christsted National Historical Site.  
 Russell Cave National Monument.  
 Cape Cod National Seashore.  
 Fort Davis National Historical Site.  
 Fort Smith National Historical Site.  
 Piscataway Park.  
 Buck Island Reef National Monument.  
 Fort St. Marks National Historical Site.  
 Lincoln Boyhood National Monument.  
 Hamilton Grange National Monument.  
 Theodore Roosevelt Birthplace National Historical Site.  
 Sagamore Hill National Historical Site.  
 Frederick Douglas Home National Historical Site.  
 Point Reyes National Seashore.  
 Padre Island National Seashore.

#### EIGHTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

Ozark National Scenic Riverways.  
 Fort Bowie National Historical Site.  
 Fort Larned National Historical Site.  
 Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site.  
 Allegheny Portage Railroad National Historical Site.  
 Johnstown Flood National Historical Site.  
 John Muir National Historical Site.  
 Fire Island National Seashore.  
 Canyonlands National Park.  
 Ice Age National Scientific Reserve.

#### EIGHTY-NINTH CONGRESS

Assateague Island National Seashore.  
 Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area.  
 Nez Perce National Historical Park.  
 Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area.  
 Cape Lookout National Seashore.  
 Chamizal Treaty National Monument.  
 Fort Union Trading Post National Historical Site.  
 George Rogers Clark National Historical Park.  
 San Juan Island National Historical Park.  
 Guadalupe Mountains National Park.  
 Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore.  
 Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore.  
 Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area.  
 Golden Spike National Historical Site.  
 Hubbell Trading Post National Historical Site.  
 Agate Fossil Beds National Monument.  
 Herbert Hoover National Monument.  
 Pecos National Monument.  
 Alibates Flint Quarries and Texas Panhandle Pueblo Culture National Monument.  
 Ellis Island National Monument.  
 Roger Williams National Monument.

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

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, earlier today, I spoke of the great service the Senator from Montana performed in the discussions in committee which led up to this bill. The Senator is recognized as a leader in conservation. On the amendment now pending, the position that he has taken is one of tremendous strength for all of us who want a national redwood park, who recognize the need for Senate action now, and who oppose this amendment.

I simply wish to repeat, in the presence of the Senator from Montana, the feelings that I have and that I believe all people interested in this park have with respect to his high level of statesmanship in this controversy.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. METCALF. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the committee, I wish to express my appreciation for the effective assistance of the able Senator from Montana in connection with the pending measure. The Senator from Montana has been active for many years as an advocate in promoting a redwood national park bill. As I recall, his interest dates back to the days when he was a student at Stanford University.

Mr. President, the Senator's forthright analysis of the so-called purchase unit matter has been stated as well as anyone could ask in defining the issues involved.

I say to the Members of the Senate that the able Senator from Montana has made our task much easier in bringing this bill to the floor of the Senate, and I commend him most highly for his help with respect to this important measure.

Mr. METCALF. I thank my chairman.

If I still have the floor, Mr. President, I wish to respond to the statements made by the Senator from California and the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). The Chair recognizes the Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I doubt whether any Member of the Senate has had more to do with opposition to land exchanges than I. I go back to the years when I was a Member of the House of Representatives, when Representative Ellsworth suggested that there be an omnibus program for land exchanges under which whenever a sustained yield area was taken for a Corps of Engineers project, a Bureau of Reclamation project, or a highway program, some of our national parks or our national forests would be exchanged. I vehemently opposed that proposal, and the House of Representatives voted it down.

I believe that the distinguished Senator from Vermont aided in preventing the addition of that amendment to the Senate bill.

But today we have a provision for a land exchange in the pending amendment, which is entirely different from what we were talking about back in the days when I opposed the Ellsworth pro-

posal. I suggested in the House of Representatives that the Ellsworth bill should be defeated because it was a suggestion that we exchange trees for stumps. It was such a suggestion. Today, we have a better bill. The Government will receive trees in exchange for stumps. The land involved in this exchange is being logged. This area is in private operation at present. We are saying that we will receive a magnificent area within the confines of the park in exchange for an area that will be logged off, anyway. The Federal Government will get the better of the bargain.

In addition, we will be saving the economy of a small county in northern California. We will be helping them to have a tax base, which is important, and we will save some jobs.

Mr. President, I suggest that the pending amendment would not set a precedent at all. Every day, Members of Congress receive requests for endorsement of land exchanges between the Forest Service and railroads or other private owners, or between Government and State agencies.

For example, many persons are now writing to Senator MANSFIELD and me in support of a proposed land exchange between the Forest Service and the Northern Pacific Railroad, in order to add to the Spanish Peaks Wilderness Area. So long as it involves an exchange of one national forest area for another, no one complains. But if it involves an exchange of national forest land that goes into the Interior Department, then we have the National Forest Service coming up and objecting.

Originally, the Secretary of the Interior suggested to Congress that the Muir Woods be a part of the land exchange in this proposal. The Muir Woods, which is named after a great naturalist, John Muir—

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Does the Senator mean that a Cabinet officer came to the Congress of the United States and recommended that the Muir Woods be traded off?

Mr. METCALF. Yes. And I made a speech about it. And when I suggested that this land exchange was not in the public interest, the distinguished Senator from California quoted that speech against me.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. To what Cabinet officer does the Senator refer?

Mr. METCALF. One of our best Cabinet officers.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Agriculture or Interior?

Mr. METCALF. One of our best—the Secretary of the Interior, Secretary Udall, a close friend of mine, the finest Secretary of the Interior, who has ever held that position.

Nevertheless, he suggested that the Muir Woods be part of this land exchange.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I assume that the distinguished Senator has been in the Muir Woods, one of the most beautiful spots in America.

Mr. METCALF. I said in committee

that when I went into the service, having been drafted, and after I was given basic training, I received a 3-day pass and my wife and I went up into the Muir Woods. When I went to Stanford University, I used to go to the Muir Woods. I believe it is one of the greatest areas for spiritual satisfaction that I have ever been in.

I would vehemently oppose the abandonment of those woods so that loggers could come in with their chain saws and destroy the area.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I commend the Senator. I went into the Muir Woods with Roger Kent, who, as Senators know, was in the Department of Defense under President Truman. It was his father, William Kent who named the Muir Woods in honor of that great naturalist. This happened in the early 1900's, some time before 1910. This area was set up as one of the first conservation areas in America.

His father, William Kent, is mentioned in the book about California Progressives and the founding of the Progressive movement in California, and in connection with the election of Gifford Pinchot as Governor of Pennsylvania. William Kent is credited by many persons as being the person who convinced Theodore Roosevelt that the conservation movement should be taken up. He had been a young man in Chicago. He went West, and was a great reform leader in California. He was one of the great conservationists in America, and he is credited with having great influence on Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot, who are regarded as the fathers of the American conservationists movement.

Mr. METCALF. If we had listened to them in those days this bill would not be before us today.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Yes, if we had listened to William Kent, Gifford Pinchot, and Theodore Roosevelt.

Mr. METCALF. But we have not and the keystone to that whole park is the land exchange. It is not significant as far as conservation goes for it is an exchange which goes on every day within the Forest Service. There was an exchange praised a day or so ago in the Washington Post in an editorial in connection with the Northern Cascades. It is the kind of exchange everyone can justify. If it is said to be setting a precedent, it is a good precedent, and it is the kind of precedent in which the Federal Government gets the better of the deal.

I have nothing but praise for the distinguished Senator from California, who sponsored the bill, and our chairman, who are giving us an opportunity for a significant national park which includes the big trees. I wish it were a little bigger, but that is what happens in the legislative process.

Mr. AIKEN. Perhaps I should not be taking part in this debate at all. I think my education is incomplete in that I have never been in the proposed Redwood park. I have been in Muir Woods. That is as near as I got. If the people of California want the national park there, I would be very much in favor of its establishment. However, I come from an area where I have seen the beneficial effects of the national forest and I cannot help but

feel that we do not want to start a precedent that will spread to my part of the country; that is, trading off sections of the national forest for other desirable assets.

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

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator wish to make a comment before I get started?

Mr. KUCHEL. Will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. The purchase unit that this bill proposes to exchange is not a part of an established national forest.

Mr. AIKEN. Possibly not in the strictest sense.

Mr. KUCHEL. This purchase unit was purchased between 1939 and 1945 by the United States from private owners, with the thought in mind that some 860,000 acres would be acquired from private owners and that the Federal Government would attempt to demonstrate the best way for redwood logging operations to proceed. But that plan collapsed. I want my friend, for whom I have No. 1 respect around here, as he knows, to know that this is not, never has been, and never will be a part of an established national forest.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator mean that the 14,500 acres are not now and never will be a part of the national forest?

Mr. KUCHEL. Are not now, and never has been.

Mr. AIKEN. Who administers it? The Forest Service administers it.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. As a further point of clarification I think that the able Senator from California stated it well. It is true that the Forest Service considered making a national forest. This proposal was turned down by the Forest Service. The Senator from Vermont must realize, as the Senator from California pointed out, that this was originally undertaken as a very large enterprise which started back in 1934 during the depression days. It was hoped they would be able to acquire this large acreage to which the Senator from California referred. They failed. Only a very small fractional part of the objective was achieved; 14,567 acres, to be precise.

I might say to my good friend from Vermont that we would not be arguing over this matter now if this particular acreage were in the hands of the Department of the Interior. This is nothing more or less than a good, old-fashioned, Washington, D.C., bureaucratic hassle. We are dealing with assets of the United States. This timber in the purchase unit is for logging. We are suggesting that that purpose continue by permitting an exchange. We are trying to create a national park. It seems to me it is just a matter of equity to make provisions along the lines we have provided for in the bill.

I wish to emphasize that if these lands were being administered by the Department of Interior there would not be a word said against it. It seems to me that Congress has some policymaking abil-

ity to see to it that assets of the Federal Government are properly managed and properly administered.

I wish to emphasize that point. This is nothing more than a fight between the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. AIKEN. That began in 1908.

Mr. JACKSON. It has been going on for a long time. I think the Congress needs to step in, where it is in the public interest, to protect the assets of the United States. We should not allow the two departments to try to make this decision.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if I may proceed, I think that perhaps my colleagues, if they are correct, should undertake to inform the American Forestry Association because I had a letter from them several days ago which stated as follows:

MY DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: We are concerned about a provision in the Redwood National Park bill, S. 2515, to use national forest land in the Redwood Purchase Unit as payment in kind for private lands desired for park purposes.

This Federal land was acquired by the Forest Service under the Weeks Act of March 1, 1911 for the practice of multiple use, sustained yield forestry. It is being managed efficiently for this purpose. Trading this land for other land to be used as a park will defeat the purpose for which national forests are established.

The annual harvests of timber from the Redwood Purchase Unit supports ten small lumber companies and their employees. One-quarter of the receipts from timber sales, a substantial sum, goes to Del Norte County in lieu of taxes. This 25 percent fund exceeds the amount of taxes received from comparable land in private ownership.

Therefore, it is clear that giving four large landowners this Forest Service land will not benefit the local economy. It merely aids four large companies at the expense of ten small companies.

Neither will such an exchange improve the tax base of Del Norte County.

Of even greater concern is the precedent to be established by such action. It will open the flood gates to demands by all sorts of special interests and land grabbers. Some of these already have appeared.

Consequently, we urge you to delete all references to the Redwood Purchase Unit from S. 2515 and to preserve this tract for the purposes for which it was acquired.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH B. POMEROY,  
Chief Forester.

Let me also quote from the individual views made by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] in the committee report:

I am in full accord with the establishment of the Redwood National Park. I am deeply concerned, however, with the committee amendment to authorize the conveyance of national forest land in the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit in exchange for lands to be acquired as a part of the park.

The federally owned property in the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit was made national forest land by the terms of the Weeks Act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961), under which it was acquired. It has always been and should continue to be treated just as all other national forest.

Mr. President, the reason I am concerned about the bill is that while the national forest is comparatively small in my State—about 250,000 acres—I have

seen the good in the community and in the State which has come from it.

I have seen steadily increasing values not only of forest land but of the land around it which has been developed, too, by reason of proximity to the national forest.

I have seen development of recreation in the national forest, particularly in the skiing industry which, last year, it was estimated to bring about \$75 million into my small State, to the owners and operators of the skiing areas—and probably much more to the people living around those areas.

I have seen the national forest develop as a refuge for wildlife—wild birds, mammals, and bears which have increased considerably. That might not be considered an asset in sheep country, but with us in Vermont, the black bear and other wildlife have been coming back and have found refuge in the national forest which runs up through the Green Mountains of my State.

I have seen developments in lumber operations. The income from standing timber sold has increased the income of the communities and of the State materially. The revenue derived from this income is being used to build roads and schools.

Thus, that is the reason I feel we would be shortsighted to trade off any part of the national forest, because just as sure as anything, if this gets by in one State, they will ask to do it in other States.

I have no doubt that today, if a promoter could get a part of the national forest which originally was purchased for a few dollars an acre, he could become rather wealthy as a result of such a deal.

Perhaps I should apologize to the Senator from California because I have not visited the Redwoods Park area in California, but I know what the national forest has done in my own State, and in the East generally. I do not want to start trading it off for other items regardless of how valuable they might be.

Of course, it is going to cost money to buy this park outright. The dollar, however, is not going to be very big in the future. Today we talk about how many pesos there are to the dollar—I believe it is 12—and until recently there were 2,700 cruzeiros to the dollar. But if inflation keeps increasing as it is increasing now, it will not be very long before we will be asking about how many dollars there are to the dollar.

Thus, this land will be a good buy, I would say, regardless of the fact that it would cost money now.

I want to add, once more, that the national forest has been extremely helpful in developing other communities, as well as those in my State, and for that reason I just do not want to make the initial start of trading off any parts of it.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. KUCHEL. Senator, I am going to urge the Senator, who is a great conservationist and a great Senator, not to say that this 14,000-acre parcel is part of a national forest, because it is not.

I wish the Senator could see the fine redwoods in northern California. I have seen them. I want those trees, which

stretch into the sky almost 400 feet, some of them centuries old, some of them thousands of years old, to be preserved.

And the path to the presentation of the bill has been a tortuous one.

There are people who want a park but disagree on where it should be.

There are people who want a park but do not want it to be too big.

There are people who want a park but say this one is not as large as it should be.

There have been all kinds of obstacles, wittingly or unwittingly placed in the path of this park legislation; but, here it is. Here it is, and it is justified.

I know that my friend from Vermont favors the acquisition or the setting aside of recreation areas for the American people in the future. I feel that he looks with favor on that concept, but I urge him not to vote for the amendment on the ground that we are talking of national forest land, for I tell him that that is not the fact.

I believe that the Senator from Vermont just read a letter from Mr. Kenneth Pomeroy.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. I received it about 10 minutes ago.

Mr. KUCHEL. Let me read what Mr. Pomeroy had to say in an article entitled "Redwoods and Parks," published in *American Forests* for May 1965:

With less than 10 percent of the reduced area in federal ownership, and with further substantial additions unlikely, the forest supervisor in charge of the unit recommended on November 1, 1963, that the gross area of the unit be decreased to the 32,409 acres north of the Klamath River, and that the area be known as the Redwood National Forest. This step would leave 931 acres in scattered tracts south of the Klamath River, which could be used as trading stock. The proposal was approved by the supervisors of Del Norte and Humboldt counties and by the Simpson Timber Company (the largest private owner in the unit) but has not been acted upon by the Forest Service.

Nor has it been since. The Department of Agriculture has consistently and recently rejected the proposal to include this small and isolated tract in an established national forest. So I think we should not refer to this unit as part of a national forest, and I believe the public interest is best served by taking this 14,567-acre parcel, which has been used by private companies, under contract, for logging operations, and use that parcel to make possible the acquisition of magnificent trees for a park.

That is the best I can do, Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I appreciate the views of the Senator from California. He always does what he thinks is best for his home State. I hope the people of California appreciate this and will soundly express their appreciation in November 1968. But there seems to be a difference of opinion, and being from a national forest area, I am still inclined to follow their policies.

I have in my hand another letter, just handed me, from the Secretary of Agriculture, in which he expresses his opposition to trading off these 15,000 acres for part of the cost of the redwood preserve. He said, "It would open the flood-gates." Right now I do not want to open

the floodgates to trading off any national forest lands.

I ask unanimous consent to have that letter to me from the Secretary printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

OCTOBER 20, 1967.

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN,  
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: You will shortly be considering S. 2515, a new bill to establish a Redwood National Park. The Department of Agriculture actively supports the establishment of such a Park.

However, this Department vigorously and strongly objects to the feature of S. 2515 which would use National Forest land as trading stock to obtain land for the Park. This commandeering of the National Forest land in the Redwood Purchase Unit is not necessary in order for the Nation to have a Redwood Park.

Using National Forest land for trading stock in this important case endangers land administered by the Forest Service all over the country. It threatens the integrity of the National Forests, a principle of long-standing.

It would open the floodgates. Right now, and repeatedly in the past, there have been made demands in other parts of the country that National Forest lands be used to pay for parks, or for reservoirs, or for highway rights-of-way. Any and every instance of such a taking of National Forest land makes the later pressures that much harder to resist.

This is why past actions of Congress have resoundingly rejected use of National Forest land for this kind of trade-off.

There are other reasons for not appropriating these National Forest lands to pay for the Park:

1. Savings derived from trading off the National Forest land would be a small part of the total cost of the proposed Park. On an acre-for-acre basis, the value of the National Forest land in the Purchase Unit, estimated at \$25 million, falls far short of the value of the old-growth groves proposed for inclusion in the Park. This is a very small sum to endanger a very basic principle of conservation.

2. The four main companies involved do not need the limited acreage of land that could be made available to them in order to continue operating for a significant number of years. The company that would experience the greatest impact could continue at its present rate of operation for 15 years or longer.

3. A move to make these companies partially whole would be at the cost of withdrawing supplies now used by smaller operators who buy the stumpage that would be transferred to the four larger, stronger companies. In recent years, 10 operators in the area have used the timber that this action would turn over to only four large companies. Thus, a trade-off of land would not create any new jobs. It would favor four large companies at the expense of 10 smaller ones.

A Redwood National Park is in the national interest. The USDA supports strongly that objective. But a raid on the National Forests and the establishment of a dangerous precedent in violation of longstanding, sound conservation principles is neither necessary nor wise.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,  
Secretary.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have just had handed to me a telegram from another organization, which earnestly advocates increasing the size of the area.

In fact, I will go so far as to say that we have people in this country who would

like to see it kept just as Columbus and Leif Ericson and Governor Bradford saw it for the first time, excepting, of course, for the property they own and live on.

I am reminded of something someone, whom my friend from California knew very well, said he did not want to own all the land in his State; he just wanted the land that adjoined his.

We have those in this country who are so esthetically inclined that they would not cut a tree anywhere, and we have those who are so monetarily inclined that they want to cut everything that would make a 2-by-4 stud. Between them we have to choose.

I am sure the Senator understands that, as Members of Congress, we first of all have to represent the areas from which we come, as well as the National Government. I believe I am representing the thoughts of many people in the East, and particularly in my part of the country, when I say we should not start trading off national forest areas. I do not see why we could not pay cash. I mean pay it over a period of time. The dollar is getting smaller every year. This property is not going to depreciate in value. In fact, barring a worldwide catastrophe, I cannot think of any real estate in the United States that is going to depreciate in value. It is going to increase in value. It has been increasing tremendously in the last 2 or 3 years. It seems to me there is not much time to lose in acquiring for the public what we will really need for public recreation and the public welfare.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I could not agree more wholeheartedly with the Senator from Vermont. I serve on the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission. That is a commission, as Senators know, which buys land for conservation purposes from the Duck Stamp program. About half the duties we have are to upgrade our parcels and estimations, because land values continually increase.

