United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, June 10, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Robert W. Olewiler, Grace Reformed Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we thank Thee for Thy never-changing faithfulness throughout all generations. We are grateful for our beloved country and we pray Thee to bless our land with honorable industry, sound learning, and pure living. We thank Thee for the Members of this House of Representatives and we beseech Thee to direct and prosper their consultations that the safety, honor, and welfare of Thy people may be everywhere preserved and Thy glory everywhere advanced.

We confess that we are not worthy of all Thy goodness and we ask Thy mercy. Help us to prove our repentance by lives dedicated more fully to Thee and to the common good. May all that we are and all that we do reflect Thy holy will, now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

CONGRESSIONAL REORGANIZATION

(Mr. SISK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, because of the keen interest on the part of many of the Members in the subject of congressional reorganization, I believe it would be well to make a brief report on that subject.

The Congressional Reorganization Subcommittee of the Committee on Rules has met for about 6 hours in three executive sessions to analyze the differences between the various bills before us.

In addition to that, the Rules Committee staff, augmented by help from the Legislative Reference Service and the legislative counsel's office, has put in additional 12 hours in staff meeting time, plus additional desk time.

We have about completed our work on title I of the various bills, which we feel is likely to be the most controversial part of whatever the committee finally comes up with.

Bearing in mind that as the flow of legislation from the committees increases, and bearing in mind also the August recess, and considering the size of the task before us, we believe we will be expressing a reasonable hope if we say we expect to be ready to begin hearings in September.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the subcommittee is not approaching its task on the basis that we will do as little as we can to get by. We are trying to do a workmanlike job and I hope that the Members and those outside Congress who are anxious to see something done will not become impatient.

WHY THE RISE IN THE INTEREST RATES?

(Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's increase in interest rates by major banks to 8.5 percent is a very serious development. In my opinion this action is wholly unjustified.

It raises the question once more as to the extent of competition between banks. If I understand yesterday's action correctly, by far the great majority of major banks across the country all increased their prime rate to the same level on the same day.

If a comparable event were to be seen in another important industry the question of antitrust action would be raised. What about banking? Is the banking fraternity subject to the same antitrust laws that regulate other business enterprise? I believe the American people deserve to know.

This action will inevitaby mean higher mortgage rates along with higher rates on other consumer-type loans. It will have an adverse effect on building, and will contribute to greater economic instability generally.

The 10-percent income surtax on individuals and corporations was justified by its supporters as a dampener on the inflationary trend. It clearly has not worked that way. I have seen no evidence whatever that the surtax has slowed the increase in interest rates.

I believe that the banks ought to reconsider their move, now, today; and at the same time the administration and the congressional leadership must offer to the country a new and more far-reaching plan for cutting back on Government spending.

The Government should provide more convincing evidence of plans for long-term reductions in spending as a force for monetary stability. This will give the banks of our country, the international monetary community, and the American people the confidence required in a time of doubt and uncertainty.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON REGULATORY AGENCIES, SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, TO SIT TODAY DURING GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Regulatory Agencies of the Select Committee on Small Business may sit today during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS

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

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 11271, AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS TO THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 413 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 413

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11271) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH) and, pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 413 provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 11271 to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes.

The authorization to NASA for fiscal year 1970 is as follows:

Research and development	$3,264,427,000
Construction of facilities	58,200,000
Research and program management	643,750,000
Total authorization	3,966,377,000

Under research and development, there are 19 programs involved. The authorizations range from a high of $1,766,800,000—the Apollo program—to a low of $2.5 million—advanced missions.

Authorization for the construction of facilities are: Electronics Research Center, $8,088,000; Goddard Space Flight Center, $670,000; John F. Kennedy Space Center, $12.5 million; Langley Research Center, $4,767,000; Manned Spacecraft Center, $1,750,000; Wallops Station, $500,000; various locations for improvements, rehabilitation, and alterations of Government-owned facilities, $26,425,000; facility planning and design, $3.5 million.

The sum of $643,750,000 is authorized for research and program management. These funds would provide for the salaries, benefits, and other related expenses of NASA Government personnel and the cost of military and civilian personnel detailed to the agency. The authorization also provides indirect support to the research and development effort in the form of travel, automatic data processing, facilities services, technical services, and adminstrative services.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 413 in order that H.R. 11271 may be considered.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules ought to be commended for bringing out an open rule for the first time on a bill, and I want to commend the members of that committee for not waiving points of order, or doing violence to some other rule of the House of Representatives.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the members of the Committee on Rules, and myself, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, appreciate the kind remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, and I am glad to assure the gentleman from Iowa that we are sending out another open rule from the Committee on Rules calling for open debate.

Mr. Speaker, the rule before us today provides for full debate without waiving points of order, with 2 hours of debate for the consideration of H.R. 11271, which is the NASA authorization for fiscal 1970.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to authorize appropriations for fiscal 1970 for NASA.

Three major areas are authorized in the bill:

Research and development	$3,264,427,000
Facility construction	58,200,000
Research and program management	643,750,000

The Apollo manned flight program receives a major share of the funding. The sum of $1,766,800,000 is programed for 1970.

The John F. Kennedy Space Center will receive some $12,500,000 in construction funds for construction, modification of launch pads for future Apollo program flights. Other construction funds are programed for the Goddard and Langley Space Centers, and the Electronics Research Center.

NASA administrative costs are authorized for fiscal 1970 at $643,750,000.

A new section is added to the bill, section 7, which will have the effect of cutting off funds to universities where riots occur. The cutoff will take the form of ending of grants for research being done on a campus. Anyone participating in such disturbances, student or faculty, will be cut off from grant-in-aid or administratively used Federal funds.

Additional views are filed by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON), and several other members. They believe that funds should be provided for the Saturn V and Saturn I–B rockets. If a regular funding program is not continued, they expect needed rockets at future times to cost substantially more.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH) opposes authorizations totaling some $258,000,000 more than requested in the Apollo program by the administration. He also opposes the new section 7 language cutting off grant programs to universities where riots have occurred.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON) also call attention to the rising unused authorizations in the NASA program and believe that present funding requests should be curtailed somewhat.

Personally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House once again that prior hereto in the supplemental budget we limited the administration's spending to $192.9 billion. We have also passed the maritime authorization bill which increased the expenditure over and above that amount of money. This is the second bill with an authorization which will increase expenditures over and above the $192.9 billion by approximately $258 million. I simply call that to the attention of the Members of the House because if we are going to place a top limit on administrative spending, then it seems to me that it is rather unfair to the executive to be placed under strict orders to keep down spending while Congress goes along adding other requests for appropriation of funds for programs it supports, but gives no such leeway to the executive.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, I think Congress has a responsibility to do its part in keeping spending down as low as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON).

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I will not use all the time, but I want to call attention to the fact, as the gentleman from California stated, that I will have an amendment on page 5, line 14, to require a reduction in the outstanding authorization for which no appropriations have been made for the fiscal years 1967, 1968, and 1969 in amount totaling $327,070,000. My amendment will read as follows:

On page 5, after line 14, insert the following:

"(h) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, authorizations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, enacted for fiscal years 1967, 1968, and 1969, for which appropriations have not been made, totaling $327,070,000, are hereby cancelled, effective June 30, 1969, or the date of this Act, whichever is later."

This will reduce the total amount of authorization outstanding, even with the current 1970 authorization added on, to a level below the Nixon budget of over $70 million.

The total authorization outstanding for NASA will be, at the end of this fiscal year, $70 million below the Nixon budget which carries over $327,070,000 in unfunded authorization.

In response to my inquiry regarding unfunded authorization NASA has provided views in their letter dated May 26, 1969, which I quote for the RECORD:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS
AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., May 26, 1969.

Hon. JAMES G. FULTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FULTON: After our discussions on Thursday and after rereading your additional views on pages 170–171 of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics Report No. 91–255, we have put our heads together here and come up with language which will, I believe, accomplish the objective which you outlined to me. NASA would have no objection to a provision of this type.

The language we have come up with is as follows:

"Amend Section 1 of H.R. 11271 by adding the following new subsection (h) to the end thereof:

"'(h) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the authorization of any appropriation to the administration enacted prior to the effective date of this Act shall expire on June 30, 1969, or the effective date of this Act, whichever is later, but only to the extent that such appropriation has not theretofore actually been made.'"

This would rescind authorization under which no appropriation has been made totalling $327,070,000 for Fiscal Years 1967, 1968, and 1969.

We would be glad to discuss this further with you if you wish.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT F. ALLNUTT,
Assistant Administrator for Legislative affairs.

I would also like to insert in the RECORD our analysis of unfunded authorization presently existing on the books, and a recapitulation of authorization rescinded under the basic Space Act.

NASA UNFUNDED AUTHORIZATION

	R. & D.	C. of F.	AO	Total
Fiscal year 1967:				
Authorized	$4,248,600,000	$95,919,000	$655,900,000	$5,000,419,000
Appropriated	4,245,000,000	83,000,000	640,000,000	4,968,000,000
Unfunded	3,600,000	12,919,000	15,900,000	32,419,000
Fiscal year 1968:				
Authorized	4,147,565,000	69,980,000	648,206,000	4,865,751,000
Appropriated	3,925,000,000	35,900,000	628,000,000	4,588,900,000
Unfunded	222,565,000	34,080,000	20,206,000	276,851,000
Fiscal year 1969:				
Authorized	3,370,300,000	39,600,000	603,173,000	4,013,073,000
Appropriated	3,370,300,000	21,800,000	603,173,000	3,995,273,000
Unfunded	0	17,800,000	0	17,800,000
Total unfunded July 1, 1968	226,165,000	64,799,000	36,106,000	327,070,000

RECAPITULATION OF TOTAL AUTHORIZATION RESCINDED THROUGH JUNE 30, 1968

Rescission date	Fiscal years affected	Total rescinded
June 30, 1964	1959, 1960, and 1961	$47,625,700
June 3J, 1965	1962	30,050,000
June 30, 1966	1963	70,000,000
June 30, 1967	1964	178,326,000
June 30, 1968	1965 and 1966	65,396,200
Total		391,397,900

UNFUNDED AUTHORIZATION—RESCISSIONS TO DATE PURSUANT TO SEC. 307 OF THE SPACE ACT

	R. & D.	C. of F.	AO	Total
Authorization rescinded June 30, 1964:				
Fiscal year 1959:				
Authorized:				
Public Law 85-568	(1)	$101,983,000	(1)	
Public Law 86-12	$20,750,000		$3,354,000	
Appropriated	66,675,000	69,825,000	86,286,300	$222,786,300
Rescinded	4,075,000	32,158,000	167,700	36,400,700
Fiscal year 1960:				
Authorized	333,070,000	62,800,000	94,430,000	490,300,000
Appropriated	330,875,000	62,800,000	91,400,000	485,075,000
Rescinded	2,195,000	0	3,030,000	5,225,000
Fiscal year 1961:				
Authorized	671,453,000	127,787,000	170,760,000	970,000,000
Appropriated	670,453,000	122,787,000	170,760,000	964,000,000
Rescinded	1,000,000	5,000,000	0	6,000,000
Authorization rescinded June 30, 1965:				
Fiscal year 1962:				
Authorized	1,305,539,000	323,075,000	226,686,000	1,855,300,000
Appropriated	1,302,500,000	316,000,000	206,750,000	1,825,250,000
Rescinded	3,039,000	7,075,000	19,936,000	30,050,000
Authorization rescinded June 30, 1966:				
Fiscal year 1963:				
Authorized	2,957,878,000	786,237,000	(2)	3,744,115,000
Appropriated	2,897,878,000	776,237,000	(2)	3,674,115,000
Rescinded	60,000,000	10,000,000	(2)	70,000,000
Authorization rescinded June 30, 1967:				
Fiscal year 1964:				
Authorized	4,119,575,000	713,060,000	518,185,000	5,350,820,000
Appropriated	3,998,494,000	680,000,000	494,000,000	5,172,494,000
Rescinded	121,081,000	33,060,000	24,185,000	178,326,000
Authorization rescinded June 30, 1968:				
Fiscal year 1965:				
Authorized, Public Law 88-369	4,341,100,000	262,880,000	623,526,000	5,227,506,000
Appropriated, Public Law 88-507	[3] 4,291,100,000	262,880,000	623,526,000	5,177,506,000
Rescinded	50,000,000	0	0	50,000,000
Fiscal year 1966:				
Authorized, Public Law 89-53	4,536,971,000	62,376,850	591,049,850	5,190,396,200
Appropriated, Public Law 89-128	4,531,000,000	60,000,000	584,000,000	5,175,000,000
Rescinded	5,971,000	2,376,000	7,049,000	15,396,200

[1] Such sums as may be necessary.
[2] Included in R. & D. appropriation for fiscal year 1963.
[3] Excludes $72,494,000 appropriated in fiscal year 1965 against fiscal year 1964 existing authorization.

We are in an era where the most exciting events in space are taking place. One of the greatest events in the history of mankind is going to take place on July 16 of this year when our astronauts, in the Apollo 11, try to land on the Moon. Incredible difficulties that the average person cannot imagine are present.

But I must say to you that everybody enjoys going with the astronauts to the Moon. I want to point out if this Congress and this House decides that we will have to cut this budget much below what this committee has decided, after having come up with a unanimous report recommending these amounts, then one of the first items to be eliminated is live television coverage of the astronauts on their flight to the Moon. It is unnecessary.

So if this House wants to take the position that the U.S.S.R. has taken so that we will not have live television coverage so the whole world can see, then we should cut it and say that, first, the unnecessary things have to go. Certainly, live television coverage for back here is one of those unnecessary amounts that will first go.

As for me, I want the live television coverage. I am against these cuts.

I would like to quote from President Johnson's letter of transmittal dated January 1969, forwarding his Report on U.S. Aeronautics and Space Activities for 1968.

The APOLLO 8 flight was preceded by the very successful 11-day orbit of the Earth in APOLLO 7—the first manned flight test of the APOLLO spacecraft.

These great missions bring us nearer to reaching our national goal of landing men on the Moon in this decade.

Our astronauts have now flown 18 manned space missions, during which they experienced 3,215 man hours in space flight. Together with the activities of the Soviet Union, this makes a total to date of 28 manned flights and 3,846 man hours in space."

I should point out that of the 28 manned missions quoted by the President, 18 of these were by the United States. Since that time Apollo 9 and 10 have been successfully completed bringing the total U.S. manned flights to 20. Likewise of the 3,846 man-hours quoted by the President includes 3,215 U.S. man-hours. Since that time Apollo 9 and 10 have flown, adding 1,299 U.S. man-hours to our record, making a total of 4,514 man-hours in space for the United States.

We should never forget that we are in a real competition with the Soviet Union in every aspect of space exploration. I would like to include here a very provocative estimate of the future space programs of both ourselves and Russia, written by Dr. Charles S. Sheldon, Senior Specialist with the Science Policy Division of the Library of Congress. Dr. Sheldon is recognized as an outstanding authority in evaluating the comparative achievements of the United States and the Soviet Union. I am sure his assessment of the future can have important values to the Members:

FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR THE SPACE PROGRAMS

Attempting to predict the future of the space program is a difficult assignment as it depends upon political decisions as much as on technical capabilities. At least, there are more engineering possibilities than there are financial resources likely to be made availa-

ble to pursue them. The issue of future goals has been with the United States for several years, particularly as the accomplishment of the dominating Apollo mission appeared nearer.

Estimating what the Soviet Union will elect to do in space may be ever harder for a Western observer because of Soviet restrictions on freedom of information. But in one limited sense, the task might be considered easier. The United States abounds in paper plans, but until the President and the Congress agree on funding, our plans stay on paper, and there is no formal commitment to go ahead. In the Soviet case, they have stated at several levels of authority, including the highest, more positively their long run goals, although without a real, public timetable. They, too, undoubtedly have to face hard budget choices before actual hardware work can begin.

The announced Soviet goal is a comprehensive exploitation of space technology including the exploration and settlement (where practical) of the planets, along the way exploring the Moon in greater detail, and using Earth orbital stations for a host of practical purposes.

SPACE STATIONS: WHAT IS LIKELY FROM THE UNITED STATES AND THE SOVIET UNION?

Under the Apollo Applications Program, the United States will have the capability of conducting at least rudimentary space station work. If, as planned, an S-IVB Saturn stage is placed in orbit, and the empty tankage turned into a station of sorts, considerable enclosed space would become available. NASA proposes that a docking hub be attached to the upper end of the S-IVB interim station, and to this hub would be coupled Apollo command and service modules serving as ferries, and also a modified lunar module serving as support for ATM, the Apollo telescope mount for astronomical research.

NASA would like to have the go-ahead to plan and construct a fairly permanent scientific station in orbit with an ultimate capacity of about 100 scientists and technicians. No concrete plan has been approved, but such a station would be within our technical capabilities in the late 1970's.

The United States plans to have flying no later than the mid-1970's a Manned Orbiting Laboratory of the Department of Defense. Its early version would barely qualify as a space station, as it would provide space for only two men for 30 days, without resupply. Later versions might be more roomy and more permanent when ferries for resupply became available.

The Soviet Union has claimed that the docked combination of Soyuz 4 and 5 in January 1969 represented a rudimentary space station, inasmuch as there were four rooms, and space for up to 12 men. In actual operations, the period the ships were docked was measured only in a few hours, and transfers between ships required EVA, rather than crawling through a continuous tunnel.

The Soviet Union has pictured a hub for a future space station to which up to four Soyuz craft could dock like spokes to a wheel. This hub should be within the lift capability of their Proton class proven launch vehicle. For the future, the Russians speak confidently of building a large orbital station for many men, for the purpose both of conducting Earth applications work and scientific observation of the stars, but also serving as an orbital assembly and launch facility to send manned expeditions to the Moon and planets. The beginnings of such a capability probably already exist, but it would be risky to predict whether such a station will appear soon, or only after some years.

MANNED LUNAR LANDING: WHO WILL BE FIRST?

When President Kennedy in 1961 asked Congress to support Project Apollo, his advisors had told him this was a project in which the United States had a good chance of being first. As of today, the odds are overwhelmingly in our favor, as all the necessary components for a manned landing and return have been tested almost as completely as is possible short of an actual landing attempt. This flight is now scheduled for Apollo 11 in the summer of 1969, if Apollo 10 in the spring goes well. Our being first to circumnavigate the Moon with men was a success that most estimators had not granted us in advance.

The Soviet Union has yet to fly a launch vehicle large enough to support a lunar landing, although such a vehicle has been predicted to appear soon by leading NASA officials. Because of past Soviet conservatism, one would not expect them to risk men in such a flight without some prior testing even if the vehicle should now appear. There is an outside chance only, that the Russians would launch a lunar landing craft unmanned in the first flight of a new large first stage. If the upper stage consisted of the already-tested Proton vehicle, one could visualize that a crew would transfer from a smaller, already-proven Earth orbital craft, and then conduct the lunar landing ahead of the United States. But many aspects of testing and scheduling militate against this.

Alternatively, the Soviet Union could forego immediate use of a very large launch vehicle, and instead assemble equipment in orbit brought up by 8 or 10 Proton class vehicles. Logic generally argues against this as a way to beat the United States, because there has not been enough practice in that kind of mass assembly and checkout.

WILL EITHER COUNTRY SEND MEN TO THE PLANETS?

The reliability demands for a planetary round trip are on the order of a couple of years instead of a week as needed for visiting the Moon. So aside from the much greater weights required to suppply the logistics for any real exploration of the planets, probably much more experience is required. Human health on so extended a mission is also in some question, although partial long duration tests of closed cabins have been conducted on Earth.

Some NASA officials would like a manned fly-by of Mars, and possibly of Venus on the same flight, before the end of the 1970's, but no such mission has won official approval and funding. A Mars landing rarely is talked of before the mid-1980's, and this has not been approved either. Failure to make a decision now will effect later possibilities because of the long lead times for preparations. The $100 billion price tag often quoted discourages most officials and legislators. But this high cost might be overcome in large measure if a low cost reusable ferry to Earth orbit were to be developed.

The Soviet Union has talked more positively about manned flight to the planets, but it would face exactly the same technical and cost problems that we do. However, if they elected to pay that price, planetary flight in the 1970's or 1980's would not be beyond their technical capabilities. A measure of this commitment may be provided by the unveiling and application of a new large launch vehicle if it appears.

HOW DO THE TWO COUNTRIES PLAN TO COMPETE IN SPACE APPLICATIONS?

It is within the expected capacity of the United States to improve the completeness and quality of its weather reporting, with some good prospect for providing accurate forecasts of a week or so.

The Soviet Union will probably improve the reliability of their weather satellite equipment, and they are also interested in providing better forecasts. Their theory of weather systems may keep pace with ours, but they may lag for a time in computer capacity on the ground to support weather analysis.

The United States working with IntelSat, the international consortium, can be expected to provide a growing number of channels to all parts of the world for telephone, television, and computer links. Direct broadcast will come more slowly for reasons of political concern and limited channel capacity. Domestic distribution of communications by satellite may appear, but delays are likely because of dispute over control of such a system.

The Soviet Union has tried to interest other countries in a Soviet communications satellite system called InterSputnik, but this has had such a poor reception that the U.S.S.R. may join IntelSat. If it does, it probably will want a share of the space hardware presently being built only in the United States.

The Earth resources field is one which suggests a large expansion of space activity in the next decade. The United States seems likely to go ahead, and it would be hard to believe the Russians would neglect Earth resources work, although their specific plans are not known.

CAN THE TWO COUNTRIES COOPERATE AS WELL AS COMPETE?

This is the hope of well-intentioned people everywhere. In some sense, cooperation already exists. There is a considerable exchange of information at meetings of scientists and engineers, and data are filed at the United Nations. There have been treaties negotiated on excluding weapons from space, not making territorial claims to other celestial bodies, and rescuing astronauts.

Further, there have been specific plans for trading of space-collected weather pictures over the "cold line" between Suitland, Maryland and Moscow. There is a joint effort underway to write a textbook on space biology. There has been some coordination of efforts on geomagnetism.

But the big question of Russians and Americans going to the Moon together has been asked more in a rhetorical sense than as a concrete offer by either side. Each side has probably been somewhat reluctant to pursue such a goal too openly during any period that one or the other was markedly ahead. Nor has either been willing to give up any basic, independent capability to operate in space, which might be implied by such a division of labor as specialization in launch vehicles or spacecraft.

Two principal motives for cooperation offered have been to lessen tensions politically, and save money. The question of tensions may be more influenced by broader political issues than space. Money savings are problematical, except as someday sharing of data might permit a division of missions as between one planet and another, for example.

No assessment of the prospects can be made successfully without forecasting the future political climate which is beyond our present capabilities.

I want to point out to you that NASA has been cutting this budget and likewise we have been cutting it. For example, in the fiscal year 1968 our committee approved $4,992,000,000 and in the fiscal year 1969 budget it came down to $4,217,000,000 and this year the committee has reduced the budget to $3,966,377,000.

Our committee thus has cut the space budget, that is the peaceful uses of space, $1 billion in 2 years. Let me see some other committees who have done that. I would like them to submit it for the RECORD also—the same sort of actions cutting millions of dollars as we have done.

In order that all Members may have before them a complete budget history of the NASA program, I insert in the RECORD at this point a series of tables showing the legislative history and expenditures in the program since its inception.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION—BUDGET HISTORY SUMMARY ALL APPROPRIATIONS

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Budget request	Authorization	Appropriation [1]	Obligations	Expenditures
1959 DOD transfer	146.6	146.6	146.6	298.7	145.5
1959	[2] 280.0	259.2	184.3		
1960	508.3	490.3	[2] 523.6	487.0	401.0
1961	964.6	970.0	964.0	908.3	744.3
1961 DOD transfer	2.7	2.7	2.7		
1962	1,940.3	1,855.3	1,825.3	1,691.6	1,257.0
1963	3,787.3	3,744.1	3,674.1	3,448.4	2,552.4
1964	5,712.0	5,350.8	5,100.0	4,864.8	4,171.0
1965	[3] 5,445.0	5,227.5	[3] 5,250.0	5 500.7	5,092.9
1966	5,260.0	5,190.4	5,175.0	5,350.5	5,932.9
1967	5,012.0	5,000.4	4,968.0	5,011.8	5,425.7
1968	5,100.0	4,865.8	4,588.9	4,520.4	4,723.7
1969	4,370.4	4,013.1	3,995.3	[4] 4,213.3	[4] 4,249.7
Subtotal	38,529.2	37,116.2	36,397.8	36,295.5	34,696.1
1970	3,760.5			[4] 3,878.0	[4] 3,950.0
Total	42,289.7			40,173.5	38,646.1

[1] Actual amounts appropriated, except the DOD transfers.
[2] 1959 budget request includes $20,750,000 R. & D. and $24,250,000 CoF for supplementals. Amount appropriated in 1960 includes supplementals of $16,675,000 R. & D. and $21,825,000 CoF, against 1959 authorization.
[3] 1965 budget request includes $141,000,000 for proposed R. & D. supplemental. Amount appropriated in 1965 includes R. & D. supplemental of $72,494,000 against 1964 authorization.
[4] Estimate.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Budget request	Authorization	Appropriation [1]	Obligations	Expenditures
1959 DOD transfer	146.6	146.6	146.6	175.7	34.0
1959	[2] 90.9	70.7	50.0		
1960	345.3	333.1	[2] 347.6	307.9	255.7
1961	671.0	671.4	670.4	644.1	487.0
1961 DOD transfer	1.6	1.6	1.6		
1962	1,380.5	1,305.5	1,302.5	1,261.3	935.6
1963	2,968.3	2,957.9	2,897.9	2,878.6	2,308.4
1964	4,351.7	4,119.6	3,926.0	3,824.4	3,317.4
1965	[3] 4,523.0	4,341.1	[3] 4,363.6	4,358.6	3,984.5
1966	4,575.9	4,537.0	4,531.0	4,468.9	4,741.1
1967	4,246.6	4,248.6	4,245.0	4,249.3	4,487.2
1968	4,352.0	4,147.6	3,925.0	3,816.6	3,946.1
1969	3,677.2	3,370.3	3,370.3	[4] 3,460.1	3,520.0
Subtotal	31,330.6	30,251.0	29,777.5	29,445.5	28,017.0
1970	3,051.4			[4] 3,168.9	3,235.0
Total	34,382.0			32,614.4	31,252.0

[1] Actual amounts appropriated except the DOD transfers; excludes transfers between NASA appropriations.
[2] 1959 budget request includes $20,750,000 for proposed supplemental. Amount appropriated in 1960 includes a supplemental of $16,675,000 against 1959 authorization.
[3] 1965 budget request includes $141,000,000 for proposed supplemental. Amount appropriated in 1965 includes a supplemental of $72,594,000 against 1964 authorization.
[4] Estimate.

CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Budget request	Authorization	Appropriation [1]	Obligations	Expenditures
1959	[2] 98.3	102.0	48.0	38.0	24.8
1960	68.6	62.8	[2] 84.6	89.7	54.3
1961	122.8	127.8	122.8	98.2	98.2
1961 DOD transfer	1.1	1.1	1.1		
1962	333.1	323.1	316.0	217.1	114.3
1963	819.0	786.2	776.2	569.8	225.3
1964	800.0	713.0	680.0	546.6	437.7
1965	281.0	262.9	262.9	522.2	530.9
1966	74.7	62.4	60.0	270.4	572.4
1967	101.5	95.9	83.0	115.9	288.6
1968	76.7	70.0	35.9	64.5	126.1
1969	45.0	39.6	21.8	[3] 104.9	[3] 70.0
Subtotal	2,821.8	2,646.8	2,492.3	2,637.3	2,542.6
1970	58.2			[3] 58.2	[3] 60.0
Total	2,880.0			2,695.5	2,602.6

[1] Actual amounts appropriated, except the DOD transfer; excludes transfers between NASA appropriations.
[2] 1959 budget request includes $24,250,000 for proposed supplemental. Amount appropriated in 1960 includes a supplemental of $21,825,000 against 1959 authorization.
[3] Estimate.

Note: Fiscal year 1959 amounts include $29,900,000 authorized and $23,000,000 appropriated for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. Obligations and expenditures include amounts obligated and paid out against unobligated and unexpended balances brought forward from NACA's "Construction and equipment" appropriation accounts for fiscal years prior to fiscal year 1959.

RESEARCH AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT [1]

Fiscal year	Budget request	Authorization	Appropriation [2]	Obligations	Expenditures
1959	90.8	86.5	86.3	85.0	86.7
1960	94.4	94.4	91.4	89.4	91.0
1961	170.8	170.8	170.8	166.0	159.1
1962	226.7	226.7	206.8	213.2	207.1
1963					18.7
1964	560.3	518.2	494.0	493.8	415.9
1965	641.0	623.5	623.5	619.9	577.5
1966	609.4	591.0	584.0	611.2	619.4
1967	663.9	655.9	640.0	646.6	649.9
1968	671.3	648.2	628.0	639.3	651.5
1969	648.2	603.2	603.2	[3] 648.3	[3] 659.7
Subtotal	4,376.8	4,218.4	4,1280.0	4,212.7	4,136.5
1970	650.9			[3] 650.9	[3] 655.0
Total	5,027.7			4,863.6	4,791.5

[1] Formerly titled "Administrative operations."
[2] Actual amounts appropriated; excludes transfers between NASA appropriations.
[3] Estimate.

Note: Fiscal year 1959 amounts include $80,500,000 authorized and $78,100,000 appropriated for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. Expenditures include amounts paid out of unexpended balances brought forward from NACA's "Salaries and expenses" appropriation accounts for fiscal years prior to fiscal year 1959.

I would like to point out that the Air Force and the DOD have requested a net increase of over $515 million in the fiscal year 1970 budget over that for fiscal year 1969 for astronautical space and research and development programs. That means something. They are raising aeronautics and space funds by a half billion dollars, when NASA is reducing its budget.

In fact, in space they are reporting a net increase of more than $128 million alone in the military space programs as well as a net rise of $387 million in areonautical research and development. Thank heaven we had already developed, through NASA research, the communications system available for use by the military.

There is one other thing. I would like to compliment the Secretary of the Air Force, my friend, Dr. Robert C. Seamans, Jr., formerly Deputy Administrator, NASA, in stating today, June 10, that the Air Force manned orbiting laboratory, the MOL program, now being carried on has been terminated and this will permit NASA to go ahead, as we have always believed, with research and development of the manned orbiting workshop. I quote a letter received from the U.S. Air Force this date to this effect:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, June 10, 1969.

DEAR SIR: The Secretary of the Air Force has requested that I inform you that the Department of Defense (DoD) has terminated the Air Force Manned Orbiting Laboratory (MOL) Program.

In arriving at this decision, a number of factors were considered. First, it was determined that most essential DoD space missions could be accomplished with lower cost unmanned spacecraft. Second, the potential worth of possible future applications of the experimental equipment being developed for MOL, plus the information expected from the flights on man's utility in space for military purposes, while worthwhile, did not equate in immediate value to other DoD programs.

Attached is a list of the associate and major subcontractors. It should be clearly understood that termination is not in any sense an unfavorable reflection on any of the MOL contractors. They have all worked very hard and have achieved excellent results.

Likewise, MOL termination should not be construed as a reflection on the Air Force. The MOL goals were practical and achievable; maximum benefit was being taken of hardware and experience from NASA and other DoD space projects; and the program was well-managed and good progress was being made. Under other circumstances, its continuation would have been fully justified.

The Deputy Secretary of Defense has scheduled a press conference for 10:30 a.m., today, June 10, 1969, at which time this information will be given to the news media.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. SHAUGHNESSY,
Colonel, USAF, Chief, Plans Group, Legislative Liaison.