I would like to have everybody concerned about my position on this bill go back and look into the debate on the Ellsworth bill.

I will say to my friend from Vermont that I do not believe we should buy railroad rights-of-way and highway rights-of-way and Bureau of Reclamation dams and Corps of Engineers dams by giving away the national forests of this country. No one has been more vehement in opposition to such a proposal than I. This is a proposal to exchange a rather isolated forest for a forest within the boundaries of a proposed national park. This is no different from what we do every day in authorizing the Forest Service to exchange national forest land for Northern Pacific land to have some boundaries taken care of.

Right now my colleague [Mr. MANSFIELD] and I are trying to organize some sort of land exchange so we can have some Northern Pacific land incorporated into a primitive or wilderness area in Montana by an exchange of national forest land.

As I have said many times, we cannot exchange stumps for trees as far as the Federal Government is concerned. This time we are exchanging trees. We are exchanging a stump area, a log-dump area, and we are getting trees back in a na-

tional park. As long as this Congress and this administration read into the bill each time the land exchange, then, as far as I am concerned, there is no danger that the fears of the Senator from Vermont will be realized, and that we will try to buy our highways and our Corps of Engineers' projects by trading off some of our natural resources.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am afraid I cannot agree that this bill provides an exchange of national forest land. It seems to me this is a sale of national forest land for dollars. The proposal is to use the dollars to buy other land for the redwood park.

Mr. President, when we make our appropriations, we make them for three purposes. The first is for the necessary expenses of Government, and we cannot avoid that. The next is as an investment for the acquisition of property, which will increase in value. The third purpose for which we appropriate funds in Congress is the "rathole." There has been an exaggerated emphasis on the "rathole" in the last few years, but I look upon the purchase of national forest land as an investment, because I have seen such land return very fine dividends on the initial cost.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Public Works Committee, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] could not be present in the Chamber today. He has asked that I submit his statement so that his views supporting S. 2515 will be on record.

I appreciate his support. Particularly do I believe significant his endorsement of the committee's desire that no road or bridge be built in the scenic corridor of Redwood Creek. Our desire is that this portion of the park can be enjoyed in the quiet and solitude of the undisturbed primitive forest.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator RANDOLPH's statement appear at this point in the RECORD.

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

REDWOOD CREEK CORRIDOR—STATEMENT BY  
SENATOR RANDOLPH

Mr. President, I commend the able senior Senator from California and his distinguished colleagues for their exhaustive study of this complex and controversial problem of preservation of the magnificent coast redwoods. Committee Report No. 641 stands as an example of their wisdom and diligence. I am of course impressed with the grandeur and magnificence of these incomparable trees; I am in complete agreement with my distinguished colleagues on the desirability of incorporating a vestige of this magnificence in our National Park system.

As Chairman of the Public Works Committee I have a particular interest in the road aspects of this legislation and the commentary on roads in the Committee Report. As outlined in the report: "The Acquisition of the lower Redwood Creek drainage and a scenic corridor down the creek will allow outdoorsmen to enjoy hiking or floating along more than 8 miles of the length of Redwood Creek."

The Committee Report goes on to say that "in authorizing the acquisition of a corridor southward along Redwood Creek to the tall trees unit and beyond, the committee intends to preserve the scenic and natural values now found along the miles of creek bank lined with virgin redwoods. The committee wishes to make clear its intention that no

improved all-weather road should be built in the corridor and that no all-weather or permanent bridge spanning Redwood Creek should be built any farther than 2 miles from the confluence of Redwood Creek and Prairie Creek. The purpose of the committee including the lower Redwood Creek watershed and the Redwood Creek corridor would be frustrated by overdevelopment and intensive use."

I commend my distinguished colleagues on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for their good judgment in determining that this corridor, which I understand is very precipitous, should remain unmarred by road and bridge construction and by the sights and sounds of motorized traffic. I assume the Committee intends that this corridor is to be enjoyed by those hikers and boaters who venture through by trail and by water trips on Redwood Creek.

The idea of providing a trail is certainly desirable, even though it may only be used by a small number of people. Certainly the idea of prohibiting roads is desirable as a means of providing opportunity for those to use the trail and creek to get away from mechanical means of transportation. To these ends I concur in the judgment of my distinguished colleagues.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I support the amendment of the senior Senator from New Mexico to prevent a trade in national forest lands as part of the establishment of Redwood National Park. Due to the vision and foresight of the early pioneers in conservation in every State, this Nation has a headstart on dealing with the problems of preserving and promoting our national resources in the face of a burgeoning population.

I am proud that North Carolina is among the leaders in planning and research in conservation. I am proud also that she has contributed her share of those dedicated men who believe that every generation holds the land and resources in trust for the future. Early in this century, some wise men saw the threats to our economy and to our society of uncontrolled erosion, fires, destruction of wildlife, and poor land use. They foresaw the effect of vanishing forests on an increasingly urban society. And they sought to ward off the day when man would be unable to return to the beauties and comforts of nature for his recreation; when he would be unable to till his land because the topsoil was lost; when he no longer had pure water to drink.

The national forest system, in cooperation with the State systems, has played a substantial role in dispelling this grim threat to our national well-being. In North Carolina alone the national forest lands, including purchase units and experimental land, amount to 1,124,470 acres.

These lands, managed under multiple-purpose plans help provide watershed protection, recreation, and wildlife. In jobs and products yield they contribute to the economies of the States and counties in which they are located. In their natural beauty they promote the spiritual well-being of the residents of those areas and of those who drive many miles to partake of their beauty.

North Carolina has been bountifully blessed, I believe, above all States in this respect. The Charokee, Croatan, Nantahala, Pisgah, and the Uwharrie National Forests, and the Nanatahala and

Yadkin purchase units are breathtaking testimony to this truth.

As our cities expand, as our rural areas become congested, as our Nation grows, these forest lands are America's investment in the future. I see no compelling reason at this point in our history to start trading them off. Once the process is started, the movement will be difficult to control. The estimated saving on this one project will not be worth the cost to all our people.

In the primeval acreage of the Nantahala National Forest stands a memorial to the poet, Joyce Kilmer, who understood so well what all of us today should remember. Men may pass all sorts of laws, but "only God can make a tree."

I believe Congress should not grant authority to trade redwood lands under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Forest Service for private lands; therefore, I support the Anderson amendment.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I rise to congratulate the great service that has been performed by Senators KUCHEL and JACKSON in bringing before the full Senate a bill to create a Redwoods National Park. I know of no conservation matter which is of greater importance than the proper preservation of the magnificent redwoods in our country.

During the consideration of this bill by the full Interior Committee, I expressed certain reservation to my fellow committee members regarding the total cost of the legislation which is now before us. I made the point in committee which met with immediate approval of fellow committee members, that it would be extremely unwise for us to place an unrealistic estimate of costs in the present bill. To be unrealistic now with the authorization for appropriation section would only subject us to possible embarrassment and difficulty in the future.

I have been assured by members of the committee and their staff, who are much more knowledgeable on this question than I am, that the authorization-for-appropriation section in the present bill is a realistic figure and that if redwood legislation can be speedily passed by both Houses the total costs for land acquisition will not exceed the amount as stated in the bill.

On the other hand, since the Interior Committee reported the bill, interested persons have presented a somewhat different point of view than was taken by the Interior Committee in its final markup session. Mr. Robert Dehlendorf, the president of Arcata National Corp., has spoken to myself and my staff several times concerning the evaluation of the redwood properties encompassed by S. 2515. Mr. Dehlendorf has indicated that cursory evaluations of his company's property show that their value exceeds the amounts authorized by the Interior Committee.

Without presuming to make my judgment on these conflicting points of view and reiterating that I have no personal experience in the question of valuation which is before us, I simply ask that an outline provided by the Arcata National Corp. which states their interpretation of the cost implications of S. 2515 be printed in the RECORD at this point. My purpose in submitting this information

is only to show that there is not unanimity regarding the values in this case.

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

COST IMPLICATIONS OF S. 2515, REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK BILL  
I. TIMBER AND LAND ACQUISITION COSTS ARE HIGHER THAN SENATE COMMITTEE ESTIMATES  
[In millions]

	Amount
(a) Senate Interior Committee estimates (sec. 6 of S. 2515)	\$100
(b) Actual costs (based on actual timber inventories and actual current timber market values of 4 companies)	160
(c) Actual costs, plus additional costs resulting from cessation of operations by Arcata Redwood Co. (includes timber, land, and physical facilities of company)	206
If the purchase unit exchange of Forest Service lands is stricken from the Senate bill, this will force an additional company, Relim Redwood Co., to cease operations:	
(d) The total cost of S. 2515 would then increase to	269

II. IMPACT OF S. 2515

	Total acreage	Old growth acreage included in total
(a) S. 2515 will add:		
From redwood industry	27,679	12,620
From other private holdings	5,310	285
Total	32,989	12,905
(b) To presently preserved lands:		
State redwood parks	107,458	59,000
Other Federal and State coast redwood forest lands	136,000	(1)
Total	243,458	59,000

<sup>1</sup> Not available.  
<sup>2</sup> Minimum.

Mr. HANSEN. In dealing with costs of such magnitude it would appear to me to be advisable to set an authorization ceiling at the latest possible time before the President affixes his signature. I am aware that the Senate Interior Committee has wrestled with the extremely difficult problem of escalating land values for many years. It would be more realistic to leave the authorization open ended. The Government's experience would confirm the soundness of such a position.

With these reservations, I warmly support S. 2515 and congratulate once again the splendid work that has been done by its principal proponents.

Mr. JACKSON. 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. JACKSON. 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. FANNIN. Mr. President, before stating my views in respect to the pending bill, S. 2215, I first wish to pay tribute to the committee chairman and the ranking minority member. As a member of the committee I appreciate fully the leadership they have again shown in steering this extremely complex and controversial conservation legislation through the legislative process. I share

the pride of my colleagues and of all Americans in our unique and magnificent national park system. I, too, believe a redwood park will be a very appropriate and outstanding addition to the system. It is fitting that the American people have this park; they have strongly expressed their desire for it. In this instance, we are confronted with the problem of how to create a worthwhile redwood national park while at the same time doing everything possible to minimize problems for the local citizens. We have a corollary problem of avoiding waste of the taxpayers' dollars, especially so in these troubled times.

The central questions before us are how large a park is needed and what specific lands must be included to adequately represent the redwoods in the national park system? The administration feels that a 41,000-acre park would be adequate. The committee is suggesting 66,000 acres. Either size would be adequate.

But size is not so vexing a problem as is the question over which specific lands shall fall within the park. The committee report says:

The Committee believes that no company which has a genuine interest in staying in the redwood timber business will be obliged to cease operations as a result of the enactment of S. 2515.

Yet, I have before me a copy of a letter from Mr. Robert O. Dehlendorf, II, president of Arcata National Corp., which very clearly states that the Arcata Redwood Co. division of his firm will be forced out of business, throwing several hundred men out of work. Let me just paraphrase the highlights of that letter.

First, he states that the mill facilities of the company would be physically isolated by park boundaries from all timber lands remaining in its ownership.

He also says that even if it had access to remaining timberlands, Arcata would be forced to employ very costly uphill logging techniques—three to four times more costly than at present. Economical downhill logging would be prohibited by park boundaries established under S. 2515.

Third, even if it had access to its remaining timberlands, the sharp reduction in acreage owned by the company would force it to operate its facilities at only 25 percent of capacity.

Fourth, under S. 2515, Arcata would lose all of the cutover and second growth timber lands it requires to support continuous, long-term operations under sound forest management practices.

Finally, he says that an alternative to continuing operations at 25 percent of capacity would be to operate the Arcata facilities at 100 percent of capacity for only 10 years, and then to cease operations. If this course of action were pursued, the impact on Arcata's operations would also be severe: Arcata's skilled employees would seek other employment knowing that the company's "life" is limited, and Arcata's wholesale distributors would turn to competitors who could assure them of continuous, long-term supply of lumber products.

We should all realize that the landowners will be paid for their property. But the wage earners dependent on this

industry that will be cast adrift receive no compensation. Many have questioned if adequate consideration has been given to eliminating the 13,000-acre block in the Lost Man Creek and Redwood Creek areas. I have been assured that this would permit the Arcata Co. to continue in business. This action, they say, would reduce the cost of the park from the more than \$200 million estimated by the companies to around \$70 million. This cost could be halved by exchanging the northern redwood purchase unit lands for private lands taken into the park. The result would be a 50,000 acre park, which is 10,000 acres more than the administration said was adequate, but at a cost of only about a quarter of the authorization in S. 2515. Further, the very vexing questions—and potential high costs—of in lieu taxes and economic assistance for local people and communities would be avoided, for as I understand no companies would be forced out of business and the impact of local tax losses reduced. In short, we would be creating an outstanding redwood national park at a reasonable cost without adding further woes to an area already classed as depressed.

Now the question may properly arise: Would not this change take out the so-called tall trees area on Redwood Creek, which many people have favored including in a Redwood National Park? Reports indicate that the location of the world's tallest trees at this moment has not been definitely ascertained. Just last week in Eureka, Calif., Dr. Randolph Becking announced that a tree 18 feet taller than the currently accepted record holder lies outside the park boundaries proposed in S. 2515. In the interest of resolving this unsettled matter of the location of the world's tallest trees, I respectfully suggest that a survey should be undertaken by the Secretary of Interior to determine the location and height of a number of coast redwood trees which might, in fact, be the tallest. This study should be undertaken before we spend many millions of dollars for this particular piece of proposed national park.

I intend to vote for S. 2515. I do so because I think passage of this bill will do much to bring the Congress closer to agreement on authorization of the Redwood National Park. I trust, however, that Senator MURPHY's reservations and my reservations to S. 2515 will be considered by the House Interior Committee when it takes up the redwoods bill next session.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. JACKSON. 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. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] without losing my right to the floor.

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

#### THE SECRETARY OF STATE SHOULD APPEAR BEFORE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, today, Secretary of State Rusk appeared before the student body of Indiana University. Last night, he appeared in Columbus, Ind. In both instances he appeared to discuss the question of Vietnam.

On October 10, on the floor of the Senate, I raised the question as to why the Secretary of State has not met in public with members of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I said at that time that if he has been invited and does not wish to appear, the time for committee insistence is long overdue.

The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations appeared on the floor of the Senate at that time and gave a record of the requests for the appearance of the Secretary of State, and at no time during 1967 has the Secretary of State agreed or been willing to appear before the duly elected Members of the Senate and their representatives on the Foreign Relations Committee to discuss the vital issue of Vietnam.

On October 24, I repeated the entire question concerning the appearance of the Secretary of State, in view of the fact that on October 10 he had given a press conference in which he made a statement to the effect that he did not intend to appear before the klieg lights and answer questions to the Foreign Relations Committee. But the Secretary of State finds it appropriate to choose his own forum, to set up his own props, to turn on his own klieg lights, and to make any statements he wishes, without the opportunity of any Member of the Senate to question him, under our duly elective processes.

I believe that every American is interested in such an appearance. I believe that any parent or a prospective parent whose child will reach the age of 18 within the next 20 years, which is now the stated time it is anticipated that this war will last, will have a vital interest in what the Secretary of State has to say.

We use the USIA to make statements to the world that we are a democratic society. We complain about the fact that President Thieu and his Vice President, Air Force General Ky, will not confront the press and will not appear before the American press. Yet, we see the situation in America in which a member of the President's Cabinet, who is not an elected official, refuses to appear before the elected officials of his own country and refuses to appear before the body, the U.S. Senate, which under the Constitution has the responsibility of advising and consenting on the question of foreign affairs. Although in other democratic societies the Prime Minister is held to account in public session before the elected members of the parliament, this process has been ignored in this country.

I believe that the Committee on Foreign Relations should insist now that the Secretary of State should appear before them and answer in public session the questions which are on the minds of the American people and on the minds of the members of the committee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am glad that the Senator from Indiana has made this statement. I should like to have his attention for a moment. I completely agree with him.

I have already expressed myself to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as a member of that committee, along the same lines as stated by the Senator from Indiana.

I say to the American people that if the Secretary of State is allowed by the President of the United States to get by with this flouting of a legislative committee of Congress, we have taken another long stride down the road in this country toward government by executive supremacy. This is a challenge, in my judgment, to our constitutional system of three coordinate and coequal branches of government, with each branch having a check on the other two.

I speak most respectfully, but I say that in my judgment the President of the United States owes it to the American people to make clear to his Secretary of State that when a legislative committee requests that the Secretary come before that committee to report and to answer questions, he either should come or should send in his resignation.

In my judgment, it is not safe, in this Republic, to permit any member of the Cabinet to take the position that he can thwart and flout and defy a legislative committee of Congress. After all, we sit here as the checkers, so to speak, in behalf of the people, exercising the check-and-balance system against the executive branch of the Government.

The Secretary of State knows very well that when he appears before the Committee on Foreign Relations and any question is put to him that in his judgment should be answered in executive session because the question—unknown to the questioner, or known to the questioner—may involve the security of the Republic, all he need to do is say, "I want to say to the committee I'll be very glad to answer that question in executive session, because it involves certain matters that I think involve the security of the Republic, and therefore we should not make that information available to potential enemies." This has been done time and time again throughout the history of the Republic.

In my discussion of this matter before the Committee on Foreign Relations, I asked that a memorandum be prepared by the staff—and it will be prepared—to go back to World War II. In the midst of that war, the Secretary of State appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations time and time again to report, through the committee, to the people of this country in regard to the questions that the members of the committee submitted to the Secretary of State.

So far as I am concerned, this is a challenge to representative government that has been laid down by the Secretary of State. He happens to be an officer of the President of the United States, and therefore the American people are entitled to find out from the President whether he will stand by and permit a member of the Cabinet to flaunt what I consider to be the very basis of our sys-

tem of representative government. Representative government does not mean government by executive supremacy. It does not mean that the Government be at the whim of the Secretary of State. The American people need to see to it that these checks are maintained in their own national interest.

If any Senator in a public hearing with the Secretary of State in any way violates his prerogatives, there will be other members of the committee to proceed at once to protect the public interest.

But the issue is simple as far as the senior Senator from Oregon is concerned: whether or not we have reached the point in this country where the representative of the executive branch of Government can, in effect, tell the Congress of the United States or a legislative committee of the Congress of the United States that there is a hot place to which it can go, although he does not engage in those semantics. There is no question about what we are being told by the Secretary of State.

In my judgment he should be either required by the President to come before the legislative committee in a public hearing to respond to the questions that the committee puts to him, or we should have a new Secretary of State. I believe we should have had a new Secretary of State a long time ago. If that had been the case, in my opinion we would not be involved in the way in which we are already involved.

All this Secretary of State is doing, in effect, is continuing the policies of a John Foster Dulles. Do not forget he was one of the associates of John Foster Dulles. History will record that what John Foster Dulles was seeking to do was to put us in a permanent military posture in Asia. That is where this mass retaliation policy came from. That Secretary of State wanted to involve us in the Indochina war.

With respect to all of this talk and State Department propaganda about containing China, we cannot contain China in the sense that the Secretary of State is talking about, because if you are going to contain China, according to the Rusk theory, you are going to contain her militarily.