There has been excellent coordination between NASA and DOD so that none of the efforts by DOD will have been wasted as a result of the termination of the MOL program. In fact, there has been excellent interagency cooperation with all agencies of the Government. I insert in the RECORD at this point a report prepared for me on this subject:

INTERAGENCY COOPERATIVE EFFORTS OF NASA

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration is actively working with other government agencies on an ever increasing scale. The close coordination with the Department of Defense and the U.S. Air Force,

in particular, is a major consideration of the Space Agency. The extent of coordination includes hundreds of daily contacts at the working levels and several key mechanisms have evolved for coordination at the management and policy levels of the two organizations. Foremost among these is the Aeronautics and Astronautics Coordinating Board with six panels devoted to coordination, concerted effort and exchange of broad areas of technical information of common interest. The thirteen NASA research advisory committees deal with more specialized subjects with strong representation from the DOD and other agencies. In all, about 130 committees, boards and groups at Headquarters and Center levels have NASA, DOD and Service membership.

The interchange of information which occurs in the meetings of joint bodies and in the conduct of the formal agreements which are frequently set forth is supplemented by frequent briefings. The result is that all levels in both agencies are well informed regarding plans, programs and problem areas of common interest.

Symposia on subjects of mutual interest have also been held. For example the Apollo, AAP and Manned Orbiting Laboratory systems symposium in April 1968 and the Space Station Symposium at Langley also in 1968. Others are planned for this year in the disciplines of bioastronautics and manned space flight operations.

Other significant examples of the productive cooperation with the Air Force are jointly developed specifications for flammability and toxicity, cooperative fuel cell development and the modification of a Gemini pressure suit for MOL use. Planning is currently underway to investigate the feasibility and merit of joint approach to major development program for the Space Shuttle.

NASA's Directorate of Space Medicine in the Office of Manned Space Flight maintains a very close relationship with the U.S. Air Force particularly the MOL program Office. One significant result of this working arrangement is the inclusion of USAF proposals for flight medical experiments to NASA for inclusion in their medical/behavioral experiments program. This arrangement permits improved coordination of the NASA/DOD effort in the medical area. The USAF conventionally sponsors development of the required hardware and NASA accepts funding responsibility for their integration into the NASA flight system. The current list of approved for flight AAP experiments includes three which originated with the Air Force. This cooperation is expected to yield tangible dividends to both NASA and the Air Force providing data and experience of direct application to the Manned Orbiting Laboratory.

Joint Scientific Advisory Groups reviewed and advised on future actions to be taken on the study of the changes in blood cell production that has been present in several space flights. Such activities permit the NASA/DOD personnel to formally address major questions related to man's adaptation and ability to live and work in progressively longer, more complex space missions with the academic community. This exchange benefits both the government personnel and the members of the Advisory panels in that operational limitations could be discussed directly with those government members responsible for the flight programs.

The DOD details active duty military personnel with NASA, provides aircraft for R&D and administrative purposes, performs industrial security and contract services. NASA provides special R&D support, uses its unique talents and facilities, including tracking network, to assist the DOD in its development of aircraft, satellite and missiles.

NASA and the DOD have carried out a number of combined studies with the objective of elimination of overlap and achieving economies. Areas investigated included manned space flight recovery operations, support service contracts at the Kennedy Space Center and the AF Eastern Test Range and Tracking and data acquisition. The significant result of these studies was the confirmation that the greatest opportunity for economy lie in the early planning stages, thereby adding incentive to early coordination of future programs in the manner the space shuttle is presently being evaluated.

The Lunar Receiving Laboratory, the quarantine facility authorized by Congress, in Houston, Texas, is the result of an agreement involving NASA and regulatory agencies of the government whose responsibility it is to protect the public's health, agriculture and other living resources. These agencies in the course of exercising of their specific statutory responsibilities contributed their specialized knowledge and experience relating to quarantine and containment.

The Departments of Agriculture; Health, Education and Welfare; and Interior; the National Academy of Science and NASA cooperated in the formulation of policy and technical procedures appropriate to the isolation and containment of the lunar samples, astronauts, spacecraft and other Apollo mission related equipment.

In addition, to consultation on policy matters, the Regulatory Agencies are furnishing scientific personnel as members of the technical staff of the Lunar Recovery Laboratory as specialists in fields such as virology-bacteriology, botany, entomology, etc. Three officers from the U.S. Air Force Veterinary Corps are supporting the LRL in the disciplines of pathology, food technology and small animal care. Each agency also provides "on call" special consultants and will furnish research teams to certify the LRL as a containment facility.

In the area of oceanography NASA has been working closely with the Department of the Army and Interior in Project Tektite. The objective of this study is determination of the capability of a small group of men to satisfactorily perform a real mission while living isolated on the ocean floor, under saturated diving conditions for an extended period of time. It is expected that data obtained from manned operations under water might be valuable in planning long-duration manned space flight missions.

NASA is engaged in development of space employed sensors with application to many ocean uses. They have demonstrated the feasibility of using remote sensors to locate cold water upwellings, biologically rich areas and thermal boundaries associated with ocean currents and using this data to improve the productivity of commercial fishing.

Another objective of oceanography space cooperation is the improvement of ship routing by measurement of sea State, detection of navigation hazards and monitoring of sea ice.

NASA's oceanographic interest extends to the improved development of the continental shelf by mapping of submarine topography and identifying potential oil sources.

NASA is also participating in the Gulf Stream Drift Mission along with the Naval oceanographic office. The Marshall Space Flight Center is providing a crew member to serve on the "Ben Franklin" submersible. The craft will embark on a four week voyage, continuously under water, from Miami along the coast to Cape Hatteras and then out to sea at an average speed of about 2 knots. NASA is placing emphasis on operations, psychological and physiological measurements although there is also interest in the maintenance and repair aspects.

NASA is also participating in Bomex, a project with the objective of studying the joint behavior and interactions of the atmospheric-ocean system. Purpose of this effort, undertaken by the Departments of Commerce, Interior, Defense, Transportation, Navy, AEC, National Science Foundation and others is to validate the current theory of energy transfer across the interface of tropical and sub-tropical waters and the atmosphere. NASA's role in the operation is in the collection, management and analysis of data.

NASA has and continues to coordinate activities with the Department of the Interior in geology, geography, prediction and assessment of flood damage, hydrology and water resources management the Department of Agriculture in agriculture and forestry and the Environmental Science Services Administration of the Department of Commerce in hydrology and certain interdisciplinary projects.

Much effort in NASA's program has gone into exploring the capabilities of instruments for measuring phenomena and characteristics which might be observable from space. For example, there have been extensive efforts with the USDA to identify ways in which space technology might facilitate more effective utilization of the nation's agricultural and forestry resources. It has been shown that the presence of crop and forest disease can be detected from multispectral data even before it can be identified through purely visual means. Marketing data on crop forecasting, corp conditions and yields are very useful to private industry, the Federal and State governments.

In the conduct of its very important programs, NASA has utilized the competence, personnel and facilities of many other government agencies. In the process of this interaction, many opportunities to cooperate and assist other agencies became evident. As can be seen by this brief accounting, the net result was beneficial to these agencies and the nation as a whole.

This program is looked upon as an outstanding program of technical competence in this country by all the peoples of the world. In my district I have had Col. Gordon Cooper, the astronaut on Gemini 5 and on Mercury 9, come to my district and speak at four high school commencements. More than 25,000 people showed up and stood up for that man at various events in Pittsburgh, Pa., last night. This is a tremendously popular program with all the people of the United States. At the time Colonel Cooper said:

> In the past 10 years we in the United States have made more progress in science, technology, and exploration of our environment than the progress of mankind has made in 10,000 years.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 77]

Anderson, Ill.	Edwards, Calif.	Pickle
Anderson, Tenn.	Feighan	Pike
Ashbrook	Gettys	Powell
Ayres	Giaimo	Purcell
Bates	Gilbert	Reid, N.Y.
Blatnik	Goldwater	Reifel
Brasco	Gubser	Ronan
Brown, Ohio	Hébert	Rosenthal
Byrnes, Wis.	Heckler, Mass.	St. Onge
Cabell	Holifield	Sandman
Cahill	Kee	Scheuer
Carey	Kirwan	Schwengel
Casey	Kuykendall	Scott
Celler	Kyros	Sebelius
Clark	Landgrebe	Shipley
Clay	Leggett	Skubitz
Collins	Lennon	Smith, N.Y.
Cramer	Lowenstein	Springer
Cunningham	Mann	Stuckey
Dawson	Matsunaga	Thompson, N.J.
Dorn	Mills	Tunney
Dowdy	Morse	Whitehurst
Dulski	Nelsen	Wilson, Charles H.
Dwyer	O'Konski	Wright
Eckhardt	Ottinger	
Edmondson	Patman	
	Pelly	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 355 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS TO THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11271) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 11271, with Mr. ROONEY of New York in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, our needs on Earth are so great that they can be met only with the continued accelerated growth of the real wealth of the United States.

Research and development stimulate growth. Leadership in science and technology is essential to maintain our competitive position in the world market. Continued growth in our national productivity is required to provide the rising standard of living we have grown to expect over the last three decades.

Technical progress occurs most rapidly under the pressure of difficult goals, demanding schedules, and tight, but adequate budgets. The last decade has demonstrated that space research and development stimulates such progress.

Permit me to give you one example. The computer industry now provides our Nation with over 800,000 jobs and has added $20 billion a year to our gross national product.

We are moving into our second decade of space exploration. Thousands of close-up photographs of the Moon have been taken by automated spacecraft from the surface and from lunar orbit. Our Apollo astronauts have added significantly to the photographic study of the Moon and the Earth, and scientists will be studying these photographs for years to come.

Our Mariner spacecraft have taken intriguing pictures of a part of the surface of Mars and sent back valuable scientific data about our cloud-wrapped neighboring planet, Venus.

Our communication satellites are commercially owned and are giving us routine coverage of world events on a regular basis at a profit.

Worldwide weather coverage from space has reached operational status. Weather satellites are sending back valuable pictures of the Earth's cloud cover and weather stations on a routine basis.

These pictures are received in 40 other countries, besides the United States, who have made the relatively small investment in equipment needed to interrogate our satellites as they pass overhead.

Research by the U.S. Navy has provided the basic technology and procedures for first generation navigation systems utilizing satellites.

The Navy's transit satellites have demonstrated the use of space technology to provide both surface vessels and submarines with precise position fixes in all kinds of weather. Furthermore, these fixes are accurate within yards whereas celestial navigation involves possible errors of miles.

We have much to report in the way of progress. Besides weather communication and navigation, we have launched surveillance and scientific probes of many kinds into space.

In the field of geodesy—a scientific discipline concerned with determining the shape and size of the earth and its gravitational field—more was learned in the first few months of the satellite geodesy than in the previous two centuries.

In the exciting new field of X-ray astronomy, celestial sources of X-rays were first discovered via sounding rockets and over 40 X-ray sources have been observed. The discovery of the Van Allen Radiation Belt was a major scientific achievement of our space program.

Pictures taken by our Gemini and Apollo astronauts with their handheld cameras reveal heretofore unrecognized geological features on earth of interest in the geological field.

Some Gemini photographs have been interpreted by geologists to reveal some promising possibilities of detecting oil and mineral deposits in remote areas of our globe.

Many fields have been stimulated by our space program, for the programs involve not only science and technology, but also almost every form of ordinary business and professional activity.

Computer technology, power conversion systems, structural and fabrication techniques, as well as management systems, are benefiting as a result of our space efforts. There are new products and new processes, new companies and whole new industries.

The requirements of the space program for a worldwide communications network demanded major improvements in the state of the art of computer technology.

The computer complex at Houston that handled the Mercury flights performed 1 million calculations a minute. Today's Apollo system handles 50 times that many—50 million calculations a minute—80 billion in a day.

Time will not permit me to elaborate on all of the so-called fallout from the space program, but the direct economic impact is quite obvious.

But of even greater importance in the long run are the basic contributions of the program to bringing together people from all disciplines—from medicine and the life sciences, through physics, astronomy and engineering to economics and public administration—and causing them to work together toward a common goal—the longterm survival of men in space.

This forced intermingling of knowledge and skills will do much to create new solutions to many of our immediate as well as long-range social and urban problems.

The Apollo program is the largest single step our Nation has ever undertaken to mobilize Government, industry, and the scientific and educational communities of our country to achieve a single national goal.

The achievement of the lunar landing, within the decade is, I believe, a visible indication of the strength, maturity, and indeed the greatness of our Nation. A country that can stay the course of a peaceful decade-long program to land men on the Moon and return them safely to Earth is a nation that can solve, if it will, any of its other problems.

The latter part of 1968 and the earlier part of this year have allowed us to witness our greatest successes in manned space flight.

And now we stand on the threshold of completing the first phase of our lunar program. In less than 6 weeks' time, we will watch a Saturn V carry three brave astronauts into space, with two of them actually landing on the Moon.

In early 1961, the late President Kennedy announced the Nation's goal in manned space flight, "To land men on the Moon and return them safely to Earth in this decade."

Now, 8 years later, on July 20, we will have kept the faith: Government, industry—both management and labor—the scientific and educational communities have done their job well. But it is not only for these segments of our society to take pride in this achievement. It is likewise for every American citizen who, with his tax dollars, has supported the effort.

However, when our astronauts reach the Moon next month, we will have only arrived at the first plateau in our exploration in space. Our logical next step will be the exploration of the Moon and con-

duct other programs in near and far space.

Lunar exploration is of the greatest national importance—for furthering our scientific knowledge, for determining the better potential for using the Moon as a base, and for demonstrating our international leadership in the exploration of space.

The Moon has particular scientific interest and potential direct benefits because of its close association to the Earth.

A number of landings are necessary to establish an understanding of the origin, history, processes, and present state of the Moon and its relation to the Earth and the solar system.

It is now expected that at least 10 landings will be needed at various distinct areas to gather data required for the major decisions on future uses of the moon.

The lunar exploration program involves the emplacement of scientific experiment packages on the moon's surface. The goal of Apollo 11 is the successful landing and safe return of the astronauts.

And the first landing will represent a large step from lunar orbital operations since descent to lunar surface, the lunar landing astronauts' activities on the lunar surface, and the ascent into the lunar orbit for eventual return to the earth are all new operations in a new environment.

The other lunar landings will continue to increase our lunar knowledge from the experience we gained in each previous lunar landing.

Production of the flight hardware for accomplishing these missions is being completed, the trained mission teams have been assembled, and following the first flight and on succeeding flights, precision landings will be made in different areas where significant economic features and important processes have been identified.

At the same time, we must carry out our operations in a way that maximizes safety and effectiveness in an operational sense. A steady, reasonably spaced launch rate is the most economic and efficient use of facilities, hardware, and personnel.

Undue spreading or gaps in the sequence will result in major programmatic programs in safety, reliability, costs, and maintaining of trained teams. The above factors lead to the judgment that about three missions per year is a good choice for launch intervals.

The effect of delaying this project by inadequate funding will require that NASA fly missions that do not effectively use the hardware that has been produced in Apollo. Missions would be flown without surface science package, without provisions for extension for staytimes or increased astronaut mobility.

The only alternative for this inefficient use of hardware would be to introduce an undesirable and costly gap in the flight sequence.

It is for these reasons that after full and complete hearings, the committee recommends in H.R. 11271 a total authorization of $3,966,377,000 which is broken down as follows:

Research and development: $3,264,427,000.

Construction of facilities: $58,200,000.

Research and program management: $643,750,000.

At the outset, let me say that the total authorized figure in this bill is $250,850,000 above the administration's request. A majority of this increase is in the manned space flight category.

One of the increases approved by the committee is for the Apollo program to support Saturn 5 vehicle improvements, for the development of surface science packages, crew training, launch flight, and recovery operations, and for Apollo applications.

We have also increased the space flight operations line item for additional support to the space station shuttle program.

Another increase in the administrations' request has been approved by the committee and is recommended in order to reinstate Saturn 5 production and to provide for the procurement of long leadtime items.

I will be followed by other members of the committee: the ranking minority member, the subcommittee chairman, and others who will outline in more detail the line items in H.R. 11271.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON).

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the question has come up on the Nixon budget for space in the coming fiscal year. On authorization, including $117 million already appropriated, the budget is $3,833,000,000. The committee report is for $3,966,377,000, which looks as if it is $133 million more than the Nixon budget.

However, Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment that I spoke of previously—that some may not have heard about—to cut $327 million of carryover authorization for the years 1967, 1968, and 1969. If that amendment carries, then the current authorization as well as previous authorizations will be $193 million less than the Nixon current and previous authorizations.

So this budget figure we are speaking of is quite a cut. We are cutting, at the same time that the Department of Defense is going up by $515 million for aeronautics and space programs.

Likewise, this particular budget the committee has approved on which the chairman has well spoken, is $1 billion less than the fiscal year 1968 budget. That means a cut of $1 billion in 2 years by our Science and Astronautics Committee on the space budget.

In addition, NASA has been able to work out well on its program, and we are now coming, on July 16, to the Moon launch. I would caution the committee against cutting the authorization at this time, because we have had such success that we should keep it rolling. So when our committee report this year on a minimum budget comes out unanimously, I think the committee has done a good job and I hope the House will sustain the Science and Astronautics Committee, on both sides, on a nonpartisan basis.

I would say also that this program is the best safety and security the United States has. It helps the military on communications. It helps them on weather. It helps them on navigation. It helps on many things for our domestic economy, and it has raised the technical competence of our Nation to the highest in the world. This is good peaceful competition. This is where we should beat the Russians, and we should beat them cleanly and freely by putting Apollo XI on the Moon with our full backing today.

Looking ahead to the Apollo launch on July 16, if any Member wants to go see it, I am sure he can get in touch with "TIGER" TEAGUE, the chairman of the Manned Space Flight Subcommittee, or with me, the ranking minority member and we will try to get him aboard. It is like seeing Columbus off.

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I believe it should be pointed out to the House that this is an authorization bill. The President has appointed a panel to make a study of space and to come forth with recommendations in September. If they do not want to use the money we authorized they do not have to.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. That is right.

We must always remember there has been a tremendous success so far.

The Apollo 204 fire, when it occurred, cost upwards of $800 million, for one fire.

We must upgrade these Saturn V's so that these men will have the best vehicle. We must have the best communications. We must have the best facilities for monitoring so that they will have the highest safety.

I believe we are going to be the first on the Moon, July 20. It is one of those historic things every one of us can take part in.

Mr. Chairman, I take pride in the careful and detailed attention that our committee gave to the NASA budget this year. I wish to comment briefly on our committee actions.

The orignal NASA fiscal year 1970 request in January for research and development was $3,051,427,000. The Nixon budget submitted by NASA in April included $3,006,427,000 or $45,000,000 less than the original request for research and development. The committee's review of the authorization request resulted in the addition of $258,000,000 to the amended request. This action results in a recommended authorization of $3,264,427,000 for research and development.

NASA originally requested $1,651,100,000 for continuation of the Apollo program in fiscal year 1970. The Nixon budget for the Apollo program recommended $1,691,100,000, or a net increase of $29,000,000. The committee recommends an increase of $75,700,000 over the amended budget.

During fiscal year 1970 a portion of the increased funding recommended by the committee in the Saturn V program would be used for engineering, manu-

facture and test operations leading to the qualification of the simplified and improved J–2S engine on a schedule which would permit early incorporation in flight stages.

In addition, increased effort would be made on determining further improvements in the space vehicle and its operation. All of these efforts would be directed to obtaining more effective and efficient vehicles with lower cost in the manufacture, production, assembly, test, and checkout.

The committee recommends that an additional $32,100,000 in fiscal year 1970 authorized funds be provided to support Saturn V vehicle improvements in the basic Apollo program.

For fiscal year 1970, the Nixon budget requested $225,627,000 in new authorization for space flight operations. That is a net total of $11 million less than the original NASA request of $236,627,000 in new authorization for space flight operations.

NASA requested $191,327,000 in new authorization for Apollo applications. The subsequent budget amendment reduced this request to $134,327,000. The committee agreed that the original request by NASA for Apollo applications would allow adequate program progress. A further reduction as proposed by the amended budget would delay the initiation of Apollo application flights 5 months. Therefore the committee recommends $191,327,000 in new authorization for Apollo applications.

The committee also recommends the authorization of additional funds in the amount of $52,200,000 to reinstitute Saturn V production. This was further supported by a budget amendment adding $46,000,000. After a careful review of the requirements for a sound space program into the next decade and the most effective means of realizing returns from our basic Apollo investment, the committee is convinced that follow-on Saturn V launch vehicles must be available not only to carry on progressive Earth orbital, lunar, and deep-space operations in the future but also to preserve the forward progress of the United States in science and technology.

The committee has, therefore, recommended $354,827,000 in new authorization for fiscal year 1970 for the total space flight operations line item.

Under space science and applications, NASA requested a total of $55,600,000 for supporting research and technology in three programs. These funds have been earmarked for support of 880 proposed research tasks, most of which would be carried out under contract by universities, industry, nonprofit organizations, and other Government agencies; a portion of these tasks are slated to be performed in-house at NASA centers.

The committee recommended a total reduction of $12 million in space science supporting research and technology funds in the fields of physics and astronomy, lunar and planetary programs and bioscience. While the committee recognizes the value of such research, and has supported it over the years, some of the proposed research tasks are believed not to be urgent, and therefore can be deferred.

In addition to the reduction of $3 million in NASA's request for supporting research and technology, the committee also voted to defer funding for four Explorer class satellites which NASA has proposed for initiation during fiscal year 1970.

The committee also voted to defer funding for the Mariner Mercury 1973 mission for which NASA has requested $3 million for fiscal year 1970 as the initial increment of an estimated total cost of approximately $90 million for this single mission. The committee recognizes that the swing-by Venus to Mercury is an attractive mission. However, it must be considered in the context of our entire planetary exploration program and the anticipated costs involved in that program.

In summary, NASA's planetary exploration program, while not as aggressive or diversified as some would like, represents very substantial future expenditures, and even today is the largest part, dollarwise, of the space science program.

Unfortunately, NASA has all but canceled the remainder of the biosatellite program. Last December, the two 21-day biosatellite missions were terminated, and under the revised NASA budget submitted to Congress in April one of the two remaining 30-day biosatellite missions was also slated to be canceled.

It has been estimated that cancellation of biosatellite–F will result in at least $2,000,000 in unrecoverable hardware costs, and if an appropriate portion of the development costs of the 30-day satellite were assigned to biosatellite–F, the amount of unrecoverable costs would be many millions more.

Because the Nation has such a substantial investment in biosatellite–F, and because the study of an instrumented primate in space for 30 days has been described as one of the most important research projects leading to a better understanding of the physiological and psychological effects of the space environment on men, the committee voted to restore the $12,000,000 which the budget amendment had eliminated from the original budget submission for fiscal year 1970.

The committee has taken the position that the space applications program should receive greater emphasis. The earth resources survey project is of special interest. Accordingly, the committee voted to increase, by $10,000,000, the amount requested by NASA for support of the earth resources technology satellite for fiscal year 1970. This will make available $24,100,000 for this purpose during the forthcoming fiscal year.

The committee believes that the development of ERTS should be undertaken immediately and aggressively pursued; the launch schedule should be compressed if possible plans for additional spacecraft should be made; and work on ground equipment should be undertaken without delay. In order that this expression of congressional intent shall not be disregarded, the NASA authorization bill for fiscal year 1970 has been amended to prohibit the transfer or reprograming of any portion of the $24,100,000 authorized for ERTS to any other use.

Under advanced research and technology, NASA's initial budget request for the nuclear rockets program was $36,500,000; the Nixon budget contains the same amount. This is substantially less than the $55,000,000 authorized for fiscal year 1969 and also represents a major reduction from the fiscal year 1968 level.

The committee is recommending that NASA proceed with the Nerva engine development at a somewhat faster pace than proposed by NASA. To do so, an increase in the nuclear rockets program of $13,500,000 is recommended. This action is taken on the basis that the nuclear rocket will provide an across-the-board advance in space propulsion in the late 1970's and 1980's. Launch vehicle systems using a nuclear upper stage in combination with a variety of lower stages could perform many missions in considerably shorter times or carry much larger payloads than our present launch vehicles.

In summary, because of the great importance of this program to the long-range future of space flight, the committee recommends that an additional $13,500,000 in fiscal year 1970 authorized funds be provided for a total of $50 million. Additionally the committee recommends that the law be written so as to stipulate that the $50 million is to be used only for the nuclear rockets program.

For chemical propulsion, NASA initially requested $25,100,000. In the revised budget NASA reduced this request to $22,850,000. The recommendation of the committee is to add $5,250,000 for a total of $28,100,000, of which $2,250,000 is to restore funds cut by the budget amendment and $3 million is for an increase in large solid motor work.

In previous years this committee has been a strong supporter of the 260-inch solid rocket motor program because of its inherent simplicity, reliability, and potential for achieving major cost reductions in payload cost per pound. The next major logical step in this program is the fabrication of a full-length test booster with a movable nozzle.

There is considerable concern caused by the lack of recognition given to increased propulsion development by NASA and the administration. Although the Committee on Science and Astronautics has shown some minor concern on this subject, I remain almost a one-man show in pushing hard for more booster and for additional upper stage propulsion capability. I have consistently advocated more funds to insure our future superiority in this important field. Only by my efforts have we been able to get NASA to place emphasis on exotic fuel research. This has resulted in research in boron and fluorine mixtures that can provide upward to 45 percent more pushper-pound or specific impulse to our rockets. This is the type potential that needs to be explored. My criticism continues to be that NASA tends to emphasize the large engineering and manufacturing projects with less and less emphasis on science and research. It is necessary that NASA respond to these needs to push back the frontiers of science.

This research is needed to keep this country abreast of our Russian competitor so that we will not be overwhelmed by them.

There is the imminent possibility of another shock such as October 1957 when because of our too little and too late booster capability the Russians were able to put tons into orbit and all we could do is belatedly launch a "grapefruit." Now, in testimony before our committee, Administrator Webb stated that the Russians are expected to have a new booster of more than 10 million pounds of thrust. He also testified that the Russians have always had a forward-thrusting development program with respect to large boosters. Their new booster will be almost one-third larger than our Saturn V rocket. Where does that leave us?

This leaves us with the same second-best propulsion capability that has throttled us since the inception of our space program. Therefore, NASA should place all propulsion research under the authority of the Office of Advanced Research and Technology. It should provide sufficient funding to provide a broad, forward-looking, and vigorous program in this field.

The current NASA program leaves us without a single new booster project in our space program, as well as no new research for boosters in NASA. They have a contingency for $3.1 million which they may utilize for further development. I contend, as I have for years, that NASA needs to complete the development of the 260-inch large solid booster. This development has progressed remarkably, but as NASA gets close to the final item they begin to reduce the funds. Now we have no project at all, only a contingency. The important thing about the 260-inch solid booster is that it is a means for placing large weights in orbit economically. Additionally, its propellant is storable for long periods of time. It provides momentary reaction capability. It is easily strapped together to double or treble the thrust at boost.

It is much simpler than the more expensive, more complex liquid engines. It is a part of the advanced technology which should be fully supported to make progress in our space program. I recommend that NASA organize a sustained effort to bring their large solid technology to fruition and to plan programs which could utilize this booster. This is particularly true for the advanced nuclear engine stages, the spike nozzle concept for upper stage use and engines using the boron and fluorine and other exotic additives. Such a program would give our country the propulsion capability it needs to stay foremost in the space field.

NASA initially requested $78,900,000 for aeronautical vehicles. The budget amendment reduced this amount by $1,200,000, to $77,700,000.

To the initial request of $78,900,000 the committee had added a modest increase of $2 million for a total authorization of $80,900,000 for use in structural analysis—mainly in helicopters; for V/STOL propulsion; and for V/STOL noise source analysis. The committee also recommends restoring the $1,200,000 cut by the budget amendment. Therefore, the total amount recommended for authorization is $80,900,000 for aeronautical vehicles.

For tracking and data acquisition, NASA initially requested $298 million, which was $13.8 million more than the fiscal year 1969 operating plan and $8.2 million more than was authorized. The requested increase was attributed primarily to increasing workloads of the three major networks: Satellite network, the manned space flight network, and the deep space network.

The material submitted by NASA and the presentation before the committee generally supported the NASA contention that the workload on all of the networks in the tracking and data acquisition area will increase in future years, including fiscal year 1970, both as to quantity and complexity of data to be acquired and processed.

The Nixon budget reduced NASA's request by $20 million, from $298 million to $278 million. This reduction would result in: First, deferral of all planned improvements to the networks; and second, deferral of improved communications. Additionally, other reductions would be necessary.

To emphasize the concern of the committee on not impairing network capabilities—but still taking into account the issues of improved efficiency and more intensive scrutiny of requirements being placed on the three operational networks—an increase of $15 million to the budget amendment amount is recommended. This action results in a recommended authorization of $293 million, which is $5 million less than the initial NASA request.

So much for our committee action on NASA's great research and development programs. I hope and believe that the House will sustain us.

There are two other matters of consequence in the NASA budget. One is the construction of facilities program and the other is research and program management, which formerly was called administrative operations.

For new construction, both the Johnson and Nixon budgets recommended $58,200,000, the smallest total in several years. The committee did not change that figure.

For research and program management, the Johnson and Nixon budgets also were identical at $650,900,000. Nevertheless, the committee believes some economies can be realized in management. Accordingly, we have cut this figure by $7,150,000 to a lower total of $643,750,000.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the committee's actions. I recommend that the bill be passed with the dollar figures as reported by the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

I wish to address myself to the Apollo program briefly at this point.

By 1970 the National Aeronautics and Space Administration will have spent approximately $23.9 billion to place men on the Moon and return them safely to Earth. On July 20, 1969, man, for the first time in history will set foot on the natural satellite of the Earth, the Moon. All of this has taken much money and time. All of this effort with skilled personnel in research and development is being accomplished right here on Earth.

We stand today as a better nation because of the Apollo program. Seven block I command and service modules have been built. Twenty block II command modules qualified for lunar flight are currently being completed. Twelve Saturn 1–B's have been built. Five of these have been launched, including the flights of Apollo 5 and 7, and the remaining nine Saturn 1–B's have been assigned to the Apollo applications program. As of today, the Apollo applications program represents our only near earth orbital manned capability in the early 1970's. Fifteen Saturn V vehicles are nearing completion. Five of these vehicles have been flown successfully. These Saturn V flights included the unprecedented successful Apollo 4, 6, 8, 9, and 10 missions. The remaining Saturn V vehicles have been assigned to lunar exploration through 1972. Fifteen lunar modules have currestly been completed or are in production. Three lunar modules have been flown on the Apollo 5, 9, and 10 missions. Lunar module 5 will be flown on the lunar landing flight in July of this year, Apollo 11. The remaining 11 lunar modules will be used for lunar exploration and for the Apollo applications program.

What has been the value of the development of this tremendous capability in space? Actually the Nation and the world is receiving more than was originally anticipated in value from the development of the Apollo program. Today we stand on the threshold of long duration flights to the Moon and the use of near Earth orbit for man's benefit. The remaining vehicles in the Apollo program will not only teach us more about the world in which we live, but provide the test beds for extended use of near and deep space.

We stand on the verge of a renaissance tied to the development of space for new knowledge and application. Continued probing on my part and by other members of the committee has caused NASA to reassess its production schedules and its scientific goals. Consequently, today we approach the lunar landing with greater confidence that all of these vehicles will be adequately utilized for maximum return on our investment. We have continually probed, questioned and encouraged NASA to adequately define the Apollo and Apollo applications missions. I am pleased to report to my colleagues today that each vehicle in the Apollo program has a definite assignment. Each vehicle in the Apollo program, and the lunar exploration to follow, is being adequately defined. The missions for the Apollo applications program have now been adequately identified.

Without the diligence of the committee we might still be without a well structured and completely defined Apollo program. However, we now have a working schedule which will insure maximum utilization of the vehicle and spacecraft in the Apollo applications program.

To assure my colleagues that there is a firm schedule for each and every ve-

hicle programed to date. I insert at this point in the RECORD a detailed analysis of vehicle assignments, uses and costs:

COMMAND AND SERVICE MODULES

Designation and disposition, March 7, 1969

Block I

CSM 002: Land impact tests.
CSM 009: Flown on AS-201.
CSM 011: Flown on AS-202.
CSM 012: Destroyed in fire.
CSM 014: Structural tests.
CSM 017: Flown on AS-501 (Apollo 4).
CSM 020: Flown on AS-502 (Apollo 6).

Block II

CSM 101: Flown AS-205 (Apollo 7).
CSM 102: Structural test.
CSM 103: Flown on AS-503 (Apollo 8).
CSM 104: Flown on AS-504 (Apollo 9).
CSM 105: Vibration Testing.
CSM 106: Assigned to AS-505 (Apollo 10).
CSM 107: Assigned to AS-506 (Apollo 11).
CSM 108: Assigned to Lunar Mission.
CSM 109: Assigned to Lunar Mission.
CSM 110: Assigned to Lunar Mission.
CSM 111: Assigned to Lunar Mission.
CSM 112: Assigned to Lunar Mission.
CSM 113: Assigned to Lunar Mission.
CSM 114: Assigned to Lunar Mission.
CSM 115: Assigned to Lunar Mission.
CSM 115A: Assigned to Lunar Mission.
CSM 116: Tentatively assigned to AAP.
CSM 117: Tentatively assigned to AAP.
CSM 118: Tentatively assigned to AAP.
CSM 119: Tentatively assigned to AAP.

Major CSM Test Articles

CSM 2TV-1: Thermal vacuum testing.
CSM 2S-1: Impact testing.
CSM 2S-2: Structural testing.
CSM 004: Structural and thermal testing.
CSM 006: Structural testing.
CSM 007: Manned uprighting testing.
CSM 008: Structural testing.
CSM 010: Thermal and dynamic testing.

The average recurring unit cost for producing these Block II Command & Service Module is $55 million.

SATURN IB LAUNCH VEHICLES

Designation and disposition/status, March 7, 1969

SA-201: Launched—AS-201.
SA-202: Launched—AS-202.
SA-203: Launched—AS203.
SA-204: Launched AS-204 (Apollo 5).
SA-205: Launched—AS-205 (Apollo 7).
SA-206: Storage—Tentatively assigned to AAP.
SA-207: Storage—Tentatively assigned to AAP.
SA-208: Storage—Tentatively assigned to AAP.
SA-209: Storage—Tentatively assigned to AAP.
SA-210: Storage—Tentatively assigned to AAP.
SA-211: Storage—Tentatively assigned to AAP.
SA-212: Storage—Tentatively assigned to AAP.
SA-213: Manufacturing and long-lead procurement.
SA-214: Manufacturing and long-lead procurement.

The average recurring unit production cost of the Saturn IB launch vehicle is $42 million.

SATURN V LAUNCH VEHICLES

SA-501: Launched—AS-501 (Apollo 4).
SA-502: Launched—AS-502 (Apollo 6).
SA-503: Launched—AS-503 (Apollo 8).
SA-504: Launched—AS-504 (Apollo 9).
SA-505: At KSC—AS-505 (Apollo 10).
SA-506: At KSC—AS-506 (Apollo 11).
SA-507: Being Prepared for Shipment to KSC.
SA-508: Test and checkout.
SA-509: Static test.
SA-510: Post manufacturing checkout.
SA-511: Manufacturing and postmanufacturing checkout.
SA-512: Ditto.
SA-513: Manufacturing.
SA-514: Ditto.
SA-515: Ditto.

The average recurring unit cost for these Saturn V launch vehicles is $186 million.

LUNAR MODULE

Designation and disposition

LTA-1: Systems integration.
LTA-2: Flown on AS-502 (Apollo 6).
LTA-3: Structural test at WSTF.
LTA-5D: Propulsion test at WSTF.
LTA-8: Thermal vacuum test at MSC.
LTA-10: Flown on AS-501 (Apollo 4).
LTA-3DR: Structural test at MSC.
PA-1: Propulsion test at WSTF.
LM-1: Launched on AS-204 (Apollo 5).
LM-2: Structural test then tentatively assigned to AAP for Backup ATM.
LM-3: Launched on AS-504 (Apollo 9).
LM-4: Assigned to AS-505 (Apollo 10).
LM-5: Assigned to AS-506 (Apollo 11).
LM-6: Assigned to Lunar Mission.
LM-7: Ditto.
LM-8: Ditto.
LM-9: Ditto.
LM-10: Ditto.
LM-11: Ditto.
LM-12: Ditto.
LM-13: Ditto.
LM-14: Ditto.
LM-15: Tentatively assigned to AAP for ATM.

The average recurring unit cost for producing these flight Lunar Modules is $41 million.

It is important to note that despite the recent successes of the Apollo program, the total launches in calendar year 1968 by the United States was substantially lower than in 1967. Our launch rate of 1967 was a numerical drop from two preceding years. However, the 62 U.S. launches in 1968 and the eight successful launches in 1969 reflect a growing sophistication in capability of our national space effort. During 1968 the Soviet Union conducted successfully 74 launches, slightly exceeding their 1967 total of 67 launches. So far in 1969 the Soviets have launched 22 vehicles. The Russians have conducted in their more recent flights not only rendezvous but dockings and transfer of personnel from one vehicle to another. They have successfully landed vehicles in the Indian Ocean and in Soviet heartland. They have launched primitive life forms on circumlunar flights. All of these are indicative of the vitality and progress of the Soviet space effort. The Soviets today have a stable of launch vehicles of ever-increasing capability including the Vostok class of vehicles for manned space flight, the Molniya type vehicle for unmanned satellite activity, as well as the Cosmos and Elektron type satellites for scientific investigation. It had been stated that the Soviets have under development a vehicle purported to have the thrust in excess of 10 million pounds. With this launch vehicle the Soviets will be capable not only of launching extremely large Earth orbital space stations but also will be capable of direct ascent lunar flights. Surely this is a time in our history when we should maintain our capabilities and capitalize on the developments which we have already made in the manned space flight program and particularly in Apollo and Apollo applications program.

In the area of advanced missions, intensive study has been under way in NASA during the past year in the development of manned permanent space stations, lunar bases and low-cost space transportation systems. The space station studies point to a multipurpose general usage laboratory that will be more advanced than the initial Saturn I workshop of the Apollo applications program. This could well be the first truly multination manned space capability. Such activities of astronomy, earth science and applications, industrial processes, physics, life sciences, and advanced technology will all be explored in this effort. Such space stations should have a life of 2 or more years and a crew of at least nine or more personnel.

Likewise, extensive studies are underway on space transportation systems to effectively utilize a large Earth orbital space station, a low-cost transportation system to carry men to orbit and return is required. Studies in parallel with space stations are being made emphasizing an operationally efficient and cost-effective transportation system. These vehicles will provide a capability to fly in space much as we fly in aircraft today. They will provide for personnel rotation, expendibility, resupply and delivery of experiments, experimental modules and the experimenters themselves. It is expected that the cost will be reduced from the current level of approximately $500 per pound for near-Earth orbit to approximately $10 to $50 per pound for the same missions. Again, it opens new vistas for truly international participation in manned space flight.

In the area of lunar exploration, I have continually questioned NASA and insisted on adequate definition of post-Apollo flights. I am pleased to report that studies have been initiated and definition of missions have reached a sufficient point of maturity so that lunar exploration following lunar exploration landing can progress smoothly.

Following the initial lunar landing, three Apollo flights will be made to the Moon, each landing at a different designated area. Each one of these areas represents unique geological features of the lunar surface and will allow us to better understand the evolution of the Moon, the Earth, and our universe. Included on each one of these flights will be Apollo lunar experiment packages designed to give seismic data on the lunar surface to better describe the geological conditions of the Moon. Experiments will be conducted to study the solar wind, observe the gross lunar terrain, and examine in detail the composition of the lunar surface.

Following these three flights, six more missions are being defined in detail which will extend man's stay time on the lunar surface, provide increased mobility for the astronauts, and expand our capability to determine the ultimate usefulness of the lunar surface for both science and utilitarian purposes. Improved Apollo systems will allow 3- to 4-day missions on the lunar surface. Highly mobile flying units will be able to range up to 6 miles from the spacecraft during the first half of the 1970's. All of these activities contributed to expanding our base

of knowledge and determining the ultimate uses of space.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE).

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the models we have before us today represent the only two large payload launch vehicles that the United States has. The smaller of these two vehicles, the Saturn IB, can launch 40,000 pounds, or 20 tons, into a near-earth orbit. The larger Saturn V can launch 285,000 pounds, or 142 tons, into near-earth orbit or 100,000 pounds to the lunar surface or beyond. The Saturn IB has two stages—the first stage built by the Chrysler Corp., and the second stage is built by the McDonnell Douglas Corp. On top of these two stages is a command and service module which is part of both the Saturn V and Saturn IB.

The command and service module is built by North American Rockwell Corp. Twelve of these vehicles have been built. Five have been flown successfully and the remaining seven will be used in the Apollo applications program to deliver the second stage tank to earth orbit to be utilized as a workshop and to launch on another mission a lunar module which has been altered to carry telescopes for extensive observation of the sun. Each of these missions will require two launch vehicles with two additional Saturn IB vehicles—one to revisit the workshop and one to revisit the telescope mount for a duration of up to 56 days.

Funds in the budget for this year will provide for the completion of the 13th and 14th Saturn IB vehicle already on the production lines. No additional vehicles of this size are being procured at this time. The 13th and 14th vehicle will provide sufficient backup so as to allow successful completion of the Apollo applications program.

The larger third stage Saturn V vehicle has a first stage built by the Boeing Co., a second stage built by the North American Rockwell Corp., a third stage built by the McDonnell Douglas Corp. which is identical with the second stage of the Saturn V, an instrument which is identical with the instrument on the Saturn I–B built by IBM, a lunar module spacecraft built by the Grumman Aircraft & Engineering Corp. and the command and service module built by North American Rockwell.

Five of these vehicles have been successfully flown and the fifth is still in orbit at this time. Fifteen of these vehicles are currently being manufactured. It is planned to use the sixth Saturn V vehicle for a lunar landing. The seventh, eighth, and ninth Saturn V vehicles will be used to deploy Apollo lunar experiment packages at three additional sites on the moon's surface to gain more knowledge of the moon and its interaction with the earth.

The 10th through 15th vehicle will be used to extend man's exploration of the lunar surface during the next 3 years. None of this will take place beyond the lunar landing if the funds which have been requested in the fiscal year 1970 authorization are not made available; $52.2 million have been added to the NASA request for the Saturn V vehicle so that long procurement leadtime hardware for a 16th Saturn V vehicle can be initiated. It is important to recognize that even with these additional funds added, an 18-month gap in the production of the Saturn V vehicle will take place and production will not be reinitiated until 1973 since the last of the current 15 Saturn V vehicles will be delivered in 1970.

Some of the items required for this Saturn V vehicle, a model of which we have before us, require as much as 42 months to procure—such as forgings for propellant pumps on each stage of the rocket, components of the instrument unit, pumps, and small retrorockets to separate the stages, some valves and fittings all require long leadtime to deliver. It is imperative that if our national space program is not to come to a halt in the 1970's that we proceed with a long leadtime purchase of the Saturn V vehicles necessary to support a progressive national space program.

It is important to point out that the original budget submission included no funds for this purpose. The amended budget submitted by President Nixon included $46 million for this purpose. However, because of the urgent nature of this requirement and the extensive hearings held by the committee, an additional $6.2 million above the amended NASA budget was added for long leadtime hardware procurement. I have mentioned specific missions planned for each one of the Saturn V and Saturn IB vehicles. The lunar exploration beyond the initial lunar landing would utilize the remaining nine Saturn V vehicles. Funds included in this budget would allow the procurement of sufficient equipment to extend the astronaut's exploration radius while operating on the moon as well as extend the length of time on the lunar surface from 1 to 3 days on each flight.

Saturn vehicles will be available because of the early success that is being achieved in the lunar landing effort. The investment of this money for additional lunar exploration represents a dividend since it will allow us to use vehicles which would originally have been used for final development of the lunar landing for actual lunar exploration. It would be folly for us not to take advantage of this opportunity. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support the authorization as included in the bill before us.

Mr. Chairman, in considering the manned space flight portion of the fiscal year 1970 NASA authorization, three budget levels were examined: The budget level as submitted to the Congress by NASA, a $4.2 billion total budget as originally submitted by NASA to the Bureau of the Budget, and a $4.7 billion also submitted to the Bureau of the Budget, which would, in NASA's view, assure a start on making the United States preeminent in space. After extensive hearings, both in Washington, at the major NASA manned space flight centers, and at the key industrial contractors, it was the conclusion of the Manned Space Flight Subcommittee that adequate funds for our national space program had not been included in the budget as originally submitted. Consequently, the subcommittee made several changes to the budget which were sustained by the full committee. Two of these several changes were further supported when an amended budget was submitted by the new administration. In two notable cases, lunar exploration and Saturn V production, the budget submitted by the new administration increased the funds available for these purposes.

Mr. Chairman, so that I may be brief, I will summarize these changes. The committee has added funds in the following areas to assure a balanced and successful continuing space program.

First. A total of $32.1 million has been added for reducing the cost of manufacture, assembly, and start of the Saturn V vehicle.

Second. A total of $4.6 million has been added above the new administration's budget for lunar exploration so that in flights following the initial lunar landing our astronauts may extend their range of exploration and spend additional time on the lunar surface and have sufficient equipment to allow a significant return of information on each flight.

Third. The amended budget assumes a successful lunar landing on the Apollo 11 flight and calls for plans to reduce the total lunar flights in 1970 from five to three. Based on this assumption, the amended budget reduced funds in the Apollo program by $39 million. Based on extensive testimony it is apparent that even if NASA sustains its highly successful lunar landing schedule, adequate preparations for flights and adequate astronaut training cannot be sacrificed. Therefore, the committee supported the original NASA request for funds in the operations of the Apollo program in fiscal year 1970.

Fourth. The amended budget reduced the Apollo applications program by $57 million. It is planned to suspend the production of the last two Saturn IB vehicles and delay the start of the Apollo applications program by at least 5 months and delay the availability of backup hardware for the Apollo applications program missions by 8 to 9 months. It is the committee's view that the further delay of the Apollo applications program can only adversely affect our development of space for utilitarian gains and allow the orderly development, in the 1970's, of a space station. Both the workshop of the Apollo applications program and the astronautical telescope mount will be our Nation's first major capability in a manned workshop and manned scientific observatory in space. Therefore, the committee supports the original request which is $57 million higher than the amended budget.

Fifth. The Nation has only two large payload launch vehicles—the Saturn IB and the Saturn V. We have built 12 Saturn IB's with two more to be completed, and we have completed 10 of 15 Saturn V's. Unless funds are provided for long leadtime items in this budget, the Apollo program will come to a halt. With the completion of the 15th Saturn V in 1970, even with the funds provided in this budget, Saturn V production will be stopped for 18 months and then restarted in 1973. Up to 42 months are

required for some of the long leadtime items. The new administration's budget added $46 million for this effort. The committee sustained this same view and based on testimony before the committee added $6.2 million above the amended budget for the purpose of Saturn V long leadtime hardware.

Sixth. The committee, during this year's authorization process, received extensive testimony on the future of our national space effort in 1970. The desirability of developing large manned orbital space stations with earth oriented applications and the development of a low-cost reuseable shuttle to travel between earth and a space station were extensively examined. The early development of such a shuttle should provide a new era in transportation by being fully recoverable and therefore low cost. The committee was impressed by the view that to assure an adequate national space effort and at the same time reduce the total cost of operations in the 1970 period that the early definition and development of both a space station and a low-cost reuseable shuttle is of paramount importance. Therefore, the committee added $66 million to the administration's request for space station and space shuttle design activity. It is my belief that this item is the single most important activity for our Nation to assure an adequate space effort in the middle 1970's and beyond.

Mr. Chairman I have tried to be brief with respect to several significant changes to the fiscal year 1970 NASA authorization but I must reemphasize that the decisions made this year will determine whether we have a major space program after 1970. I urge your support and the support of all the members of this committee in the recommendations made by Chairman MILLER and the other members of our committee.

I. WHY SPACE?

Our growth and survival as a nation has become dependent on technological progress during this latter half of the 20th century. To maintain our leadership among the community of nations requires our leadership in science and technology to allow our leadership in the world market place. Our personal standard of living in an ever more populated world demands this same technological leadership.

With demanding but obtainable goals our national research and development capability can remain a vital and effective cornerstone of progress. Our space program is a major stimulus to our development and growth as a nation.

The present budget before the Congress does provide substantial funds for meeting needs on earth. The fiscal year 1970 request includes about $27.2 billion for aid to the poor, $18.5 billion for medical and health related activities and about $9.8 billion for education. Cutting the space program would not provide much help in proportion to adding to these programs, while it would most certainly inhibit future economic and technical growth which provides the real wealth to meet future needs in these areas.

We have just completed 10 years in space. We have viewed the Moon at close range. Spacecraft have retrieved valuable data from the vicinity of both Mars and Venus.

Space satellite communications today are a commercial success.

Forty nations of the world avail themselves of satellite weather data from U.S. satellites.

Not only in communications, weather and navigation but also in business and industry our Nation benefits from our space effort. New products and processes derived from our space effort are fostering new industries and companies.

Several hundred technological advances emanating from the space program have been made available to industry through the NASA technology utilization program. For example:

The fuel cell, which had lain dormant for many years, was activated to power spacecraft in orbit. Twenty-eight natural gas companies now have a $20,000,000 program for adaptation of the fuel cell for home power units.

We had to know on a real-time basis, that is, while it was happening, how fast the hearts of the astronauts were beating while they were in space. We had to know how much oxygen they were using; we had to know how their muscles were responding to their strange environment. So we invented another new system, biosensor to computer to data gathering equipment, and through the communications network to the Manned Spacecraft Center at Houston—from 100 miles—or from a quarter of a million miles out in space. Now, a half a dozen newly formed companies are now manufacturing adapted space-created instruments for the use of doctors and hospitals here on earth.

The need for fireproof materials for Apollo spacecraft has demanded a complete testing and documentation of the flammability characteristics of hundreds of materials. These results have been computerized and are available for the asking. Within a short time there will be no excuse for a large percentage of disastrous fires—from mattresses burning, to children's sweaters catching fire, to aircraft curtains igniting. Information on flammability of materials developed for Apollo has been passed along to the aircraft manufacturers for their guidance in outfitting new jet transports. Fireproof Beta cloth has been developed which has the potential use for firefighter suits in municipal departments as well as on board our aircraft carriers at sea.

A television camera system designed to visibly detect hydrogen leaks in the testing of the J-2 rocket engine, sensitive to infrared radiation, has been adapted for use aboard aircraft to enhance visual approach and landing capability. Radiant sources such as runway lights or other similar incandescent arrays are "picked up" by this system at distances as great as 5 miles, even through cloud cover fog, or other adverse weather conditions.

To analyze a variety of problems related to rocket engines vibration, ignition, and combustion processes, a contractor developed a cross correlated spectral analysis computer program. It is being used for studies of brain reactions in animal subjects. The program is also expected to find application in oceanography for underwater noise studies and surface wave studies, in earthquake prediction, in analyzing vibration and wind factors for bridge construction, and for other purposes.

A less obvious effect of our national space program is the gathering together of people from diverse skills and background to work toward common goals. This will surely lead to an improvement in our ability to find new ways to deal with not only space-oriented but Earth-oriented social and urban problems as well.

Apollo with its lunar landing is tangible proof that our national vitality can be marshalled for the good of mankind. It is essential that we maintain the momentum of our activity into the second decade of space exploration and utilization so that the maximum return be achieved for our human and material investment.

II. STAC WINTER STUDY

The Science and Technology Advisory Committee convened on December 6 through 9, 1968, to consider the prospects for manned space flight in the decade 1975–85. Members of this distinguished body included three Nobel Prize winners, Chairman Charles H. Townes, Luis Alvarez, and William Shockley. Dr. Lee DuBridge was also a member up to the time of his appointment as President Nixon's science advisor. The findings of this group were published in a document entitled, "Uses of Manned Space Flight, 1975–85" proceedings of a winter study conducted at LaJolla, Calif., December 1968, and released in April 1969.

Conclusions reached by the Committee are as follows:

1. The United States should remain in the forefront of all major categories of space activity, including space sciences, solar system exploration, manned flight capability, and economic applications.

I agree wholeheartedly with this conclusion.

2. It is reasonable to utilize ½ to 1 percent of the gross national product to support this nation's civilian space flight program.

This is reasonable in my view also.

3. Within the space flight program the following elements are of major importance and should be strongly supported:

a. An aggressive automated planetary exploration program as recommended by the Space Sciences Board of the National Academy of Sciences. Options must be kept open for a manned phase to follow the early automated phase.

This requires more study, in my view.

b. An economic applications program of the general nature recommended by the 1968 Summer Study on Space Applications carried out by the National Academy of Sciences.

This entire program of economic applications requires much more than NASA has given in the past.

c. A continuation of lunar exploration following the Apollo landing as recommended by the Lunar and Planetary Missions Board of NASA.

I strongly agree.

d. A vigorous program of astronomical observations in Earth orbit along the general lines recommended by the Astronomy Missions Board of NASA.

This, too, I strongly endorse.

e. The extension of manned space flight capability in Earth orbit to longer duration and to permit application for scientific and technological purposes.

This is very important and I agree.

4. The achievement of a manned low-cost transportation system is the keystone to the future development and large scale practical application of the space program. Development of such a system and plans for its effective use deserve high priority.

This must be done, I strongly endorse.

5. The use of a long duration manned space station appears to be a logical step in the evolution of manned space flight capability. It offers considerable potential support to the scientific and technological programs which appear desirable in a number of disciplines, and is necessary as a precursor to eventual manned planetary exploration. Since a space station should be designed to support men in the weightless condition unless unexpected biomedical problems are encountered or overwhelming engineering advantages for artificial gravity are discovered.

This conclusion does not go far enough, this is a must for the Nation's future.

6. It is generally agreed that strong arguments exist for placing observatories and laboratories in Earth orbit. Large, complex facilities and instruments for astronomy, Earth Applications, space physics, life sciences, and new materials development all have interesting potentials, and all can profit from manned attendance. Relative emphasis among these activities and the extent of manned attendance desirable in each must be decided by appropriate studies and early experiments.

I agree with this conclusion.

These and further detailed recommendations indicate a generally favorable attitude toward the role that space can play in the United States and toward the specific program objectives which NASA is now pursuing in manned space flight.

III. NEED FOR MAINTAINING PRODUCTION OF THE SATURN V LAUNCH VEHICLE

The Saturn V is the most powerful launch vehicle ever to be developed, produced and proven in space. Possessing six times the payload capability of the Nation's intermediate-size booster, the Saturn V is the free world's largest booster and the only launch vehicle capable of lifting large payloads into earth orbit or carrying out manned missions to lunar distances. The United States has no immediate plans to develop any other booster of equal or greater power, since the Saturn V provides the Nation with the basic launch vehicle capability to carry out a variety of space operations in the 1970's. Development of the proposed space shuttle will provide a low-cost transportation system for carrying 12 to 25 tons of payloads into a low-earth orbit.

In the range of large payload weights, the Saturn V is the Nation's sole means of launching 125 tons into earth orbit, sending 50 tons out to lunar distances, and landing 20 tons on the lunar surface. This versatile launch vehicle is the key to capitalizing on the gains of the Nation's first decade in space and realizing returns on the skills, technology, equipment, and facilities created in Apollo. The Saturn V provides the payload capability required for a progressive space program in the 1970's, including continued lunar exploration and future missions such as the space station or deep-space missions.

Effective utilization of the Saturn V can be maintained only by preserving the industrial capability brought into being at great expense over the last 9 years. Continuing the present trend will result in expensive shutdown and startup costs. Skills will be lost and have to be retrained, tooling refurbished, and parts requalified. In fact, the restart would take on many aspects of an R. & D. program. The projected unit cost reductions associated with learning and with streamlining the existing production base would therefore be impossible of achievement under stop-startup conditions. Certainly the longer the gap the more difficult and costly are the startup conditions.

Another important factor associated with loss in production capability in the technical support required to complete the flight program associated with the present buy of 15 vehicles. A substantial cadre of skilled personnel is required at the factory to handle unforeseen technical problems encountered in the flight program. With no future production, this support will undergo steady degradation.

To preserve the technological strength of the United States it is essential to provide for follow-on production beyond the 15th Saturn V launch vehicle—the last one in the current program. Additional Saturn V's are required to continue a sound space program through the next decade and to prevent disruption or loss of the gains of the first 10 years in space.

IV. SPACE STATION

The Nation requires the technical and political power resident in a flexible and extensive capability in earth orbital manned space flight. From earth orbit the world can be readily assessed and accessed. Earth orbit also affords effective outward viewing from the scientific standpoint and otherwise takes advantage of the unique characteristics the space environment, such as weightlessness and unlimited hard vacuum.

The next logical and necessary step in the progress of earth orbital space flight is the establishment of a space station or a centralized and sustained base of operations. Such a station will do much for the general advance of our capability as a space-faring nation. In fact, the capabilities for sustained operations that can be developed in a more economical and safe way through establishment of a space station in earth orbit is directly applicable to the establishment of lunar bases or to manned exploration of the planets in the future.

The utilization of a space station concept opens many arenas for more rapid progress in scientific knowledge, technology advance, and applications of space flight. Typical of these are the possibilities for more extensive international cooperation. The space station will be the first program where nonastronauts can participate directly in space flights. Thus, foreign nationals will not only find it easier to participate as investigators, but can have the opportunity to involve themselves in the actual conduct of their experiments in space. These statements are just as applicable to user elements within our own national structures.

As a result of the studies underway, we are likely to find that the development of a space station is the most attractive option for space progress and benefits in the immediate future and that we should move out as rapidly as possible.

V. NEED FOR CONTINUING LUNAR EXPLORATION

The Moon provides an opportunity to better understand the evolution of the universe, provides the potential for an extra terrestrial base and serves as a demonstration of space leadership by our country.

If we are to achieve any of these ends the Moon must be visited several times and in several different places.

The flight hardware is now being completed for 10 missions. An orderly rate of flight will assure safety and economy in operations.

V. NEED FOR CONTINUING LUNAR EXPLORATION

Lunar exploration is of great national importance—for furthering our scientific knowledge, for determining the future potential for using the Moon as a base, and for demonstrating our international leadership in the exploration of space.

The Moon has particular scientific interest and potential direct benefits because of its close association to the Earth. A number of landings are necessary to establish an understanding of the origin, history, processes, and present state of the Moon and its relation to the Earth and the solar system. It is now expected that 10 or more landings will be needed at various distinct areas to gather data required for the major decisions on future uses of the Moon.

Production of the flight hardware for accomplishing these missions is being completed, the trained mission teams have been assembled, and the initial lunar landing is expected this summer. Following the first flight, the plan is to visit at least three additional lunar regions, each of a generally different nature, and then with the remaining six flights to make precision landings at points where significant unique features and important processes have been identified.

At the same time we must carry out our operations in a way that maximizes safety and effectiveness in an operational sense. A steady, reasonably spaced launch rate is the most economic and efficient use of facilities, hardware, and personnel. Undue spreading or gaps in the sequence will result in major programmatic problems in safety, reliability, costs, and maintaining of trained teams. The above factors lead to the judgment that about three missions per year is a good choice for launch interval.

We have a good understanding now of the basic methods and measurements to obtain the needed data. Candidate land-

ing sites have already been selected. Sufficient lead time exists to provide scientific instrumentation, means to significantly improve mobility, and extensions of surface staytime for the last six flights which will significantly improve the quality of the data return.

The effect of delaying this project will require that NASA fly missions that do not effectively use the hardware that has been produced in Apollo. Missions would be flown without surface science packages, without provisions for extended stay-times or increased astronaut mobility. The only alternative to this inefficient use of hardware would be to introduce an undesirable and costly gap in the flight sequence.

VI. NEED FOR LOW COST SPACE TRANSPORTATION

Past and current manned spacecraft and launch vehicle systems are characterized by high cost of flight hardware and support operations. This condition was not unexpected, for the emphasis in both of these space transportation elements for pioneering flight missions has been on performance and reliability.

To support future space flight operations, there is a strong need to greatly reduce the annual costs of space transportation operations, while sustaining the necessary number of space flights. During this first decade of space operations, our technology base has steadily advanced to the point that new systems can be defined now, which can satisfy first, the basic need of major reductions in the cost of placing satellites, men, equipment, and supplies, into orbit, and second, major advances in space system versatility. To use space as we use other parts of our environment, it must be accessible, readily and economically. The most significant feature of the new concept is maximum reusability from flight to flight.

This new class of space vehicles, the space shuttle, is a key to national space flight operations in the last half of the 1970's and beyond. As presently conceived, the space shuttle will have the inherent capability for multiapplications. Space operations by other agencies, such as the Department of Defense, could use the shuttle and its support equipment with little modification. To maintain a space station or base for sustained operations in Earth orbit, extensive logistic support operations are required. Present systems or modifications thereto will be costly and limited in performance for the task of logistic support of a space station. In addition to low operational costs and large and flexible payload delivery and return capability, the ability to carry nonastronaut personnel to and from orbit under low acceleration loads in a shirtsleeve environment is of fundamental importance to effective use of space for exploration and operations. Internationally, the United States can use the development of a space shuttle to establish world leadership in the field of space transportation. The use of a space shuttle will provide a broad range of experience in space operations—experience that would be directly applicable to almost anything the United States would want to do in space.

VII. APOLLO APPLICATIONS

Plans in Apollo applications provide for continuation of flight hardware development and for integration of modified subsystems into hardware for five Earth-orbital flights.

We must realize that manned space flight is still in an embryonic stage. Yet, this year, within the target date set 8 years ago, and well within the lower range of the costs estimated at that time, we fully expect to land men on the Moon and return them to Earth with our first samples of the Moon's soil.

For the first time we will be in position to evaluate the natural resources of another world. With the insatiable demands of an industrial society for raw materials, a body one-fourth the diameter of Earth, only 3 days away, demands exploring.

Apollo applications uses the equipment developed and produced in Apollo to begin to bring us return on our basic investment.

Apollo applications will utilize the facilities, the Saturn launch vehicles, the spacecraft, the worldwide communications network, and the teams of scientists, engineers, and workers. The Nation's first space station, with some 10,000 feet of free volume, the Saturn upper stage, will be launched into orbit, outfitted and used as a base for experiments, observations and other work in space.

The experiments to be conducted on board early space stations will include evaluations of man's physiological and psychological tolerance to the space environment for long periods, beginning with a 28-day mission, then one of 56 days, and building up to perhaps 1 year. By studying the "well man" in space, the Nation expects to gain significant information on improving health and preventing sickness here on Earth. Dividends from this part of our space investment can benefit each one of us—all of mankind.

Another important part of this program is the linking to the workshop of a large solar telescope called the Apollo telescope mount. Approximately 32,000 times as much energy as the human race is now using reaches the Earth each year from the sun. Thus it can be to our great advantage to acquire as much information about the sun as possible not only for its value to science, but in the hope that eventually some portion of that energy may be diverted to use on Earth.