I want to warn the American people before it is too late that we cannot police Asia or set ourselves up as the military policeman of Asia, for we will isolate the rest of the world against us. The rest of the world knows what it will lead to eventually: war with China. If she moves against us in Asia we will have to have the manpower to meet her in Asia, and you will not do it with nuclear bombing because that will not only endanger a nuclear war but also nuclear bombing in Asia will endanger hundreds of thousands and hundreds of thousands of Americans in the United States.

That is why I have pointed out on this floor that we had better talk to the physicists and nuclear scientists. If you drop a hydrogen bomb today on Peking, it is only a matter of not so many hours before that fallout hits the west coast, and some say it could go all the way to the Middle East, beyond Chicago, with

the devastating loss of lives. That is my answer to the hydrogen bomb boys.

With respect to these super-hawks, who think what we should do, irrespective of the morality or immorality, is to bomb China, what are we thinking of? What has happened to us that we have developed this lack of responsibility?

I would think that, when these hawks walk into their churches on Sundays, their church pews would melt under them because of the course of action they are advocating with regard to the immoral course of action they urge us to follow in respect to the crisis in Vietnam.

I wish to thank the Senator from Indiana for laying it on the line again and making perfectly clear that we have to stand up and be counted in support of a continuation of our system of representative government. You do not have this system of representative government if you permit any Cabinet officer—and he is the only one that I know of—to take this position and to say to the Senate, "I will not appear in public hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations." He is willing to appear before press conferences. Of course, he is not subject there to the questioning of Senators. He is willing to appear where he thinks he can run the show.

He has always been dealt with courteously, and he should be dealt with courteously and with propriety before the Committee on Foreign Relations. I hope my President will make clear to the Secretary of State without further delay that, when the Committee on Foreign Relations asks him to come before it and testify in public, that is where he will be.

I thank the Senator from Indiana.  
Mr. HARTKE. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his eloquent statement.

The whole question here presented by the Secretary of State is a question of oversimplification on his part. He wants to oversimplify everything in the record. He has said that it is a matter of detail.

I think it is obvious from Secretary Rusk's record of the past, and his recent statements that he is afflicted with a kind of Sinophobia. It is obvious that he is structuring and shaping our policy with all its massive consequences in terms of his Sinophobia.

I grant that China is a problem for the United States, but it will take the best and most careful analysis and policy planning; not the easy psychological warfare that he is trying to hand out when he has his own klieg lights, and yet refuses to appear before the committee of which the Senator from Oregon is a member.

I ask that the Senator from Oregon transmit to the committee of which he is a member, and to the chairman, the urgency that the constitutional requirements of the Secretary of State, as the representative of the President, to appear before the Committee on Foreign Relations should be insisted upon forthwith.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator.  
Mr. HARTKE. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I am sure the Committee on Foreign Relations is already aware of the point of view that the Senator from Indiana has expressed.

## REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2515) to authorize the establishment of the Redwood National Park in the State of California and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to discuss now the pending bill before the Senate, the Redwood National Park bill. I wish to express, as a Senator from the Pacific Northwest, my very deep appreciation and thanks to the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] for the introduction of this bill. I wish to say to both of them that I think it will become one of the legislative monuments, for your record in the Senate will remain known in American history for a long time to come because this is a sound conservation program in the best sense of the word conservation.

I rise only to associate myself with your objectives, and this is not the first time we have all stood together on sound conservation programs. I think what you are doing here will be remembered by future generations of American boys and girls as they are allowed to enjoy the great cathedral which you propose by this legislation to set up.

Therefore, I say, Mr. President, that I think this is long-overdue legislation which proposes to create a cathedral to the Lord out of one of His most magnificent wonders.

I regret that some segments of the timber industry oppose this vital bill. Coming from the State which leads America in the production of forest products, political discretion should dictate that I oppose this bill. I would not be true to my trust if I did not support this legislation. It has my full support with one exception—the exchange provision—which I shall discuss shortly.

I shall not detain the Senate long, but because of the importance of the forest products industry and forestry in Oregon, certain compelling facts of life need to be stated.

Since I have been in the Senate I have championed increased expenditures for access roads, stepped up reforestation and timber stand improvement, tree genetic research, forest insect and disease control actions, forest fire control, research and practical applications of aerial and helicopter logging, plus efforts to expand forest products research as an aid to increased forest utilization.

The forest has great commercial utility and we have an obligation to go into the forest on a sane and scientific basis to extract its crop of wood. I am proud of my constant support for sound commercial use of the forest resource.

But the forest has uses and values other than timber. Therefore, I have urged and supported activities to protect the clear water the forests nurture and yield, the wildlife and fish they produce, and the great recreation, wilderness and esthetic values our forests possess.

Foresters—and it is the Forest Service that has led, starting with Gifford Pinchot—foresters have devised two great concepts of conservation management—multiple use and sustained yield. Fifty years ago and even less, commercial

timber men opposed these concepts. Today, more and more timber companies embrace them.

Our great public forests—the national forests and the other public forests such as the Interior Department's O. & C. lands in Oregon, have long been under sustained yield and multiple use.

There are some, however, who have urged stepping up the public forest's allowable cuts beyond the sustained yield presently obtainable at current levels of knowledge.

I think it is time, however, that we in the Congress who have established under law in our national forests these proven policies of sustained yield and multiple use, recognize what we have really licensed. We have licensed a policy of perpetual yield but this does not mean, in my State of Oregon for example, replacing the giant 400-year-old Douglas-fir that is 6 or 8 feet in diameter and over 200 feet tall with a tree of like size. No indeed—we are replacing these trees with young, fast-growing forests that will be harvested when the tree is 70 to 90 years old and maybe 20 inches in diameter.

The significance of this fact is that we are going to preserve—and I use that word advisedly—we are going to preserve the forest primeval, nature's forest—God's forest—only through the concept of publicly supported multiple use in the public's national forests or in our national parks.

It simply cannot be expected that the commercial timber companies can apply the concept of sustained yield on an economic basis to grow and maintain a 400-year-old Douglas-fir or an 800-year or 1,000-year-old redwood.

It is being done in the national forests only under the concept of multiple use—by setting land aside in wilderness, in natural areas, in research plots, or in scenic strips where these great old trees are kept under careful supervision.

With the public forests committed to sustained yield under shorter harvest cycles, any careful examination of the commercial private forests that are also under sustained yield will show that they to are on this same shorter commercial harvest basis.

I have been deluged with pronouncements that the private redwood forests are managed on the sustained yield principle, and perhaps they are, but I want to make it clear that the senior Senator from Oregon who supports sustained yield for public and private commercial forests knows just what it is.

Redwoods extend from a small volume in Curry County, Oreg., along the Pacific coast to just south of San Francisco. In a century they have been logged so extensively that they are threatened with extinction not as a species but as natural examples in their ecological community of one of the Lord's great gifts to man—the giant redwood forest.

For my part, I do not want to see these magnificent redwood trees cut for patio furniture.

The giant redwoods we preserve now are the only ones that will be preserved. Even if the entire redwood industry goes on a sustained yield program, and it is not, it will not be growing these legend-

ary giants that our generation has inherited.

The case for this bill is overwhelming. We have so few tracts of primeval redwoods left. Its passage will in no real substantial way diminish the availability of prime timber-growing forest land which can be made to produce crop after crop of useful wood in 70- to 90-year cycles.

We do not have to gut the redwood forest, to bespoil the redwood forest land in California, in order to assure an adequate lumber supply for the future.

In my judgment, the committee has produced a bill with a reasonable acreage of prime old growth redwoods in a setting that will assure that both their esthetic and scientific values will be preserved for every generation that will follow. The committee has made a reasonable compromise of the commercial interest, the profit motive, and the public interest.

## ONE AMENDMENT NEEDED

I support the amendment of the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], which would strike out on lines 19 through 21 on page 3 the words: "or any federally owned property he may designate within the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit in Del Norte County, California."

For my part, I would prefer that the bill had no timberland exchange opportunities whatsoever in it. Exchanges of public timberland now under sustained yield management on lands under the Secretary of the Interior's jurisdiction are not planned if policy enunciations made earlier by the present Secretary of the Interior remain.

Let me digress here to say—which I shall point out in greater detail later—that we have had every reason to believe that the Bureau of the Budget was against land exchanges, and we have every reason to believe that the Secretary of the Interior has been on record against land exchanges in this area. I assume that the Bureau of the Budget and the Secretary of State do not speak without administration approval. In considering this bill, I do not think that we should make the mistake of underwriting land exchanges. It has been one of the most difficult, one of the hardest, and one of the toughest issues which has confronted us for years in the Senate in regard to the conservation of our natural resources.

I have been criticized in my State, from time to time, because I have stood adamantly against land exchanges, at least the kind of land exchanges which have been proposed to date. I am very wary, let me say, of the land exchange provision to which I have just referred on page 3 of the bill, and I hope that when the Anderson amendment comes before the Senate to strike the land exchange provision from the bill, it will receive a substantial majority vote in the Senate.

But if we do not adopt the Anderson amendment then the Secretary of the Interior, by inference, will have had weakened his policy of nonexchange in the sustained yield managed BLM forest lands in California and elsewhere. In California, according to "Public Land Statistics," the Bureau of Land Management has 465,000 acres of commercial

forest land with a standing volume of 6.6 billion board feet of timber and an annual producing capacity of 66 million board feet of timber.

Mr. President, in my research in the preparation of this speech, I have prepared a table that sets forth the public domain forest land in California in comparison with the public domain forest land in other States.

The major States are: Alaska, California, Colorado, Idaho, Minnesota, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon-eastern, Utah, Washington, Wyoming, Oregon-western. The Oregon-western includes O. & C. land, Coos Bay, wagon-road lands, and public domain lands. The source of my material is public lands, USDI, BLM statistics.

The tables estimate the area of production capacity of forest woodland administered by the Bureau of Land Management.

I ask unanimous consent to have this table printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). Is there objection?

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

State	Acres	Standing volume (thousand board feet)	Annual producing capacity (thousand board feet)
Alaska	40,000,000	180,000,000	1,500,000
California	465,104	6,620,940	66,000
Colorado	603,530	2,097,000	14,850
Idaho	301,883	2,349,385	40,966
Minnesota	30,523	61,064	1,221
Montana	648,000	1,159,000	23,900
Nevada	50,000	250,000	2,500
New Mexico	76,748	218,732	2,302
Oregon (eastern)	153,140	623,371	10,363
Utah	634,500	1,900,000	6,000
Washington	103,930	687,000	6,600
Wyoming	429,990	1,125,000	22,700
Oregon (western)	2,176,538	54,953,770	1,127,000

<sup>1</sup> Includes O. & C. lands, Coos Bay Wagon Road lands, and public domain lands.

Source: Public land statistics, U.S.D.I., BLM, table 65, "Estimated Area and Producing Capacity of Forest and Woodlands Administered by Bureau of Land Management."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to point out, and I think my colleagues will find the statistics interesting, that although California has 465,102 acres of public domain in forest land, Alaska has 40 million forest acres.

Colorado 603,530.

Idaho 301,883.

Montana, 648,000 acres.

Oregon, eastern—just the eastern part of my State—has 153,140 forested acres. The western part of my State has 2,176,538 forest acres, both O. & C. and public domain.

I think 52 percent of my State is owned by the Federal Government, which gives the Senate, I hope, some conception of how important the handling of the public domain is to the welfare of the people of my State.

Utah has 632,500 forested public domain acres.

The State of Washington has 103,930 forested public domain acres.

Wyoming has 429,990 acres.

So let the record show that the statistics in relation to the public domain

forest lands are important not only to California, with its 465,102 acres, but to every other State. That is why I think we need to consider very carefully and review very carefully the provisions of this bill to see that we do not establish a precedent by authorizing a type of land exchange that, in my judgment, will prove to be a great detriment to the maintenance and future of a sustained yield program and a detriment to maintaining in the future a control over the forest lands of this country by the Government for the benefit of all the people, from coast to coast.

I say this most respectfully. I say it with respect to the timberlands in my State. The Federal timberlands in my State are now owned by the people of my State. We happen to have a special responsibility of trusteeship in relation to them, but those lands are owned by the people of this country, the people in Maine as well as the people in Oregon. That is true of California. That is true of the redwoods. In fact, may I say that if one accepts the basic premise of my whole record of my years here in the Senate vis-a-vis this matter of protecting our natural resources, I repeat it again today, each generation is but the trustee of God's gift of these natural resources to our country. We have no right to despoil them, and we have no right to take the attitude that we own them in fee simple title in the sense that we can do anything we want to do with them.

I believe we labor under a mandate of future generations for hundreds of years to come and that if we are to keep our obligation to that mandate or that trusteeship, then we will not follow a course of action that will permit the gutting of these redwoods, despoiling them by cutting them down for profit dollars.

I hope there are things more valuable than dollars. I happen to think that the redwoods are much, much more valuable to future generations than any profit that powerful lumber companies want to make now, as they have brought pressure to bear on the Senate either in opposition to the Jackson-Kuchel bill, or in a proposal to modify the Jackson-Kuchel bill so that irreparable damage will be done to the trusteeship concept for which I have argued so many years in the Senate.

As I understand the policies of the Department of the Interior under classification and multiple use legislation applicable to the public domain, enacted by the Congress in 1964, the Secretary may not proceed to dispose of public land unless it is classified; after a proper public hearing is held; due regard is given to valid public views, and positive findings are made.

If I am incorrect as to the policy set forth by Congress and the policy of the Secretary of the Interior, then, in my judgment, legislative history ought to be made now that the language in the first part of this sentence does not diminish the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior to retain in public ownership timberland under sustained yield management.

Mr. President, do not forget what would happen under a land exchange

program if you did not watch all the time. As we provide for a land exchange program, the land that is taken in by the private company is taken out of sustained yield. Do not forget, the public domain now is under sustained yield. Mr. President, you should be surprised by how many requests I get each year from lumber groups in my State trying to get me to go along either with a sale of public land or the exchange of private land for public land. Always, the land they want to exchange has been depleted. They want to get the timber land, for which, if the exchange were allowed, they would exchange a lot of cut-over land for a much smaller acreage of timber land. But what they are seeking is to get that timber land out from under sustained yield and make their profit killing now, mow it down, leave the hillside scarred, and increase our problems with respect to protection of our natural resources, create problems of erosion, and create problems of floods as a result of the removal of the trees so essential to holding back the water that is necessary in a river basin.

No, Mr. President, this is an old, old story. It involves exactly the same far-seeing purposes of Gifford Pinchot, who was really the founding father of the whole development of the type of conservation I am pleading for once again on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. That is why I think it is so important that the Anderson amendment be adopted in opposition to the land-exchange provision of the bill which I have been arguing against for the last few minutes.

So far as I am concerned, I would prefer that we make it clear by adding to the Bureau of Land Management provision language which clearly indicates that the exchange must be in the broad public interest. That has been our policy up to now. It is one of the criteria. I do not believe it was eliminated from the language of the bill by design. I know the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] too well. I am only pointing out that the language I shall suggest eventually by way of an amendment—not at the present moment, but I am serving notice now—should meet the broad public interest criterion which is written into the Anderson amendment.

Turning to the language on page 3, lines 19 through 21, and line 25 on page 3 through line 3 on page 4, I would like to remind Senators that a controversy arose in my State in 1965 over the very idea of the Bureau of Land Management's possibly entertaining an exchange on some sustained yield public domain timberland in Oregon to aid in the creation of the Point Reyes National Seashore in California.

I shall not discuss the side issues and charges that were disseminated in my State. Suffice it to say that the fact that the Secretary of the Interior and his subordinates were even exploring the possibility of considering a change authorized by the Point Reyes law was sufficient to create a controversy in Oregon.

The underlying issue was that those Oregon public domain lands were and

are under sustained-yield forest management. This policy has the support of the rank and file of the lumber industry, the men and women on every Main Street in Oregon, and the children in the schools of my State as they study conservation policy.

If these lands were traded at fair value in aid of creating a park, they would no longer be under sustained-yield management. The timber could be cut off and the land not restored to sustained-yield productivity. So no matter what the purpose, the people of my State want these public forest lands kept under sustained-yield management. The mills and communities that have grown to depend on these great public domain and O. & C. and national forest lands want the land well managed and the timber placed on the market for bidding under good forestry practices and under sound sustained yield principles. They have seen the private forests cut over and cut out. They know many private forest holdings sporting the Tree Farm sign are still under a liquidation cutting. They want the public forests to be a never-ending reservoir of wood flowing to the mills under sustained yield. Even more, they want the multiple benefits the sound conservation policies of the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management have produced.

The committee report has done its best to argue that these 14,567 national forest acres in California are different and do not amount to much, and thus trading them to these companies is of small moment.

In my judgment, the committee report does not make its case when compared with the positions of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Bureau of the Budget.

Turning specifically to the northern redwood purchase unit, these national forest lands are capable of producing 20 million board feet annually—forever. In the past few years, over 10 separate sales were made to local lumbermen, and more than 30 timber operators bid on this timber.

If this timber is bartered away under the provisions of subsection 3(b), valuable public timber resources—belonging to all Americans—will be granted to a privileged few. This proposal will not create new jobs. While the privileged operators keep their men at work, other local operators will lose their long accustomed opportunity to bid on this timber, and the jobs it now supports. The end result, allowable cut from the national forests will be down 20 million feet.

Also, Del Norte County will lose an important source of income, which has produced an annual average of \$150,000 to \$200,000 in recent years for local government use.

And what worries me most is that this "payment-in-kind" would be an open invitation to those who would carve up our national forests and other Federal forests piece by piece for the sake of commercial exploitation.

I want to make it clear that I favor the Redwood National Park. The demand for recreation lands is growing more and

more intense each year. New public recreation areas are going to be created to meet this demand. If we authorize exchange of the redwood purchase unit in aid of the redwood park, we expose all our public forests to grave danger as each new special Federal area is considered if it uses private land.

The trouble is, the demand for all the resources on the Federal force is increasing apace with recreation demand. The price we pay for a payment-in-kind is an inability to meet these increasing multiple-use demands. The national forests are multiple-use lands. Trading off the timberland of the northern redwood purchase unit is trading off watershed, wildlife habitat, and recreation land for a limited and special purpose—timber production.

In my judgment failure to adopt the Anderson amendment will provoke controversy that will attend every step of a proposed exchange. Demands will be made that the terms of appraisal be examined minutely. Protesting operators will show that they would provide just as many jobs, pay full value for the timber which would be cut under sustained yield; that the payments to the counties from this 14,567 acres of national forests will be beneficial.

First, on lines 19 through 21 the Secretary of Agriculture is deprived of any decision regarding the value or public interest aspect of exchanging these national forests land because the authority of the bill turns these lands over to the Secretary of the Interior for their disposal through exchange. The Secretary of the Interior may dispose of all or a part of these 14,567 acres and thus as soon as an exchange application is filed on the lands, all new timber sales must be stopped while the exchange is decided.

Even worse is the sentence starting on line 25 of page 3 through line 3, page 4 which reads:

Through the exercise of his (the Secretary of the Interior's) exchange authority, the Secretary shall, to the extent possible, minimize economic dislocation and the disruption of the grantor's commercial operation.

Mr. President, I think this language sets new and untested standards for an exchange. Heretofore, on national forest exchanges the Secretary of Agriculture has had to make a finding that the granting of the Government lands and acquiring of the private lands was in the public interest. There, the public comes in for protection. This language junks these concepts, and introduces a new and I think very poor standard, directing the Secretary to be guided by minimizing "economic dislocations and disruption of the grantor's commercial operation."