The Apollo telescope mount experiments are designed to scientifically study the Sun. The surface of the Sun, the observable sunspot cycle, and the nature and pattern of the solar flare activity may hold the key to understanding the basic forces and elements which control the solar system. The unmanned Orbiting Solar Observatory—OSO—spacecraft provided the first opportunity to study the Sun without the interference of the Earth's atmosphere. The Apollo telescope mount will provide a significant increase in the quality and depth of our knowledge of the Sun by providing greater pointing accuracy than was possible with the smaller Orbiting Solar Observatory; a capability of film return which can provide better quality pictures than has previously been possible; and a selective discrimination capability provided by the crewmember who will manage the instruments to permit the gathering of data on phenomena of the greatest scientific interest.

The substantial scientific benefits of the solar astronomy mission will make a significant contribution to the knowledge required to plan future space operations activities. It will test the effectiveness of man's combined capabilities of scientific judgment, reasoning, and motor response in the orbital operation of complex scientific instruments to a greater degree than any previous manned experiment. It will provide a much more extensive and valid understanding of the future utility of manned space flight. The solar astronomy mission also incorporates a number of technological and operational concepts which are under active consideration as integral elements of the space station. These include: launch, rendezvous, and docking of a sophisticated unmanned experiment payload; the use of control moment gyros for stabilization and control; the use of gravity gradient torque in momentum management; and the use of a large gimballed system for precise pointing and stabilization of major instruments.

Crew activities are structured around the operation of this solar observatory. Medical observations on the crew during this open-ended 56-day mission will add significantly to the data base on man's reaction to the space environment. These activities can be conducted on a minimum interference basis with the solar experiment operations.

The rationale for developing both the man-operated Apollo telescope mount and the automated Orbiting Astronomical Observatory II lies primarily in the difference in the scientific objectives of the two missions and the differing nature of the phenomena to be investigated.

The Orbiting Astronomical Observatory II objective is principally to obtain observations of stellar bodies in ultraviolet light. One important task for this satellite is to survey the sky and map all objects radiating in ultraviolet. It will take 6 months of observing to catalog only one-fourth of the celestial sphere. The extended mission duration currently characteristic of automated satellites, is ideally suited for such programs.

The scientific objectives of the Apollo telescope mount, and therefore its operation are quite different. The ATM will record, with high spatial and spectral resolution, X-ray, ultraviolet, and visible radiation from unique features on and about the sun.

One unique feature offered by the Apollo telescope mount, because of the presence of man, is the capability for the use of film to record the scientific data.

Photographic film, classically used at all ground based astronomical observatories, is capable of recording more information per unit of observing time than any other form of detection.

Another unique feature afforded by

the manned Apollo telescope mount missions is the determination of man's capabilities in the operation and maintenance of complex scientific instrumentation in space.

Since its inception in fiscal year 1966, the Apollo applications program schedule has slipped a total of 40 months because of reduction in funding requests and budget cuts.

The manned space flight program is supporting the earth resources program to the maximum extent possible by continuing to photograph earth resources from Apollo spacecraft as was done in Gemini. It is anticipated that the Apollo applications program will also support the earth resources program. Excellent photography in support of the program was obtained through a four-camera arrangement on the Apollo 9 mission.

VIII. APOLLO

The Apollo program's four manned missions have brought us within striking distance of meeting the goal of placing men on the Moon and returning them safely to Earth within this decade. Exploration of the Moon will extend man's knowledge to a new world. We will begin to understand the dynamic processes on Earth through direct comparison of the Earth and the Moon. Through lunar exploration we will be able to evaluate the natural resources of the 14.6-million-square-mile lunar surface. By exploring the Moon we have the opportunity to gain new understanding of the solar system and its origin and perhaps to gain clues to the origin of life.

The Apollo program was conceived, designed, and developed to achieve a capability for the United States in the realm of manned space exploration. The immediate objective of the program will be achieved by the initial manned lunar landing and return of the astronauts to Earth. The planning and the development of this Apollo capability included sufficient hardware and facilities to attain the immediate objective with a reasonable allowance for contingencies. Continued success in the Apollo program and an early lunar landing will make Apollo hardware available for continued development of capability.

The lunar exploration program is planned to take advantage of success in the Apollo program. This program involves the emplacement of scientific experiment packages on the Moon's surface. Operational capabilities will also be increased and the accumulation of scientific data significantly increased. The exact number and the schedule of lunar exploration flights is subject to budgeting limitations and the success of prior missions.

Since NASA is unable to completely simulate the one-sixth gravity environment of the lunar surface, it is difficult to predict, with high confidence, the metabolic rate data necessary to estimate the difficulty astronauts may have in doing tasks on the lunar surface. Biomedical unknowns have raised concerns regarding the degree to which lunar surface activities might fatigue the crew and adversely affect performance during the critical ascent and rendezvous phases. As a result it was decided to defer deployment of the Apollo lunar scientific experiments package—ALSEP. The ALSEP design requires deployment of all experiments prior to establishing the Moon-Earth radio communications link, making partial deployment unfeasible. However, the first landing will include several scientific experiments including a seismometer to measure moonquakes, a multipiece glass mirror to reflect the light of ruby-lasers mounted in telescopes on Earth for the purpose of measuring the physical relationships between the Earth and the Moon more accurately, as well as devices to measure solar wind and tools to obtain geological samples.

The major manned space flight milestone schedule for 1968 was achieved in December with the Apollo 8 mission. As with all progressive efforts, Apollo looks forward to the continued challenge of planned operations for this year. The accomplishment of the lunar landing this year will mark the beginning of a period of lunar exploration planned for the Apollo program. The primary goal is to assess the utilization of the Moon in the interest of our Nation and its potential for benefiting the world.

IX. MANAGEMENT OF THE PROGRAM

The NASA fiscal year 1970 request for manned space flight is down some 40 percent compared to fiscal year 1966. Comparing the funding request for fiscal year 1970 along with the effects of inflation to prior years, it is evident that the level of activity in manned space flight will be reduced to that of 8 years ago, namely fiscal year 1962.

This reduction in funding is reflected in the overall manpower situation. By June of next year, employment on the manned space flight programs will be at its lowest point since June 1962. This is about one-third of the 300,000 employment peak that was reached in February 1966.

NASA has been faced with situations which have required the release of some of the more successfully performing contractors. NASA has been reducing both civil service and contractor personnel levels at the Marshall Space Flight Center for several years because of the very successful performance of the Saturn family of launch vehicles. NASA was forced to require the release of approximately 1,600 contractor personnel associated with the Saturn I-B launch vehicle. The continued reduction in the capability that has been built up so long and so painstakingly makes it difficult for NASA to get good people to work on the programs because they feel as soon as the hardware on which they are working becomes successful they are out of a job.

The estimated reductions for fiscal year 1969 are as follows:

All locations in manned space flight:	
Hardware contractor	−23,581
Support contractor	+154
Civil service	−747
Total	−24,174

Assignments of the three contractors involved in support of the Office of Manned Space Flight have been continually screened to assure a consistent role for each and to avoid duplication of effort.

Bellcomm's role in support of manned space flight consists of the requirements aspect of systems engineering, including: First, the determinations of system specifications and conceptual designs of major elements of the program; second, the review of ongoing programs to identify and evaluate possible alternative courses of action; third, preparation of long-range plans and participation in development plans for future manned space flight programs; and fourth, implementation of long-range studies.

The Boeing-Tie role, on the other hand, stresses the implementation aspect of systems engineering for Apollo, including areas of program control, configuration management, technical integration, design certification and flight readiness reviews, logistics, and other downstream assignments related to the day-to-day planning and implementation required at this stage of the Apollo program.

The role of the General Electric Co. has been primarily that of a supplier of checkout and electrical ground support equipment. In addition, General Electric has provided engineering support to Apollo program office and the three manned space flight centers in the areas of test and checkout, reliability and quality, data management, and management system development. General Electric's role as the Apollo quality contractor has been stressed because of its across-the-board involvement in reliability and quality.

Our national space program is an essential element of our growth and progress. Mr. Chairman, I urge the support of this body to insure this continued progress for our Nation.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I am in strong support of H.R. 11271. More than 90 percent of all NASA dollars are contracted outside of Government and spent in the private sector of our economy. At the peak of activity in fiscal year 1966, the space program employed a combined force of some 420,000 industry, university, and Government men and women, only 35,000 of whom were NASA employees. It is interesting to note that in the first decade of space exploration, this Nation mobilized for the space program a force comparable to that required to build the transcontinental railroads in the 19th century.

The peak of 420,000 persons has long since passed. The number will drop to about 125,000 the end of this fiscal year. In contrast, the Soviet Union is still building its space activities, with the clearly expressed intention of attaining preeminence in space.

As I look at NASA today, the problem is to preserve the strong scientific, technological base and the management capability that has been created these past 10 years. The Nation cannot afford to suffer the loss of these trained personnel organized as effective teams.

Of NASA's 32,000 employees, about 80 percent are technicians, scientists, engineers, and other professionals. These are the people who conduct and manage the supporting research and development work in NASA research centers, and protect the Nation's investment in manned space flight.

What has the Nation invested in the

manned space flight program? The total in ground installations and facilities represents a capital investment of $4.5 billion. NASA has been able to make use of ground facilities and plants worth about $760 million established by the Department of Defense for missile and other programs. Beyond this, American industry has invested some $650 million of its stockholders funds in new facilities and equipment required to do this job.

At the Marshall Space Flight Center, NASA manages the work of industry in the development of launch vehicles and the integration of experimental devices in spacecraft.

In New Orleans, La., NASA administers a very large installation called the Michoud Assembly Facility. Here industrial contractors have manufactured Saturn booster first stages. The Mississippi test facility, which is 40 miles from Michoud, represents another large facility which was converted from Mississippi delta swamp land. Here the first and second stages of the Saturn V have been test fired prior to acceptance from the manufacturer.

The Manned Spacecraft Center at Houston, Tex., was converted from a cattle range to a modern installation in less than 3 years. The work of managing the development of spacecraft, the training of flight crews, and the support of manned space flight operations is carried on in this center.

The Kennedy Space Center in Florida is the center for launch operations affecting manned space flight. All of the flight equipment that is manufactured and tested at all of the various facilities is shipped to this center by barge, helicopter or special aircraft for integration into the Apollo Saturn vehicles which are then launched from the cape.

After the craft is launched into space, the mission is controlled from the Mission Control Center at Houston.

These manned space flight facilities are spread across the United States—Government installations in Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, and New Mexico, and plants used by industry in California, New York, Wisconsin, and Minnesota—and, of course, subcontractors and vendors in all parts of the country.

Altogether, the manned space flight program is carried out by a team that consists of the Washington office, three field centers, 12 prime contractors and some 17,000 subcontractors.

Another precious national asset is the working relationship between NASA and more than 200 universities across the country who are furnishing expert knowledge and research capabilities available from no other source. We should note here that NASA has not just used the university capabilities, but strengthened the universities in the process by helping them build additional research facilities. NASA also sponsored a predoctoral program which has produced 1,300 Ph. D.'s in space-related disciplines.

In the past 10 years we have created the facilities, the technologies, the trained manpower, the industrial know-how, and the university relationships that comprise a very vital national resource. We cannot afford to see these facilities, these men, these Government-industry-university teams dispersed; for, once they are dispersed, it will be extremely difficult and expensive to rebuild the capabilities they represent.

A typical example is the Saturn V production gap that NASA will experience, even with fiscal year 1970 funding. Gaps in the delivery of vendor items will occur, and with no fiscal year 1970 funding, these gaps, now 17 to 27 months in length, would increase to about 30 or 40 months. Under these circumstances, it can be expected that NASA will lose some vendor services and will be burdened with the requirement for some requalification effort. If fiscal year 1972 became the first year when funds are made available, the gaps would increase to over 4 years. A shutdown of such length could almost surely result in the loss of all of NASA's qualified vendor sources.

The situation of the in-plant effort at the major Saturn V contractors is also marginal. Specialized skills for specific manufacturing operations will experience gaps, and if no fiscal year 1970 funding is made available, these skills will be lost and a new labor force would have to be assembled and retrained in fiscal year 1971 before production can be reinitiated.

If the gap is extended by 1 more year—that is no fiscal year 1971 funding—the ability of our present major primes to completely reestablish both the manufacturing as well as the engineering capability becomes a serious question.

Today the United States stands at the crossroads. If we go below the level of funding recommended by this committee, which incidentally does not include the continuous loss due to inflation, it will no longer be possible for us as a Nation to continue to hold together these hardwon capabilities and utilize them effectively in meeting the challenges that face this Nation in the 1970's.

Continuing advances in science, technology and the ability to manage large enterprises will be the cornerstone of our national power in the future. Much of America's present national power has been derived from past large-scale Government and university research programs. The beneficial effects of research suppport of university education is well known. This lesson has not been lost on the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has poured vast energies and resources into technology since World War II. They, too, appreciate the power of large-scale technical advances. They are building whole new cities based on space. They are graduating large numbers of scientists, engineers, and technologists. These accomplishments will enable them to move forward to a position of world leadership. They know that future world power and prestige depend upon meeting the challenge of new technological advances involving substantial investments.

We as a Nation must maintain the spirit of national challenge. Maintaining a strong effort to meet the challenge of space is not easy. We have built a great capability in NASA. We have organized a mighty industrial base to put together the systems that are flying today. We have attracted an extremely brilliant group of university scientists to work for the Nation in the space program. This Government-industry-university team has proven itself in carrying out a sound American space program. We must not lose this great national asset.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to yield to my good compatriot, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MOSHER) for 5 minutes or such time as he may consume.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman, my support for H.R. 11271, the NASA authorization bill, is considerably tempered by my long-time, strong feeling that priorities in our national space program have been badly distorted, and that distortion obviously will continue for at least another year according to the proposals in this bill.

In using the word distorted, I refer to the most expensive aspect of our national space effort, the manned space flight program. Approximately two-thirds of the research and development funds in the proposed NASA budget are earmarked for support of manned space flight, and in past years the percentage has been even greater.

These enormous expenditures for manned space flight should force us to give more attention to the question of priorities within the NASA program. The problem has become particularly acute during this period of enforced budget constraint when, for reasons really not related to the merits of the space program, the total NASA budget has declined. Yet, the Apollo program, because it is the Nation's only announced goal in space with a specific target date, has always been adequately funded.

The result has been a serious neglect of certain very important areas of the unmanned space effort.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications, I have become acquainted with many of the details of the unmanned space program. I am convinced that the most significant scientific data thus far has been generated by our relatively modest unmanned program.

With automated spacecraft NASA has accomplished rather extensive exploration of the Moon, as well as significant information about the nearby planets, Mars, and Venus.

With unmanned satellites we have learned a great deal about the sun, the stars, the spatial environment of the earth, and the Earth-Sun relationship. NASA's successful unmanned, instrumented missions are too numerous to recount, and yet they are too few as related to the total budget.

I suggest that the most important aspect of the unmanned effort is the space applications program. This program includes satellite systems for communication and meteorology, to mention just two which have already produced remarkable results. These unmanned space systems provide measurable economic benefits. Other applications satellites on the horizon may make even greater contributions toward solving our problems here on Earth and improving the quality of our lives.

I think the most existing new program in this area is the earth resources technology satellite project. The ERTS satellite will include television cameras, infrared imagers, microwave radiometers and various other types of remote sensors for collecting a wide variety of data of great value to geologists, cartographers, agriculturists, hydrologists, and oceanographers, among others.

In short, such a satellite will be a powerful new tool for measuring, assessing and understanding our earth environment and our natural and cultural resources. This is a really "down to earth" program that can produce literally billions of dollars in benefits for life on our own planet.

By authorizing an additional $10 million for this project for the forthcoming fiscal year, our committee has gone on record as favoring an accelerated earth resources satellite development program.

Recently, the National Academy of Sciences issued a report on Applications Satellites. The Academy concluded that:

> We are convinced that the present space-applications program is too small by a factor of two or three, if we measure it in the light of the substantial opportunities that can be pursued effectively only if financial support is increased.

Our committee believes that an effective Earth resources satellite system, in terms of its potential benefits to mankind, will provide the greatest direct return on investment the space program has to offer. The goal is to discover and assess the resources of our planet, to improve their exploitation and management, to assist in their conservation and in their application for the public good.

Mr. Chairman, let me close by saying that I believe it is essential to the future strength and progress of our country that we continue with a vigorous space program, and I think that H.R. 11271 will make it possible to do so during the forthcoming year.

But I trust that in the months ahead both the Congress and the administration will review all aspects of our national space program, hopefully to achieve a better balance between the manned and unmanned programs.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KARTH) the chairman of the Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 11271, as reported by the Committee on Science and Astronautics, with particular reference to the program for space science and applications as recommended by the subcommittee of which I am chairman.

Our committee gave very careful scrutiny to the NASA budget for fiscal year 1970. We held 7 days of hearings in March on the original budget request—the Johnson budget—followed by 3 days of committee discussion in executive session. Then, after the President submitted his revised budget, we held another day's hearing in April—on the Nixon budget—and reconsidered all of our prior decisions in an additional executive session. Our subcommittee report was considered further by the full committee which approved it on April 23.

I recite this history in order that the Members will know that detailed attention has been given by our committee to NASA's request for funds for space science and applications, and that a hard look has been taken at all issues and all items of possible controversy.

Now, the substantive question is, What did we do about it?

Well, we made some cuts. We made a few increases, which I will explain. Overall, our proposal to the House is for an authorization of $524,400,000 for research and development in space science and applications in fiscal year 1970. That is approximately $35 million less than the original budget request submitted to the Congress in January. It is $6,600,000 more than the revised budget submitted in April.

In addition, our portion of the NASA budget includes $9 million for the sustaining university program, $88 million for administration—R. & P.M.—and $3.8 million for construction. Each of these three items is unchanged from the identical figures proposed by both President Johnson and President Nixon.

The committee report to the House—Report No. 91-255—has been available to the Members since May 19. I am hopeful that those of you who are interested in particular programs in this report have taken advantage of the opportunity to read the justification for NASA's proposals, as well as the reasons for the committee's action on the proposals. Today, I wish to touch only on a few highlights.

Our biggest cut was one of $8 million in what is called supporting research and technology. The reason for this reduction is that we learned from the testimony that for several prior years NASA had not been spending all that it has asked for to finance these support studies in certain fields. We made other reductions of $2 million in physics and astronomy and $3 million in the lunar and planetary program.

We also went along with several reductions proposed in the new Nixon budget, although these items, of course, do not now show up as current budgetary cuts. They include $8 million for planetary explorers, $10 million for the procurement of certain launch vehicles and $7.4 million for three space applications programs which the committee felt could be deferred for a year.

On the other hand, we decided in favor of NASA's original requests—the Johnson budget—on two related items which were reduced in the revised budget—Nixon. These items are a restoration of $12 million for a bioscience program called Biosatellite-F, and a restoration of $1.6 million for the Delta launch vehicle that is required to put Biosatellite-F into orbit. Biosat-F is a 30-day primate flight already planned and virtually ready to go, designed to determine the biological effects of weightlessness and cosmic radiation on a living specimen removed from the Earth's rotation. Cancellation of this project now would result in an unrecoverable loss of several millions of dollars.

In only one instance has our subcommittee proposed an increase in the original NASA budget request. This is for the program called Earth resources surveys. In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, it is the most important action that our committee took.

Specifically, we have added $10 million to the budget item of $14.1 million that was included in both the Johnson and Nixon programs for the Earth Resources Technological Satellite. Our purpose is to accelerate the development of this experimental satellite system which has as its objective the design, testing and ultimate operation of sophisticated sensor spacecraft in orbit around the earth.

An ERS system of this sort has potential benefits to mankind that can be tremendous in scope—and in our own time, our own generation. Started now, such a system can in a few years produce extremely valuable data for the discovery, inventory, management, and conservation of the natural resources of this planet. And then similarly it can record the changes that take place from year to year or season to season, in farm patterns, in forests, river basins, ocean currents, cloud cover, geography, geology and mineralogy. We already have an Earth Resources Survey Program Review Committee, chaired by NASA and including representation from interested user agencies such as the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Commerce, and the Navy.

Mr. Chairman, it is time that we take more positive steps toward providing greater material benefits from our space expenditures to a wider cross-section of our population—benefits that are something more than those which accrue to industry, to universities, to research institutions and certain communities in the vicinity of NASA centers and aerospace plants. Those dollar benefits from such public expenditures are real enough, but they are not the end objective of the space program; rather, they are a necessary means to the end objective, which is the exploration of outer space.

On the other hand, the potential benefits of the earth resources satellites are of a different sort—they are end-result benefits of direct significance to farmers, fishermen, and engineers engaged in river basin planning; to the people involved in the harvest of timber and the exploitation of minerals; plus all those who are concerned with the location and development of highways, harbors, inland waterways, power transmission lines, airports, new cities, and parks. The list is almost endless.

These people are entitled to end-result benefits from our space program. Here is an opportunity to offer a large segment of our population something more than pride in our astronauts; something more than the inner satisfaction that we all feel for the accomplishments of the space flights to the Moon and the planets. Incidentally, it also is a way to expand the community of support for the next decade of missions in outer space, both manned and unmanned.

So, while the Earth resources survey is different, in that its objectives are strictly terrestrial, it is complementary rather than competitive with outer space exploration. And the Earth resources

survey can hardly be called expensive. The authorizing legislation now before the House includes $35.1 million for this work, of which $24.1 million is designated for ERTS only. The ultimate cost of ERTS, including current and future funding, is estimated at less than $50 million.

I have taken this time to justify this budget item, not because I think the House will cut it or reject it, but rather because it is an appropriate occasion today to describe briefly to my honorable colleagues a new and modest space program that I am confident will yield tremendous dividends here on earth to a broad spectrum of our society.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KARTH. Yes. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I believe the gentleman will agree with me and with the gentleman from Ohio that we should go ahead with the manned space flight system in order to get low-cost transportation, which would be at 10 percent of the present cost. Next, I believe he will agree we should have a shuttle developed as well as a manned orbiting workshop with laboratories in it. We should also be able to check out life sciences in space. That we can only do with men, and possibly come up with new procedures. It has been suggested by Dr. Barnard, an eminent scientist from South Africa, that we might be able to get the answer to tissue transplants in this manner, as he believes tissue rejection can be overcome in space. Do you not think that those things should be equally emphasized?

Mr. KARTH. Yes. My answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania is I feel very strongly the applications technology satellite programs are those which have not received the emphasis they should and are extremely important programs. Probably in the final analysis they hold a greater potential payoff for the taxpayers than any other single program or combination of programs. I do think that we need a well balanced overall manned and unmanned program, but I am inclined to agree with the gentleman from Ohio that in the past it has not been balanced as well as I would like to see it. I think, if the gentleman will permit me to say so, it is because the budget has been going down as opposed to reaching a reasonably decent level where the scientific and technological endeavors of the space agency could be reached and which, if they were reached, would provide a better balanced program.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KARTH. Yes.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I would agree with the gentleman that the Earth resources program should be greatly emphasized both in the atmosphere and in space.

The benefits from space application are expected to be large—larger than originally believed, and certainly larger than the costs of achieving them. An extensive, coherent, and selective program will be required to achieve these benefits.

First, and of paramount importance, the possibility is that failure of any one launch in such a program can extend to as much as 3 years the interval between opportunities to obtain R. & D. results from space. While the situation can be ameliorated to some degree by increasing both the "experiments stockpile" and the booster stockpile to permit a "call-up" launch in the event of a launch failure, we are convinced that a substantial increase in the present schedule of test-bed satellite launches—to at least double—is required if many important space applications are to be achieved within the next decade.

Second, high-caliber scientists and engineers are not challenged by, or attracted to, a program the launch schedule of which can only be characterized as "leisurely." The kinds of scientists and engineers needed for space applications will be attracted by a vigorous program providing frequent opportunities to try new approaches in space, and by a program strongly supported by the Government.

The present space-applications program is too small by a factor of two or three, if measured in the light of the substantial opportunities that can be pursued effectively only if financial support is increased. Additional funding would permit expansion of the applications program, and would enable the Nation to proceed toward critically needed investments in preparation for future operational applications systems. NASA would be able to carry certain work through the space flight operational experimental phase, so that both the potentials and the problems of future systems could be thoroughly understood.

NASA should give greater emphasis in its future programs and activities to earth-satellite programs with promise of beneficial applications.

It should commit additional Federal funds to support, in certain applications, both an expanded research and development program and prototype operations that will test out the technical capabilities and benefit potentials of possible practical applications.

NASA should accept responsibility for organizing the required space-flight operational experiments in close cooperation with potential users, and for providing the necessary satellites and related ground equipments to execute this important phase in the development of space applications. Personnel from potential user agencies should be involved from the beginning in the planning and design of experimental programs.

Examining existing or suggested patterns for international space applications underscores the importance of institutional arrangements that can be adapted easily and rapidly to functional requirements as they evolve with the technology. Imaginative organizational and political innovation may be as crucial as technical innovation in this sphere, especially where national systems interface with international ones.

NASA, in cooperation with the Department of State, should continue to develop its international programs concerned with space applications, even in the face of budgetary problems, to ensure the development of a favorable climate for international acceptance and use of practical space applications, as they become technically feasible.

Business and industry in the United States will be involved in practical applications of space technology. The implementation of space-applications programs will require education and training of very large numbers of data interpreters and technicians, and a substantial number of high-level scientists and engineers. NASA and user agencies should cooperate with universities, technical schools, and industrial organizations in meeting this crucial manpower problem.

The list of ultimate users and recipients in space-applications programs is certain to be long and diverse. This situation presents special technical, social, and political problems in the couplings to and among users. Moreover, many proposed systems will not fit into existing patterns of governmental agencies and, hence, will present formidable management problems.

Studies should be made to identify clearly the interests and possible responsibilities of the various user agencies with the ultimate objective of creating appropriate, viable, and effective organizations capable of adopting and managing the new systems.

Support of sensor-signature R. & D. should be increased, as we are convinced that a modest investment in this area will generate great advances in our capability to evaluate the use of satellites for beneficial purposes.

In the near future, satellites can be flown with imaging sensors that can provide useful output data. A common approach involving forestry, agriculture, geography, hydrology, and possibly oceanography is feasible. Moreover, if a properly phased R. & D. effort could be started immediately, an operational system for overall earth-resources information seems realizable within a decade, if the results of R. & D. are favorable.

NASA should promptly initiate a pilot program to provide pictorial information in familiar and immediately usable form. This early system, which could be of global land use, would furnish much of the understanding required for future, more advanced systems.

Space applications are further advanced in meteorology than in other fields. The sensors, data use and interpretation, and organization are also ahead. There probably are few common features with other disciplines. Direct quantitative inputs for mathematical models are needed in the interests of numerical weather prediction. For this purpose, large, high-speed electronic computers are available, and several techniques for securing the data from geosynchronous as well as low-altitude, polar-orbiting satellites seem promising.

NASA should continue to support and expand its space-technology programs aimed at securing the quantitative, worldwide, general-circulation atmospheric information required by the meteorological community for mathematical models of the world weather system.

At present, more than 14,000 small data-collection platforms—for meteorol-

ogy, oceanography, hydrology, and related disciplines—are operating around the world; the number is expected to reach 26,000 by 1975. Only restricted synoptic, real-time data-collection service from these data platforms now exists. It is important that all the data be collected on a timely schedule, and a satellite system is substantially less costly than the conventional means of doing so.

Broadcast by satellites is technically feasible from low-power satellites with large ground stations for transmission and/or rebroadcast, to high-power satellites with direct broadcast into homes.

Of all the uses, two seem so easy technically, so reasonable economically, and so potentially desirable that consideration of their implementation by the proper authorities would be a matter of high priority. One is a multichannel distribution system for the use of network television transmission for both the private and public sectors of the industry. The other is a multichannel system of the "teleclub" type for educational, instructional, and informational television for developing countries, as well as for those audiences sparsely spread throughthe United States, who require and need programing suited to their special interests—such as, physicians, lawyers, engineers, and educators.

A satellite system for navigation and traffic control over the North Atlantic would be likely to pay its way for shipping alone, provided all shipping were included. It would also provide for aircraft.

You can see there are gains to be achieved immediately. But I likewise feel that when we have a laboratory in a manned orbital workshop or space station the procedures must be geared to the development of new devices.

With the perspective of these varied values, NASA's program for the next two decades must make reasonable choices in emphasis and in specific projects among a wide variety of possibilities. Furthermore, planning for the time period 1975–85 requires a projection of the state of technology for that period. The major goals which involve manned flight, or a combination of manned and unmanned operations may be grouped in three categories:

First. Extensive exploration and initial colonization of the Moon.

Second. Exploration of Mars, or possibly other planets, including manned landings.

Third. The extensive use of orbiting stations for Earth applications, astronomy, and research in the natural and life sciences.

These three classes of possible goals have been considered broadly, with some concentration of attention on the significance of a reduction in cost of launches into space and on the possible uses of manned space stations. In connection with goals of the third class, two types of national orbiting facilities deserve consideration: space observatories and space laboratories. Both may be operated in conjunction with the same space stations.

Observatories would serve the space-oriented disciplines of astronomy and high energy cosmic ray physics, and the Earth-oriented disciplines of Earth sciences and resources, communication, and traffic control. For these disciplines, the unique advantages of a space observing platform, above the atmosphere and at a high vantage point above the Earth, are so compelling that it can only be a matter of time before man utilizes them heavily. Man's role in these operations will probably be most important in deploying, servicing, and repairing complex and versatile experimental equipment, and in assisting in early test and development of new systems.

Space laboratories would serve the life sciences—biomedicine and biology; high energy particle physics; the study of the physics and chemistry of matter in zero gravity; and work on the formation and processing of new materials possible only in zero gravity. The medical study of man himself in zero gravity is important in preparation for future roles of man in space; a manned space station will make possible, for the first time, prolonged and thorough studies of both man and other biological systems. Man as an experimenter in the physics and materials laboratories would play a role more similar to that in Earth laboratories than in the case of space observatories.

In general, a balanced space program is desired which not only reaps the returns of present capabilities, but also progresses steadily toward the much greater capabilities achievable in the future. The program must also be balanced in its use of manned and automated operations. The merits of each mode must be considered in the light of the particular objectives of the program involved, with the hope that plans can be laid for an integrated program which best uses all potentialities.

Recognizing that they must be somewhat tentative because of the abbreviated nature of this study, we nevertheless have drawn the following conclusions from our discussions:

The benefits to the Nation, both internal and international, dictate that the United States remain in the forefront of all major categories of space activity, including first, space sciences; second, exploration of the solar system; third, manned space flight capability; and fourth, economic applications of space flight.

It is reasonable to utilize one-half to 1 percent of the gross national product—$4 to $8 billion—to support this Nation's civilian space flight program.

Within the space flight program the following elements are of major importance and should be strongly supported:

First. An aggressive automated planetary exploration program as recommended by the Space Sciences Board of the National Academy of Sciences. Options must be kept open for a manned phase to follow the early automated phase.

Second. An economic applications program of the general nature recommended by the 1968 Summer Study on Space Applications carried out by the National Academy of Sciences.

Third. A continuation of lunar exploration following the Apollo landing as recommended by the Lunar and Planetary Missions Board of NASA.

Fourth. A vigorous program of astronomical observations in Earth orbit along the general lines recommended by the Astronomy Missions Board of NASA.

Fifth. The extension of manned space flight capability in Earth orbit to longer duration and to permit application for scientific and technological purposes.

Achievement of a manned low-cost transportation system is the keystone to the future development and large-scale practical application of the space program. Development of such a system and plans for its effective use deserve high priority.