No mention is made of the economic dislocation and disruption that will occur to those firms, including small operators, now dependent on the national forest timber harvested from these 14,567 acres.

As my fellow Senators know, I have been greatly concerned about these small operators over the years. Little town after little town in my State is dependent for its economic sustenance upon a small lumbermill that employs its man-

power. Those small mills are constantly confronted with the problem of being outbid by the lumber giants.

So, some years ago, the Morse-Murray set-aside bill was passed by Congress. It has been used rather extensively in the State of Washington until recently.

Unfortunately, the regional officials of the Forest Service had not warmed up to it in the State of Oregon. Now there is great interest in it. In fact, the Forest Service, in recent weeks, has made clear that in one section of my State, they are going to set aside certain tracts, limited to the bidding of small mill operators.

Mr. President, this is all embedded in the general overall forest problem to which we ought to give some thought in the debate on this bill. I think it is very important that we keep in mind that in California, there are some small mill operators who are going to lose out, as far as their protection under a sustained yield program is concerned, if we provide for a land exchange with the different type of criteria that, in my judgment, is involved in the language that is used in this bill.

I think one of the great benefits of the Anderson amendment is that, not as one of its indirect results but as one of its direct results, it will give the small mill operators in that area of California a protection to which they are entitled.

Most alarming is the sentence starting on line 25 of page 3 through line 3, page 4 which reads:

Through the exercise of his (the Secretary of the Interior's) exchange authority, the Secretary shall, to the extent possible, minimize economic dislocation and the disruption of the grantor's commercial operation.

This language sets new and untested standards for an exchange. Heretofore on national forest exchanges the Secretary of Agriculture has had to make a finding that the granting of the Government lands and acquiring of the private lands was in the public interest. This language junks these concepts and introduces a new and very poor standard directing the Secretary to be guided by minimizing "economic dislocations and disruption of the grantors commercial operation."

No mention is made of the economic dislocation and disruption that will occur to those firms, including small operators, now dependent on the national forest timber harvested from these 14,567 acres.

This language puts a shotgun to the head of the Secretary of the Interior to make an exchange guided by the needs of the party acquiring the land. There is not one word about the public interest as a criterion.

If one examines the National Forest Exchange Act (16 U.S.C. 485) and the Bureau of Land Management exchange authority (43 U.S.C. 315g), he will see each starts out "When the public interest will be benefited."

This is too precious a provision to be set aside. The provisions in the bill in effect classify the national forest land for disposal. In the process they reach out and abrogate the policy governing other BLM forest lands managed by the Secretary of the Interior in California that may be sought for exchange under the

redwood bill by setting up these new criteria. The language is so inclusive that in any exchange involving either forested or nonforested BLM land or any part of the 14,567 Forest Service acres, the proponent of any exchange can argue that the Secretary must be guided by the concept of minimizing the grantor's economic dislocation and disruption of his commercial operation.

So this is not restricted language with a limited impact. It sets a new and a very poor standard upon which the Secretary of the Interior will be directed to preside over the liquidation of 14,567 acres of sustained-yield national forest which was purchased with taxpayers' money. Even more, it reaches out to affect the equally valuable public domain land that became subject to exchange under the redwood bill.

In my view this is a provision which will be used in more than this single case. Even if it were used only once, it is so disastrous in its dimensions that it ought to be rejected on those grounds alone.

In every State where our priceless national forests or public lands are located, it will bring forth requests for exceptional treatment adverse to the public's interest and welfare.

I think a bad precedent is being created by this bill. I do not think we shall be able to escape this precedent once we have set it up. What we should be doing is discouraging land exchange and not setting up a precedent that will be looked up as a breakthrough and encouragement of land exchange.

When the wild rivers bill was before the Senate on its first trip, I strove to eliminate all exchange. The manager of the bill, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] did not agree fully with my proposal, but I did have his support for eliminating exchanges on the O. & C. lands in Oregon. I also had his support for the sustained yield in the public lands because in that bill there was still the regular classification concept for public lands which carried with it the Secretary's responsibility to find that the proposal, if it applied to public lands, was in the public interest. And likewise the national forest exchanges authorized therein had the regular public interest tests. In addition, under the wild rivers bill the exchanges were optional and not directed toward destruction of a national forest unit.

I think it is time for the Congress to circumscribe these exchange provisions in park bills. Actually, the first bill with such provisions was the 1962 Point Reyes Act. It has been included in some other new park authorizations but always reasonably well circumscribed.

Now we see the cancer of a bad idea spreading. We are told that this intrusion into the great national forest system is unique. Cancer still is considered unique, but devastating. I agree that the intrusion is unique and it is disastrous, too, for by its terms it sets standards so adverse to the public interest as to constitute a policy that would have been rejected even in the free and easy public land days of 1849—the year California became a State and the Department of the Interior was created.

I urge the bill be at least amended to strike the appropriate language in lines 19 through 21 on page 3, and the last sentence of section 3b starting on page 3 line 25 through page 4 line 3 and to circumscribe the exchange of BLM land under sustained yield by adding this clause in line 18 after the word "California": "except property needed for public use and management."

In fact, I suspect the entire bill would be improved and much less of a headache later to the Senators from California if all of section 3(b) were struck.

We ought not to fool ourselves for 1 minute with the dollar cost argument which is advanced in favor of these exchanges and especially exchanges to be made under the instructions this bill provides.

You show me a land sale made at auction or sealed bid and compare it with a negotiated sale and I will show you taxpayer dollars lost.

In addition, before we go further in exchanges based on the notion that they are a cheaper way to acquire land than outright purchase, we ought to have before us the cost records of the agencies on the administrative and appraisal costs to negotiate these exchanges. Also, we would need to add the overhead costs of the Department and GAO investigations that have occurred when some of these exchanges wind up in controversy. In my judgment an examination of the record would show that these exchanges are far more costly than use of arm's-length purchases.

So, for the part of the case that rests on economy, I think the burden of proof needs to be made that this will save taxpayers' dollars. The taxpayers own these land assets. These are part of the capital assets of the United States. They belong to all the taxpayers. So any method of commercial disposal which does not produce the top dollar and costs more to administer ought to be rejected on economy grounds.

I do not want to condemn all exchanges. The 1962 forest exchange law was designed to adjust land boundaries, to facilitate and improve public forest administration, to produce savings over time.

The insertion of the exchange provision as written into the final Point Reyes Act, I think, was a most unfortunate step. That language did not have the precision of that in the most recent wild rivers bill. It was bottomed on the fallacious premise that Interior's public domain managed by BLM was at least in part still to be disposed of on the choice of an applicant. No doubt some of it will be disposed of that way.

In this way we retain the basic public interest tests and the classification procedure. We also keep out of the public lands and forests those who seek lands already classified for and dedicated to a public program.

We hold these exchange provisions to disposable lands placed in this category under orderly procedures. So rather than broaden these exchange provisions to sweep in the national forests, we ought to reverse the procedure. We ought to use the land and water conservation

fund. It was just betting underway in 1962.

We ought to appropriate the money. Last year Interior realized far more than anticipated from its sale of offshore gas and oil. We can allocate a block of this windfall to conservation and preservation.

I wish to digress for a moment to pay my high regard to the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] for a bill he has introduced, which is in the legislative hopper, so to speak, which would do exactly what I have just indicated. It would provide that funds from the sale of offshore gas and oil would go into the land and water conservation fund.

As the Senator from Washington knows, earlier this afternoon, thinking I had a bright idea, I contemplated adding to this bill an amendment which applied to the very principle involved in the Senator's bill. I am sure he knows—in fact, I made it clear to him—that if I had done that, I would have given him the full credit for the idea; because the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] is the initiator, the originator, and the first proponent of this program.

When my proposal was submitted to the Senator from Washington and to the staff of the committee, as he knows, I agreed that it should not be added to this bill, but that I would make the statement, I am now making, setting forth my complete support and approval of the Senator's bill. I would much prefer to have it handled as a separate bill. My concern is that time may run out, and we may find ourselves, by the time this session concludes, not in a position to take action on the bill. But we can do so next time. I believe it is wise that we make the record this afternoon as to the applicability of the principle of the Senator's bill to the fund to which I have alluded.

I am not offering the amendment. I told the Senator I would not offer the amendment. I would rather wait and come to his assistance when he brings his bill, as an independent bill, to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

(At this point, Mr. HOLLINGS assumed the chair.)

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the able senior Senator from Oregon for his helpful comments.

I hope that our committee, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, will be able to take action on this matter some time after the first of the year. I certainly shall welcome the support and the help of the Senator from Oregon when the matter comes up on the floor. I believe it is a wise approach to dealing with problems involving acquisition of lands for public use and enjoyment, and I would hope that we could get the bill through the Senate next year.

Mr. MORSE. I believe the Senator will succeed. The Senator has an unanswerable case in support of his bill. I believe it is only a matter of time before the Senator's bill will be the law of the land.

Mr. President, there is no idle Federal

money. Whether we sell off the national forests, allocate offshore oil revenues, or appropriate dollars, the cost to the American people is just as real. What counts is whether we have devised a procedure that gets the most land for the best cost—paid a fair price to the landowners and received value for the taxpayer.

I believe the redwood park is of such necessity to the unborn generations that we have an obligation to act now. Is this Nation so poor that it cannot act well and wisely? The redwood park has national support and so do the national forests. We should not trade away the golden ring of conservation to buy the diamond.

The distinguished chairman of the Senate Interior Committee [Mr. JACKSON] in association with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], taking cognizance of the increasing need of funding important conservation programs, introduced S. 1401, which would provide the additional funds necessary for acquisition, without exchanges. This measure has the widespread support of all conservation organizations.

I urge that expeditious action be taken on S. 1401. It represents a far better method of handling land acquisitions than does the exchange procedure. The chairman of the Senate Interior Committee has my assurance of support and all possible assistance in bringing about passage of S. 1401.

As Senator JACKSON, Senator KUCHEL, and all other Senators know, the senior Senator from Oregon has worked very closely with various conservation groups in this country for many years.

One of the men among many I could mention is C. R. Gutermuth, known to most of us as "Pink" Gutermuth, one of the most able legislative representatives of the Wildlife Management Institute. He is the vice president of that institute.

The incomparable conservationist, the president of the group, Ira N. Gabrielson, for years and years has made representations to us in Congress in connection with conservation. To me, he is the Gifford Pinchot of our time because of what he has done through his dedicated public service over the years. He has carried on the ideal and the vision, in a very inspiring fashion, of Gifford Pinchot.

Gabrielson and Gutermuth and other conservation leaders in the country have been my leaders, as I have sought to carry out the major objectives of their conservation program. I have consulted with them in connection with this bill, and I have received a great deal of assistance from them.

I should like to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter of October 25, 1967, signed by the vice president of Wildlife Management Institute, Mr. Gutermuth, to all State directors of the Wildlife Management Institute. Every Member of the Senate knows that this nationwide organization has served as a watcher over the degree to which Congress does or does not carry out the

trusteeship obligation to which I have referred in my speech. I ask unanimous consent that the 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:

WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE,  
Washington, D.C., October 25, 1967.

To All State Directors:

The U.S. Senate, on Tuesday, October 31, is scheduled to consider S. 2515, a proposal to authorize a new Redwood National Park in California.

The park that would be created is a satisfactory compromise of earlier proposals. It is acceptable to the vast majority of conservationists throughout the country.

S. 2515 offers a serious threat to wildlife and outdoor recreation opportunity over the nation, however, in that it would force the U.S. Forest Service to relinquish lands it administers in northern California in exchange for private timberlands that would be taken for the new park.

This is the same kind of a proposition that was advocated by the timber interests in the 1950's when they launched their ill-fated raids on the national forests. You will recall that the House Government Operations Committee held that trades of national forest lands in support of unrelated federal programs are not in the public interest. The full House of Representatives firmly rejected another national forest grab in a decisive floor vote.

Should that kind of a trade be authorized in connection with the Redwood Park bill, it will open the doors for similar raids in all states in which national forests and grasslands are located.

Senatorial leaders who want to prevent this kind of an undesirable precedent are planning a floor fight to delete the national forest trade provision in S. 2515. The interest of your agency and of the hunters and other recreationists in your state quite obviously is involved. Many conservationists already are telling their Senators that they support the Redwood National Park, but that they want Congress to authorize the purchase of lands that are needed rather than trading off national forest lands.

Time is short; floor action is expected next Tuesday, the 31st.

Sincerely,

C. R. GUTERMUTH,  
Vice-President.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I never take credit that is due elsewhere, and I think it only fair to these conservationists to point out that the thesis of my speech this afternoon dealing with that part in opposition to the land exchange is the result of a great deal of help that I have received from conservationists such as Mr. Gutermuth, such as Spencer Smith, and I could go on and give the Senate a list of conservationists whose names are well known to every Senator.

Mr. President, Mr. Gutermuth supplied me with a list of questions and answers, and I shall not take the time now to read them. In view of the fact that the vote on the bill will not be until tomorrow, and in the interest of the time factor, and so that I do not hold the Senate in session unduly long, I shall ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point the list of questions and answers that Mr. Gutermuth supplied me and which Senators will see provided the considerable amount of data that I used in my speech this afternoon.

I did not use the material until I studied it carefully and convinced myself that it will stand up against all analysis. I think this great conservation group has performed a very valuable service to the entire Senate in putting in question and answer form their data dealing with the subject matter of this bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the questions and answers may be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with an October 20 letter addressed to Senator AIKEN by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, and a press release of the American Forestry Association.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLINGS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The material, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

Question: What would be the effect on other timber operators if the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit is turned over to four companies?

Answer: The provision in S. 2515 which would use National Forest land as trading stock to obtain National Park land would help four companies which already have substantial supplies of private timber to support their operations. It would deprive some 20 struggling firms of a competitive chance to survive.

Over the past several years, 10 different timber companies have purchased sale offerings. In doing so, they bid against over 20 other firms. The companies buying this timber are those who own little private timber, if any. They bid on the National Forest timber to survive.

The National Forest land is providing a cut of 20 million board feet per year. This yield is offered for competitive sale in units of various size. It is fully utilized by a number of timber companies. It would provide favored treatment to four out of many companies and interfere with competitive processes.

Question: What is the Forest Service estimate of the value of the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit?

Answer: There has been no comprehensive appraisal of the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit which would be useful in considering its value as Federal trade-off property to help pay for the proposed park. Nor has there been a comprehensive appraisal of the private lands which must be acquired. It is entirely speculative that a significant savings would result from this feature of S. 2515.

Those who conceived this idea must have visualized that an acre of National Forest land would buy an acre of private land. This is far from the case. Considering the superlative quality of the old-growth redwood needed for the park, its heavy volumes per acre, and its location—all compared to the National Forest resource in the purchase unit, it is possible that four acres of the Federal property would be needed to offset one acre of the private. Thus the 14,000 acres in the unit would buy something less than 3,500 acres in the park. This is not precise, but realistic.

For this very small benefit as compared to the total cost of the park proposal, we would be breaking faith with one of the cornerstones of American conservation. By using National Forest lands as trading stock in this important case, we would be setting a precedent for the breakup of the National Forest System all over the country.

Question: Is the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit used for recreation or other non-timber purposes?

Answer: The Northern Redwood Purchase

Unit supports an important part of the recreation use of the Six Rivers National Forest. Last year the Purchase Unit recreation use amounted to over 71,000 visitor days. This was more than one-fifth of the total for the National Forest.

Approximately one-half of this use involved the rivers and streams for boating and fishing. This fishing use (20,000 visitor days last year) is particularly dependent upon land management which will assure protection of the watersheds.

The Purchase Unit is also a significant part of the game range of the National Forest. Last year, it supported about 5,000 visitor days of hunting, 3,000 of which were for hunting blacktail deer.

Question: Is there any difference between the Northern Redwood National Forest Purchase Unit and any other unit of the National Forest System?

Answer: The public lands in the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit were bought by the United States under the Weeks Law of March 1, 1911, to promote the production of timber, the regulation of stream flow, and other National Forest purposes. The Weeks Law provides that lands purchased under its provisions shall be permanently reserved, held, and administered as National Forest lands. The Northern Redwood Purchase Unit lands are therefore identical with other National Forest lands so far as purposes of management and the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to administer is concerned. Section 11 of the Weeks Law permits the Secretary of Agriculture to place lands acquired under that Act into a National Forest when he considers this timely.

Lands within this Purchase Unit, as all other purchased National Forest lands, differ from National Forest lands reserved from the public domain in that they are not subject to location and entry under the mining law. Minerals may be extracted under lease or permit.

Question: Why did the Forest Service stop buying lands within the Redwood Purchase Unit?

Answer: Purchases were started in the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit about 1939. Funds allotted for these purchases were limited by the need for land acquisitions to further consolidate previously established National Forest purchase areas in the Eastern United States. World War II intervened while the purchase program in the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit was in the process of getting fully underway. Funds for the purchase of land for National Forests purposes became virtually nonexistent during and after the war until the fiscal year of 1947. Subsequent to 1947, appropriations limited to as little as \$50,000 or \$75,000 per year prevented renewed purchasing activity in the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit.

Question: Why was the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit never made a part of the adjacent National Forest?

Answer: Addition of the unit to the Six Rivers National Forest would operate to distribute the 25 percent share of receipts derived from the purchased land to several counties, thus substantially decreasing the net financial contributions National Forest lands make to the Del Norte County Government. Discussions which led to local approval for establishment of the purchase unit considered possibilities for these lands to give greatly needed assistance to meeting the costs of the county government as well as assistance to the local economy. Management of the purchased lands for these purposes has therefore always been considered a particular obligation by the Forest Service.

There appeared to be no particular advantage in designating this relatively small unit as an individual National Forest, though this has been considered from time to time. A suggestion in 1965 by the County Supervisors of Del Norte County that it be estab-

lished as the "Redwood National Forest" was not acted upon by the Department of Agriculture because by then there was public discussion of establishing a Redwood National Park in California. It was not thought desirable to confuse the issue by establishing a Redwood National Forest.

Question: Why is there such a big hassle when there is no net loss in Federal lands? As the Committee points out, we are merely determining that a set acreage of Federal redwoods should be used for park purposes rather than for timber production.

Answer: The real issue is whether we are willing to sacrifice national forest lands for other Federal purposes. The national forests are permanently reserved for special purposes—purposes fully as important as national park purposes. And these purposes have proved their worth. Timber production is, of course, one of these purposes.

If we allow this to happen here, we take the chance it will happen elsewhere in the future—likely for other unrelated purposes such as reservoir or highway construction.

The direct answer to the question is *precedent*. We must provide full and permanent protection to the integrity of our national forests.

Question: To what extent has the forest industry recognized the research done by the Forest Service in the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit?

Answer: The Redwood Experimental Forest was activated over 25 years ago for the purpose of developing new knowledge to assist forest land managers in maintaining and improving the redwood timber type. After activation, the Simpson Logging Company entered into a cooperative agreement for facilitating the redwood research program. The studies have emphasized problems of redwood regeneration and cultural treatments of redwood stands. The results of these studies are made available to the forest industry as they become available. There is strong interest in the research. Industries in the area make wide and continuing use of the findings.

OCTOBER 20, 1967.

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN,  
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: You will shortly be considering S. 2515, a new bill to establish a Redwood National Park. The Department of Agriculture actively supports the establishment of such a Park.