The use of a long duration manned space station appears to be a logical step in the evolution of manned space flight capability. It offers considerable potential support to the scientific and technological programs which appear desirable in a number of disciplines, and is necessary as a precursor to eventual manned planetary exploration. Such a space station should be designed to support men in the weightless condition unless unexpected biomedical problems are encountered or overwhelming engineering advantages for artificial gravity are discovered.

It is generally agreed that strong arguments exist for placing observatories and laboratories in Earth orbit. Large, complex facilities and instruments for astronomy, Earth applications, space physics, life sciences, and new materials development all have interesting potentials, and all can profit from manned attendance. Relative emphasis among these activities, and the extent of manned attendance desirable in each, must be decided by appropriate studies and early experiments.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROUDEBUSH).

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, I too rise in strong support of this authorization bill for NASA for fiscal year 1970, and I will say, Mr. Chairman, that I support the bill in the way we reported it from the committee, because in my opinion it represents a minimum program and in my opinion it is a well-rounded program.

Mr. Chairman, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is now in its 11th year of existence. NASA was activated on October 1, 1958, with a nucleus of personnel from the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, its facilities, and personnel and space projects inherited from the Army and Navy.

We have watched the agency grow from its infancy to a mature, well-rounded organization of scientists, engineers, and technicians capable of tackling the most complex problems of space age technology. Starting with an in-house force of 9,000 in 1959, the NASA strength rose to its peak in 1967 of 35,000 personnel and is now tapering off to a level of 33,900 by the end of this fiscal year with a further reduction to 31,600 planned for fiscal year 1970.

We have watched the development of a tremendous industry work force numbering at its peak some 400,000 people which was used to apply previously developed aeronautical knowledge to space work and to expand the Nation's base of

space competence. As projects such as Ranger, Lunar Orbiter, Surveyor, Mercury, and Gemini have been successfully completed, many of the aerospace industrial teams have been disbanded. By the end of this fiscal year the industry work force will have dwindled to approximately 200,000 personnel with a further dismantlement of this competence in the offing for fiscal year 1970.

The Nation's major space "firsts" now number 41 as compared to 27 by the Soviet Union. Of 255 NASA launches to date 211 have been deemed successful, which represents a very respectable launch success rate of about 83 percent. This record excludes thousands of sounding rockets launched successfully to expand our scientific and technological knowledge of space phenomenon necessary to the successful accomplishment of other major programs.

We can justly point with pride at this Nation's achievements in space. But our successes have not come cheaply. Since the inception of the space program, 11 budget requests have been submitted by the President aggregating $38.5 billion. The Congress, in its judgment, has cut $2.1 billion from these requests, authorizing a total of $37.1 billion and appropriating $36.4 billion for the space effort.

Many people question the need for billions of dollars for space exploration when our needs on earth are so great. I, for one, am a strong supporter of the space program and despite the seemingly staggering sums that are required for space, consider that this Nation should maintain its space posture as best while we can at the same time take into consideration our needs on earth.

My support for a strong space effort is not based so much on the technological challenge that space exploration presents, but rather the benefits that accrue to mankind as a result thereof. Many fields have been stimulated by our space program, for the projects involve not only science and technology but also almost every form of ordinary business and professional activity. Computer technology, power conversion systems, structural and fabrication techniques as well as management systems, to cite a few fields, are benefiting as a result of our space efforts. There are new products and new processes, new companies and whole new industries which have been borne of the space age.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 11271, the NASA Authorization Act for 1970 now before the House is, in my opinion, a minimal program which will maintain at least some of the momentum built up over these last 11 years. I say minimal because in my judgment it is far from optimum. The bill now under consideration will provide the National Aeronautics and Space Agency with new obligational authority in the amount of $3,966,377,000. This is almost $1 billion short of the amount considered necessary to move this Nation to a position of world leadership in space and aeronautics, according to the testimony received by the Committee on Science and Astronautics during its deliberations on the bill.

The budget guidelines issued by the previous administration were, in effect, that NASA should submit estimates for a minimum program for continuing ongoing programs, include only new starts considered absolutely essential, and wherever possible, defer new programs and leave the decisions to the new administration. Under these guidelines, NASA requested $4.2 billion, but also submitted an optional budget of $4.7 million as the optimum required to maintain world leadership in space. The Bureau of the Budget approved a program of only $3,760,527,000 in new obligational authority, $1 billion short of the optimum and $0.5 billion short of the minimum program.

The new administration subsequently submitted an amended budget of $3,715,527,000 which was $45 million less than the original request. This year's authorization request is the smallest submitted by NASA since fiscal year 1962. The Committee on Science and Astronautics, after very careful scrutiny of the fiscal year 1970 requirements, which involved not only extensive hearings in Washington, but considerable field investigation, has added $250,850,000 to the overall request. This adjustment is a composite of additions in the amount of $270 million and reductions of $19,150,000.

Actually the bill before you now breaks down into three broad categories. For research and development $3,264,427,000; for construction of facilities, $58,200,000; and for research and program management—formerly called Administrative Operations—$643,750,000.

The research and development part of the request can be readily considered in four general categories which coincide basically with the program offices in NASA and with the subcommittee organization of our committee. These categories are: Manned space flight; space science and applications; advanced research and technology; and tracking and data acquisition. I would like to address myself generally to these areas.

As in past years, manned space flight activities continue to comprise the largest portion of the NASA budget. This program is basically designed to develop and demonstrate the capability of man in space both for operations and exploration.

It is in this segment of the budget that we find the fantastically successful Apollo program. The readiness of the Saturn V launch vehicle and the Apollo command and service module for lunar operations was demonstrated by the Apollo 8 mission in December 1968 and the readiness of the lunar module was demonstrated by Apollo 9 in March 1969. Just last month the final qualification of the lunar module in lunar orbit was demonstrated by the highly successful Apollo 10 Moon orbital mission. Hopefully, next month Apollo 11 will accomplish the Nation's objective of landing man on the Moon and returning him safely to Earth in this decade.

The fiscal year 1970 amended budget request was $1,691,100,000 for the Apollo program. The committee added $75.5 million to this program and is recommending an authorization for Apollo of $1,766,800,000. The adjustments to the program consist of an additional $32.1 million for Saturn V vehicle improvements in the basic Apollo program primarily to initiate the development of a simplified, improved and more economical version of the J-2 engine; an additional $4.6 million for scientific equipment and systems modifications necessary to institute a proposed series of six additional landings on the lunar surface beyond those presently planned; and $39 million more than requested for Apollo operations to assure that maximum safety measures are sustained in crew training, and launch and flight recovery operations for fiscal year 1970.

For space flight operations, the amended budget included $225,627,000. This program involves the application of the capabilities developed in the Gemini and Apollo programs to manned missions of increasing duration and complexity in the future. The committee is recommending a total new authorization of $354,827,000 for this line item.

The program focuses on the development of a manned space station system for flight in the mid-1970's. An initial series of manned orbital missions designated as "Apollo applications" is scheduled to begin in fiscal year 1972. This plan involves five launches using the Saturn I-B vehicle and the Apollo spacecraft modified to meet mission requirements.

The committee adjustment of $129,200,000 to this line item includes $66 million for the initiation of a program to develop a space shuttle system; $57 million to augment the amended budget for Apollo applications in order to avoid costly delays in flight schedule; and $6.2 million to reinstitute the Saturn V production lines at the Michoud assembly plant in Louisiana.

The advanced missions programs, which is the third category of manned space flight activities in the research and development field, is basically a study program to determine the direction of future manned space efforts. Long-range planning is absolutely essential to the promulgation of an orderly program of future space endeavors. The committee has approved the NASA request of $2.5 million for these purposes.

The next category of space expenditures in the field of research and development is that for space science and applications. For these purposes the President requested $517,800,000 for fiscal year 1970. The committee is recommending $524,400,000, which is $6.6 million more than requested.

The space science part of this program is broad based, concentrating on studies of the solar system, stars, and space environment. Planetary exploration will receive increased emphasis in 1970. The program includes analysis of data acquired from Mariner-Mars 1969 and the Pioneer series of spacecraft, preparation for the Mariner-Mars 1971, development of the Viking orbiter and lander spacecraft for the Mars 1973 opportunity, and continued development of the Pioneer spacecraft for investigations of the interplanetary medium as far out as the orbit of Jupiter. This program also includes research on Earth and its local environment through the use of balloons, sounding rockets, explorers, and orbiting geophysical observatories. Solar studies are carried out

using the orbiting solar observatory. The orbiting astronomical observatory, explorers, and sounding rockets support a program of research in astronomy, including investigations in the optical, radio, X-ray and gamma ray regions of the spectrum. The bioscience program continues to investigate the effects of the space environment on living organisms and to study methods of increasing knowledge on the origin, nature, and distribution of life in the universe.

The applications part of this program is made up of activities for adapting space technology to the direct benefit of mankind. Tiros and Nimbus continue to support requirements of the atmospheric sciences research community and improvements in operational weather satellite systems. The development of a meteorological satellite for synchronous orbit is planned to begin in 1970. Applications technology satellites are being used to develop information and test techniques for new applications in the areas of communications, navigation, and traffic control. Geodetic satellites will continue to conduct measurements on a global basis. The Earth resources survey program will receive increased emphasis in fiscal year 1970 with the initiation of an Earth resources technology satellite to test remote sensing and data acquisition techniques.

The committee's action to add $6.6 million to the request for space science and applications represents a composite of additions and reductions. Two small scientific satelites, two small astronomical satellites, and the initiation of the Venus to Mercury planetary mission were deferred. The development work on the biosatellite F project was reinstated and $10 million was added to the space applications program to give further emphasis and impetus to the development of the Earth resources survey project.

The third general area of research and development is advanced research and technology. This is a continuing project aimed at providing a technical base for significant future aerospace missions. This effort covers the spectrum of activity from basic research to improving our fundamental scientific knowledge, through applied technology to improve our practical capability for developing advanced space and aeronautical systems. The specific areas of efforts in this program are basic research, space vehicles systems, electronics systems, human factor systems, space power and electric propulsion systems, nuclear rockets, chemical propulsion, and aeronautical vehicles.

The amended budget requested $277.4 million for these activities for fiscal year 1970. The committee has added $31.5 million resulting in a recommended authorization of $308.9 million. One of the most significant additions by the committee was the increase of the nuclear rocket program from $36.5 million to $50 million. This program has primarily to do with the development of the nuclear powered rocket engine, NERVA. In reviewing the NASA request for this item, the committee is urging NASA to proceed with the NERVA engine development at a somewhat faster pace than proposed by the budget submission. Another significant adjustment was the addition of $3 million to continue technical improvements in the 260-inch solid rocket motor.

The next category in the research and development program is the tracking and data acquisition effort which provides the support required by the space flight programs. As in the current year, the largest part of the fiscal year 1970 request is for the operation of the worldwide network of tracking and data acquisition facilities.

NASA had originally requested $298 million for these purposes and the committee reduced the request by $5 million. The amended budget included only $278 million for these purposes and consequently the committee action is $15 million above the amended budget request.

The second broad category of requirements for fiscal year 1970 is the construction of facilities program. The NASA request for fiscal year 1970 was $58.2 million and the committee has approved the request as submitted. I should point out to my colleagues that the majority of the facilities required in support of the space program have been completed. The capital value of NASA's plants at the present time is approximately $4.4 billion. Most of the annual requests for the last 2 years have been basically for capital plant improvements rather than for new facilities. Our estimate is that the construction program from here on out will be at about the level being requested for fiscal year 1970.

Just a brief word about the research and program management part of the bill now before the House. This element of the annual request basically provides the funds for compensation of personnel and related benefits and the general housekeeping activities of 18 field centers. It is interesting to note that over 71 percent of the request is for personnel compensation and benefits for the 31,600 personnel on the NASA rolls. About 70 percent are scientists, engineers, and technicians doing research, development and test work. The remaining 30 percent provide professional, administrative, and clerical support to the research and development program.

For fiscal year 1970, NASA requested $650,900,000 to cover these costs. The committee has reduced this request by $7,150,000 and is recommending authorization in the amount of $643,750,000.

Mr. Chairman, I fully realize that it is difficult to even consider the addition of over $250 million to the President's request for space at a time when there are so many other critical demands on our national resources. However, based on our most careful review of space activities for 1970 and the future, I am convinced that we must do this if our Nation is to maintain any semblance of leadership in space. I recommend the passage of H.R. 11271 which would authorize appropriations in the amount of $3,966,377,000 for NASA in fiscal year 1970.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. BELL).

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, in considering the NASA authorization today, it might be valuable to reflect on the many benefits which have accrued to our Nation and its citizens because of our journey to the frontiers of space.

Domestically and internationally, space exploration inspires social progress and economic growth.

It stimulates international cooperation and creates new opportunities, new wealth, new jobs, and the expansion of international markets.

The energizing force of the space program is a seedbed for invention, a stimulus to higher productivity and a taskmaster for precision and reliability.

Even aside from the direct goals of space exploration, our Nation has reaped many indirect benefits.

Advances in aeronautical technology stemming from NASA research give promise of reducing noise pollution caused by the sonic boom.

Other research is progressing toward perfection of vertical and short takeoff aircraft, improving prospects for transportation between crowded cities.

The Earth resources satellite will help us to manage our limited supplies of fresh air, clean water, and mineral reserves.

It will speed the coming of the day when we can tap the wealth of the oceans, examine the totality of how the weather affects the oceans, how the oceans affect the weather, and how both are affected by change in the Sun's radiation.

Nimbus III, a new weather satellite, has demonstrated the possibility of providing the detailed information needed for accurate, long-range weather forecasts which can save billions of dollars per year.

The Communications Satellite Corporation is now operating at a profit, indicating that this benefit of space flight is here to stay.

Space requirements have been a principal stimulus to the computer industry which now grosses $20 billion per year and provides 800,000 jobs—more than 1 out of every 100 in the United States.

More than 2,750 technological advances have been shared with industry through the NASA technology utilization program.

These include medical applications, power conversion systems, structural and fabrication techniques, improvements in metallurgy, television and other electronic equipment, new lubricants, better insulation, welding and galvanizing methods, fireproof materials, and safety measures.

Of special benefit is the technology of perfection developed to meet the demands of space flight.

Of the 15 million parts in the Saturn V launch vehicle, only five experienced noncritical failures in the Apollo 8 mission last December.

This performance is 99.9999 percent perfect.

If such perfection can be achieved in space flight, it can also be achieved in all other realms of human endeavor.

It is an inspiration to excellence.

It is a convincing demonstration that the most complex of problems can be ap-

proached and overcome by systematic commitment to specific goals.

Mr. Chairman, the fruits of the space program have far exceeded early expectations.

In July we hope to witness the landing of the first man on the Moon.

We have learned many lessons during these years, some of them too expensive to be repeated.

Principal among these is that we cannot fail to continue a well-balanced space effort.

The realities of the future demand nothing less.

Such a level is reflected in the authorization bill before us, and I would urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. PETTIS).

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11271, the NASA authorization bill, for fiscal year 1970.

I support this bill because I am convinced that a vigorous national space program has great potential for improving the quality of our lives here on earth.

Many people think of space exploration as an exciting adventure which has little, if anything, to do with the welfare of mankind. There are a good many who wonder if our expenditures for space are justified, and whether the funds might not be better spent for other needs which seem nearer at hand, and more urgent.

For this reason, I think it is important to recognize some of the practical contributions which our space program has made, and will make in the future.

Mr. Chairman, in this regard I want to mention one part of the unmanned program which I consider to be most significant—the so-called applications satellite projects. These include satellite systems for communications, meteorology, and navigation, among others. These are the space systems which bear a direct relationship to the Nation's economy and which can make immediate contributions toward solving some of our more pressing problems.

NASA can point with understandable pride to steady progress, highly worthwhile accomplishments, and the attainment of many objectives. Communications satellites are now in daily operational use, both by the military and by commercial communications carriers.

Most of you already have seen the results of communication by satellites on your own television sets. Broadcasts originating from abroad have been brought into millions of American homes, and important overseas events have been witnessed by our citizens "live via satellite."

It is now possible to make a telephone call anywhere in the world using satellites, whereas only a few years ago many places were simply inaccessible.

More important, perhaps, is the potential that communications satellites have for the field of education. Direct broadcast satellites of the future could revolutionize the educational systems of every country in the world.

Closely related to this work in communications, research in navigation and traffic control techniques and equipment has already indicated that satellites can assist overocean aircraft and ships at sea to obtain more precise position information under all weather conditions and will some day aid in air-sea traffic control, and in coordination of emergency rescue operations.

NASA's meteorological satellite projects have been the most successful of all NASA programs. The United States has launched more than 20 meteorological satellites without a single spacecraft failure. Our weather satellites have been operational for 3 years, and our weather forecasters currently receive valuable data from satellites on a routine daily basis.

As meteorological satellite systems improve, there is every reason to believe that it will be possible to make accurate weather forecasts up to 2 weeks in advance, rather than just a few hours, which is the best we can do today. Among other things, better weather forecasting will help prevent food shortages by permitting better management of agriculture and reducing the risks of farming.

Even now, weather satellites enable us to monitor storms over great areas, and to give early warnings of severe weather conditions coming our way. The value of lives and property saved in this way cannot be calculated.

Perhaps the most exciting new project in space applications is the so-called Earth resources survey program. In cooperation with the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Interior and Navy, NASA is now designing a research satellite for surveying the World's natural resources from space.

Within the next few years we should have operational satellites capable of measuring, describing, and understanding our environment, our natural and cultural resources.

For example, healthy crops and trees can be distinguished from diseased and infected ones using sophisticated sensors in such satellites. Early detection of plant disease over wide areas of farmland and forest will make it possible to save millions of dollars worth of crops and timber every year.

Geologists believe that an earth resources satellite system will assist them in petroleum and mineral exploration, as well as in scientific investigation of the earth.

In addition, such a satellite will be very helpful in the management of our water resources. Patterns and rates of melting snow can be monitored by satellite over wide areas. Predictions of spring runoff can, therefore, be made more accurately so that the impounding and release of water in reservoirs can be better managed. In that way, seasonal flooding, irrigation and power production can be brought under better control. This can mean tremendous savings in the prevention of flood damage, increased crop yields, and electric power profits.

In short, a better understanding of the earth's resources, and their more thoughtful use and conservation, will come from our investment in the space program; an investment I am certain will prove to be worthwhile.

Mr. Chairman, in my humble opinion, this Congress has a great opportunity today to take another step toward the development of a nuclear-powered engine. This engine is already over the major hurdles and will contribute greatly to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

The technical feasibility of manned and unmanned probes to the outermost planets in the solar system and orbital laboratories has already been demonstrated. On the basis of gigantic strides made by space technology during its first decade of existence, we can expect even more impressive accomplishments during the three remaining decades in this century. This claim is neither a boast nor a guess, because the NERVA nuclear-powered engine is already more than half-way along toward a flight-type model.

One variable could still affect the future of the U.S. space program: Will continuity of effort be maintained, so that the space program is able to chart a systematic and logical sequence of effort toward its long-range goals?

Continuity of effort, then, is essential to the overall success of our space effort. Because propulsion is the pacing item in the ongoing space program, it will be necessary to have a flight-type NERVA engine for application to the next generation of missions in the late 1970's, 1980's, and beyond.

Specific mission plans will have been generated by then, even though these missions are still being investigated and defined. Continuity of effort is particularly significant at this point in time because this is the crucial transitional period from conventional chemical rocket propulsion to nuclear propulsion. This transition represents a quantum-scale technological advance.

Availability of a nuclear-powered engine will release space science from the restrictions imposed by chemical propellants. Current technology has essentially brought the conventional solid and liquid propellants to their maximum stage of development. The most efficient of these chemically propelled engines are capable of a specific impulse of 400 and maximum burning durations of about 3 minutes.

Having extracted the maximum power from conventional propellants, aerospace engineers and scientists must now move ahead into the nuclear field of propulsion or restrict future development in accordance with the limitations imposed by the technology of the 1960's.

In contrast, the recently completed NERVA technology program has already demonstrated that a specific impulse of 800 and up is possible. Furthermore, the nuclear engine is capable of at least 60 minutes of firing time, in bursts of preselected duration.

This new reservoir of power will enable heavier payloads, faster trips, increased reliability, and improved flexibility in short- and long-range space program planning.

Another advantage of the NERVA engine is that it is completely compatible with the Saturn and Titan, and other large- and intermediate-class launch ve-

hicles that have already been proven during earlier programs.

Mated to the lower stages of these conventional vehicles, NERVA extends the flight capabilities enormously. For example, the payload capability of the Saturn V will be doubled by replacing the current third stage with the nuclear engine.

The extended versatility provided by the NERVA engine is another way of describing the advantage of cost effectiveness. Anything a conventional vehicle can do, can be done better and more economically by using an upper stage NERVA. It is as though one of the major automobile manufacturing companies had developed an internal combustion engine that combined all the best qualities of a racing car and truck engine, and then provided the miles-per-gallon capability of the Volkswagen.

Aside from its application to deep space probes, the NERVA engine also has promising uses relative to satellites and orbital laboratories. Within a decade, space stations will be widely used to advance basic and applied research in many scientific disciplines: physics, astronomy, biology, communications, medicine, and meteorology, to name a few.

Space operations related to these sciences will undoubtedly require heavier payloads, greater maneuverability, velocity changes, and minimum costs. All of these criteria can be met by calling upon the unique characteristics of the nuclear-powered engine.

Reviewing past accomplishments and projecting forward to the ultimate nuclear rocket capability helps to underscore the need for continuity in the NERVA program.

Nearly 10 years of effort have already been expended, and the major milestone of completing the technology program was achieved in 1969. Continued effort is required to further improve organic and inorganic materials in the various components that are subjected to cryogenic and radioactive environments.

Additional effort is required in the design and demonstration of flight-type hardware. Then all of the components must be mated into a flight-type engine, and flight experience will be required to isolate anomalies that cannot be detected in ground testing.

Finally, experience that can be obtained only during actual missions will be required to bring the nuclear engine to its maximum potential of performance. Brought to its highest point of development, the NERVA engine is expected to be capable of the following: Specific impulse in the range of 875 to 900; several hours of firing duration; high reliability; mission flexibility; and reusability.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak a moment in behalf of this program. As a freshman member of the Science and Astronautics Committee and as a former jet pilot with approximately 5,000 hours of flying time, I appreciate the tremendous knowledge and insight that I have gained as a member of this committee as well as the great work of our distinguished chairman of the full committee, the minority leader, Mr. FULTON's articulate knowledgeable leadership, and the chairmen of the subcommittees who have held hearings on this bill. Of course, in our judgment, we feel that this bill as was reported out of the committee is reported at an appropriately funded level and that we should try to sustain this program.

Mr. Chairman, if there has been one bright spot in America this year, it has been our astronauts and the achievements which they have accomplished by offering their lives in the exploration of outer space. We have had riots, we have had problems, and we have had other disturbances. But I feel we must recognize the fact that the one bright spot has been our astronauts and the feats which they have accomplished.

So, I think to do anything less than what we have recommended here would be pulling our confidence from under our astronauts as they are about to set foot on another planet.

So, Mr. Chairman, for this reason I think we should show them that they have the confidence and support of the Congress in their endeavors.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. PRICE), a new member of our committee, upon his excellent statement and compliment him also upon his fine work on the committee. The gentleman from Texas has gone to the various installations. The background and experience which he possesses in this field has been invaluable to the work of the committee. His keen interest in the space activities of this Nation stand him in good stead with his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. We look forward to many valuable contributions from Mr. PRICE in the future formulation of space policy.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER).

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, advanced research and technology forms a great reservoir which will determine the strength and the future of the space program. We are authorizing close to $800 million in advanced research and technology—in tracking and data acquisition, and technology utilization. These are areas which will determine the kind of a space program we will have in the 1970's and in the 1980's.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to point out that the agency for which we are authorizing this money is named the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. We must never forget that the authorization goes for aeronautics as well as space. The subcommittee and the full committee has through the years been putting increasing stress, and has urged NASA itself to put increasing stress on the development of aeronautics.

This weekend I had a conversation with the first man to break the sound barrier, Col. Charles (Chuck) Yeager, one of the most renowned citizens of the State of West Virginia. He made a pioneer flight on October 14, 1947, when he became the first man to fly faster than the speed of sound.

Colonel Yeager pointed out that we are in danger of drying up the reservoir of advanced research in aeronautics, unless we can put the type of emphasis which we put on the development on aeronautics at the time when the old NACA was in operation. At that time, by the kind of research we developed, we made America preeminent in the world in aeronautics.

I hope we can put additional stress on aeronautics in considering this space authorization because I believe that this is an area where the payoff is very great. And unless we continue to advance forward this cutting edge, America will lose its preeminence in the world of aeronautics.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PODELL).

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise at this time to express my support for the program and for the wonderful work done in technology in the space program that has been done under guidance of our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from California. Under his direction we of the committee have made a thorough investigation of the various facets of our space program today.

I would like to talk for a moment perhaps not on the importance of going to the Moon, which I feel is important, yet places an unreal aspect on the work of the space program. I believe the technological advances that have improved the very fabric of our society are even more important, things that we have accomplished as a result of our efforts up to today. Today there are over 2,500 new technological products that have been brought about because of our work in the space program, creating new industries, creating new jobs; for example, the computer industry, which is a direct result of the working of the space program which is today a $20 billion industry in America employing some 800,000 people. That is approximately 1 percent of the total working force of America.

Satellite development: The need for global communication and weather observation, has brought us all immediate benefits. Not to forget TV viewing for those who wish to watch TV.

Weather watch and early warning systems for natural weather disasters have saved innumerable lives. An example of this is, as many of us will recall, recently when the early warning satellite predicted Hurricane Carla, and permitted the evacuation in Galveston and parts of Louisiana of some 500,000 people, thus saving countless numbers of lives.

To those of us who talk of austerity, I say—try and put that in terms of dollars and cents.

Then in the field of communications systems, there is the development of the miniature TV camera, in size 4 inches by 3 inches by 2 inches, and which weighs

just over 1 pound, which will soon be of benefit in police work and be used by firemen and be used in the medical field and so on.

In the medical field the advances and achievements are truly outstanding. As a result of the necessity of measuring physical reactions on behalf of the astronauts thousands of miles away has brought about the development of ingenious medical instruments.

There has been the development of new sensors which can detect cancer.

There has been the development of an oscillometer which can detect life in a seemingly dead person so that no longer will it happen as has happened where an individual who was apparently dead and then buried when, in fact, he was still alive.

The astronaut helmet has been adapted for the treatment of asthmatic children.

The lunar walker has been adapted for paraplegics and other crippled people so that they can move more easily in the street and for climbing stairs and so on.

There are delicate sensors which can now detect Parkinson's disease and monitor the health of other medical patients in their homes.

Then there is a "space blanket" which fits into a shirt pocket and which provides sportsmen with warmth and comfort outdoors.

There are new heat-resistant paints that will change the entire system of painting in our own homes so that no longer will paint crack and peel in a couple of years, but instead will remain for years and years and years, saving many millions of dollars to homeowners who, of course, are using paints of various kinds.

For those Members who may be chubby perhaps as I am, there is the development of the new teflon pans which permits you to fry your eggs without butter.

These are just but a few of the thousands of technological improvements that have improved the fabric of our existence.

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

Mr. PODELL. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman saying that all these things have been brought about through the space program?

Mr. PODELL. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman saying that all the medical advancement and research has been brought about through the space program?

Mr. PODELL. All of the things that I mentioned a moment ago have been brought about as a result of new technology and developments as a result of the space program.

Mr. GROSS. Then do you suppose we ought to cut down on the NIH and scores of other similar programs? This Government has a $370 billion national debt and only yesterday the prime interest rate was increased to 8½ percent.

The goose is not hanging high and everything is not lovely in this country in spite of all the wonderful things that have been done, and I just do not find it possible to credit all these discoveries to the space program.

Mr. PODELL. Let me suggest that I certainly agree with the gentleman's concern about this increase to 8½ percent on the prime interest rate, which is going to prevent many middle-class citizens from applying for loans.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PODELL) 1 additional minute.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to emphasize this to the gentleman from Iowa, that the space program has only been in its infancy so far as the development of new technological improvements is concerned, and I am sure, they will extend even further.

Mr. Chairman, these are some of the reasons I support the program fully.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FREY).

Mr. FREY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. Even though I am a new member of the committee, I may have a little extra perspective on space as I represent a district which is heavily involved in the space program.

Let me say, I think the space program, just as any other program before Congress, must stand on its own merits regardless of whose district it is in.

I think we must view this program as part of our national requirements and ascertain what place it has in our national priorities. To turn our backs today from the space program when we are about to land on the Moon; to turn our backs from the investment this country has made to date; to turn from the scientific knowledge that we have gained; to destroy the scientific and engineering teams we have put together, would certainly be wasteful and foolish, and not in our national interests. We are today on the brink of great dividends being returned from the space program. It would be foolhardy, I think, for me or for anybody else to stand here and predict exactly what returns will come from the space program. I believe it was in 1934 or 1935 when a report was filed in Congress about future scientific progress. Radar, computers and Moon rockets were not included.

I think we can say, however, that the space program has given us great benefits, not only in terms of national interest and national prestige, but benefits right here on Earth. There is no reason to expect any less in the future. We are not shooting money up in the air. This money is being spent on Earth, and the benefits are being derived on Earth.

What dollar value do you put on helping a child who cannot hear, hear again? What dollar value would anybody put on the potential of a cure for cancer? There is not a dollar value. We are spending less than 2 percent of our national budget and 1 percent of our gross national product on the space program. The space industry provides jobs to industries employing over 200,000 people here on Earth.

Let me illustrate the spinoff from the space program mentioned earlier which has benefited us on Earth.

They include such items as a new electromagnetic hammer which allows you to smooth and shape metal without weakening it. This new tool is being used in shipbuilding, the automobile industry and in aircraft factories.

Studies at the Langley Research Center in Virginia on the causes of airplane accidents on wet runways have led to safer designs for highway and airport runway surfaces and have already saved millions of dollars and many lives by reducing the number of rainy day accidents. Fifteen major airports have already modified runways and 25 States are experimenting with treacherous sections of highways based on the new knowledge. For example, in California, five heavily traveled test strips were grooved. Before this grooving, there were 124 accidents. After the grooving, there were only eight accidents during a similar length of time. An unusual tough coating which has been developed for spacecraft is the basis of a new long-wearing paint which was developed for consumer use. Approximately 25 companies are now producing this paint.

In the area of medical research, the same technique using digital computers to enlarge or clear up photographs of the moon are being used to clarify medical and biological X-rays. A wheelless wheelchair for crippled children has resulted from the proposed moon explorer. An astronaut's helmet has become a respirometer for young children. Even in the area of cancer research, a scientist engaged in basic research into the effects of space radiation and body cells has discovered intercellular linkages which may help in understanding the behavior of certain types of cancer. This discovery is serving as a basis for further study by scientists to determine if these cell bridges exist in, and possibly constitute, the basic cause of uncontrolled proliferation in many types of human cancer.

The company which develops instruments for spacecraft is researching electronic sight-aid for the blind. They have also developed a small electronic sensing device, an integral part of a spacecraft, for restoration of hearing to the deaf by surgical implantation. Eye surgery with a pinpoint of intense light from a laser has been accomplished successfully and indicates that the laser can be used in eye tumor removal, retina welding and brain surgery. What dollar value can be put on the saving of human life? What monetary figure can be put on restoring the hearing of a deaf child?

Many of these important advances have not been given sufficient publicity. Knowledge of them may possibly affect those who feel that there have been no real benefits from the space program.