However, this Department vigorously and strongly objects to the feature of S. 2515 which would use National Forest land as trading stock to obtain land for the Park. This commandeering of the National Forest land in the Redwood Purchase Unit is not necessary in order for the Nation to have a Redwood Park.

Using National Forest land for trading stock in this important case endangers land administered by the Forest Service all over the country. It threatens the integrity of the National Forests, a principle of long-standing.

It would open the floodgates. Right now, and repeatedly in the past, there have been made demands in other parts of the country that National Forest lands be used to pay for parks, or for reservoirs, or for highway rights-of-way. Any and every instance of such a taking of National Forest land makes the later pressures that much harder to resist.

This is why past actions of Congress have resoundingly rejected use of National Forest land for this kind of trade-off.

There are other reasons for not appropriating these National Forest lands to pay for the Park:

1. Savings derived from trading off the National Forest land would be a small part of the total cost of the proposed Park. On an acre-for-acre basis, the value of the National Forest land in the Purchase Unit, estimated at \$25 million, falls far short of the value of

the old-growth groves proposed for inclusion in the Park. This is a very small sum to endanger a very basic principle of conservation.

2. The four main companies involved do not need the limited acreage of land that could be made available to them in order to continue operating for a significant number of years. The company that would experience the greatest impact could continue at its present rate of operation for 15 years or longer.

3. A move to make these companies partially whole would be at the cost of withdrawing supplies now used by smaller operators who buy the stumpage that would be transferred to the four larger, stronger companies. In recent years, 10 operators in the area have used the timber that this action would turn over to only four large companies. Thus, a trade-off of land would not create any new jobs. It would favor four large companies at the expense of 10 smaller ones.

A Redwood National Park is in the national interest. The USDA supports strongly that objective. But a raid on the National Forests and the establishment of a dangerous precedent in violation of longstanding, sound conservation principles is neither necessary nor wise.

Sincerely yours,  
ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,  
Secretary.

[A press release from the American Forestry Association, Washington, D.C.]

PRECEDENT-BREAKING TRADEOFF OF NATIONAL FOREST LAND IN CALIFORNIA WOULD OPEN FLOOD GATES NATIONALLY FOR SPECIAL INTERESTS AND LAND GRABBERS, AMERICAN FORESTRY ASSOCIATION SAYS—ALL MEMBERS OF CONGRESS URGED TO DELETE PROPOSALS NOT CONSIDERED IN PUBLIC INTEREST

WASHINGTON, D.C., October 27.—The American Forestry Association today called on all Members of Congress to oppose a trade-off of National Forest land in California as a part of a proposed Redwood National Park package that would, if adopted, "open the flood gates to demands by all sorts of special interest and land grabbers."

In a letter to Senator George D. Aiken, of Vermont, copies of which were sent to all Members of Congress, AFA Chief Forester Kenneth B. Pomeroy said lawmakers should delete proposals in S. 2515, the Redwood National Park Bill, to use National Forest land in the Redwoods Purchase Unit as payment in kind for private lands desired for park purposes.

This Federal land, Mr. Pomeroy said, was acquired by the Forest Service under the Weeks Act of March 1, 1911, for the practice of multiple use, sustained yield forestry. It is being managed efficiently for that purpose. Trading this land for other land to be used as a park will defeat the purpose for which national forests are established, he said.

The annual harvests of timber from the Redwood Purchase Unit supports ten small lumber companies and their employees, Pomeroy said. One-quarter of the receipts from timber sales, a substantial sum, goes to Del Norte County in lieu of taxes. This 25 percent fund exceeds the amount of taxes received from comparable land in private ownership.

"It is clear that giving four large landowners this Forest Service Land will not benefit the local economy," Pomeroy said. "It merely aids four large companies at the expense of ten small companies. Neither will such an exchange improve the tax base of Del Norte County."

But the mall of members of Congress is already reflecting the greatest concern of all, Pomeroy said. That is the precedent-breaking nature of a proposal that would have ramifications for National Forest land far beyond the borders of California and could lead to other trade-offs and give-aways of National

Forest lands that have served as models of efficient forest management for multiple use.

The American Forestry Association has supported the national effort to establish a Redwood National Park but the association, and allied conservation organizations, contend that the trade-off principle now poses a direct threat to the public interest everywhere in the United States, as well as in California.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also have been influenced in my thinking in regard to the bill in respect to the suggestions I have offered in my speech and in relation to the amendments I shall offer tomorrow—which I hope will not be considered very controversial—by a whole group of conservation organizations, which on October 27, 1967, sent a wire to President Johnson which reads as follows:

OCTOBER 27, 1967.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

We support a Redwoods National Park and are looking to you to uphold the outstanding conservation record of your administration as well as long established policy that national forest lands of this country not be used as trading stock in support of unrelated Federal programs. Specifically, we are opposed to provisions in the current Redwood National Park bill which would exchange national forest lands for private timber lands. We can see no purpose in subordinating the broad public interest to the pressures of some California interests.

American Forestry Association, Kenneth Pomeroy, Chief Forester; Boone and Crockett Club, John E. Rhea, Conservation Committee Chairman; Izaak Walton League of America, Joseph W. Penfold, Conservation Director; National Rifle Association of America, Frank C. Daniel, Secretary; National Wildlife Federation, Thomas L. Kimball, Executive Director; North American Wildlife Foundation, C. R. Guter-muth, Secretary; Sport Fishing Institute, Philip A. Douglas, Executive Secretary, Wildlife Management Institute, Ira N. Gabrielson, President.

There was issued on October 27 a press release, the first sentences of which read as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C., October 27.—National conservation leaders today expressed grave concern about a provision of the Senate's bill to create a new Redwood National Park in California.

That provision calls for the forced trade of land administered by the U.S. Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture for private timber holdings that lie within the park. If this trade is pushed through the Congress, the conservation leaders say, it would be a precedent and constitute a serious threat to national forests and other public lands such as wildlife refuges and national grasslands throughout the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire press release be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

WASHINGTON, D.C., October 27.—National conservation leaders today expressed grave concern about a provision of the Senate's bill to create a new Redwood National Park in California.

That provision calls for the forced trade of land administered by the U.S. Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture for private timber holdings that lie within the park. If

this trade is pushed through the Congress, the conservation leaders say, it would be a precedent and constitute a serious threat to national forests and other public lands such as wildlife refuges and national grasslands throughout the country.

The leaders expressed surprise that the trade is being recommended by the Senate Interior Committee. The Administration is firmly on record against trading national forest lands in support of unrelated federal programs.

The House of Representatives in a record vote in 1953 and at later dates soundly defeated moves that would have given private interests this kind of preferential treatment. In 1959, the House Government Operations Committee held that such trades would set a "dangerous precedent" and that the fee transfer of national forest timberlands under sustained-yield management to specified timber operators would simply benefit the grantee at the expense of other users.

The Senate Committee's bill contains the same situation that the House Committee found unacceptable in 1959. These fundamental principles of protecting the people's interest in national forests and other managed public lands is still valid today, the conservationists say.

Speaking for the President on this subject, the Bureau of the Budget stated in a letter of June 22, 1967, to the Chairman of the Senate Interior Committee: "The Administration will not consider the transfer of fee title of Forest Service land on a barter basis, or as compensation in kind. . . ."

On July 13, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall wrote to Senator Clinton P. Anderson (D-N.M.): "President Johnson asked me to reply to your letter about the Redwood National Park proposal in which you urged that we not trade off national forest lands in an effort to establish a Redwood National Park. . . ."

"The position of the Administration is firm against the transfer of national forest lands to the State of California or to private lumber interests as a part of the Redwood National Park transactions. We feel this general principle must be upheld always.

"It has been the long-standing position of the Government, and I know you are in agreement with this, that the national forests should be maintained intact and that when private timberlands are needed by the Federal Government in the public interest, payment should be in cash and not in kind. I agree with this principle and you need have no concern on this point insofar as the Administration is concerned."

The national conservation leaders expressed their support of Udall's statement of the Administration's position in his letter to Senator Anderson.

The conservationists said they also endorsed fully Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman's statement in a letter of October 20 sent to Senators: "Using national forest lands for trading stock in this important case endangers land administered by the Forest Service all over the country. It threatens the integrity of the national forests, a principle of long standing.

"It would open the flood gates. Right now, and repeatedly in the past, there have been made demands in other parts of the country that national forest lands be used to pay for parks, or for reservoirs, or for highway rights-of-way. Any and every instance of such a taking of national forest land makes the later pressures that much harder to resist.

"This is why past actions of Congress have resoundingly rejected use of national forest lands for this kind of trade-off."

The conservationists said they are in full support of Senator Anderson's announced amendment to the Redwood Park bill, due for Senate consideration early next week. It would delete reference to the national for-

est lands. They say most of the nation's conservationists want the Congress to appropriate the necessary funds to buy the new park instead of trading off national forest lands.

In his comments on the Senate Committee's bill, Anderson, one-time chairman of the Committee and a widely respected conservation legislator, described the forced forest trade as a "kind of robbing Peter to pay Paul." Except for the trade of national forest lands, the conservationists said the Senate Committee's Redwood Park bill is much superior to the smaller park recommended earlier this year by the Administration. The Committee's park would be located where the best virgin redwoods are, the conservationists pointed out, and would save more acres of the big trees than would the Administration's plan. The conservationists have regularly supported an even larger park than that proposed by the Senate Committee, but said that the compromise bill is acceptable except for the suggestion that national forest lands be used as trading stock for the new park.

Such a trade, they say, would make national forest and other managed public lands vulnerable to trading everywhere they occur.

American Forestry Association, Kenneth B. Pomeroy, Chief Forester; Izaak Walton League of America, Joseph W. Penfold, Conservation Director; National Wildlife Federation, Thomas L. Kimball, Executive Secretary; Sport Fishing Institute, Philip A. Douglas, Executive Secretary; Wildlife Management Institute, Ira N. Gabrielson, President.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, here again the record is clear that I have in my speech today simply associated myself with the viewpoint of these conservation leaders in respect of the land exchange provisions of the bill. I think they are right and that is why I have made clear that I am going to support the Anderson amendment.

Mr. President, I have two more items. Under date of July 13, 1967, Secretary Udall wrote a letter to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,  
Washington, July 13, 1967.

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: President Johnson asked me to reply to your letter about the Redwood National Park proposal in which you urged that we not trade off National Forest lands in an effort to establish a Redwood National Park.

There have been extensive discussions between State officials and representatives of the Bureau of the Budget and the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture. The subject you raise has been thoroughly aired. The position of the Administration is firm against the transfer of National Forest lands to the State of California or to private lumber interests as part of the Redwood National Park transactions. We feel this general principle must be upheld always.

It has been the long-standing position of the Government, and I know you are in agreement with this, that the National Forests should be maintained intact and that when private timberlands are needed by the Federal Government in the public interest, payment should be in cash and not in kind. I agree with this principle and you need have no concern on this point insofar as the Administration is concerned.

In this connection, you may be interested in the letter of June 22, 1967 to Senator Jackson from the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget which discusses this question in some detail and makes clear the Administration's position.

Sincerely,

STEWART L. UDALL,  
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the letter sets forth some views of the Secretary of Interior that I think very pertinent to the discussion of the issues that I have raised in my speech.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the letter of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] to the President, dated June 26, 1967, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON AERO-  
NAUTICAL AND SPACE SCIENCES,  
June 26, 1967.

The PRESIDENT,  
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Partly due to the Dodd matter, the Senate has been upset on our schedules, and I am very much afraid we are going to be delayed considerably in passing all the appropriations bills and other needed legislation. One of my worries has been that in the final windup before the July 4 holiday we will miss careful action on the proposal for a Redwood National Park.

I have gone over the suggestions on some of these redwood proposals, and I appreciate the fact that you have had excellent advice. I know that Laurance Rockefeller has helped, and he is one of the most dedicated conservationists that I know. However, I am not sure that the Sierra Club members in and around the San Francisco Bay area have been agreeable to the trading suggestions which have been made.

My particular worry is that trading might create some precedents which would be hard to overturn and which I believe are undesirable. Apparently the State of California would be asked to turn over to the Federal Government for the redwood forest some 30,000 acres in two existing state parks. It seems to me that we ought to count the cost and see if the State of California has asked for too much in the final transaction.

I feel that the turning over of 30,000 acres of state land now in existing state parks must be balanced by pay from the Federal Government to the state. This arrangement would give the state an opportunity to drive a hard bargain. Governor Reagan is alert to this possibility and may have requests to exchange forest land which possibly should not be traded.

I know you are familiar with this whole situation and have asked many people to see what is involved. But my attention has been called to the fact that Governor Reagan submitted to Congressman Aspinall on May 3 a letter which sets forth the price demanded by the State of California. The Governor's letter, plus subsequent conversations, make it very clear he considers trading to California the 14,500 acres in the national forest Northern Redwood Purchase Unit as an essential part of the state price.

My fear is that the people who are trying to save the redwoods and want to create a fine national park might agree to trade off these national forest lands as part of the price of getting national park support from the state. I think that such a trade might tend to become a precedent for other forest lands to be used to pay for other national parks. People might want to swap forest lands for highways, for reservoirs, or to pay off Indian claims, and it might cause serious

embarrassment if such requests should be made and the trades completed.

If we can say now that we would not trade forest lands for parks of any kind, then I think that we will be safer and the national interest would be protected.

I am not trying to say that this is a new position. A reservoir trade-off proposal was seriously advanced as H.R. 4646 in the 83rd Congress. It was defeated on the floor of the House. But we can find numerous instances where owners have been asked by letter to be repaid in kind for land needed for highway purposes.

I am not sure if this letter covers exactly what I am thinking. My main worry is that if national parks are to be created, they should be financed from private gifts and public money, but not by trade.

This letter has not been written to criticize anybody. I refer to Governor Reagan only because he is the Governor of California and has a responsibility to his citizens. His letter of May 3, 1967 to Congressman Wayne Aspinall says:

"We have developed eight general principles that we in California submit for your consideration with the hope that they will be incorporated into any final plan for a Redwood National Park."

Then Governor Reagan very properly lists his eight general principles; the second which is:

"Exchange in fee title of state park lands to be incorporated into a national park for currently-owned federal lands suitable for park and recreational purposes in our state system."

The third principle is:

"Exchange in fee title of privately-owned timberlands for like kind of property accomplished through negotiation rather than condemnation. Where cash transactions are necessary, the payment period for private property taken should ideally be funded in the minimum number of years required for maximum tax advantage."

I only suggest to you that the new principle of exchange can be harmful, I think, and I would watch it very carefully.

In 1949 I suggested what is now known as the Anderson-Mansfield Act by which I wanted to preserve the forests and protect them in any way I could. I want to continue that protection, but I feel that we could give too great a payment on an exchange basis. If we want to obtain the redwoods by trade we could make bad trades and hence be involved in a worse situation than in establishing these parks.

Let the park people come in with a proposal to acquire, not a proposal to trade. We may have to shrink the boundaries of the park because purchases could be too high. But we will be better off shrinking the boundaries than to start trading forest land from the Federal Government to the State of California. At least that is my feeling, and I hope your excellent advisors and helpers will count carefully the entire cost of the program. It is my desire that trading federal forest lands to states will not be supported.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there is nothing privileged about this letter. It has received wide public dissemination, but it should be a part of the legislative record of this debate. The letter sets forth some of Senator ANDERSON'S views in regard to some of the issues I have raised in my speech this afternoon.

I highly commend the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] for not only the record he has made in connection with the pending legislation, but also for the great record he has made over the years as a Member of the Senate in his

various capacities, including serving as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which position is now so ably filled also by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

I want the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] to know that any views that I have expressed about the bill this afternoon have not expressed the slightest degree of criticism, direct or indirect, of their leadership in connection with this bill.

Quite to the contrary, we have differences of opinion to a degree as to how best to carry out the objectives that the Senator from Washington and the Senator from California have in mind in relation to the subject matter of the bill.

Mr. President, I wish to say as I close, as I said in the beginning of my speech, that I have nothing but the highest commendation for their leadership on this subject matter. I hope that tomorrow, after they have had an opportunity to scan at least, and their staff to analyze the points of view I have expressed in this speech, we might be able to come to an understanding at least in connection with some of my suggestions and find them acceptable to take to conference.

I have explained to the majority leader that I prefer not to offer my proposals in amendment form tonight but to offer them tomorrow when other Members of the Senate will have had an opportunity to scan my remarks, if they care to.

Mr. President, I am about to yield the floor, unless the Senator from Washington or the Senator from California wish to make inquiry of me.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will my able friend yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Oregon knows my feelings for him, my respect for him, and my respect for his leadership in conservation. I also realize that I would be hard put to persuade my friend to change his mind on the amendment. But I do want to say this, in all sincerity. I have lived with the problem of fashioning this bill for the greater part of three years. As my colleague knows, there have been all sorts of cross-currents involved in trying to fashion it. Even among good, sound conservationists whom the Senator and I both respect, there were divergencies of view as to park location, park size, and the merits of park acquisition. Under the leadership of the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Parks, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], we finally became convinced, with the aid of our excellent staff on both sides, majority and minority, that the best way to proceed would be to attempt to concentrate on the acquisition of superlative old growth virgin redwoods, and that we should meet the fears of potential unemployment in the areas where the park would be located, by using this purchase unit which has been logged and which is being logged by private operators to acquire private land for the park by exchange.

Mr. President, when I introduced the bill recommended by the Save the Redwoods League and endorsed by the administration, it had in it a provision for "in lieu" payments by the Secretary of the Interior to the county of Del Norte. Those "in lieu" payments were to continue a number of years in an effort to cushion the economic shock which it was alleged would come to Del Norte County if, of a sudden, the areas in private lumber company hands were to be taken over by the Government for cash.

As my able friend knows, there were those on the committee and those in the Senate who opposed the idea of "in lieu" payments. One of the reasons which prompted us to use the purchase unit was that it became easier to reject the "in lieu" payment provisions if damage to the industry could be minimized through exchanges. We also realized that in these times, no matter how worthy—and this is a worthy project—no matter how worthy a national park project might be, it would be difficult to persuade some of our colleagues that \$100 million should be expended in this fashion. By using the purchase unit, we would minimize the direct cost.

For these and other reasons, we fashioned the pending bill. I say that, leading up to the one point I am going to make to my friend—and it may not make a difference, but I do want him to consider it—that the pending bill is endorsed by the Save the Redwoods League which sponsored the other bill and is endorsed by the Sierra Club which has, over the years, devoted itself to the cause of a Redwood National Park.

In that connection, I inserted in the RECORD earlier, but I am going to reread, the words of the distinguished president of the Sierra Club, Dr. Edgar Wayburn, of San Francisco, on this very point:

The key to the financing of the compromise bill of the Committee is use of the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit, which the Federal Government now owns, on an exchange basis to acquire needed parkland.

The unit itself does not lend itself to park management. The Committee felt, and we agree, that it makes good sense to phase out this abortive redwood program to enable the National Park program to succeed. No adverse precedent is intended as these lands are not regular forest lands and have never served their intended purpose.

I only say this, in that connection, to the distinguished Senator from Oregon, that the quotation from the president of the Sierra Club accurately reflects the intentions of those of us who sincerely believe that this bill in its present form may be the last hope we have of saving the redwoods, which the Senator from Oregon has so eloquently described.

Mr. MORSE. I want the Senator from California to know that his viewpoint on any matter always receives my very careful consideration.