There are many more examples of benefits both direct and indirect from the space program. The real question before us is whether or not we are going to cut the budget on this program and in effect take this country out of the space business. I think it would be tragic at this time to cut back a program which has accomplished so much, and which has such vast potential to man in space and

also to man in his environment on Earth.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I would like to compliment the gentleman, one of the new members on the committee, particularly for his devoted and dedicated attention to duty. This is not an easy committee to serve on. Many technicalities and many technical programs are involved, as well as questions involving interrelation between programs on which judgment must be exercised. So far the gentleman has demonstrated real judgment and has been impartial on the space program. So I would like to compliment him especially.

Mr. FREY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH).

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, this bill authorizes $204.9 million more for the Office of Manned Space Flight than was requested by the administration. The amendments I will offer would reduce the amount authorized for the Apollo program, and for space flight operations to the original request of the President.

Manned space flight is by far the most expensive part of the national space program. It is also important to understand that there are two agencies of the government now making large-scale expenditures for manned space flight operations. On the one hand, there is NASA with its Apollo program and the proposed manned flights to follow the initial lunar landing. On the other hand, the Air Force has had its manned orbiting laboratory (MOL), which was canceled today.

As I pointed out in my additional views which appear on page 167 of the report which accompanies the bill under consideration, it seems to me at least unwise, and at most outrageous, for Congress to increase these enormous expenditures for manned space flight in the light of the urgent economic and social problems faced by people on earth.

I have had correspondence with officials of NASA in an attempt to determine the primary goals of the manned space flight program. Based upon this correspondence I have concluded that these problems are limited to determining the physiological and psychological effects of the space environment upon man, and assessing man's ability to perform in space. It seems equally clear that the scientific objectives of manned space flight are secondary and that in virtually every case, aside from medical and biological data, the scientific objectives of space exploration can be achieved more effectively and economically using automated spacecraft. Thus it appears that the greatest values which will be produced by our national space effort will be achieved using automated equipment.

For these reasons I strongly favor an increased effort in the relatively less expensive unmanned space program, costing one-fifth that of the manned program, and a reduced effort, in the future, in the extremely costly manned space flight program. For fiscal year 1970, however, I am prepared to support the request of the administration for the manned program.

Mr. Chairman, I rise also in support of an amendment which I will offer to strike out section 7 of the NASA authorization bill.

Section 7 is a new section added to the bill by the Science and Astronautics Committee, of which I am a member. It attempts to deal with the type of unrest and disorders which have occurred on a number of campuses of American colleges and universities.

I submit that the Science and Astronautics Committee is not the proper forum to consider such a statutory proposal. I submit further that if such legislation is deemed necessary it should be considered by appropriate committees of Congress, public hearings should be held in the traditional manner, and an attempt made to deal with the problem as a whole, not simply in connection with NASA's relations with colleges and universities.

As I said in my additional views in the report that accompanies the bill, on page 169, it seems quite irresponsible for a committee such as ours to attempt to deal with a subject such as this, in a piecemeal fashion, without benefit of hearings, and then to propose to the House of Representatives a statutory provision which is beyond the committee's proper jurisdiction.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON).

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say how much I appreciate the opportunity to serve on this committee—and participate in the hearings which produced the budget we review today. It would be presumptuous of a freshman Member to "commend," but certainly not to thank the chairman, and the chairmen of the three subcommittees for their courtesy and understanding in orienting the new Members to the demanding and complicated issues involved, not only in the space program per se, but in the relevance of its technology to life on earth.

In a time when some thoughtful persons perceive a conflict between space exploration and unfinished terrestrial business, I think the committee's opening panel hearings on "The Role of Technology in the Urban Crisis" demonstrated clearly that while looking out to the stars the committee has its feet on the ground.

The budget under discussion today—the smallest in years—has been pared down to the rough equivalent in financial costs of 2 months of our current military involvement. It is a minimal level, I should think, given the challenge that is ours as Frank Borman described as "envoys of man" seeking to learn enough about our universe, and the Earth's life-sustaining atmosphere, to judge correctly the likely long-term effects of the haphazard use of our growing powers, and guide ourselves accordingly.

The Departments of Agriculture, Interior and Commerce look forward to considerable savings occasioned by the penetrating findings of Earth resources satellites. Mining and fisheries to await with interest the unlocked secrets of mineral formations and the undersea life cycle once science is given this key to turn. If our own well-endowed agencies of Government welcome these improvements, think of their application to a more carefully constructed and efficient program to assist other countries to develop their own resources.

Lastly, we well remember Borman's report on this floor and his description of Earth seen from the Moon's edge as a little ball hanging in the stillness of space, and the sense of brotherhood and the need for brotherhood it gave. To translate the perception of a spaceman into more fervent efforts on Earth is not an unworthy challenge. We have witnessed an historic meeting of astronauts and cosmonauts and shared their humor. Why must such spirit be restricted to such brief encounters? Our encounter with the land that produced Chekhov and Titov must not be brief; it must be a lasting one. At least that is the vision we should keep before us, knowing that while a few reach for the Moon, millions still reach, as it were, for the Sun. If the nobler task for nations and governments is to see that the reach of the helpless does not exceed their grasp, reasonable men might some day agree on the point.

Meanwhile the cement of human curiosity and shared challenge can help bind a fragmented civilization and give it both the time and the techniques to heal its wounds. The world's warm reception to the men and the knowledge produced by our space program should encourage us to pursue it at the recommended level.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI).

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman.

I am delighted to associate myself with the remarks made by my colleagues, the gentleman from New York (Mr. PODELL), and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON).

Like the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON), I, too, am a member of that committee and am privileged to serve thereon. It has been a period of enlightenment for me. There is no doubt their approach and application is genuine, sincere, and broad, ever mindful of the needs of the people.

The question that comes to my mind in connection with some of the criticism is the thrust of priorities. Those who suggest that the money should be expended on the domestic level rather than on this effort are losing sight of the application of the technological spinoff of this program. This spinoff so clearly enunciated by Congressman PODELL is only a promise of what the future holds to help alleviate the burdens of mankind. This program is part and parcel of a phenomenon in America today.

For the first time in my memory we are spending extraordinary sums of money in a peacetime effort, without the spilling of blood and without the needless sacrifice of lives. The Government is involving itself in a program which is producing benefits and hence a better way of life.

It has been said that the urban prob-

lems can be better addressed as a result of the studies. The subcommittees on which I have served have clearly demonstrated this interest and have clearly illustrated this need, thus assuring me that the ultimate conclusion will be satisfactory as far as the total community is concerned.

This committee does not suffer from tunnel-vision. It carefully applies itself to the multifaceted problems of today. Surely, we think in terms of the dramatic, the manned space programs which are essential. However, now that we are about to achieve our objective, we find critics emerging from all portions of the Nation. This objective did not just happen. It was the result of genuine, sincere application on the part of the people in this program.

I cannot reiterate too emphatically, to those who suggest a question of priorities, that they should reappraise or at least examine the total picture and be more knowledgeable, for to cut any money at this time would be performing a disservice to a most noteworthy program and affect adversely the priorities of the domestic scene as well.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RAILSBACK).

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Chairman, I should like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding. I should like at this point to ask the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH) a couple of questions.

I also am concerned with section 7, which deals with, what appears to me to be, punitive provisions in respect to campus disorders and provides for permitting the administration to make a determination that some student has violated the rules or has been convicted of an offense, and then provides for funds to be cut off.

I should like to ask this: As I understand it, the gentleman will offer an amendment. Does the amendment contain two sections? Is this the second part? Is the portion relating to campus disorders the second part of the amendment?

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

Mr. RAILSBACK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KOCH. Yes; there are two separate amendments. One has to do with the appropriations and the other would strike the section the gentleman has referred to, section 7.

Mr. RAILSBACK. That being the case, I want to indicate my strong support for at least the second amendment that the gentleman intends to offer, because it has been my experience that the students feel very strongly they have no voice, first of all, and they feel that their antagonists are the administration. What we are doing here is saying, I think, that the administrators in their wisdom have the right to determine if a particular grievance which may be against the college administration has violated the university rules. Once that decision is made their funds can be cut off. I think this is wrong.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RAILSBACK. I yield.

Mr. KOCH. I want to make it clear that support of this amendment has nothing to do with whether one is for doing something about student disruption or not. It is my contention that not every committee in the Congress should tack on an amendment to its authorization or appropriation bill, regulating the students on campus. If there is to be a Federal law controlling student activity on the campus—and I do not believe there should be because the Federal Government has no business playing schoolmaster with its funds—it should come out of a proper committee having such jurisdiction and after hearings are held, so that what we do is not done in haste. Unfortunately, I believe we are now going to see every committee of this Congress trying to deal with this problem of student unrest and disruption. In reacting this way, we are panicking and doing what some students are doing, not acting rationally and logically.

Mr. RAILSBACK. I believe there are already two sections that came out of an HEW bill relating to campus disorders. I am inclined to agree, if we start doing this piecemeal we will not do a good job, first, and second we run the risk of driving all the moderate students right over with the radicals.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CABELL), a member of the committee.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee for yielding me this time.

I feel I would indeed be remiss if I did not attempt to correct the RECORD on one particular aspect of the authorization which is before us, as was enunciated by the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH). Mr. KOCH gave the implication that there is a duplication between the DOD and NASA with reference to our exploration and development of space and space technology. I would like for the RECORD to show that it has been announced this morning that the DOD has abandoned its manned orbiting laboratory which has engendered some criticism in the past with reference to a possible conflict between the two departments. I think it is significant for two very imporant reasons that this be brought to your attention today.

One reason is that this proves definitely America's space program is one which is intended for the development of space and space technology as well as survival in a space environment for peaceful purposes and peaceful purposes only. Therefore it is more important than ever that the full authorization as recommended by this committee for the Apollo applications program be retained in the authorization before you today.

I would also like to call your attention to the fact that the Russian space effort is entirely under the control of the Russian military. I do not think it should take a lot of time to give you the very serious implications to America of that fact. I also call your attention to the fact—and there is no use in being naive about it—that what we learn from space we can apply to peaceful processes without domination by the military. However, I am sure that if the need arises, we have sufficient intelligence and balance within our Department of Defense so that they can take what we learn in our peaceful exploration and use and adapt it if it becomes necessary. However, unless we develop our capabilities we will not have anything to turn back to.

I do urge that you keep this authorization as the bill outlines it before you.

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

Mr. CABELL. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FUQUA. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas, because I concur 100 percent in his statement. I think it is even more imperative that we recognize the fact, based on the decision made by the DOD today, that we should proceed with the Apollo applications program as the committee has recommended to Congress. It is very important in the light of what happened today and even more important than it was before.

Mr. Chairman, during this decade of the 1960's, the Apollo goal of landing men on the moon has served as the focus for a broad complex effort in the development of manned space flight. The Mercury and Gemini flights were forerunner programs providing the foundation for Apollo and beyond.

MANNED SPACE FLIGHT PROGRAMS

Mercury, Gemini, and Apollo—through Apollo 9—have provided nearly 4,000 man-hours of experience, including duration up to 14 days; guidance, rendezvous, docking, and lunar orbital flight; more than 13 man-hours of activity outside the spacecraft; precise reentry flight control, and a perfect record of safety in flight.

Early experiments in manned space flight were largely in the areas of equipment performance and in the functioning of man himself in the space environment. With the maturing of the program, experiments were conducted in other areas. The spectacular photographs from Gemini flights from Mars are perhaps the best known. Pictures stimulated considerable interest in earth resources, for example, and a more advanced experience in this area was conducted on Apollo 9.

Beginning with Apollo lunar surface exploration, and the Apollo applications orbital workshop and solar astronomy experiments, manned capabilities for scientific and applications purposes will be used even more extensively. Results of these missions will permit a more detailed assessment of man's role in space. For actual exploration on the moon, the advantage of having men on the job was obvious.

ASTRONOMY

For the solar astronomy experiments, a number of major astronomical instruments will be needed. These will perform the detailed observations required over a broad range of the electromagnetic spectrum. Various large instruments are required for the X-ray optical, and radio wavelength regions, as well as unique instruments for solar observations.

The potential roles of man in such experimentation fall into five general cate-

gories. These are: first, to maintain, repair, and replace faulty subsystems; second, to update, modify, and replace subsystems; third, to deploy the initial structure; fourth, to aline and calibrate; and fifth, to operate instruments as a scientist-astronaut.

Of course, astronomical observations in space can be conducted without man. However, when we are dealing with large, complex, and hopefully long-lived telescopes, we are faced with an economic decision as to whether man should maintain and update the instrument in space. Instruments such as the long focus solar telescope appear more feasible if manned deployment and adjustment are available.

EARTH SCIENCES AND APPLICATIONS

Other programs for earth sciences and applications call for observation of the Earth. These observations will be conducted in broad areas of the spectrum using both active and passive techniques. In the earth sensing area, the instrument requirements are in general an extension of earlier imagery, radiometry, and spectrometry capabilities, allowing higher spatial and spectral resolution and better vertical sounding discrimination. New instruments may of course be expected.

As in the case of astronomy, the roles of man—or of manned spacecraft—should be resolved by economic studies. There is little support for man as a scientific operator; most functions can be preprogramed or controlled from the ground. At the same time, it is admitted that a manned spacecraft should have windows and that the flight of an occasional scientific specialist should not be discouraged. However, obtaining applications data, whether experimental or operational, tends to be repetitive, prolonged, and peculiarly suited to automation.

In the applications area, there appears to be natural roles for man in the developmental phases of new instruments and in the proof of feasibility of measurement techniques. These are laboratory activities, where the man observes instrument performance and makes adjustments as required. Such functions are not particularly sensitive to geographic coverage, and need not be in the orbits of an operational system.

The role of man may be particularly pertinent when dealing with structures of great size or light materials, erectable only in zero gravity. This role of man is again a matter of economics; the Echo balloon and the 1,500-foot antenna span of the radio astronomy Explorer show that simple structures can be deployed automatically.

As in astronomy, man can contribute to the earth sciences and applications program by performing repairs, calibrations, alterations, and maintenance. For those instruments which are accessible to him—on a space station or via shuttle from space station or the earth—he can assure the quality of the data and extend the useful lifetime of sensors.

It is likely that the best observatory program is a combination of manned and unmanned stations. The decision on the proper combination should include consideration of economic factors. At this time we do not have sufficient data to make this tradeoff. However, appropriate studies and tests have been initiated to form a basis for such an evaluation.

Mr. CABELL. I thank the gentleman for his contribution to this very important subject.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CABELL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I want to compliment and commend the gentleman for the statement that he has made. I believe he uses excellent judgment on the committee. With his previous administrative experience he has contributed a lot in making sure there is no duplication between the military and the peacetime space programs. Also he has paid a great deal of attention to the programs within NASA itself. On his trips with us we have checked through these various programs to see that they are being well run. I think he deserves a great deal of credit from this side.

Mr. CABELL. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I would like to commend the ranking minority member of the committee for his diligence and the amount of time that he gives to this important subject. I think the committee is better off for his membership on the committee.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASEY), a former member of the committee and one whom we are very proud to call an alumnus.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics for yielding me this time. I did indeed have the pleasure of serving with this distinguished committee and I might say that I miss the excitement as well as the work and the education that I received while serving on that committee.

Mr. Chairman, I want to join in urging the House to approve this request for authorization and I want to reiterate what the gentleman who just preceded me in the well, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CABELL), stated with reference to the need that it is more urgent now to give full authorization in funding to the NASA program, especially in view of the fact that the Department of Defense has canceled the manned orbiting laboratory program under their operation.

Now, one thing that I have been pleased to hear today is some of the Members expressing themselves as to the spin-off, if you want to call it that, by the application of the knowledge and the techniques and mechanics, if you will, that have been developed in the space program.

True, I want to say to the gentleman from Iowa, "The goose does not hang high." Sure, we are tight for money. I want to say to the other gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH) who urges that more things be done for social benefits, I have never seen this House during the 11 years I have been here, and based upon my observations prior to that time, cancel out a program and use the money for another program. In other words, if they want to do it, they do it. They do not worry about whether they have cash on hand with which to do it.

So, I want to say to the gentleman that each of the programs that comes before this House stands on its own merit.

Mr. Chairman, we must stay abreast in our space program. We must show the leadership to our own constituencies because in my view we have short memories as everyone knows. We one day stand and applaud Frank Borman and his associates and others who make these tremendous flights, but 30 days later one does not hear much more about it. You know, I daresay thousands of times in the well of this House some Member in the past has said, "We cannot do this or we cannot do that any more than I can fly to the moon."

Mr. Chairman, that old expression is out the window now because you can fly to the moon. Why? Because President Kennedy said we were going to land a man on the moon in this decade and in spite of the accidents which we have had, in spite of the tragedy we had and the failures which we have had, this dedicated committee of the House and the dedicated committee in the other body as well as the dedicated men and women in both Government and industry have made that prediction come true and have made that challenge come true.

Mr. Chairman, are we going to throw this opportunity away? Are we going to show that we are through? We are just beginning. We need a manned orbiting laboratory, but in my opinion it should be under NASA. It should be a peaceful exploration. It should be a program in which we can invite other friendly countries to participate in the exploration of space.

In the spin-offs we have learned more in oceanography in several of these flights than we could gather within the span of 20 years using ships on the surface of the ocean.

Mr. Chairman, we have made advancements in medicine, as was pointed out by the gentleman from New York (Mr. PODELL) but not in cures. That is the work of the National Institute of Health, to find cures. But in technology you help the National Institute of Health in finding cures and in helping your hospitals at home in monitoring the patients with less personnel, and with more accuracy.

Mr. Chairman, we must never quit and be afraid to move ahead. I daresay—and I have said this before but will repeat it again—if Queen Isabella, after she pawned her jewelry to send Columbus on his adventurous trip to the New World had had to stand for reelection, she would have probably been beaten for taking that gamble.

And there were some so jealous that when Columbus came back he was jailed.

Let us show the strength and the fortitude and the leadership that we need to keep this country first in space, and in the peaceful use of space. We in this House are the ones who can show that leadership, and we in this House can take pride in what has gone on in our space program. Let us continue to give it our support.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support H.R. 11271. This bill, authorizing funds for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management and for other purposes for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, amounts to $3,966,377,000 for the fiscal year 1970.

There is probably no finer peace program in the Nation. Aside from all its benefits to the military in the areas of communications, navigation and weather observation, its overflow benefits to our society has resulted in more than 2,750 technical innovations that are presently, or soon to be used in industry, medicine and other nonaerospace applications. NASA research has already resulted in sharper X-ray pictures, longer lasting paints, safer highways, smaller TV cameras and miniature medical instruments, just to mention a few of the benefits to the public.

This is the type of legislation, as compared to so many of our so-called giveaway programs, which we need to pass, for it is this type of program which encourages and assists man to help himself to develop new businesses and broaden his horizon for more financial benefits.

I urge the passage of the bill.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, this bill includes an addition in amount of $3 million for the large solid booster rocket development. This is an area where the committee voted to increase the authorization over the original fiscal year 1970 budget request. It is an area that the committee has followed very closely over the past years. They are very familiar with the facts involved. And over the past 4 years I have supported this uphill battle, to pursue the development of this 260-inch large solid rocket booster. We are convinced that this development is essential if we are to reduce the enormous costs of launching large payload weights into orbit, which surely we will be doing in the future. We have proved the correctness of this position by the progress that has been demonstrated.

We have not had a large first stage booster development since the Saturn V was initiated during the beginning of the space program. It is our intention to take advantage of newer materials and methods in producing this highly reliable and efficient booster. To do this, it is necessary that NASA be authorized an additional $3 million which we have included in this bill, restricting its use for this work only. In previous years I have been a strong supporter of research, particularly in the booster field. I have supported the 260-inch solid booster because of its inherent simplicity, reliability and potential major cost reduction in payload cast per pound in orbit. Additionally, the successful experiment to date has tended to bear out the expectations that I have just enumerated.

The next logical step in the program, after three successful one-half-length firings, is to bring the development to its final conclusion, that of firing a full-length test booster. The bill does not provide for this booster to be produced in quantity or to commit enormous sums for production facilities. I merely propose that the program be completed with sufficient component technology development—such that the device can be considered for a planned mission if required. This booster is now about 75 percent developed, and to fail to complete it at this time would only result in extensive start-up cost and additional expenses in a future search for this type of cheaper and simpler booster. We would also be failing to take advantage of prior year expenditures.

I should remind my colleagues that now is the time to place emphasis on our research program, particularly in the propulsion field, before we embark on our continuation space program. I need not remind you of the limitations to our early space program caused by a lack of propulsion power. The history of power generation devices is one of too little, too late, and a crash program to catch up that costs many times an orderly program of development. For these reasons I urge you to support the full amount, $28.1 million, recommended by the committee for this program.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, today we are considering H.R. 11271, authorizing funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

I am sure that all of us here today share a proper pride in the remarkable progress the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has made since its inception in October 1958. The scope of NASA's programs and the successes it has achieved have truly been testimony to outstanding management and leadership. I am sure that you are deeply impressed and excited by the results of the Apollo and unmanned space flight programs so far.

We have come a long way, to be sure. But it is a mere first step in the journey we have before us. In the years ahead the United States should explore space to the utmost of our ability. I hope we will be sending spacecraft to the outer reaches of the solar system, and perhaps some day beyond. American astronaut-scientists will soon probe the moon and possibly the planets. This will be a great investment for the American people. But the return to them will be far, far greater.

It has been said that people either progress through the willing and courageous acceptance of great challenges, or they stagnate and their society disintegrates through the rejection of reality. Nations are either dynamic and continue to grow, or they wither and die.

The need for a national space program and the energy it injects into a national society has been recognized by almost every nation on the earth. And the list is lengthening. Aside from ourselves and the Soviet Union, England, France, Germany, Italy, Canada, and even India, to name only a few, have space programs well underway. To be sure, theirs are much more modest than ours. They have nowhere near the resources available to invest that we have. Nevertheless, effective national space programs will give those nations a share in tomorrow's technology. It will give them the right of influence and decision in the future shaping and molding of world affairs.

For me, there is no question that the nations which fail to master the space technology that is within their capabilities will, in turn, fail to develop the technological knowledge necessary for the development of their people.

As far as the United States is concerned, it is vital that we achieve unquestioned superiority in every aspect of space exploration, because the advance that is inherent in the knowledge gained, in the security potential of operational capabilities, and in the economic value of applied technology derived from space research, is becoming more and more decisive.

Whether or not the whole vast effort is worth the cost is the basic question. The NASA program is costing us about one-half of 1 percent of our gross national product.

The Soviet Union spends much more on its space program in relation to its gross national product than we do. The motivation, I am sure, for the Soviet Union to undertake a national space program is not much different from ours in essence, but it sharply differs in emphasis.

Within their frame of political reference, it was vital that they impress the world that, under the Communist system, they had achieved a level of general technological achievement on a parity with ours. And there is no question that they momentarily succeeded with Sputnik I in convincing many people, especially in the undeveloped areas, that this was so.

What must be underscored here, at this point, is the return being made to the investors. As far as I know, the Soviet Government is returning little or no benefits to the Soviet citizen out of their space exploration. Their program is being paid for by the Russian people at the price of better and more houses to live in, better and less expensive shoes on their feet, and fully stocked food stores for them to shop in. The reverse is true here, as you well know. Not one American that I know of has gone without the things that he needs or wants solely because we have undertaken to explore space.

With us, the new knowledge we are gaining in space science and technology is producing in turn new materials, new processes, new techniques; testimony that our space program was the decision of our people and has been their collective investment. Likewise, the profit is theirs.

The list of benefits from space research is almost endless. The application of space sciences to the problems of people and society expands at a logarithmic rate. If nothing more, space science and the resultant applied technology are providing us with a means to create a better society, making possible healthier people, and the achievement of solutions to world problems that were the source of despair only a few years ago.

However, there is more to our space program than just profit. It is quite possible that the future of the world may well depend upon our accomplishments in this field. Our national security depends upon every sinew and fiber of our

society. It depends utterly upon the knowledge of our people and their willingness to put that knowledge to work whenever necessary. Where space developments and capabilities are needed for our defense, they are as important to our society as are the most advanced arms and armament necessary for maintaining the superior strength of our Armed Forces.

We recognize the potential threat that lies with space operations. The use of space for hostile purposes holds grim possibilities which our leaders have thoroughly explored and evaluated. We have no choice but to develop the greatest capability in space to guard against any contingency and to prevent any nation from developing space technologies which we could not match or counter.

We would be foolish to assume or presume that we could, by sheer rationalization, select the specific knowledge we would need for our future security, or to decide that the cost of investigating any given area of national interest was too high. Hence the exploration of space as a national goal for security reasons is a motivation that carries with it a high priority.

There is no question that America must experience a rate of progress in every facet of its culture that is dynamic and questing. We must not cease growing. We must not cease to dare, to venture. Everything learned from space exploration thus far indicates that the discoverable knowledge awaiting those who will be able to examine the universe from outside the earth's atmosphere is beyond estimation. Surely we will find the answers to the origin of our solar system. our galaxy, and the forces that govern them.

Satellite telescopes now orbiting the earth have produced information about the universe in a few short days that we have been unable to acquire from the 200-inch giant telescope since its installation on Mount Palomar.

If our effort in the bioastronautics disciplines results in improving the health of our people through greater knowledge of human anatomy and life processes, that alone could provide one of the major justifications for the funds we are committing to space. If by sending men into space we can discover new and far-reaching scientific facts that can answer the problems of hunger and poverty in the less favored portions of our world, then that alone would be worth the price that we and other nations will pay.

No one can foresee what new things we must have, what energies we must mobilize, in order to insure our future survival as a nation and as a leading member of the world community.

It would be a fallacy for any nation to assume that through the sheer force of armed strength or through the pressures of overwhelming technological might it can dictate the ultimate destiny of men. We live in a world of change. Who can foresee the challenges that will affect us all?

Now, H.R. 11271 represents an outstanding effort on the part of the Committee on Science and Astronautics. Every facet of NASA's budget has been weighed and evaluated in relation to the overall space program. A casual reading of the committee report reveals very quickly the mature and well developed judgment the members of the committee exercised in their areas of responsibility.

These are times of critical decision in our national program of space exploration. This House has endorsed and supported the program for more than 10 years. Let us not fail to continue that support.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Chairman, around our Nation and the world we have vast testing and programing facilities dedicated to America's effort to achieve success in the exploration of outer space and, I am sure, someday in the future, due to our efforts today, we will be able to make good use of those usable elements which our astronauts and scientists find in space. We have committed billions of dollars to continue our research, development and exploration of space already and along these same lines we must continue this commitment.

I, therefore, Mr. Chairman, state my full support of H.R. 11271, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 1970.

Almost every Member in Congress has some space-connected program in his or her district which not only is helping build toward a better future for America but today, right here and right now, is supplying a major market for employment.

My State of Nevada is a prime example of what I have just cited. We have the exciting NERVA rocket program at our test site near Las Vegas which is successfully engrossed in testing nuclear reactors and engines for future space flights. As our scientists have pointed out, to quote from the bill:

> A nuclear stage would be capable of performing a wide variety of advanced space missions beyond the performance potential for chemical rockets.

And to continue in the bill—

> The advantages of nuclear propulsion over chemical propulsion results from its high payload performance, propulsion efficiency and versatility.

Our nuclear rocket program as advanced for fiscal year 1970 is set at $50 million—a part of the overall $3,264,427,000. I urge for approval by the House of Representatives to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the distinguished chairman, Hon. GEORGE P. MILLER, and the members of the Committee on Science and Astronautics for bringing before us this bill and report which recognizes the need for our Nation to advance and take advantage of our investment and its many beneficial applications to more Earth-bound problems.

The committee has wisely increased the authorization for funds to reinstate production of the mighty Saturn V launch vehicles and other needs of the Apollo program and spaceflight operations.

In so preserving these essential programs, the committee has assured the most economical utilization of our space technology.

Reductions and curtailments would have meant forfeiture of that which could be realized and eventually higher costs when the magnificent NASA and space industry team had to be reassembled to start again on what must be our national commitment to move ahead in this area.

Our Nation, with such a small percentage of the world population, has achieved world leadership by riding the first waves of each new age.

In so doing, our citizens of the United States have realized a level of personal prosperity unequaled at any time in recorded history.

It was this idea which prompted the late President John F. Kennedy to advocate that the Nation "set sail on this new sea" not merely to be the first on the moon but to strengthen our national leadership in a new and adventuresome age.

The benefits of space technology for medical and biological sciences, communications, weather prediction and management, for industrial and research techniques, and for a world of day-to-day improvements is well documented. These benefits continue to increase and become more important to each of us.

It is our responsibility to assure that our space program does not become a political football, cashing in on the more tangible and immediate results at the expense of meaningful, long-term endeavors.

The committee's proposal before us today moves in the right direction of a worthwhile effort.

I urge support of full authorization as reported by the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the House is considering H.R. 11271, the bill authorizing appropriations of approximately $4 billion for fiscal year 1970 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

I have carefully studied the bill and the 178-page committee report which accompanies it. I have carefully listened to the extensive debate today.

Unfortunately, the committee report does not carefully delineate the difference between the request for funds in the President's budget and the amount here authorized. However, as can best be ascertained, the authorization in the bill is for somewhere in the neighborhood of a quarter of a billion dollars more than was requested by the administration.

After studying the report and hearing the debate above alluded too, I am unable to see justification for an authorization exceeding the request of the administration. In view of our crucial domestic needs in this country, we should be more circumspect in the expenditure of billions of dollars in space.

Nevertheless, in my judgment, the space program is necessary and our progress in that area is commendable.

Mr. Chairman, a rollcall vote cannot be obtained in the Committee of the Whole on the amendment to lower the authorization on the President's request therefore a record vote after the com-

mittee rises cannot be had unless the amendment is agreed to.

On final passage before the House I will vote in favor of the legislation and have chosen to explain my vote as above set out.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, we are rapidly approaching the mission of Apollo 11 and if the previous successes in our space program are any indication an American will be walking on the moon next month. This is such an awesome undertaking that the reality of today is often confused with yesterday's fiction.

Yet we are on the threshold of what truly is man's greatest adventure.

We have come this far in our space program because of the impetus of one man—President John F. Kennedy. It was President Kennedy who, in his first months in office, committed the United States to a manned lunar landing "before this decade is out."

Now, Mr. Chairman, an important daily newspaper, Newsday, in an editorial on June 3, has come up with an excellent idea of how we might honor President Kennedy's memory in a way he would have appreciated. Newsday suggests, and I shall write to the Vice President and the administrator of NASA supporting this suggestion, that the spacecraft to be used in the Apollo 11 mission be commissioned "The John F. Kennedy."

The aforementioned Newsday editorial clearly explains the reasons behind this suggestion and I wish to include that editorial in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Newsday, June 3, 1969]

NOW IS THE TIME TO TAKE LONGER STRIDES TO HONOR JOHN F. KENNEDY

In a special State of the Union message in May 1961, President John F. Kennedy challenged America to land a man on the moon and return him safely to earth "before this decade is out." There is every reason to believe his vision will be fulfilled before this summer is finished.

If we do succeed, John F. Kennedy, more than any other public figure, will have inspired our achievement. For he was the first President to make the exploration of space a national priority and the first to point us definitely toward the moon. Soon after he entered office he sharply increased the budget request for development of the large Saturn rocket booster; he began to assemble the manpower and scientific talent upon which success would depend; and he began to spell out his dream.

The U.S., he believed, achieved world leadership by riding the first waves of each new age—the industrial revolution, modern invention and nuclear power. He believed we should "set sail on this new sea" not merely to be the first on the moon but to strengthen our national leadership in a new and adventuresome age.

He saw, too, beyond the parochial national interest of space exploration and appealed to the Russians to cooperate in joint efforts. "The cold reaches of the universe," he said, "must not become the new arena of an even colder war." His hope was that we might not see space "governed by a hostile flag of conquest, but by a banner of freedom and peace . . . not . . . filled with weapons of mass destruction, but with instruments of knowledge and understanding . . . for the progress of all people."

The Kremlin turned a deaf ear to his pleas, but even today his aspirations are eloquent reminders of what the space venture may yet become.

Kennedy looked upon the landing of a man on the moon as one of the great human adventures of modern history. "No single space project in this period," he said, "will be more impressive to mankind or more important . . . (or) so difficult or expensive to accomplish." Controversy surrounded the project from the beginning. Critics labeled it a "science fiction stunt," or said it cost too much, or argued that other space projects were more important. Kennedy refused to retreat.

"In a very real sense," Kennedy declared, "it will not be one man going to the moon . . . it will be an entire nation. For all of us must work to put him there . . . This is not merely a race. Space is open to us now; and our eagerness to share its meaning is not governed by the efforts of others. We go into space because whatever mankind must undertake, free men must fully share."

Within two months, if all goes well, the first man will land on the moon, and as Kennedy predicted, millions of others will share their experience vicariously, even as we did in the thrilling ride of Apollo 8 around the moon at Christmas.

It seems fitting that the leadership of John F. Kennedy be recognized as the culmination of his vision is reached. He would have smiled wryly at all of the monuments which now bear his name, for he was a man who admired human deeds and the achievements of the spirit above steel and concrete. Newsday suggests, therefore, that the spacecraft which carries the astronauts to the first moon landing be commissioned "The John F. Kennedy."

Controversy still surrounds the need for a moon landing, but whatever the arguments, the nation is about to accomplish what Kennedy challenged us to do eight years ago. To those who say the risks of failure are large, the answer is that Kennedy would have understood—he was a man to whom risks were familiar.

An aircraft carrier of the U.S. Navy already bears his name. But even though he was a naval hero, Kennedy abhorred war. It would be appropriate for the first spacecraft to reach the moon, envisioned by Kennedy as a vessel of peace, also to be named in his honor.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, we have all been awed and impressed with the marvels of manned space flight, with the seeming miracles which are being performed daily by the scientists and engineers of our space program. In a matter of several months we expect to set humans and manmade machines on the surface of the moon. Our successes in conquering space are indeed phenomenal.

If we are to draw a philosophical conclusion from these events, it is that there are no limits to the ability of purposeful, thoughtful men in tune with the facts of their environment. Indeed, the sky is no longer the limit.

Romantic and awesome as these visions are, as far as I am concerned they are not the primary benefits of the space program. Mining the moon or selling real estate there are not the objectives of the space program. We have already begun to realize the primary benefits of the space program in the form of spin-off discoveries, applications, and stimulation of the scientific mind. From communications, to manufacturing, to agriculture, to biomedicine—to name just a few fields—the impact of the space program is staggering. Even so we are only beginning to feel the effects of the growth of our knowledge. The macrocosm is teaching us about the microcosm.

My colleagues are aware, I am sure, of the technology utilization program started by the directors of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The purpose of the program is to watch for and report discoveries and applications which can be used in general industrial and commercial areas.

I think the general public is aware of the strides which have been made in metallurgy due to the impetus of the space program. The opportunity for commercial application of newly developed alloys such as corrosion-resistant titanium, or lighter weight aluminum, or high-strength stainless steels. Applications in the future of this new materials technology should not only make our lives easier, and living costs lighter, but increase our safety at the same time.

I have only to mention the computer and the tremendous advances in computer technology as a spinoff of the space program to fully justify our investment in the program. Refining, air traffic control, industrial process control, medical diagnosis, weather analysis, agriculture: computer applications as a result of the space program are too numerous to mention.

System engineering techniques—originally developed to assist in management of the Apollo program—is now being applied to such fields as medicine, law enforcement, transportation, and traffic problems, State water projects, and electrical power generating and distribution systems.

Space medicine has fathered enormous advances in various biomedical fields. Development of artificial organs and special heart-lung equipment which maintains the patient's life while these and other organs are being subjected to surgery are spinoff benefits of the space program.

Of great importance to the people of my area of the country are the benefits being derived which contribute to land and water conservation and to the development of more scientific approaches to agriculture. Satellites are being utilized to discover and map earth resources. We know that this technology puts us at the brink of great breakthroughs in geologic exploration, water conservation and utilization, forestry, agriculture, and transportation.

The moon is a first step for man. I expect we will reach even farther among the stars to know the universe. But in the final analysis it is ourselves and our immediate environment we are coming to know.

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, the committee has fought for the continuation of the NERVA program from its inception to provide an important new propulsion capability in the years to come. Need I remind the House that we are fighting to preserve the impetus that now exists in the program and to insure that the funding level is consistent with an orderly, efficient development. We are not asking for unusually large sums that are normally associated with a development of this type. We are asking specifically for $13.5 mil-

lion additional to carry out the following work:

First, to increase the fabrication and procurement of development components—specifically the long lead-time items needed for such an engine—and to provide greater assurance of meeting the present schedule of delivering a flight-ready engine in the latter half of the 1970's;

Second, to advance the procurement of a new exhaust duct and associated equipment required for the existing engine test stand in Nevada;

Third, to provide some increases in contractor technical staffing; and

Fourth, to accelerate stage system design concepts, analytical studies, and associated facility design leading toward the initiation of a stage development at a later date.

In fiscal year 1969 NASA failed to fund this program at the authorized level because of budget restrictions within the administration. Testimony revealed that the results of this reduction will add $30 million to the cost of the development. Also, there has been a reduction of the contractor engineering and scientific personnel which will result in a further cost penalty when the eventual rehiring of new personnel occurs. There will be a further reduction at the Nuclear Rocket Development Center in Nevada of about 50 percent of the testing personnel at the station. Furthermore, there will be no engine testing for the next 2 years. Although NASA did program $32 million in fiscal year 1969 for this program area, a reduction of the order which we are discussing has serious effects on the program.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the importance of this program to our space capability in the latter 1970's, it is urgent that we support this program at a level which will not cost more in the long run and extend the development time. The testimony that the committee has taken over the years has adequately shown the enormous improvement that this rocket provides over existing chemical systems. For most missions, the payload improvement is approximately 100 percent, and of course many more missions are possible that would be otherwise uneconomical by purely chemical means. Also, much more flexibility is inherent with this propulsion device over most chemical means. Therefore, the committee chose to increase the program to the $50 million level to prevent further deterioration of the progress and the special technical talent that has been assembled to carry out this work. I believe that the program has been improved by this addition and that the space effort will attain this desired capability sooner by providing the full amount.

Mr. Chairman, in summary this new propulsion capability will provide us with a true space transportation system—a "bus-type" it might well be called. It marks a significant departure from "riding ammunition" which is what we do today. This is not satisfactory for the long pull; we need an advanced propulsion system such as NERVA for the future.

In another advanced area, electric propulsion technology offers great potential for future missions. While all of the near-term deep space missions currently are planned to be conducted with chemical propulsion, eventually electric propulsion could be advantageously used instead for many of these missions. For example, the payload capability of most launch vehicles could be substantially increased with the use of solar electric propulsion for high energy missions. This means that modest-sized launch vehicles could carry out missions that otherwise would require much larger vehicles. For planetary orbiters, electric propulsion could reduce planet approach velocities, making it much easier to get into orbit.

Our experience to date—both flight and ground testing—confirms the potential advantages of electric propulsion in providing spacecraft operational flexibility, simplicity, increased payload or decreased trip time, or reduced spacecraft weight. All of these advantages are highly valuable. To achieve them and to avoid playing second fiddle to the Soviets we must move forward actively.

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Chairman, in the last decade we have seen some wonderful things come to fruition through our national space effort. These were more than just spectacular pictures of the space phenomena—what they really represented were the results of the forward thrust of our science and technology. There is little doubt that we must maintain this forward thrust for the maintenance of our national and international well-being.

In many ways too numerous to mention here today, our life has been improved through the technology process of the space program. Nothing can match the vigorous outpouring of products, processes, ideas, hundreds of thousands of jobs, and the stimulus to our education system—these are representative of the many and diverse impacts of the space program on our way of life.

Now is the time to stand up for our space program. During the past several years it has been cut substantially time and again. I believe it has been cut to the bone and we should resist any other reductions. I strongly believe this is the psychological moment to encourage those who have been so instrumental in bringing about the remarkable achievements of the past 10 years in space, both in Government and industry. No other major program has suffered such a proportionately large reduction from its earlier levels. Few other programs are as valuable to maintaining the strength of our Nation.

Turning now to a specific area I would like to say that propulsion is one of the keys to progress. We are now using chemical rockets but they have limitations. We can now look forward to an exciting advance in propulsion that will enable us to continue our forward thrust into new regimes of technology and space exploration. This advancement is the nuclear rocket for space propulsion—NERVA. This new engine, a workhorse of the future, offers us many features that will provide greatly enhanced capability in the coming space program.

Fundamentally, nuclear propulsion makes large amounts of propulsive energy available for a variety of purposes. The benefits to be realized fall into several categories: First, extend the performance of launch vehicles now in existence; second, make feasible certain near Earth mission that would otherwise be impractical with chemical propulsion systems; and third, increase the potential for mission success due to special characteristics which can be brought into the system design. Most important, all of these benefits can be achieved through the development of one basic propulsion system. These factors lead to the prediction that the NERVA engine in a nuclear stage will become a workhorse propulsion system of the future space program, beginning in the late 1970's, and thereafter.

The earliest applications of the nuclear rockets in the advanced space programs are likely to be in lunar logistics, unmanned exploration of the solar system, and Earth-orbital operations. A nuclear stage, powered by a 75,000 pound thrust NERVA engine and incorporated as a third stage on a standard Saturn V launch vehicle, will approximately double the gross payload of the Saturn V. In terms of useful payload, the introduction of nuclear propulsion will turn marginal situations into effective, substantial capabilities.

Another class of missions involves a more sophisticated mode of orbital operations. Here, the nuclear rocket will be called upon to operate many times during the mission and could be reused after being resupplied with propellant. Included might be reusable interorbit ferries, plying between low orbit and synchronous or lunar orbit, and maneuvering satellites moving about extensively on demand. At the same time, the early development and flight use of nuclear rockets will form the foundation for more advanced missions. As these missions begin to crystallize, the requirements for higher payload, longer operating duration and reliability will be in constant demand. A nuclear stage powered by the NERVA engine can provide this performance and is the only advanced propulsion system now under development by the Nation on a schedule consistent with the other requirements imposed by these missions.

As a new propulsion system type, nuclear rockets can be expected to be used for decades and in ways we may not now contemplate. Space missions during this time period will make increasingly better use of advanced propulsion systems, and, concurrently, nuclear rocket performance will evolve toward ultimate capability. Thus, the near-term benefits of nuclear rocket development will be backed up by substantial longer-range benefits.

During testimony before the Congress, it became evident that the budget request submitted by the President provided for only a minimum program and that a modest increase in funds would allow for more efficient progress and enhance the possibility of earlier flight experience and use. We are thoroughly convinced of the importance of the nuclear rocket to our overall space program and give it our whole-hearted support.

Because the nuclear rocket program, like other technical programs aimed at extending the frontiers of knowledge, provides for the needs of the future, it is frequently suggested that Congress defer the funding of such efforts and concentrate on the more immediate needs of our Nation. It is important to remember, however, that the nuclear rocket is a long-lead-time development, and work must proceed now if it is to be made available for missions of the late 1970's and 1980's. We must not ignore the vital role of an ever-advancing technology in keeping the Nation strong. A dynamic technology is a source of wealth, know-how and stimuli which are assets to be drawn upon in the solution to a variety of national problems. Its preservation at this time requires that we be farsighted enough to invest now in the advanced technologies which will become the capabilities of the future.

For reasons such as these I offered an amendment in committee to increase the nuclear rockets program by $13,500,000. I believe it highly important to sustain the program effort now underway to insure that we shall have this important national capability in future years.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROUDEBUSH). In these times of great confusion and little faith, the American people are entitled to this tribute for pride in accomplishment.

I can think of no more fitting words than "Place Our Flag on the Moon," an editorial by Don Carpenter which appeared in the Glendale Independent on June 4, which I would like to read into the RECORD:

Gradually Americans are being turned against their national flag and what it stands for. In most cases, this has been so subtle that many Americans do not realize that it has been done. But watch the people near you at a parade; many do not know what to do when the flag passes or they feel self-conscious. The men often do not remove their hats, they do not stand, they don't even stop talking.

Or observe the number of flags displayed on a national holiday. Notice the number of homes or business houses that do not display the American Flag . . . And notice the almost belligerent apathy when the matter is broached by members of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts or some other organization that still take pride in patriotism.

Throughout history, veneration of a symbolic standard has been tradition. Men have died defending or carrying the banner they are pledged to defend. Flags have been planted in the soft sand of newly discovered lands, carried across trackless miles of ice, unfurled atop the loftiest mountains. They have become the most revered of "decorations" as they flutter above the graves of brave men, because of the deep meaning in a flag. In a small piece of colored cloth is embodied all of the history, the tradition, the honor of a nation, and all the courage and valor of the men who established that nation.

It is small wonder that when someone wants to insult a nation, the greatest insult is desecration of that nation's flag. It goes deeper than destruction of cloth—it involves an almost personal insult for every person who honors that flag. Small wonder the desecration of a flag stirs resentment. It is the ultimate insult; it is the extension of the failure to honor the flag by simply standing as it passes on parade.

Realizing that things do not simply happen—they are planned and programmed—let's consider an incredible conflict in the Congress, one that is receiving little attention in the nation's press:

There is a rumor that the Flag of the United States of America may not accompany the astronauts when they fly to the Moon in the months ahead (except as painted on the side of their spacecraft). There is a persistent rumor also that the spider flag of the United Nations will be planted on the Moon by the American astronauts.

In the Congress, Congressman John Rarick has been seeking information on this matter and is "concerned over the reluctance of our space administration people to confirm or deny to our citizens that our astronauts on reaching the Moon may not be authorized to erect the U.S. flag. The solon notes that it is American technology, American tax dollars and American men who are involved. He asks that Old Glory be raised on the Moon and that it be flown first over the U.S. Capitol.

Seeking an answer to this important though simple question, Mr. Rarick receives words and sweeping generalities. He is told that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) is "giving consideration" to what articles will be taken to the Moon to be left and those that will be brought back for permanent display on earth. The bulk of the reply is the usual mimeographed bureaucratic gibberish. Such as, "We appreciate knowing of your constituent's expression of concern and assure you that all viewpoints will be seriously considered before decisions are reached."

The answer from NASA should be quick and positive: The American Flag will be carried to the Moon, and God willing, placed there by our astronauts. The proper time for the announcement would be June 14, National Flag Day and the final day of National Flag Week.

Mr. Carpenter's words express my sentiments and I feel the desires of the vast overwhelming numbers of our fellow countrymen.

We owe this vote to our people.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, we have before us today another situation in which, after the amendment process has been completed, the legislation under consideration contains a number of unfortunate provisions as well as some necessary ones.

I support the amendment offered by my colleague from New York (Mr. KOCH), to eliminate the additions to the amount authorized over and above the amount requested in both the Nixon and Johnson NASA budgets, and to eliminate the misguided attempt of the committee to use this legislation as a kind of club against students who participate in campus disturbances. With regard to the latter, I thoroughly agree with the gentlemen from Illinois (Mr. RAILSBACK) when he said that this kind of legislation will tend to drive the moderate students into the camp of the radicals. Furthermore, I do not believe that we should commit ourselves to 10 manned moon explorations for purposes of reaping scientific evidence before we have achieved our first manned landing on the moon and before we determine in some preliminary way whether there appears to be enough of scientific interest on the moon to require 10 manned explorations.

I oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROUDEBUSH). I believe the matter of what flag or flags should be carried to the moon should have been left to the President's discretion. I would personally hope that the President would direct that a United Nations flag be planted on the moon along with the U.S. flag to symbolize our support of the United Nations, our recognition that the tremendous American achievements in outer space have been built on the discoveries of scientists of many nations, and to reaffirm our determination that the moon will not become an arena for conflict among nations.

Finally, I have grave doubts about the wisdom of even planning for explorations of Mars and other distant planets, which will assuredly cost billions of dollars, when we have so many unmet needs here at home which will require all the resources and commitment we can muster for many years to come.

However, despite these and other reservations, I have decided to vote in favor of this legislation. In doing so, I have been greatly influenced by the judgment of my friend and colleague from New York (Mr. KOCH) who serves so ably on the Science and Astronautics Committee.

Another element in my decision to vote for this legislation is the fact that it does not prescribe any rigid time schedule for proposed future space operations and expenditures. The timing of such undertakings and expenditures—if they are to be made at all—will be decided later by the administration through its requests for appropriations which are, of course, subject to congressional review and action. My own view is that, so long as the present stringent lack of funds for badly needed domestic programs persists, there should be a drastic stretching out of the space program. We have responded to the challenge posed by early Soviet space achievements, and we have proved our capacity to overtake them in the race to the Moon. There is now considerably less urgency attached to our space efforts. With that in mind, I intend to devote careful attention, when they come before the House, to administration appropriations requests that will determine, in the final analysis, whether, and at what rate, we proceed with the program and related expenditures authorized by this legislation.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration constantly shows dramatic proof of progress. In the 11 years of NASA's existence, the United States has come from behind and now leads the world in space technology and space exploration—a far different aspect than when Sputnik was launched in 1957 while America merely watched.

I strongly support H.R. 11271.

Critics may assail the $3.2 billion authorization as exorbitant, but this is tunnel vision that is completely out of place in the void, limitless space. The research and development program does not benefit NASA alone. Already, we have used their technological know-how and breakthroughs in the field of medicine, our communications systems have become more sophisticated and streamlined, and our jobs have increased throughout related industries.

In reviewing the money needs for

NASA it is easy to call the glamour names of the space industry—names like Lovell, Borman, Anders are justly revered in American history. They have taken us to new vistas and we are indebted for their skill and courage. In the glamour of a space shot, however, it is too often too easy to overlook the quiet people who make the program work. Men like Dr. Thomas Paine, Administrator, NASA; men like Dr. Kurt Debus, Director, John F. Kennedy Space Center in Florida; men like Dr. Robert Gilruth, Director, Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston; and the thousands and thousands of faceless scientists, researchers, technicians, and workers throughout the system—all of these deserve our praise.

In little more than a month, the United States will land men on the moon. Again, a nation will unite breathlessly from lift-off until the men and machinery have splashed down safely. In casting my vote for these appropriations, I am honored to have played a small part in this Nation's space efforts.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to myself.

Mr. Chairman, I take these 2 minutes to express to the Committee on Science and Astronautics my personal deep appreciation of the manner in which the members have conducted that committee, and also to pay my respects to the very efficient staff of that committee.

Mr. Chairman, this committee is now going on 10 years old, and at no time have politics entered into the picture, and at no time has it become factional.

Mr. Chairman, I particularly want to commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KARTH), the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER), and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. DADDARIO), and the chairmen of the subcommittees, on the excellent work that they have done.

Mr. Chairman, it has been an exceptionally great pleasure also to work with the Members on the other side of the aisle. There have been times when the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON) and I have disagreed, but in the main we get along very well.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to compliment the chairmen of the full committee, as well as the subcommittee chairmen and the ranking subcommittee minority members for their detailed work and attention to this program.

This is not the kind of a committee where large issues involving flaming emotions occur. This is a scientific program. In evaluating these major programs it takes quite a bit of judgment, and a good bit of homework. I want to say that I believe everybody on the committee did their homework.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration:

(a) For "Research and development," for the following programs:

(1) Apollo, $1,766,800,000;

(2) Space flight operations, $354,827,000;

(3) Advanced missions, $2,500,000;

(4) Physics and astronomy, $112,600,000;

(5) Lunar and planetary exploration, $131,800,000;

(6) Bioscience, $27,400,000;

(7) Space applications, $138,400,000, of which $24,100,000 is to be used only for the Earth Resources Technology Satellite Project;

(8) Launch vehicle procurement, $114,200,000;

(9) Sustaining university program, $9,000,000;

(10) Space vehicle systems, $30,000,000;

(11) Electronics systems, $35,000,000;

(12) Human factor systems, $23,600,000;

(13) Basic research, $21,400,000;

(14) Space power and electric propulsion systems, $39,900,000;

(15) Nuclear rockets, $50,000,000, which is to be used only for the nuclear rockets program;

(16) Chemical propulsion, $28,100,000, of which $3,000,000 is to be used only for the two-hundred-and-sixty-inch large solid motor project;

(17) Aeronautical vehicles, $80,900,000;

(18) Tracking and data acquisition, $293,000,000; and

(19) Technology utilization, $5,000,000.

(b) For "Construction of facilities", including land acquisitions, as follows:

(1) Electronics Research Center, Cambridge, Massachusetts, $8,088,000;

(2) Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Maryland, $670,000;

(3) John F. Kennedy Space Center, NASA, Kennedy Space Center, Florida, $12,500,000;

(4) Langley Research Center, Hampton, Virginia, $4,767,000;

(5) Manned Spacecraft Center, Houston, Texas, $1,750,000;

(6) Wallops Station, Wallops Island, Virginia, $500,000;

(7) Various locations, $26,425,000; and

(8) Facility planning and design not otherwise provided, for, $3,500,000.

(c) For "Research and program management," $643,750,000.

(d) Appropriations for "Research and development" may be used (1) for any items of a capital nature (other than acquisition of land) which may be required for the performance of research and development contracts, and (2) for grants to nonprofit institutions of higher education, or to nonprofit organizations whose primary purpose is the conduct of scientific research, for purchase or construction of additional research facilities; and title to such facilities shall be vested in the United States unless the Administrator determines that the national program of aeronautical and space activities will best be served by vesting title in any such grantee institution or organization. Each such grant shall be made under such conditions as the Administrator shall determine to be required to insure that the United States will receive therefrom benefit adequate to justify the making of that grant. None of the funds appropriated for "Research and development" pursuant to this Act may be used for construction of any major facility, the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds $250,000, unless the Administrator or his designee has notified the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate and the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate of the nature, location, and estimated cost of such facility.

(e) When so specified in an appropriation Act, (1) any amount appropriated for "Research and development" or for "Construction of facilities" may remain available without fiscal year limitation, and (2) maintenance and operation of facilities, and support services contracts may be entered into under the "Research and program management" appropriation for periods not in excess of twelve months beginning at any time during the fiscal year.

(f) Appropriations made pursuant to subsection 1(c) may be used, but not to exceed $35,000, for scientific consultations or extraordinary expenses upon the approval or authority of the Administrator and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.

(g) No part of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(c) for maintenance, repairs, alterations, and minor construction shall be used for the construction of any new facility the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds $100,000.

SEC. 2. Authorization is hereby granted whereby any of the amounts prescribed in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), and (7) of subsection 1(b) may, in the discretion of the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, be varied upward 5 per centum to meet unusual cost variations, but the total cost of all work authorized under such paragraphs shall not exceed the total of the amounts specified in such paragraphs.

SEC. 3. Not to exceed one-half of 1 per centum of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(a) hereof may be transferred to the "Construction of facilities" appropriation, and, when so transferred, together with $10,000,000 of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(b) hereof (other than funds appropriated pursuant to paragraph (8) of such subsection) shall be available for expenditure to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations at any location (including locations specified in subsection 1(b)), if (1) the Administrator determines such action to be necessary because of changes in the national program of aeronautical and space activities or new scientific or engineering developments, and (2) he determines that deferral of such action until the enactment of the next authorization Act would be inconsistent with the interest of the Nation in aeronautical and space activities. The funds so made available may be expended to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment. No portion of such sums may be obligated for expenditure or expended to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations unless (A) a period of thirty days has passed after the Administrator or his designee has transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President of the Senate and to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate a written report containing a full and complete statement concerning (1) the nature of such construction, expansion, or modification, (2) the cost thereof, including the cost of any real estate action pertaining thereto, and (3) the reason why such construction, expansion, or modification is necessary in the national interest, or (B) each such committe before the expiration of such period as transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the

effect that such committee has no objection to the proposed action.

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act—

(1) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program deleted by the Congress from requests as originally made to either the House Committee on Science and Astronautics or the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences,

(2) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program in excess of the amount actually authorized for that particular program by sections 1(a) and 1(c), and

(3) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program which has not been presented to, or requested of, either committee,

unless (A) a period of thirty days has passed after the receipt by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate and each such committee of notice given by the Administrator or his designee containing a full and complete statement of the action proposed to be taken and the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of such proposed action, or (B) each such committee before the expiration of such period has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the proposed action.

SEC. 5. It is the sense of the Congress that it is in the national interest that consideration be given to geographical distribution of Federal research funds whenever feasible, and that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should explore ways and means of distributing its research and development funds whenever feasible.

SEC. 6. No part of the funds authorized under this Act shall be used to provide payment, assistance, or services, in any form, to any person who is convicted by a court of competent jurisdiction of an act to overthrow the Government of the United States.

SEC. 7. If any institution of higher education determines, after affording notice and opportunity for hearing to an individual attending or employed by such institution—

(a) that such individual has, after the date of the enactment of this Act, willfully refused to obey a lawful regulation or order of such institution and that such refusal was of a serious nature and contributed to the disruption of the administration of such institution; or

(b) That such individual has been convicted in any Federal, State, or local court of competent jurisdiction of inciting, promoting, or carrying on a riot, or convicted of any group activity resulting in material damage to property, or injury to persons, found to be in violation of Federal, State, or local laws designed to protect persons or property in the community concerned;

then the institution shall deny any further payments to or for the benefit of such individual which (but for this section) would be due or payable to such individual and no part of any funds appropriated pursuant to this Act shall be available for the payment of any amount (as salary, as a loan or grant of any kind, or otherwise) to such individual.

SEC. 8. This Act may be cited as the "National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, 1970".

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that it be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FULTON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania: On page 5, after line 14, insert the following:

"(h) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, authorizations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, enacted for fiscal years 1967, 1968, and 1969, for which appropriations have not been made, totaling $327,070,000, are hereby cancelled, effective June 30, 1969, or the date of this Act, whichever is later."

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I have discussed this with the ranking minority member and with the members on this side and we accept the amendment.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

May I just say this. This reduces the total authorization outstanding below the Nixon budget for the NASA space program as discussed in my remarks on the rule.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, what I want to get straight is this: Is the bill $250 million above the Nixon budget asking?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. May I give the gentleman the figures?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; but first I would like to observe that the report accompanying this bill does not give comparative figures.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The Nixon budget, that is the amended budget, is $3,833,000,000. The committee actually reported out for the current authorization $3,966,377,000.

My amendment after cutting $327,070,000 from the existing authorization which could be used for appropriation reduces the total amount now outstanding and authorized for NASA by $193,693,000 below the Nixon budget. That is not taking into consideration the figure of $117,473,000 which was held back from appropriation expenditures in the act of 1968 under the expenditure control act.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY) in the report on page 172 says that this bill, as reported by the committee, is $250,850,000 in excess of the amount recommended by the new administration.

My question is, What does your amendment do toward eliminating that $250,850,000?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. You are talking of the current authorization for the fiscal year 1970. My amendment says that the previous authorization that is unused for the 1967 fiscal year and the 1968 fiscal year and the 1969 fiscal year will be canceled as of June 30, 1969. It does not affect the current authorization.

Mr. GROSS. With all due respect to the gentleman, I must say that that sounds like gobbledygook to me. Can I not get an answer to the question?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I do not touch the current authorization by this amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Then the $250,850,000 is still in the authorization; is that correct?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The current authorization of the committee is $250 million more than the Nixon amended budget.

Mr. GROSS. So, it is still there?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. That is the current authorization. But as to the total authorization outstanding, when you adopt my amendment it is $193,693,000 less than the Nixon total outstanding authorization, considering the current fiscal year 1968, 1969, and the coming fiscal year beginning July 1, 1970.

Mr. GROSS. This authorization is more than the actual appropriation for the last year; is that correct?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. It is about the same as the appropriation for last year. The appropriation for last year was $3,995,300,000.

Mr. GROSS. Is the Nixon administration not recommending cuts in spending for this as well as other purposes. According to your figure of $3,095,300,000 for last year, this bill is $900,000,000 more.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I do not believe that it is. You have to realize that on July 16 we are launching the third manned shot to the Moon.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask a question on that score. Is it not true that, regardless of what you do in this bill, it will have no effect whatever on the July 16th flight?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. We have to move ahead and get more modern equipment.

Mr. GROSS. But how about the July 16 flight? This bill is not going to affect that?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. If we cut the authorization the first thing that must go are the nonessential expenditures, which I think you would agree with. The first thing that will then go is the live television coverage of the Apollo 11 flight to the Moon. We will have no television coverage at all. It will not be worldwide; it will not even be for this country.

Mr. GROSS. Would that be fatal? Let us get back to the original question. The money that would be authorized in the consideration of this bill would have nothing to do with the flight on July 16. The money is already there, is it not?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Last night I had Astronaut Col. Gordon Cooper in my district speaking before 25,000 cheering people. He said to me just last night as I left Pittsburgh and he was flying down to Cape Kennedy again:

For heavens sake, have them back us now. This is when we astronauts need the encouragement.

And I thoroughly agree with him. So it would have an effect.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to encourage them, but I do not know that that entitles me to vote $250 million more than this new administration says you need for this program. I do not know that any astronaut needs that kind of encouragement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

(On request of Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GROSS was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. You see, if you use that argument, then you should vote against the Nixon administration upping the Johnson administration by $40 million on the Apollo program and the space flight operations program for the Nixon administration went $46 million above the Johnson administration's budget. Why are you not against that?

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY) does not say that. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY) says that the request was $45 million below the Johnson budget request.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Yes, but that has all sorts of research and development programs in it.

Mr. GROSS. I do not care about that.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. That is the figure that is clear down. The Johnson budget was $3,878,000,000, with $117,300,000 retention. The Nixon budget is clear down, much lower than that, because if you take off the $117 million retention it is down to $3,715,000,000.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question: How much money is there for space over in the Department of Defense?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I have already explained that the Department of Defense is going to up the 1970 budget through the science adviser to the Secretary of Defense by $515 million, and that $128 million of that will be space and the rest of that will be aeronautics.

Mr. GROSS. Are they spending as much or more than you want to authorize on an annual basis in the Department of Defense?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. If you took all the missile programs in there, I would say it would be decidedly more, because, as you well know, that budget runs up to an $80 billion figure. I am not at liberty to discuss parts of the Department of Defense budget that we know of for military uses in outer space that are restricted. I think you had better get some other Member on the floor in the Armed Services Committee, who can better tell you what I am allowed to reveal and what I am not. I know a good bit about it.

Mr. GROSS. You could put a dollar value on it, could you not? That would not be betraying much by way of secrets.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I would say that in the total space budget you are speaking of, if we include the communications of the military and their relevance to ours in space, has been going between $1,800 million and $2,000 million. Now they want to increase it by $128 million. But if you include in the total space budget programs such as the Navy program on navigation, and the programs of all the other departments, I would put that amount somewhere between $7 and $9 billion. This includes the $3.96 billion level for just the peaceful uses of space.