I know the point of view of the president of the Sierra Club. I have studied that point of view. I have ended up finding myself convinced by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the other conservationist groups whom I have quoted from extensively this

afternoon. I am going to vote for the bill, whatever its final form is. I seek only to do what I think would perfect the bill. There we have a difference of opinion on policy.

As I stated at some length this afternoon, and will only mention now in a broad brush stroke, I think that one of the things I do not like about this, without the protection I have pleaded for, is the taking out of the sustained yield timber that would result. I think it should be part of the sustained yield. I think that is part of the conservation program. If I am correct in my facts, and I do not specify it in great detail, but if I am correct in my facts, the result of the exchange would be to reduce the ownership of this tract into a very limited number of new owners, whereas at the present time a series of small companies have access to this Federal timber. To me, that is a very important matter. But I want to assure the Senator that before I come to the floor of the Senate tomorrow, I am going to reexamine the position he has taken. I do not want to give him any false encouragement because I have studied this at such depth that I think there is really a policy problem here to which I do not want to make an exception.

I know he believes that no precedent will be established. Too many times in the Senate I have seen a claim made that no precedent would be established, but that it then became a precedent. I am talking about past experience. It would always be brought up again.

All I can say, as of tonight, is that I appreciate, as usual, the Senator's courtesy and fairness in debate when he disagrees with somebody. It is so typical of the Senator from California. His view deserves exactly what I told him I would give it. I will reexamine it and meet with my advisers again, including conservation advisers, and then cast my vote. If I were to vote this minute, I would vote for the Anderson amendment.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the acting majority leader [Mr. BYRD of West Virginia], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] came over to my desk and restated an understanding that he is willing to enter into.

I do not have the amendment in written form, may I say to the Parliamentarian, but in my argument I urged the public interest criterion be written into the bill on page 3, line 18.

The Senator from Washington said that if I offered that amendment tonight, it would be acted on. I want to cooperate and get out of the way all the business that we can tonight.

The amendment would be on line 18, of page 3, after the word "California", to insert "except property needed for public use and management."

If the Parliamentarian will write out that language, I will repeat it for him: "except property needed for public use and management."

I understand the clerk has the amend-

ment. I ask that the amendment be stated. I am ready for action on it. I have no more to say about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be temporarily laid aside?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendment is temporarily laid aside.

The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 3, line 18, after "California" to insert a comma and the following language: "except property needed for public use and management."

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I have conferred with the ranking minority member of the committee [Mr. KUCHEL]. We both agree that the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Oregon would improve the bill. We are, therefore, pleased to accept the amendment as proposed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to thank both Senators very much. I offered it only because I thought it improved the bill and would be helpful to the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do Senators yield back their time under the unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, section 2 of S. 2515 indicates that the boundaries of the park shall be as generally depicted on drawing No. NP-RED-7112, dated October 1967, on file in the National Park Service offices. While it can be said that the sentence in section 2 which gives the Secretary of the Interior power to revise the boundaries from time to time would authorize him to revise the boundaries to include up to 64,000 acres of private land, that is, to draw boundaries so as to exclude the State parks, it is clearly the intention of the committee that the power of the Secretary is only to make minor adjustments in the plan depicted in the previously mentioned drawing.

The committee report on S. 2515 states on page 24:

The purpose of the authority given the Secretary to revise boundaries, is to make relatively minor adjustments where necessary or desirable from the standpoint of administration or land acquisition. The Secretary is not authorized to depart from the general boundaries described in the bill to make major acquisitions which would change the character of the Park or the emphasis the committee has placed on various watersheds.

If there was confusion regarding this matter, I am sure that the report and this discussion clarify it beyond dispute.

On another question, concern has been expressed that the park boundaries, as presently drawn, will deprive some companies of access to timber holdings on the edge of the park. It is not the inten-

tion of the committee—and I speak as the ranking minority member—or the sponsors of the bill that logging be prohibited in areas outside of the boundaries, and we urge that the Secretary of the Interior, in administering the park, make every effort, consistent with the principles of sound park management, to allow timber companies reasonable access through park lands so that they may engage in economical logging outside of the park. This may involve transportation of logs over park roads, but this can, I believe, be done in a manner and at a time which will not interfere with good park management practices.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the committee, and for the benefit of the legislative history of the matter referred to by the able ranking minority member of the committee [Mr. KUCHEL], I will say that his understanding with respect to these two matters as stated is correct.

CUTTING MORATORIUM

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on September 7, 1966, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs [Mr. JACKSON] and I were privileged to announce that four major redwood companies, owning land within the boundaries of various redwood park proposals, had agreed to a 1-year moratorium on cutting that would jeopardize the park proposals.

I ask unanimous consent that the texts of the communications from the companies to the committee, and my statement announcing the moratorium, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

RAGAN & MASON,

Washington, D.C., September 8, 1966.

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: I have been authorized to advise you, on behalf of the Miller Redwood Company, as follows:

Our logging plans call for a seasonal move of our operation from the low, drier areas during the summer months, to the higher hill and mountain areas that are well drained in the winter months. This move was scheduled to take place this year, as every year, when the rainy season starts. However, out of deference to the President of the United States, and to you as Chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the Senate, and to Congressman Wayne Aspinall as Chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, we will immediately cease cutting down trees in the area near the alleged park-type Redwoods on the flats which are adjacent to the Jediah Smith State Park. This is the area that has been indicated to be vital to any consideration of a park proposal as contemplated by S. 2962.

This will involve, at no cost to the Government, moving our operation to steeper areas containing smaller and non park-like trees, with a substantial amount of Douglas fir timber. This mixture of species should supply enough timber this winter to both the sawmill and veneer plant to enable us to keep our employees working. It should be emphasized that this timber can in no way be construed as park-type caliber. Before we would return to the controversial

area noted above, we agree we will consult with both you and Congressman Aspinall.

During this winter season we intend—and again at no cost to the Government—to be moving toward the areas that are outside of the so-called Administration-proposed boundaries.

We believe this program will give Congress more than a sufficient time to deliberate the establishment and location of a Redwood National Park without in any way endangering the alleged park potential of this area—a potential, of course, which we do not agree with.

It does appear from the above advices that we are authorized to submit that the Miller Redwood Company has again evidenced an attempt to be cooperative.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM F. RAGAN,  
Counsel for Miller Redwood Co.

NATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS  
ASSOCIATION,

Washington, D.C., September 7, 1966.

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,  
Chairman, Senate Interior and Insular Affairs, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: The President of the Arcata Redwood Company at Arcata, California, phoned me to give you the following message immediately:

"The Arcata Redwood Company is not now logging in the Redwood Creek Watershed and is agreeable to holding off operations in the area for one year pending further study of park alternatives. We are willing to discuss with you and other officials conditions pertaining to our property. This does not mean we are endorsing currently proposed park legislation. We consider the present California State Park system outstanding when the additional superlative trees now reserved for park purposes by various timber companies are added.—Howard A. Libbey, President, Arcata Redwood Company, Arcata, California."

This communication may be used as you see fit.

Sincerely,

RALPH D. HODGES, Jr.,  
Vice President, Government Relations.

SEPTEMBER 7, 1966.

SENATOR HENRY JACKSON,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

It has been the longstanding policy of Georgia-Pacific Corp. that the special interests of the Corporation, its employees and their families must be sacrificed if the national interest requires it. We earnestly believe however that this national interest must be clearly established before such a sacrifice is required. Under pending Redwood National Park proposals Georgia-Pacific Corp. could lose as much as 75 percent of its timber reserves in the redwood region. This loss would jeopardize our entire industrial complex in Humboldt County representing 1,500 jobs and annual payroll of \$8 million.

Our opposition to the further acquisition of privately held timberlands for Redwood Park purposes is a matter of record with you and the Congress. All of the parklike groves are already preserved in existing parks or are voluntarily set aside by industry awaiting public acquisition. Existing Redwood Parks are largely unused and undeveloped. Most of our Redwood Creek holdings are commercial timberlands which are unsuitable for national park purposes.

Nevertheless we recognize that some people believe it is in the public interest to establish a National Redwood Park on our land and that they are concerned our harvesting operations might impair the alleged parklike quality of the land pending congressional

action. We wish to let you know Georgia-Pacific Corp. is and always has been willing to work out any reasonable adjustment in our harvesting program on our redwood lands in order to minimize cutting in proposed Redwood Park areas. We believe a 1-year period would give everyone sufficient time to study carefully the needs for more Redwood Parks and the suitability or unsuitability of our land for such parks.

GEORGIA-PACIFIC CORP.,

GRAY EVANS,

Vice President.

SIMPSON TIMBER CO.,

Seattle, Wash., September 8, 1966.

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,  
Chairman, Senate Interior Committee,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: Simpson Timber Company is responsible for 2,000 employees and their families in the Redwood Region of Northern California. We are also a partner in the Crown Simpson Pulp Mill at Eureka, Calif. which will begin operating in October, providing an additional 500 jobs in supply and manufacturing of pulp from sawmill and plywood leftovers.

Our consideration of park expansion affecting lands which provide employment for our people must at all times protect their welfare, the needs of our national and international customers and our community obligations.

We believe that the preservation of redwood trees deserving of park status has substantially been accomplished through the creation of California's excellent state park system. We believe, also, that a redwood national park which would encompass superlative stands of redwood trees now being reserved for park purposes could be created in a manner which would make—not take—jobs.

We believe that a thorough and objective Congressional study of national park alternatives and the economic requirements of timber-dependent communities in the Redwood Region is essential.

To help provide a satisfactory environment for such a study, Simpson is agreeable to immediately discussing with appropriate officials conditions and procedures under which we will continue to defer harvesting timber in superlative stands of redwood trees critical to areas seriously being considered for inclusion in the national park system.

We assure you of our continued cooperation in the interests of an equitable solution to redwood park problems.

Sincerely,

DAVE JAMES,  
Vice President, Public Affairs.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KUCHEL

The public interest of the American people is well served today and the cause of sound conservation has been advanced. We are a little nearer to the creation of a Redwood National Park because of the voluntary action of the lumber industry. Congress may proceed next January to consider Redwood Park legislation. Meanwhile, the giant and ancient trees in the proposed park sites are in no danger.

Miller Redwood Company has agreed to stop cutting the redwoods from along the south boundary of the Jediah Smith State Park. It will simply carry on its logging operations in other parts of its properties, which is all we sought at this time. It has agreed that until Congress has had a reasonable time to act on Redwood National Park legislation, it will not cut in the prime areas of aged virgin redwoods. It will not shut down during this period; no one will be out of a job.

To their great credit, the redwood companies which operate in the area proposed by the Sierra Club for a park have announced that they will voluntarily, and at no cost to the American people, adjust their cutting operations so that the park value of the Redwood Creek watershed will not be defaced pending action on a Redwood National Park bill. These companies are Georgia Pacific Corporation, Simpson Timber Company, and Arcata Redwood Company.

In its telegram to me this morning, Georgia-Pacific Corporation stated:

"It has been the long-standing policy of Georgia Pacific Corporation that the special interests of the Corporation, its employees and their families must be sacrificed if the national interest requires it." I salute it.

Miller-Rellim apparently will cut about 100 acres of what it describes as "non-park quality" trees this winter, but it has agreed to consult with the National Park Service on the location of this cutting. It has also agreed to consult with the Chairmen of the House and Senate Interior Committees before moving back into the prime stands about which I have been concerned over recent months.

As the Chairman has indicated, we can look toward early passage of a Redwood National Park bill in the next session of Congress. Areas of disagreement still exist on where and how big the park should be. The Save-the-Redwoods League, the National Audubon Society, the California Division of the Izak Walton League, the National Geographic Society, Mr. Laurence Rockefeller, and other distinguished conservationists favor the bill which I introduced on President Johnson's recommendation. Governor Brown of California also favors this bill. The good people of the Sierra Club and other conservation organizations favor a vastly larger park located in a different area.

I believe the national interest requires a great Redwood National Park for the benefit and enjoyment of the American people. I also believe that the national interest requires the conservation organizations of this country to set aside their differences and to agree on a park site which will do justice to the majesty of these centuries old trees, while protecting the timber-based life and economy of the north coast region of my State of California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, late this summer, the chairman and I wired the four companies to request an extension of the moratorium. The companies agreed. I ask unanimous consent that the telegram, in which the chairman and I joined and the responses which we received from the companies, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegrams ordered to be printed in the RECORD, are as follows:

SENATE INTERIOR COMMITTEE,  
August 30, 1967.

G. GRAY EVANS,  
Vice President Georgia-Pacific Corp.,  
Portland, Oreg.:

HAROLD A. MILLER,  
President Miller-Rellim Lumber Co.,  
Portland, Oreg.:

STARR W. REED  
Vice President, Simpson Timber Co.,  
Seattle, Wash.:

ROBERT O. DEHLENDORF II,  
President, Arcata National Corp.,  
Palo Alto, Calif.:

We expect the Senate to act on a Redwoods National Park bill before adjournment of the Congress this year. Therefore, we request the continued cooperation of your company in extending, for the balance of this session of the Congress, the expiration date of the

understanding reached with you last year affecting lumber operations in areas involved in pending park bills. Your continued forbearance in the public interest will be appreciated by this committee.

HENRY M. JACKSON,  
Chairman,  
THOMAS H. KUCHEL,  
Ranking Minority Member,  
Senate Interior and Insular  
Affairs Committee.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
September 1, 1967.

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL,  
Senator HENRY M. JACKSON:  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

In reply to your wire asking extension of the understanding which we proposed on Sept. 7 last year for certain redwood timberlands, let me say that the terms of the understanding are imposing a burden. Continuation of this is not in the interest of good forest management. We are aware of the complexities of the problem but had hoped that a year would be sufficient time to decide if a need for more than the 140,000 acres of already preserved redwood lands even exists. We remain convinced that the lands involved in the understanding are not of Redwood Park quality, but we shall abide by our understanding for another 60 days as a reasonable length of time. This does not mean that at the end of the period the timber involved would be harvested. It simply means that intelligent management calculated to maintain redwood forests forever on all the land would be put back into effect. As your consideration of the matter proceeds, I hope you will consult us prior to making final decisions if any of our lands are involved.

GEORGIA PACIFIC CORP.,  
R. B. PAMPLIN,  
President.

ARCATA, CALIF.,  
August 31, 1967.

Hon. THOMAS KUCHEL,  
Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON,  
Chairman, Senate Interior Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

This is in reply to your wire received today about Redwood Park legislation. Your attention is directed to a letter sent you Sept. 8, 1966 by Dave James vice president public affairs of Simpson Timber Co. in which Simpson agreed to continue to defer harvesting timber in superlative stands of redwood trees critical to areas seriously being considered for inclusion in the national park system. You will also recall a map submitted to the committee showing our logging plans in the areas under consideration in the public interest and in the interest of helping the Congress reach a carefully reasoned solution to the park issue. Simpson will continue to cooperate with Congress by refraining from harvesting timber in the areas being seriously considered until Congress adjourns this session.

Sincerely,

STARR W. REED,  
Vice President, Timberlands Simpson  
Timber Co.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,  
September 1, 1967.

Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON,  
Chairman,  
Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,  
Ranking Minority Member, Senate Interior  
and Insular Affairs Committee, U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.:

In reply to your telegraphic request of August 30, 1967, that our Arcata Redwood Company Division continue to refrain from logging in areas involved in all pending alternative park bills, please be advised of the following. For the balance of the first session

of the ninetieth Congress, Arcata Redwood will continue not to extend logging operations into that property which lies west of U.S. Highway 101 nor into the main watershed of Redwood Creek which is bounded on the east by the Bald Hills county road and on the west by the main channel of Redwood Creek. This agreement is not of course, subject to the following exception that, in conformance with sound logging practices and established procedure, logging crews may be moved into such areas to remove timber felled or endangered by wind or fire should either event occur during this period of time.

In complying with your request for continued cooperation, we do so in the trust that the Federal Government, State of California, and the Redwood industry will soon be able to arrive at an equitable solution—a solution that strikes a sensible balance in terms of the total public interest. Such solution should not be at the expense of the present and future perpetual operation of any single company, the economy of the area and the livelihood of the people who are directly or indirectly dependent upon the industry's survival. These people more than anyone else deserve and will welcome an early resolution of this problem that has left them in a state of continuing uncertainty and anxiety.

C. DAVIS WEYERHAEUSER,  
Chairman of the Board,  
ROBERT O. DEHLENDORF,  
President, Arcata National Corp.

MILLER REDWOOD CO.,  
Crescent City, Calif., August 30, 1967.

Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: As our Counsel has advised you by separate correspondence, this company is agreeable to continue the moratorium set forth in its letter of September 8, 1966. We do so in an attempt to continue to have a spirit of cooperation, particularly in light of the fact that your Committee is moving toward a resolution of the problem.

We of course cannot remain indefinitely in a state of moratorium since, as I am sure you are aware, it is quite a hardship on the company. However, before making any move into the so-called "controversial" area we would certainly consult with you and with Chairman Aspinall of the House Committee. We hope this is satisfactory.

Yours very truly,

HAROLD A. MILLER,  
President.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, within the last 2 weeks the companies made a further announcement with respect to the moratorium. I ask that the text of an October 18, 1967, telegram from Mr. Starr Reed be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

OCTOBER 18, 1967.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington D.C.:

Am authorized as chairman of Redwood Industry Land Committee to advise on behalf of Arcata National, Georgia-Pacific, Miller Redwood, Pacific Lumber and Simpson Timber that the companies will individually make every effort to withhold logging within boundaries of new Senate redwood park proposal S. 2515 pending investigation of impact and Senate consideration urge your assistance in obtaining postponement of Senate floor consideration while impact on companies, employees and communities is evaluated. There is no question but that

S. 2515 will eliminate at least one company and seriously affect others.

STARR REED,  
Simpson Timber Co., Seattle.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I think I can say our hope is that with Senate passage of S. 2515 these companies can refrain from any cutting within the boundaries described in S. 2515 pending House action on the legislation. I am pleased to announce that the Arcata National Corp., parent corporation of the Arcata Redwood Co., which owns 12,500 acres of land within the boundaries set forth in S. 2515, has informed the chairman and me that it will not perform any logging operations within the boundary described in S. 2515, prior to the end of the second session of the 90th Congress, next year.

The American people should be grateful that this company, while opposing S. 2515, does so with due respect for the legislative process and the public interest, rather than ruthlessly carving up forest lands within the park boundaries to frustrate congressional efforts to create a park.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

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

#### ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR ELLENDER TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of morning business on tomorrow, the able senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] be recognized to speak on his amendment.

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

#### AUTHORIZATION FOR PERMANENT INVESTIGATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO MEET DURING SESSIONS OF THE SENATE ON NOVEMBER 1, 2, AND 3

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], I ask unanimous consent that permission be given for the Permanent Investigations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations to meet during the sessions of the Senate on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, November 1, 2, and 3. The meetings are to be held in connection with hearings on riots and criminal and civil disorders.

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

#### APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 84-689, appoints the following Senators as delegates to

the North Atlantic Assembly, to be held at Brussels, Belgium, on November 20-25, 1967: Senators SPARKMAN, JACKSON, BAYH, MCINTYRE, MONDALE, JAVITS, COOPER, MUNDT, and HANSEN, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey and MONTROYA, alternates.

#### FREE WORLD ASSISTANCE TO VIETNAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in a statement on the floor of the Senate on October 10, I referred to a memorandum inserted in the RECORD on October 5 by both the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. The memorandum was entitled "Free World Assistance to Vietnam as of October 1, 1967."

I remarked on October 10 that neither the Senator from Wyoming nor the Senator from Texas had mentioned the source of the memorandum. I have now received a copy of the same memorandum which was issued under a Department of State letterhead. Perhaps the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Texas felt that the information would have more credibility if it was not identified as having originated in the Department of State. I hope that this was not their reason, for it would be a sad commentary on the reputation of this great Government department. In any case, to complete the historical record, I request unanimous consent that the first paragraph of the memorandum entitled "Free World Assistance to Vietnam as of October 1, 1967," including the Department of State letterhead, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The first paragraph of the State Department memorandum begins by stating:

Thirty-one nations besides the United States are assisting Vietnam under the Free World Assistance Program. Six other countries not considered part of the FWA Program and the United Nations also assist, and promises of help have come from three other nations.

This statement is not entirely correct. It is true that at some point in time the countries listed in the State Department memorandum were assisting Vietnam. But all of the 31 nations mentioned in the memorandum are not now assisting in Vietnam under the free world assistance program and all of the six other countries listed in the memorandum, not considered part of the free world assistance program, are also not now assisting in Vietnam.

Mr. President, the Department of State has provided information which contradicts its own assertions that 37 nations "are assisting Vietnam." On October 9, I wrote Secretary of State Rusk and asked him several questions relating to free world assistance. I ask unanimous consent that my letter of October 9 and the reply from Assistant Secretary William B. Macomber, Jr., dated October 16, together with its enclosures, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The questions I asked Secretary Rusk were designed to elicit information on trade with North Vietnam by countries also assisting South Vietnam; the years in which assistance to Vietnam has been provided by certain countries—countries whose assistance has been modest, totaling \$26,000 or less; and the dollar value of the assistance provided in calendar year 1967 by 26 of the countries listed in the State Department memorandum.

The material provided in the enclosures to Assistant Secretary Macomber's letter of October 16 shows that while the State Department memorandum inserted in the RECORD by the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Texas lists Brazil, Ecuador, Greece, Guatemala, Laos, Liberia, Luxembourg, Turkey, Uruguay and Venezuela as countries "assisting Vietnam under the free world assistance program," in fact these countries did provide assistance in 1964 or 1965 or 1966 but they have not given one single dollar in 1967. As for the "six other countries not considered part of the FWA program and the United Nations," Ireland, Pakistan and Norway are shown as having given assistance in 1965 but not since.

On the face of it, I would think it logical to conclude that, at least in some cases, the countries which have given aid in the past, but are no longer providing assistance, view the war with increasing reserve and obviously wish to disassociate themselves from it.

I have inserted in the RECORD before, on both May 25 and October 10, a letter from Assistant Secretary Macomber dated May 15, the enclosure to which showed the dollar value of assistance provided by 30 countries under the free world assistance program during the period June 1964 through December 1966. I noted, in my remarks on the floor on October 10, that the assistance provided by 13 of these 30 countries totalled \$26,000 or less for the two and a half year period. In considering the assistance to Vietnam from the other 11 countries—the countries which have given more than \$26,000—it seems to me that it is necessary to look at their assistance in a somewhat broader context.

In the first place, three of these 11 countries—Brazil, Liberia, Venezuela—have apparently given no assistance in 1967.

In the second place, in many cases, assistance to South Vietnam is far less than the amount of trade with North Vietnam. According to the statistics provided in the enclosures to Assistant Secretary Macomber's letter of October 16, Japan's total two-way trade with North Vietnam in the period 1964 through 1966 was about 20 times the amount of Japan's assistance to South Vietnam during the same period, Italy's trade with North Vietnam was more than 10 times Italy's assistance to South Vietnam, New Zealand's trade with North Vietnam was about eight times its assistance to South Vietnam, the Netherlands' trade with North Vietnam was more than

three times Dutch assistance to South Vietnam and the United Kingdom's trade with North Vietnam was almost twice the amount of British assistance to South Vietnam.

In the third place, and to me this is the most important and disturbing factor, in many cases the assistance being given to South Vietnam seems disproportionately small when compared to the money being earned from the war in Vietnam. For example, Japan has provided a total of \$2,250,000 worth of assistance to Vietnam in the period June 1964 through December 1966, according to the State Department. But at the same time, Japanese exports to South Vietnam—and most of these exports were either purchases by the U.S. Government or by the South Vietnamese Government with U.S. funds—totaled \$138 million in 1966, compared to \$36 million in 1965. And I have seen statements in the press, which I understand are accurate, that Japanese economists believe that Japan's exports in fiscal year 1967 to the United States, South Vietnam and other Southeast Asian nations directly related to the conflict will total between \$1.4 and \$1.7 billion.

According to Assistant Secretary Macomber's letter of May 15, assistance to Vietnam from the Republic of China totaled \$775,000 in the period June 1964 through December 1966. Yet the Republic of China's exports to South Vietnam in 1966 totaled \$89 million, compared to \$50 million in 1965, and in addition, according to the Government of the Republic of China, that country is making about \$1 million a month from expenditures by American soldiers on rest and rehabilitation leaves.

Mr. President, these countries are not the only ones whose economies are profiting greatly because of the war in Vietnam. South Korea's earnings in South Vietnam as a result of the war—from remittances from Korean soldiers and civilians in South Vietnam, from construction and service contracts and from commodity procurement—totaled \$59,540,000 in 1966 and \$83,583,000 in the first 8 months of 1967.

And Singapore, which apparently is not providing any assistance to South Vietnam, saw its exports to South Vietnam increase to \$85.5 million in 1966, from \$37.4 million in 1965, and it is estimated that Singapore's exports to South Vietnam in 1967 will be on the order of \$95 million. In fact, South Vietnam has now displaced the United Kingdom as Singapore's second largest customer.

Mr. President, I said in the Senate on October 10 that the old proverb that one cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear seemed to me particularly applicable to the Department of State's claims regarding free world assistance to Vietnam. The facts are that very few countries are supporting us in Vietnam in any meaningful way and that most Asian countries are profiting from the war while we, and, of course, the South Vietnamese, do the spending and dying.

Mr. President, the bulletin of the Department of State to which I have referred is, I believe, the kind of official Government information which is responsible for the answers to the questions

asked in the Gallup poll of October 25 which appeared in the Washington Post, on page 14.

The question was:

Do you think the Johnson Administration is or is not telling the public all it should know about the war?

Twenty-one percent answered: "Yes, the administration is telling the facts." Seventy percent replied: "No, the administration is not telling the facts." Nine percent had no opinion.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the effort of the State Department to create the impression that there is widespread support for the war, on the basis of the countries listed in the bulletin is very misleading, to put it mildly.

#### EXHIBIT 1

#### DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

#### FREE WORLD ASSISTANCE TO VIETNAM AS OF OCTOBER 1, 1967

Thirty-one nations besides the United States are assisting Viet-Nam under the Free World Assistance Program. Six other countries not considered part of the FWA program and the United Nations also assist, and promises of help have come from three other nations. Five Asian countries now have almost 60,000 troops on the ground in Viet-Nam. A detailed listing by geographic area follows:

#### FAR EAST

##### Australia

Australia is providing a wide and substantial range of aid to Viet-Nam under the Colombo Plan and by direct bilateral assistance. Economic aid since 1964 is valued at more than \$10 million.

##### Military aid consists of:

1. Approximately 5,750 combat troops including a brigade and support, and a squadron of 8 Canberra bombers. In addition, they provide naval assistance and a guided missile destroyer.

2. 100 combat advisors (primarily specialists in jungle warfare).

3. A 73-man air force unit at Vung Tau with six Australian caribou planes which fly daily logistical transport missions in support of Vietnamese military forces.

##### Economic and technical assistance includes:

1. Three surgical teams, totaling 37 personnel, in 3 provincial hospitals. These teams, in addition to performing major operations, have established a blood bank and are giving lessons in nursing.

2. A group of civil engineers working on water supply and road construction projects.

3. Three experts in dairy and crop practices and radio techniques.

4. Training of 130 Vietnamese in Australia.

5. In goods and materials: 1,250,000 textbooks in Vietnamese for rural schools; 3,300 tons of corrugated roofing for Vietnamese military dependents' housing; 6 large community windmills; 15,750 sets of hand tools; 400 radio sets and 2,400 loud-speakers; 16,000 blankets and 14,000 cases of condensed milk.

6. A 55 kilowatt broadcasting station at Ban Me Thuot.

The Australian Government decided on February 1 to increase its non-military aid to Viet-Nam during FY 1967 to \$2 million. This will permit substantial enlargement of current medical and civic action programs and the undertaking of new projects such as providing equipment for refugee resettlement centers.

##### Republic of China

The Republic of China has provided:

1. An 80-man agricultural team.
2. An 18-man military psychological warfare team.

3. A 34-man electrical power mission under the leadership of Taipower.

4. A 16-man surgical team.

China has also provided training for more than 200 Vietnamese in Taiwan. In the way of goods and materials, they have provided 26 aluminum prefabricated warehouses, agricultural tools, seeds and fertilizers, 500,000 copies of mathematics textbooks and an electrical power substation.

##### Japan

Japan has provided over \$55 million worth of economic assistance to Viet-Nam, chiefly through reparations. Japan has sent two medical teams, considerable amounts of medical goods (4,544 cases), 20,000 transistor radios and 25 ambulances. It has provided technical personnel and funds for the construction of a large power dam across the Da Nhim River and electrical transmission line. A new medical aid agreement (\$1.1 million) was signed in June 1967.

##### Korea

Korea has sent approximately 48,800 troops including:

1. 2 combat divisions and 1 combat brigade.

2. A 130-man Mobile Army Surgical Hospital (MASH).

3. 10 military instructors in Korean karate for training Vietnamese military in hand-to-hand combat.

4. A 2,200-man Task Force Unit composed of the following elements: 1 Army engineer battalion, 1 Headquarters group, 1 Army Transportation company, 1 Marine Corps Engineer company, 1 Infantry battalion, 1 LST and 2 LSM's, 1 Composite Support unit (communications, medical supplies, etc.).

Korean military medical personnel are providing some medical care to the local population in areas where ROK troops are stationed. In addition, 7 civilian medical teams totaling 118 doctors, nurses and support personnel are working in provincial health programs.

##### Laos

One million kip (\$4,167) for flood relief in 1965 and a small cash donation for refugees in 1966.

##### Malaysia

Since 1963, Malaysia has trained over 2,000 Vietnamese military and police officers. Groups of 30-60 are regularly sent for about a month's training in counterinsurgency with Malayan Police Special Constabulary. Malaysia has previously provided substantial amounts of counterinsurgency materials, primarily military and police transport such as armored vehicles. Medicines and relief supplies have also been donated.

##### New Zealand

New Zealand has sent an artillery battery and an infantry company (approximately 350 men) and provided a 25-man army engineer detachment.

In non-military aid, New Zealand has sent a 15-man surgical team, and a professor in English language for the University of Saigon. A second 16-man medical team will be sent to Binh Dinh province. They are presently training 83 Vietnamese in New Zealand and have provided 7,500£ (\$21,000) for equipment for a technical high school. They are also assisting by providing approximately \$600,000 for a science building at the University of Saigon.

##### Philippines

The Philippine Government has sent a 2,000-man military engineering unit with security support personnel, a station hospital, and rural health and civic action teams.

In non-military aid, approximately 60 Philippine civic action personnel including military and civilian medical teams have been working in Viet-Nam for several years.

##### Thailand

Thailand has sent a total of approximately 2,200 men including a recently arrived com-

bat brigade. A 150-man Thai naval group manning an LST and PGM patrol craft arrived in Viet-Nam in December 1966. A 35-man air force contingent has been flying operational transport missions for the Vietnamese forces. The Thais have also been providing jet training for Vietnamese pilots in Thailand.

In *non-military aid*, the Thais have provided rice for refugees and cement and zinc roofing materials. At the Manila Conference, the Thais offered the Vietnamese a \$20 million rice credit. The Thais have also announced they will send a medical unit to Viet-Nam.

## MIDDLE EAST

## Greece

Greece has contributed \$15,000 worth of medical supplies.

## Iran

Iran has contributed 1,000 tons of petroleum products to Viet-Nam and has dispatched a 20-man medical team to Viet-Nam.

## Turkey

Turkey has provided medicines and also offered to provide a substantial amount of cement.

## EUROPE

## Austria

Austria has offered to supply medical supplies, blankets, tents, through the Austrian Red Cross.

## Belgium

Belgium has provided medicines and an ambulance and has given scholarships for 15 Vietnamese to study in Belgium.

## Denmark

Denmark has provided medical supplies and has offered to train 12 Vietnamese nurses in Denmark.

## Germany

## Personnel in Viet-Nam:

A 3,000-ton hospital ship, the "helgoland" with 8 doctors, 30 other medical personnel and 145 beds is on duty in Viet-Nam.

Seven Germans, a director and six instructors, are teaching at the new Vietnamese-German Technical High School at Thu Duc near Saigon. At Hue University there are five Germans: three physicians in the Medical School, a professor of music, a professor of German language, and one expert in forestry is working at the Department of Rural Affairs, Saigon.

*Vietnamese in Germany:* Forty Vietnamese are studying in Germany and the Germans have agreed to accept 30 more primarily for training as future instructors in the technical high school. A considerable number have previously been trained.

*Goods and Materials:* The Germans have provided the following credits:

(1) DM 15 million (\$3.75 million) for import of German products such as machine tools, fertilizer, etc. The plaste funds generated go to the National Office of Agricultural Credit to aid farmers, particularly with loans;

(2) a credit of DM 50 million (\$12.5 million) for development of the major industrial complex at An Hoan-Nong Son;

(3) a credit for DM 20 million (\$5 million) for construction of an abattoir at Saigon-Cholon, and three coastal vessels;

(4) a credit of DM 500,000 (\$125,000) for equipment at the Vietnamese-German Technical High School at Thu Duc.

In April 1966, the Germans announced a gift of DM 17.5 million (\$4.4 million) worth of pharmaceuticals, the first shipments of which have arrived. Also in the medical field, they have provided two mobile dental clinics and 30 ambulances for the Ministry of Health.

In June 1966, the Cabinet voted DM 25 million (US \$6.25 million) for new aid to Viet-Nam including: 1) sending 25 experts to establish a refugee center; 2) building a

home for wayward youths; 3) expansion of eight social centers and construction of a ninth, and 4) establishment of a training center for social workers. The Germans have also donated 260 tons of rice for refugee relief programs.

## Italy

The Italians provided a 10-man surgical team and have offered science scholarships to 10 Vietnamese to study in Italy.

## Luxembourg

Luxembourg has provided plasma and blood transfusion equipment.

## The Netherlands

The Dutch have undertaken to build 5 tuberculosis centers in Saigon; sites for 3 have been selected. In August, the Netherlands announced a contribution of \$355,000 for a 4-year UN project in social welfare, part of the \$1 million they have earmarked for UN projects in Viet-Nam. In 1964, the Dutch gave antibiotics and 4 scholarships for Vietnamese. They previously provided a dredge.

## Spain

Spain has sent a 12-man medical team to Viet-Nam and has provided 800 pounds of medicines, medical equipment and blankets.

## United Kingdom

The United Kingdom has supplied economic aid valued at more than \$2 million in the past three years. It has provided six civilians for the British Advisory Mission and a Professor of English at Hue University. Twenty-one Vietnamese are receiving training in the United Kingdom. A pediatric team of four British doctors and six nurses went to Viet-Nam in August, 1966.

In 1963-64, the United Kingdom provided the following goods and materials: Laboratory equipment for Saigon University; a typesetting machine for the Government Printing Office; a cobalt deep-ray therapy unit for the National Cancer Institute; various equipment for the faculties of Medicine, Science and Pharmacy at Saigon University, the Meteorologic Service and the Agricultural School at Saigon, and Atomic Research Establishment at Dalat and the Faculty of Education at Hue. In 1965-1966, British economic aid totalled \$226,800 for roadbuilding equipment, diesel fishing boat engines, and portable anesthetic machines. Total aid in British FY 1967 was \$515,200 and it is estimated \$666,400 will be expended in FY 1968.

## LATIN AMERICA

## Argentina

Argentina is contributing 5,000 tons of wheat.

## Brazil

Brazil has sent a substantial quantity of medical supplies which was carried to Viet-Nam by a Brazilian Air force plane and has also provided coffee.

## Costa Rica

Costa Rica is contributing an ambulance for use in Viet-Nam.

## Dominican Republic

Cement has been offered by the Dominican Republic for use in Viet-Nam.

## Ecuador

Ecuador has sent medical supplies to Viet-Nam.

## Guatemala

Guatemala has sent 15,000 doses of typhoid-paratyphoid serum for use in Viet-Nam.

## Honduras

Honduras has contributed drugs and dry goods for refugees in Viet-Nam, flown there on a Honduras Air Force plane.

## Uruguay

Uruguay has contributed \$21,500 for relief supplies and medicines for Viet-Nam.

## Venezuela

Venezuela has provided 500 tons of rice for refugee relief, and two civilian doctors are working in Viet-Nam.

## AFRICA

## Liberia

A contribution of \$50,000 has been made by Liberia for the purchase of hospital equipment and other medical supplies for Viet-Nam.

## Tunisia

Tunisia has made available 15 to 20 scholarships for Vietnamese.

## NORTH AMERICA

## Canada

Almost \$6 million of development assistance to Viet-Nam has been provided by Canada.

1. Since 1964 Canada has supplied more than \$4.5 million in economic aid. It increased its aid to South Viet-Nam this fiscal year allocating \$1 million for medical assistance including providing ten 200-bed emergency hospital units. The first two units have arrived and have been installed at Phan Thiet and at Phu Tho near Saigon. A Canadian doctor and technician visited Viet-Nam in the fall to inspect potential sites. Canada has sent 650,000 doses of polio vaccine for Vietnamese school children and offered additional vaccines against polio, TB and smallpox. Consideration is being given to establishment of a children's rehabilitation center in Viet-Nam.

2. Since 1958, Canada has provided \$850,000 worth of food aid for Viet-Nam. Funds generated by sales are used for capital construction projects in Viet-Nam.

3. A new science building for the medical faculty at the University of Hue is being built costing about \$333,000, drawn from counterpart funds generated by sales of food supplied by Canada. Construction has passed the half-way mark.

4. The Canadians have also agreed to construct an auditorium for the Faculty of Sciences at Hue University which will cost about \$125,000.

5. Canada is printing half a million copies of a social sciences textbook for Vietnamese grade school children.

6. *Personnel in Viet-Nam:* A Canadian Supervisor has been at Quang Ngai supervising construction of a small TB Clinic which the Canadians are funding. The Canadians have sent two doctors and four nurses to staff the clinic. A professor of orthopedics is working at Cho Ray Hospital, Saigon, and there is a Canadian teacher at the University of Hue.

7. *Vietnamese in Canada:* 380 Colombo Plan trainees and a total of 463 trainees under all programs, including those sponsored by other agencies and third countries (as well as Colombo Plan), have been trained in Canada. There are currently 231 Vietnamese students in Canada.

## OTHER ASSISTANCE

Six other nations whose help does not fall under the Free World Assistance Program have provided valuable assistance to Viet-Nam in economic and humanitarian fields.

## France

Since 1956, France has contributed about \$115 million in assistance to South Viet-Nam. Present aid is running at a rate of about \$4 million per year, largely in the cultural field.

In 1965 France had nearly 500 persons serving in South Viet-Nam. Among them were 65 experts under France's program of economic and technical assistance, including 32 physicians, professors and other medical personnel. Under its cultural programs, 471 professors (350 French and 121 Vietnamese) were teaching at 9 French-teaching institu-

tions, and 30 French professors are at Vietnamese institutions. France provided in 1965 for Vietnamese to study in France, 55 fellowships for technical training and 85 academic fellowships. These programs are continuing on a somewhat reduced scale.

France has provided low-interest credits of 100 million francs (\$20 million) for financing imports of French equipment for Vietnamese industry, a grant of 500,000 francs (\$100,000) for equipment for L'Ecole Nationale d'Ingenieurs des Arts Industriels.

In 1960 France extended a low-interest credit of 70 million francs (\$14 million) to aid construction of the major coal and chemical complex at An Hoa Nong Son south of Da Nang which is underway. It also provides a low-interest, five-year credit of 60 million francs (\$12 million) for construction of Vietnam's largest cement-producing complex with plants at Hatien and Thu Duc. In 1964, France provided a 930,000 francs (\$186,000) grant for the installation of a training center for electrical technicians and in 1965 a gift of 1.25 million francs (\$250,000) for teaching equipment, primarily in the medical field.

#### Ireland

The Irish people have contributed 1,000 pounds (\$2,800) for Vietnamese flood victims through their Red Cross.

#### Israel

Israel made a gift of pharmaceutical supplies for flood victims and will train five Vietnamese in irrigation and animal husbandry.

#### Norway

Norway sent a contribution through the International Red Cross for flood victims in February 1965.

#### Pakistan

Pakistan made a financial contribution for assistance to flood victims and donated clothing for them.

#### Switzerland

The Swiss have provided microscopes for the University of Saigon. The Swiss Red Cross has sent an 11-man medical team through the International Committee of the Red Cross to work in a provincial hospital in the Central Highlands of South Viet-Nam.

#### U.N. aid to Vietnam

The United Nations and its specialized agencies are also making a significant contribution to the social and economic development of Viet-Nam. Under the Expanded Program of Technical Assistance of the UN Development Program, 15 technical assistance projects are scheduled for 1967 and 1968 at a cost of \$724,475. These projects range across such varied fields as maternal and child health, labor administration, educational planning, telecommunications, meteorology and civil aviation. Among the participating agencies are ILO, FAO, UNESCO, WHO, ICAO, ITU, WMO, and the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the UN. In addition UNICEF has substantially expanded its health and child care programs with the 1967 program totalling \$562,000, an increase over the 1966 level of \$226,000.

Several major projects financed by the Special Fund of the UN Development Program are about to get underway. A National Technical Center (total international contribution approximately \$1.5 million), with UNESCO is becoming operational. The Special Fund in January approved a Fisheries Development Project including exploratory and experimental fishing in the waters of the South China Sea, to be executed by FAO at a cost of \$1.3 million. Also being negotiated is a Social Welfare Training Center to be executed by the Bureau of Social Affairs of the UN. ECAFE is pressing ahead with regional projects of benefit to the nations of the Mekong Basin and has undertaken

surveys of irrigation, hydro-electric facilities and bridge construction projects in Viet-Nam.

#### EXHIBIT 2

OCTOBER 9, 1967.

HON. DEAN RUSK,  
Secretary of State,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you know, there has been considerable discussion in recent days on the floor of the Senate regarding assistance provided by other countries to the Government of South Vietnam. I would appreciate the answer, as soon as possible, to the following four questions:

1. What commitments has the United States Government made to, or what undertakings have been entered into with, the governments of South Korea, Thailand and the Philippines in connection with their provision of troops?

2. Which countries aiding South Vietnam under the Free World Assistance Program trade with North Vietnam and what has been the amount of such trade in each of the past three years?

3. In which calendar years has assistance to South Vietnam been provided by Austria, Denmark, Ecuador, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Ireland, Laos, Liberia, Luxembourg, Norway, Pakistan, Tunisia, Turkey and Uruguay?

4. What is the dollar value of the assistance provided in calendar year 1967 to South Vietnam by Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Laos, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Norway, Pakistan, Spain, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, Uruguay and Venezuela?

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,  
Chairman.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, October 16, 1967.

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT,  
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,  
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Secretary has asked me to reply to your letter of October 9 regarding assistance provided by other countries to the Government of South Viet-Nam.

With regard to your first question, the United States has not entered into any new security commitments with South Korea, Thailand, and the Philippines in connection with their provision of troops to South Viet-Nam. We are preparing and will send you shortly a classified summary of the support undertakings we have with these three countries.

The answers to your questions 2, 3, and 4 are provided in the enclosed tables.

I note that the list of countries under questions 3 and 4 comprises only the smaller contributors, and omits those nations which made the largest contributions. It is reasonable to expect that a small country, far distant from Viet-Nam, and with relatively limited resources such as Ecuador, Guatemala, and Honduras, would find that a small contribution was about all it could do in the circumstances. Nonetheless, the Department does attach significance to these contributions, modest as they may be, as an indication of support for the South Vietnamese people.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, JR.,  
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

(Enclosures: (1) Exports from Selected Countries to North Vietnam; (2) Imports by Selected Countries from North Vietnam; (3) Assistance to South Vietnam by Calendar Year; (4) Dollar Value of Assistance in Calendar Year 1967.)

#### EXPORTS FROM SELECTED COUNTRIES TO NORTH VIETNAM, 1964-66

[In thousands of dollars]

	1964	1965	1966
Argentina.....	606		
Australia.....		300	2
Austria.....		1	(1)
Belgium-Luxembourg.....	2	1,685	515
Brazil.....			
Canada.....			
China.....			
Costa Rica.....			
Denmark.....	12	75	9
Dominican Republic.....			
Ecuador.....			
Germany.....	1,108	136	212
Greece.....			(2)
Guatemala.....			
Honduras.....			
Iran.....			
Italy.....	1,274	633	399
Japan.....	3,372	3,853	5,649
Korea.....			
Laos.....	(3)	(3)	(3)
Liberia.....			
Malaysia.....	\$1,288	\$2,799	
Netherlands.....	144	93	302
New Zealand.....	24	19	41
Philippines.....			
Spain.....		2	
Thailand.....			
Tunisia.....			
Turkey.....			(3)
United Kingdom.....	101	202	104
Uruguay.....			
Venezuela.....			

<sup>1</sup> Under \$500.

<sup>2</sup> Not available.

<sup>3</sup> Includes Singapore in 1964 and 1965.

#### IMPORTS BY SELECTED COUNTRIES FROM NORTH VIETNAM, 1964-66

[In thousands of dollars]

	1964	1965	1966
Argentina.....			
Australia.....			
Austria.....	58	78	139
Belgium-Luxembourg.....	767	604	19
Brazil.....			
Canada.....			
China.....			
Costa Rica.....			
Denmark.....	10		
Dominican Republic.....			
Ecuador.....			
Germany.....	236	215	147
Greece.....			(1)
Guatemala.....			
Honduras.....			
Iran.....			
Italy.....	278	485	143
Japan.....	9,872	11,457	9,651
Korea.....			
Laos.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Liberia.....			
Malaysia.....	\$1,434	\$1,859	179
Netherlands.....	1,312	573	112
New Zealand.....			(3)
Philippines.....			
Spain.....			
Thailand.....			7
Tunisia.....	1		
Turkey.....			(1)
United Kingdom.....	165	333	255
Uruguay.....			
Venezuela.....		3	3

<sup>1</sup> Not available.

<sup>2</sup> Includes Singapore in 1964 and 1965.

<sup>3</sup> Under \$500.

#### ASSISTANCE TO SOUTH VIETNAM BY CALENDAR YEAR

	Year
Austria.....	Assistance offered.
Denmark.....	1964 and 1967.
Ecuador.....	1965.
Greece.....	1964.
Guatemala.....	1965.
Honduras.....	1967.
Ireland <sup>1</sup> .....	1965.
Laos.....	1965 and 1966.
Liberia.....	1966.
Luxembourg.....	1965.
Norway <sup>1</sup> .....	1965.
Pakistan <sup>1</sup> .....	1965.
Tunisia.....	1967.
Turkey.....	1964.
Uruguay.....	1966.

<sup>1</sup> Assistance is not considered part of the free world assistance program.

## DOLLAR VALUE OF ASSISTANCE IN CALENDAR YEAR 1967

	Value
Argentina.....	\$290,000 (in process). <sup>1</sup>
Austria <sup>2</sup> .....	
Belgium.....	\$75,000 (scholarships).
Brazil.....	
Costa Rica.....	\$7,000 (in process).
Denmark.....	\$60,000 (training).
Dominican Republic.....	
Ecuador.....	
Greece.....	
Guatemala.....	
Honduras.....	\$10,000. <sup>3</sup>
Iran.....	\$80,000. <sup>4</sup>
Ireland <sup>5</sup> .....	
Israel <sup>6</sup> .....	(0).
Italy.....	\$50,000 (scholarships).
Laos.....	
Luxembourg.....	
Malaysia.....	\$50,000 (training).
Norway <sup>7</sup> .....	
Pakistan <sup>8</sup> .....	
Spain.....	(0).
Switzerland <sup>9</sup> .....	(0).
Tunisia.....	\$48,000 (scholarships).
Turkey.....	
Uruguay.....	
Venezuela.....	

<sup>1</sup> This contribution was included in the summary supplied in our letter of May 15, 1967. However, the commodities have not yet been delivered.

<sup>2</sup> Assistance is not considered part of the free world assistance program.

<sup>3</sup> This contribution was included in the summary supplied in our letter of May 15, 1967. However, the supplies were not delivered until March 1967.

<sup>4</sup> Estimated annual cost of medical team assigned to Vietnam.

<sup>5</sup> No estimate available of the cost of Vietnamese training scholarships.

<sup>6</sup> Estimated cost not available of the medical team assigned to Vietnam.

<sup>7</sup> Not available.

### THE DEADLOCK EXISTING IN THE CONFERENCE ON THE FOREIGN AID AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. President, on August 17, when the Senate passed the foreign aid authorization bill, I promised the Senate that I would do everything I could to hold the bill as the Senate passed it. I said:

I could not have supported the bill if the Senate had not sustained the committee's work on it. I will let the bill languish in conference indefinitely if we cannot reach a satisfactory agreement on the major proposals.

Subsequently the House passed a bill on August 24. The Labor Day recess intervened and the conferees met for the first time on September 14. Since that date, the conferees have met 10 times.

There were 89 points of difference between the House and the Senate bills. The conferees have tentatively resolved 72 of those points. Of the 17 remaining differences, most have to do with the question of foreign military credit sales, and it is upon this issue that the conference apparently has deadlocked.

I therefore feel it my duty to report to the Senate on what has transpired and on what the situation is on that very controversial piece of legislation.

Over the years, the Congress has provided the administration, primarily the Department of Defense, with steadily broader authority to finance foreign credit sales of military equipment. About a year ago members of the Foreign Relations Committee began to be concerned over the manner in which this authority was being exercised. I believe the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] was the first to call it to the attention of the committee.

As a result of the Senator from Minne-

sota's concern, the staff of the Foreign Relations Committee made a study which was published in January 1967 under the title "Arms Sales and Foreign Policy." This study recommended that the United States "reappraise the adequacy of the present machinery of policy control and legislative oversight governing the sale of arms." It pointed out that over the past 4 years there has been a basic change in the composition of American military assistance. The sale of arms has now replaced the giving of arms as the predominant form of U.S. military assistance. While dramatic in character and of major importance in its implications for alliance relationships and for the problems of arms control in the developing regions of the world, the significance of this change has not been fully appreciated by the hierarchy of the American executive branch or the Congress. In Europe, American arms salesmanship has often been zealous to the point of irritation, and overpowering to the point of encouraging Europeans to compete more aggressively for the arms markets in the underdeveloped regions of the world. In some underdeveloped regions of the world—notably Latin America and the Middle East—where there are no significant balance-of-payment incentives, the United States, when faced with tough decisions as in Iran and Argentina, seems to be drifting into a policy of preemptive selling rather than the more difficult alternative of arms denial.

Subsequently the Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Subcommittee on Disarmament, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], held extensive hearings on the problem.

As a result of these hearings, there were revealed many abuses of the authority to sell military equipment on credit, and the Foreign Relations Committee in marking up the foreign aid bill voted to curtail that authority rather drastically. The committee was sustained by the Senate. The foreign aid bill as it passed the Senate repealed the authority of the Department of Defense to guarantee loans by the Export-Import Bank or private banks for the purchase of military equipment. It also provided for the liquidation, as of December 31, 1967, of the revolving fund which the Department of Defense has used to finance credit sales of military equipment to underdeveloped countries.

This is the issue upon which it appears that the foreign aid conference is deadlocked.

Although holding strong views about the matter, a majority of the Senate conferees have offered substantial concessions to the House.

First. The Senate conferees have offered to agree to the continuation of the guarantee authority to June 30, 1968, as contrasted with the Senate bill which would repeal the authority upon enactment. The House conferees insist upon continuation of the authority to June 30, 1969.

Second. Senate conferees have offered

to agree to an overall limit on credit sales to developing countries of \$175 million. This is more than halfway between the administration's original plans for such sales in the amount of \$294.5 million, and the Senate's position that such sales ought not to be made at all except for cash or on short-term credit.

Third. The Senate conferees agreed to postpone liquidation of the revolving fund from December 31, 1967, to June 30, 1968.

Fourth. The Senate conferees offered to increase the authorization of appropriations for military assistance from \$475 million in the Senate bill to \$510 million, but this was rejected by the House conferees who insisted upon \$585 million.

So, Mr. President, it appears that the foreign aid conference has deadlocked over these issues. There is talk that the House may pass an appropriation bill for foreign aid despite the fact that there is no authorization for it. If this happens, amendments will be offered in the Senate to bring the appropriation bill in line with the action of the Senate on the authorization bill, particularly with respect to military credit sales.

I do not intend to argue the matter further at this time. That can await Senate consideration of the appropriation bill if such a bill comes over from the House. However, I do think it my duty at this time to give the Senate a factual report on what has transpired in the conference committee. The Senate conferees have gone further than I and many of my colleagues would have liked in an effort to reach agreement. The proffered concessions on the part of the Senate have been to no avail.

I have reluctantly come to the conclusion that the public interest would be better served by no foreign aid bill than by the bill which passed the House and which would allow—indeed encourage—a continuation of the policy of arming poor and underdeveloped countries.

By continuing the present authority of the Department of Defense to guarantee credit sales to underdeveloped countries we are saying to them, in effect: Even though you are so poor as a sovereign nation that you can't buy a jet squadron on commercial credit, we are ready and willing and able to get you easy government credit so you can do so—whether you need it or not." Continuation of this program means that the U.S. Government and the American people have no objection to becoming a cutrate, easy credit institution of the sale of sophisticated military supplies—much in the pattern of those domestic credit institutions which advertise a dollar down, and 25 cents a day for the rest of your life.

I do not think the United States should be in this position.

The Senate will have an opportunity to vote on this issue again if and when a foreign aid appropriation bill comes before it.

### ORDER OF BUSINESS

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.

**AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS AND INDIVIDUAL, MINORITY, OR SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS**

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be permitted until midnight to file reports, after the adjournment of the Senate today, together with any individual, minority, or supplemental views, if desired.

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

**CHARLES HASLET, ABLE NEWS-PAPERMAN**

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, today Charles C. Haslet will end a distin-

guished career of 43 years with the Associated Press.

A native of Wellington, Kans., for the last 30 years Charlie has effectively covered Capitol Hill for newspapers and radio and television stations of Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, and Oklahoma. Starting his career on the Wellington, Kans., Daily News, he joined the Associated Press in Chicago in 1924, and subsequently worked in the Tulsa and Oklahoma City bureaus.

Charlie's dedication and hard work, his always cheerful greeting as he called for news, will be missed by all of us who have known him over the years. On this, his last day before retirement from the Associated Press, it is an honor to extend to him our thanks for his years of responsible journalism and our best wishes for the future.

**PROGRAM**

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I want to remind Senators that on tomorrow, immediately following the disposition of morning business, the senior Senator from Louisiana will be recog-

nized to speak on his amendment, and that the unanimous-consent agreement has already been entered to vote on final passage of the pending measure at 2:30 tomorrow. There will likely be rollcall votes.

**ADJOURNMENT**

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 12 o'clock meridian tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 1, 1967, at 12 o'clock meridian.

**NOMINATION**

Executive nomination received by the Senate October 31, 1967:

**NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD**

John Harold Fanning, of Rhode Island, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of 5 years expiring December 16, 1972 (reappointment).

**EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS**

**L. B. J. Defeats Republicans in Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, and New York Polls**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 1967

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, with just a year to go before the presidential election the Republicans are trying desperately to boost party morale by already claiming victory.

Unfortunately for them, the election will determine the winner—not their publicity releases. And while I hate to be a killjoy, I would urge the Republicans not to order their victory champagne before the final results are in.

Just last week, for example, polls conducted in Pennsylvania and New Hampshire revealed that President Johnson could defeat handily the top five Republican hopefuls.

The polls, conducted by an independent firm in Princeton, N.J., showed that in Pennsylvania, the President ran ahead of Richard Nixon, 51 to 37; ahead of Rockefeller 45 to 41; ahead of Romney, 48 to 35; ahead of Reagan, 51 to 33; and ahead of Percy, 50 to 29.

The sampling covered 657 persons throughout Pennsylvania.

In New Hampshire, the poll showed the President and Nixon running neck and neck, but Lyndon Johnson running ahead of Rockefeller, Romney, Reagan, and Percy.

In addition, an earlier poll covering New York State—conducted by this same

firm—showed President Johnson easily defeating this same group of Republican rivals.

The Republicans want to claim victory in 1968 a year early. Now if only those polls would cooperate.

I think the polls will cooperate with the Republicans to the same degree that they have cooperated with the Johnson administration in passing needed legislation.

In other words, the Republicans do not have a chance.

**Alexander Wiley**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 1967

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep sorrow that Wisconsin and the Nation received the news of Senator Alexander Wiley's death last week. The 24 years of his distinguished service in the Senate—longer than any other Wisconsin Senator in history—reflects the respect and reverence with which he was held by the citizens of Wisconsin.

As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee it was my periodic privilege to serve with Senator Wiley on various conference committees. While Senator Arthur Vandenburg was widely regarded as the outstanding exponent of bipartisan cooperation in international affairs, Senator Wiley epitomized that same philosophy in his work on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Over the years of his dedicated service on that committee Senator Wiley demonstrated an impartiality and fairness in his judgment of the issues—weighing each on its own merit and for the ultimate good of all Americans. He served his country and State well.

He was, in addition, a man motivated by strong religious principles, always honest, humble, and forthright in his dealings with all whatever their rank or station. The courage of his convictions was never underestimated.

I join with my many colleagues and with his countless friends and admirers in expressing my personal sorrow over Senator Wiley's passing. Mrs. Zablocki joins me in extending heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Wiley and the Senator's children.

**More Progress Needed in Air Pollution Fight**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. GEORGE M. RHODES**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 1967

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Clean Air Act, which we passed in 1963 and have since amended, was the beginning of a nationwide effort to combat the evils of air pollution. Unfortunately, we still have a long way to go before the war is won. Last December 12, Vice President HUMPHREY, in addressing the Third National Conference on Air Pollution, made it clear that the Johnson administration is extremely