Mr. GROSS. Then the total for space is somewhere on an annual basis of $11 billion to $14 billion.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. But it is not the same function. The military communications must be kept entirely separate. They are really expending their amount on defense installations, which I think is wise. I think it prevents a new world war, in Pearl Harbor style, from starting.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KOCH

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I have two amendments to offer. Will it be appropriate to treat them both at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. They could be handled together by unanimous consent.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I suggest we handle the first one first, and it will be easier—for myself, also.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, as the first amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KOCH: On page 1, line 7, strike out "$1,766,800,000" and insert "$1,691,100,000".

On page 1, line 8, strike out "$354,827,000" and insert "$225,627,000".

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, the bill authorizes $258 million more for research and development than was requested by the administration, and the bulk of the increase is earmarked for the manned space flight program. Based upon correspondence which I have had with officials of NASA, the purposes of manned space flight are limited to determining the physiological and psychological effects of the space environment upon man, and assessing man's ability to perform in space. It seems clear that the scientific objectives of such flights are secondary, and it appears that in virtually every case these objectives could be achieved more effectively and more economically using automated spacecraft. I am convinced that the greatest values from our vast expenditures in the national space effort have been, and will be, achieved using automated equipment, and I strongly favor an increased effort in the relatively less expensive unmanned program, and a reduced effort in the extremely costly manned space flight program.

In a period of extraordinary and urgent demands upon our national resources brought about by enormous defense expenditures, and pressing economic and social problems many of which are not being met adequately, I regard it as at least unwise, at most outrageous, for Congress to increase the already large-scale expenditures for manned space flight.

It is noteworthy that Congress learned for the first time this year that NASA plans to make 10 manned space flights to the moon after the initial Apollo landing.

In my view, manned exploration of the moon should not be based upon the availability of Saturn-Apollo equipment taking billions of dollars from our needs here on earth, but rather upon genuine scientific objectives and the amount of new information each successive flight can produce. Before committing ourselves to 10 additional manned lunar landings, let us first see what the first ALSEP and the soil samples brought back by the Apollo astronauts produce. It is possible that the ALSEP and the soil analysis will reveal that there is not enough material of scientific interest on the moon to warrant a total of 10 more manned missions. Must we proceed at a rate of three lunar landings a year—after the initial landing—when there are urgent priorities here on Earth?

I support our need and desire to explore space, but there is a matter of priorities which our committee must recognize. Until the hungry in this country, and indeed this planet, are adequately fed, we should take pause before we shoot for the outer planets when those trips could be stretched out and delayed, but not terminated.

In summary, I oppose any increase in the manned space flight budget beyond the amount of the Administration request as entirely unwarranted.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there are two or three points that should be made in connection with this amendment. If we will observe the models in front of us, the one on the right is Saturn V. Whatever we do today will determine whatever kind of space program we have 4 or 5 years or more into the future. If we adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH), it means in 1970 the production of Saturn V will stop.

My subcommittee went to Huntsville, to Cape Kennedy, to New Orleans, and to North American Rockwell, the McDonnell and Douglas Corps., where these are made.

The amount of money which is recommended by our committee will permit the long leadtime items for the Saturn V to be procured. Then we will not have a gap where the teams that build the Saturn V will disintegrate.

I urge that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I believe we should point out the delay which will be occasioned if we do not institute this Saturn V program. We have completed number 11 out of 15 of them. The contracts are already let. The question is: Shall we cancel the contracts, which will probably cost more than otherwise?

I believe the gentleman from Texas and I in our separate remarks pointed out that if we do not have the funds there will be a gap in production of Saturn V's that will run probably 18 to 42 months.

If we get beyond 42 months we have lost the teams, we have lost the equipment, and we have lost the energy and the mobility and really the driving force; is that not correct?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is true. Of course, we already have a gap of a number of months.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Already there is a gap of somewhere between 12 and 18 months.

I am strongly against the gentleman's amendment.

We who have been working on this program for a good many years have been looking into scheduling. On NASA's own figures, if we go below three flights a year, the so-called Apollo lunar flights, it will cost in 2 years over $300 million more. So it is cheaper and more efficient to go at a optimum rate of three a year.

We have been all through this. As a matter of fact, to save money we have cut down from five flights last year. I hope we will have only four flights or maybe five this year. Then we are going to cut down to three. We are cutting down. We cut a billion dollars out of the program, at the committee level, from 1968 fiscal year through 1970 fiscal year.

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. I wonder if the gentleman could explain to me whether it is the contention of the committee that the President and the administration are insufficiently aware of these problems, or are insufficiently enthusiastic about doing the proper thing for the space program. I am troubled about ignoring or overruling the President lightly on a matter about which he has been so deeply concerned.

Could the gentleman tell me why he thinks the administration requested the smaller amount of money? I share your enthusiasm for the space program and want to see it adequately financed, but this is a puzzling situation.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Of course, we are all aware of the problem of lack of money. We know that NASA asked the Bureau of the Budget for this amount of money which we have in this bill. We also know that the Bureau of the Budget agreed to a lesser amount. Just why they did it I do not know.

I am very confident that my subcommittee, considering all the work we did and all the study we gave to it, has done what is right for the space program.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. What troubles me is not that the committee has not done a commendable or even an admirable job, but in dealing with the total problem of national priorities, we do have difficulties in deciding more or less piecemeal about each question. We might be wise to pay closer attention to the assessment of the administration as to these needs.

I am prepared to overrule the assessment of the administration on national priorities when I feel it is wrong, and I know the gentleman is, too. But I am asking how we are to determine whether our assessment on this particular request is wrong, or whether their assessment on this particular request is wrong. I should like to know, if possible, what impelled the administration to make the recommendation that we are asked to exceed today. This administration has not seemed to me particularly shy about its requests for money for space or military and security matters. So while I am sure that the committee has done its job well, those of us who are trying hard to balance priorities more equitably are concerned about going beyond even the requests of the President in this field.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I would say to the gentleman I believe the administration expressed its own doubt when the President appointed a panel headed by Dr. DuBridge to come up with recommendations on the space program.

This bill is an authorization bill. If they want to use the money they can. If they do not want to they do not have to. Since they themselves appointed a panel which will come back in September, which is quite late, it shows they are not certain on all points as to what the space program should be.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON) rise?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in order to answer the gentleman further. I have a statement by Mr. Thomas Paine, Administrator, under date of May 30, 1969, on the certainty of the program in the future, about which the gentleman remarked. The Administrator of NASA says:

In line with our testimony on the amendments to the FY 1970 NASA Budget, we are in the process of reassessing certain elements of the Apollo Applications Program. The AAP program has been making substantial progress over the past two years despite stringent fiscal limitations. We have been working to establish a relatively firm program schedule and total run-out costs to make possible definitization of major AAP contracts. As you know, we have been proceeding in recent months on essentially a level-of-effort basis under letter contracts because of program and schedule uncertainties.

We had hoped to be able to definitize these contracts by the end of this month. But as detailed cost estimates for 1971 and beyond have become clearer and as negotiations with the contractors have progressed, I have decided that we should not definitize the AAP contracts now. We should first complete our reassessment of the AAP program elements in the context of NASA's manned space flight planning for FY 1971 and beyond.

Accordingly, I have asked the Office of Manned Space Flight, together with the other appropriate NASA offices, to undertake a further assessment of AAP program elements in the context of Manned Space Flight and total NASA programs as best we can foresee them for 1971 and beyond. I have asked that the alternatives considered include, among other possibilities, launching the workshop and ATM on a Saturn V, thereby eliminating two separate Saturn IB launches and automatic rendezvous and docking. I am also asking that the content of each proposed AAP mission be reviewed to see whether future costs can be reduced while strengthening the AAP program.

I am writing to you at this time to keep you informed of the status of our AAP program planning.

Sincerely yours,

T. O. PAINE,
Administrator.

In recent weeks, NASA has begun issuing requests for proposals from the aerospace industry on planned post-Apollo programs. The space agency is in the midst of a major reorganization within its Office of Manned Space Flight to manage the studies.

NASA's latest effort is to establish two task groups within the manned space flight area—one to deal with proposed earth-orbiting space stations; the other to evaluate the space shuttle systems that would provide logistics for the stations.

Basically, NASA wants to initiate work on a space station that could be orbited in 1975 with a 12-man crew, but with growth potential through modularity that would permit an eventual crew of 100 men and women.

Responses from industry to the requests for proposals on portions of the space station studies were due June 9, Other proposals, concerned with experimental modules, were due by May 22.

NASA would prefer to establish the kind of space station that would provide broad support for various activities, such as oceanography, meteorology, and physics.

It also would support biomedical laboratories, physical science workshops and solar and stellar observatories.

NASA has initiated studies of experiments. The definition phase of the space station program now being undertaken will include an in-depth evaluation of the most preferred concepts, including the necessary logistics systems.

It can thus be seen that there are in negotiation many contracts resulting in hundreds of subcontracts. Likewise it can be seen that the NASA leadership does not know what money they are going to get yet. Therefore, NASA people are in a position where they cannot see beyond 1971 just what the programs are. This is not an appropriation procedure, but an authorization procedure which establishes a financial ceiling within which NASA will operate. Therefore, I believe the amendment of the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH), should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROUDEBUSH

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROUDEBUSH: On page 9, after line 16, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 8. The flag of the United States, and no other flag, shall be implanted or otherwise placed on the surface of the moon, or on the surface of any planet, by the members of the crew of any spacecraft making a lunar or planetary landing as a part of a mission under the Apollo program or as a part of a mission under any subsequent program, the funds for which are provided entirely by the Government of the United States. This act is intended as a symbolic gesture of national pride in achievement and is not to be construed as a declaration of national appropriation by claim of sovereignty.

On page 9, line 17, strike out "SEC. 8." and insert "SEC. 9."

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to accept the amendment.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this side accepts the amendment as well.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KOCH. Is there an opportunity to discuss this amendment notwithstanding the fact that it has been accepted by the committee chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may ask for recognition.

Mr. KOCH. I do so.

The CHAIRMAN. However, the Chair first recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROUDEBUSH) to explain his amendment.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered would require that our astronauts upon landing on the Moon, hopefully next month, implant or otherwise place the flag of the United States, and no other flag, on the lunar surface. The amendment would apply, not only to the scheduled Apollo 11 landing, but to subsequent landings on any other celestial bodies as a result of follow-on programs, the funds for which have been or will be provided entirely by the United States.

I feel compelled to offer this amendment in view of the many proposals being put forth which advocate that our spacecraft carry to the surface of the moon the United Nations flag, the flags of other nations, or other emblems or articles symbolic of international cooperation in space exploration. I endorse the concept contained in the basic Space Act which stipulates that the United States cooperate with other nations, or groups of nations, in the peaceful exploration of outer space. My amendment is not intended as a departure from that concept.

I certainly would have no objection to transporting the flags of other nations or articles to the surface of the moon aboard our spacecraft and my amendment would not prohibit such acts. However, I consider that Congress must emphatically insist that no flag other than that of the United States be physically placed on the moon's surface.

The American people are extremely proud of our accomplishments in outer space, particularly the successes achieved in the Apollo program. Through the television medium and our advanced technology, the American public have become more aware of the direction our space program is taking, and in fact now have a sense of personal participation, as they view with pride the accomplishments of our American astronauts via live television.

The fulfillment of our national objective of landing man on the moon and returning him safely to earth next month will be a historical event. The accomplishment of this objective will not have been inexpensive. Over $23 billion in hard-earned taxpayers money will have been spent to carry out this formidable task. In all due fairness to the American taxpayer it does not seem too much to ask that our flag—Old Glory—be left on the lunar surface as a symbol of U.S. preeminence in space to which the citizens of this Nation can refer with just pride.

There are those who will oppose my amendment on the grounds that it violates the Treaty on Outer Space. I can assure my colleagues that no part of the treaty prohibits the placement of a national symbol on the surface of any celestial body. I have very carefully reviewed the language of the treaty, as well as the accompanying papers, and can find no restriction against such an act.

There are precedents for such actions. The Antarctic Treaty of 1959 reserved that area exclusively for peaceful activity and provided for cooperation in scientific endeavors. The American flag has been implanted in the Antarctic on more than one occasion. The Soviet Union's recent unmanned interplanetary station Venus 5 delivered to the planet Venus a pennant with a bas relief of Lenin and the U.S.S.R. coat of arms. Since these acts have not been construed as treaty violations, then I submit that the placing of the U.S. flag on the lunar surface will likewise not constitute a violation of the Treaty on Outer Space.

To allay the fears of those who consider my amendment a violation of the treaty I have included language in my amendment to assure all that there is no intent to declare sovereignty by this action. I quote the last sentence in my amendment:

> This act is intended as a symbolic gesture of national pride in achievement and is not to be construed as a declaration of national appropriation by claim of sovereignty.

Mr. Chairman, our achievements in space technology have been made possible only through the dedicated efforts of thousands of Americans and billions of U.S. tax dollars. History and national pride dictate that our achievements be duly commemorated. I know of no act more significant nor symbolic that would memorialize our achievements than the erection of the "Stars and Stripes" on the surface of the moon.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on this amendment because a similar, although I am sure slightly different amendment, was proposed in the Science and Astronautics Committee and it was defeated to the best of my recollection.

Mr. Chairman, what is disturbing to me is that after the committee did defeat it, it is offered on the floor and accepted as part of the committee report.

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

Mr. KOCH. Of course.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. This is not the same amendment as offered in the committee, I will say to the gentleman from New York. The language is very much different and all of the objections to the amendment offered in the committee have now been met.

Mr. KOCH. Your original proposal in the committee was that no flag other than the U.S. flag should be taken on these space flights. Now you propose that we allow other flags to be carried under cover in the Apollo vehicle, but that we not allow their removal from the spacecraft and their display on the Moon. I submit that as a practical matter there is little difference in the amendment which was rejected by the committee and the one you are offering today.

I think the committee in its original vote against your amendment made its feelings very clear. And I believe it is wrong to accept the amendment so similar to the defeated one without giving the committee the opportunity to discuss it especially in view of the discussion in the committee on how your original proposal would run counter to the spirit of international outer space agreements. I felt then and do now as other members did who spoke in committee that our national interests and the world's would be best served if there was at least one place in the cosmos where nationalism would give way to international friendship.

The space treaty which we entered into, when we said that the Moon would not be the subject of someone or some country taking physical possession of it, did we not mean that? None of us would dispute that the U.S. flag should be implanted on the Moon, and most of us in the committee at that time thought there would be nothing wrong with having other flags such as the U.N.'s placed thereon; and it would not be in derogation of America's honor and prestige to do so, rather it would enhance it. When the matter came up before the Space Committee I thought that the "silly season" had started, but fortunately, the committee in its good sense defeated the amendment. I advised my confreres at that time if the amendment carried, then I would propose another amendment making it a 5-year felony to burn a flag on the Moon, to point up the irrationality of these approaches which were denigrating the great opportunity now given to man in exploring outer space.

Up to now the space program has exhibited great international cooperation and spirit—and unfortunately, this amendment runs counter to that spirit of brotherhood and undermines that international good will. For this reason it should be defeated.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Would the gentleman yield? Since the gentleman is talking about the silly season, I believe his remarks are something I would classify in the silly season in this House.

Mr. KOCH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I would like to explain the reasons why I am supporting the amendment. The previous amendment had been intended—as has been stated—to prevent any other flag from being carried in any one of our space capsules in any subsequent program by our astronauts.

Actually, in previous flights we have had aboard with the astronauts the flags of many nations. These flags have been presented to the Ambassadors of the various nations as tokens of good will. I feel this is a very good gesture.

Incidentally, as I believe the chairman will corroborate, the flag of the United States of America is already on the Moon, and remains there after a Surveyor flight.

Is that not right?

Mr. MILLER of California. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is right.

It was there unofficially, I believe, but it was related to one of the Surveyor-type preliminary Moon flights, and I have a picture in my office of the Surveyor with the flag on the side of it.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I did not want to make it sound illegal, but at least the flag is already there. But this concerns what we shall do in the future. I have understood there is to be a flag that is to be carried to the Moon. It is to be with the astronaut when he lands on the Moon and steps out of the capsule.

I have known Astronaut Neil Armstrong, the commander of Apollo 11, for many years, ever since he was a pilot on the X-15 out at Edwards Air Force Base in California. I have discussed with him whether he would be willing to take a flag, and he said that yes, he is doing it. I have also discussed this with the Administrator of NASA, with General Phillips, head of the Manned Space Flight, and with Dr. George Mueller, and also other NASA leaders. In response to that, on June 9, I have a letter which covers both these points, from Dr. Willis H. Shapley, Associate Deputy Administrator, to me. It states:

> In response to your inquiry, I can now advise you that NASA's plans are to erect an American flag on the surface of the moon.

May I say parenthetically that it is not only intended to implant, but to erect an American flag; not only to carry it aboard and carry it out, but to put it in a cairn or something to hold the flag.

> We also plan to take and bring back from the moon an American flag for presentation to the Congress. Our final decisions on the symbolic articles to be taken on the lunar mission and their disposition are, of course, subject to approval by the President.

That brings me to my final statement: Everything that these astronauts carry is subject to the final approval of the President. So no matter what we do here, I want it to be understood that we are not infringing upon the prerogatives of the President, nor denying him the power of his office either as Commander in Chief or as head of the Government. We are recommending that this be done.

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would ask the gentleman is it not true that, regardless of what we do today, that the descent part of the lunar module has a great big "U.S.A." and a great big American flag painted on it?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. That is certainly right, and I am glad the gentleman asked the question.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am troubled about the amendment for a number of reasons, none of which have to do with my enthusiasm for the American flag or my joy at the prospect of its arrival on the Moon.

Of course, as has been pointed out today, the flag is already there for all intents and purposes. I am not clear precisely what the difference is between its being there "unofficially" and its being there "officially." It is either there or it is not there, and as we all know, as a matter of fact, it is there and the rest seems a bit of a quibble.

Everyone is enormously proud of the achievements of our scientists, technicians, and astronauts, and few hearts will not beat faster in this country and everywhere else on Earth when the module bearing the American flag touches down on the Moon. That is why I am troubled about this amendment.

In the first place, the first man on the Moon will not need to be wrapped in an American flag for it to be generally known that he is an American. Would it be a slight to his Americanism if we were to use the unusual occasion of his appearance on the Moon to confirm his—and our—adherence to the human race as well? I rather think not. Could this best be done by his bearing a United Nations flag as well as an American flag? Might such a gesture enhance America's standing on this planet? If the President thinks so, would that be such a bad thing to do these days, all things considered?

Then there is the question of whether this sort of ad hoc tinkering is the best way to make a decision like this. It seems to me, despite words to the contrary, that this amendment is precisely an attempt to tell the President what it would be most suitable for him to do. Otherwise I cannot see what the amendment is supposed to do. But I wonder what has been discovered suddenly that suggests the President lacks what it takes to make this particular decision. Is he lacking in patriotism so one cannot trust his decisions about the space program? Is his devotion to the flag underdeveloped? Has he been found embracing a Union Jack in secret or abusing the memory of Betsy Ross?

The President quite properly has the authority to decide what he wants done about this matter, and whatever my disagreements with him on other questions, I am sure he will make this decision in the best interest of the country and the world. I am distressed to find so many of my colleagues apparently so mistrustful of his patriotism or so doubtful about his judgment that they want to legislate this decision so abruptly, without even inquiring if the President has any thoughts on the matter.

Or are we counting on the Senate to stop this odd proposal from becoming law, so we can engage here in a bit of political flag planting without the results becoming too awkward for all concerned?

Perhaps none of this would be worth worrying about if it were not for the harm we can do the United States by tying the President's hands this way, and by announcing, in the process, how narrow a spirit moves us in this body today, on the eve of so magnificent a triumph of human initiative and ingenuity. Would it really denigrate American taxpayers if the President were to decide that it was in the national interest to let America provide the vehicle by which other emblems might be placed on the Moon subsequent to the American flag? But that decision, too, would be illegal if this amendment became law.

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

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. My amendment does provide for an American flag solely to be carried to the Moon.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. I know. What I am saying is that it troubles me that if this amendment is adopted the President could not in his wisdom decide that other items might—even subsequently—be added to the decorations being contributed to the Moon.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. If the gentleman will yield further, I hope the amendment is adopted.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Of course, I understand the gentleman hopes the amendment is adopted. Otherwise I assume he would not have offered it. I am trying to explain why I hope it is not adopted.

Suppose the President feels it is in the best interests of this country to plant other items in addition to the American flag—perhaps symbols of the great religions. Or a symbol of peace. Must Russians be ceded permanent rights to the use of such symbols? Would that demean the flag? Or even pictures of someone not Lenin—George Washington perhaps. Or Pope John XXIII. Or John F. Kennedy. Dwight Eisenhower. Einstein. Gandhi. Jules Verne. Mrs. Roosevelt. Lincoln. Beethoven. Martin King, Jr. Buddha. Moses. Jesus. What I am saying is simply that it strikes me as bad policy for us to make this decision.

Personally I would hope the President would not go in for a picture gallery on the Moon, at least not right away. I don't think it added much to the prestige of the Soviets to send Lenin off into space—it seemed somewhat parochial. It was hardly an encouraging or attractive augury of what to expect if people from the Earth are now to engage in exterior decorating in that spirit and with that kind of taste.

Maybe planting anything on the Moon risks contaminating it and should be sacrificed—maybe whatever it is we are to take along, we should waive and not plant after all. Are we really prepared to make such decisions here?

But whatever is ultimately decided, I want to make it very clear that it is not somehow more patriotic to say that only the American flag should be planted on the Moon. I think, to the contrary, that it will help America more if we were to use our strength in a way that would show a generous awareness of the other peoples' sensibilities. Planting a U.N. flag after, or next to, ours, if any flags are to be planted, might after all be the best way to capture this moment for ourselves, for the human race, for history, for the future. I rather think so, but I am willing to accept the President's decision.

In any case, this is too solemn a moment in the eternity of human experience to yield to ordinary temptations of political flag waving or flag banning. Think of how many contributions from how many peoples through how many centuries will have gone into that

breathless landing. And what a hopeful opening to more peaceful, more cooperative times it could be.

But if in the end the President decided to send only the American flag onto the Moon, how much better off we would all be if that decision could have been made without a prior display of the narrowest form of chauvinism. We do no credit to America this way. We do her no service.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment raises very serious questions as to whether or not we are serious about international cooperation in space. President John F. Kennedy in September 1963 spoke about a joint expedition to the Moon. In his speech to the United Nations on September 20, 1963, he suggested "sending someday in this decade to the Moon, not the representatives of a single nation, but the representatives of all of our countries."

Instead of such cooperation, man's efforts to reach the Moon have been a matter of national competition, and the United States presumably will be first. When it happens, no one will ever doubt that the United States was first to land a man on the Moon. History will not be rewritten, and the accomplishment will always stand as a matter of national pride and prestige.

In the successful achievement of the lunar landing mission, I would think the United States might want magnanimously to share man's conquest of space—not flaunt it. It is a very chauvinistic attitude to insist that the U.S. flag "and no other flag shall be implanted on the surface of the Moon." It may well be that the President would decide that it would be appropriate to place on the Moon the flag of the United Nations. The amendment would deny the President the authority to have that kind of symbolic gesture made.

By resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the members of the United Nations have forsworn any claim to sovereignty in outer space or on celestial bodies and declared that the United Nations Charter will apply.

I join my colleagues in expressing very grave reservations concerning the hasty acceptance of this amendment on the floor. It seems to me that we ought to reconsider the matter now. I would hope the amendment would not be pressed.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The question comes up when other nations are acting similarly, why should we not be free to do what we want in our feeling of pride for our own country? I understand that the Russians recently sent the coat of arms as well as a picture of Lenin to the surface of Venus.

I quote from a Moscow Tass International news release dated May 16, 1969:

> Having covered some 350 million kilometers in 130 days of flight the automatic station delivered to Venus with a pennant with a bas-relief of Lenin and the U.S.S.R. coat of arms.

I do not think we should in any way object to that, because they have made such a very successful flight to Venus. I rather compliment them. But in the same vein, because this is peaceful competition, why should we not stand up for our fellows and our country by calling for the implanting of our flag on the surface of the moon? I support that.

Mr. RYAN. If I may respond to the gentleman, of course, our flag will be on the Moon. The question is whether any other flag will be allowed, including the U.N. flag. The lunar landing itself will make clear that we are the pioneer in space. However, the amendment would deny to the President and our astronauts authority to permit any other flag, even as a symbol of good will and international cooperation.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment restricting Presidential discretion with regard to the future implantation of flags on the moon and other planets. I realize the Congress is determined to "assert" itself in matters of foreign policy, but I think this particular form of assertion not only rather diminutive but unwarranted and unwise. The amendment's modest disavowal of intent to claim extraterrestrial sovereignty fails to relieve it of a tinge of chauvinism contrary to the spirit of the space treaty and related assurances.

Only last January, Astronaut Frank Borman, addressing a joint session of Congress in this Hall, described himself and his colleagues as envoys of mankind, who "stood on the shoulders of giants." Many of the giant spirits and intellects of the past which have propelled curious man and fortunate America to this pinnacle of achievement came, and still come, from other nations. Jefferson wanted us to maintain "a decent respect for the opinions of mankind." What "respect" does this graceless edict demonstrate for the opinions of nations which produced Galileo, Copernicus, Newton, Einstein, Tsiolkovskiy, and other giants in thought and deed?

Will the moon's first visitors come from an ingrate society? On the other hand what star or stripe is tarnished on Old Glory by a simple gesture honoring the whole history of man, his collective dream, and his epic persistence without which our own continent might yet be undiscovered?

It is argued that the Soviet Union has placed on Venus a pennant bearing the likeness of Lenin and the U.S.S.R. coat of arms, and, presumably, no other standard. I do not recall that this occasioned the general approbation of mankind. Nor did I realize we were accepting lessons from that particular source in how to win the hearts and minds of men. On the contrary, I thought recognition of the dignity, sovereignty, and inherent worth of all nations and peoples were one of the distinguishing features of the Nation and system our great flag represents.

It is further argued that the American taxpayer deserves the honor. The American taxpayer pays for something more tangible than prideful symbolism. He invests, he hopes, in a secure, just, and peaceful world and the best use of his Government's judgment to that end. To deprive him of that best judgment does him no honor.

Colonel Borman won heartfelt good will for America on his trip abroad following his return from lunar orbit. Will future visits of this kind be enhanced or impaired by this decree?

> If Apollo 8 was a triumph at all—

Said Borman—

> it was not an American triumph of all mankind—and we acknowledge it as being such.

He did describe the mission as "an American accomplishment in a narrow sense." This amendment would fit the latter description.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROUDEBUSH).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KOCH

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows.

> Amendment offered by Mr. KOCH: On page 8, strike out section 7 beginning on page 8, line 21, and ending on page 9, line 16, and redesignate the succeeding section accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the new section 7 of H.R. 11271, which deals with unrest and disorder on the campuses of American colleges and universities. It is my belief that adequate criminal laws already exist to deal with unlawful activities on college campuses and that such laws should be enforced against students to the same extent as other citizens. I further believe that discipline on campus is the special responsibility of college administrators and I feel certain that they have sufficient authority to deal with these problems. Students must be held responsible for their conduct—but the Federal Government has no business using its funds to play schoolmaster.

In any case, if this Congress wishes to consider Federal regulations, then legislation should be introduced and submitted for the consideration of appropriate committees of Congress and public hearings should be held in the traditional manner. It seems to me quite irresponsible for a committee such as ours to attempt to deal with a subject such as this, in a piecemeal fashion, without benefit of hearings, and then to propose to the House of Representatives a statutory provision which is beyond the committee's competence and authority.

I think it is especially noteworthy that those who have opposed Federal aid to education on the basis of their fear that such financial assistance would ultimately lead to control of education by the Federal Government seem to be the very ones who would assert Federal control by denying Federal funds in cases of campus unrest.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. It is perfectly obvious to me that the committee which has reported this bill has expended

a great number of hours with reference to the subject of space technology. It is equally important to me, though, and equally obvious to me that the committee has not expended any time whatsoever with reference to the subject of campus unrest.

I happen to sit on two committees of this Congress, both of which have been considering this tremendous problem confronting this Nation. I sit on the Education and Labor Committee of this House. I sit on the House Internal Security Committee. The Committee on Education and Labor, and particularly the one dealing with higher education, has been considering this momentous problem for some 3 months.

They are unable at this time to report to this body any particular kind of legislation due to the tremendous problems that campus unrest presents for this country. Just this past week our House Internal Security Committee conducted hearings regarding the SDS activities on college campuses.

The overwhelming evidence is that the majority of students in this country are not involved in violence. It does seem to me we ought to take into account the testimony we have heard from some of the outstanding educators in this country. They have said to us that we already have sufficient laws on the books to deal with campus unrest.

Just a few weeks ago the Attorney General of the United States appeared before our committee and said to us at that time that he has adequate laws to deal with the problems of unrest in this country. He has said in effect also that additional laws at this time regarding campus unrest merely play into the hands of the militants.

It would seem to me we ought to wait until those who have this particular jurisdiction given to them bring to this body some recommendation, before we attempt by piecemeal to enact legislation in this area.

Therefore I urge this Congress at this time to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH). In support of my remarks I insert the statement of Attorney General John N. Mitchell before the Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor concerning campus disorders on May 20, 1969:

CAMPUS DISORDERS

(Statement of Attorney General John N. Mitchell)

INTRODUCTION

Madam Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

I appreciate the opportunity to appear before this Subcommittee to state my views on a matter of grave concern to all of us—violence on the campus.

At the outset, let me state that I shall confine my remarks to those aspects of the problem which fall within the ambit of my responsibilities and authority as Attorney General. I leave to others, including Secretary Finch, who has already appeared before this Subcommittee, those facets of the problem which relate to education itself and Federal financial assistance to the colleges and universities and to the students who attend them.

Also at the outset, I want to make clear that the problem to which we are addressing ourselves is one which involves a small fraction of our school population and an equally small fraction of our schools, but is, nevertheless, a most serious problem requiring attention at the highest levels of school administration, state and local government, and Federal government.

Most of our students at our colleges and universities across the country are of serious purpose in their quest for truth and knowledge. This great majority recognizes the bounds of permissible dissent and that violence and disruption are not the appropriate means to effect necessary or desirable reforms.

On the other hand, we have those relatively few violence-prone militants who seek only to destroy or who are misguided into believing that terror can lead to improvement.

Permit me to give you some of the factual background of campus disorders, which has come to the attention of the Justice Department, to illustrate what I consider to be the proper role of the Department, and to call to your attention existing federal criminal laws which are available to deal with various aspects of this grave problem.

THE PROBLEM

As I indicated in my recent Law Day speech, we have already had disturbances on more than 250 college campuses. These incidents have resulted in more than 3000 arrests and in property damage exceeding $2 million. The incidence of disorders has continued to increase in frequency and in the extent of violence. For example, in California alone:

At San Francisco State College a bomb permanently blinded one student, and a second bomb was discovered before it exploded.

At Pomona College in Claremont, a secretary was blinded in one eye and lost two fingers when a bomb exploded as she was removing it from a college mailbox.

At the University of California in Santa Barbara, a custodian at the Faculty Club died from burns when he picked up a package containing a bomb.

At Berkeley, in the last eight months, there have been four instances of arson and two bombings, and $1.1 million in property damage.

In short, the wave of student disorders has brought personal injury, death, and millions of dollars of property damage. And it has disrupted the education of many earnest students. Further, the evidence indicates that this upswing in disorders is attributable, in some part at least, to planned and concerted action by certain small groups. One of these is the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). I would like to highlight for the Subcommittee some of the activities of this militant student group.

THE MILITANT STUDENT MOVEMENT—ORGANIZATION, OPERATION, AND GOALS

The militant student movement currently instigating and leading many campus disorders across the country involves several groups, consisting largely of students, many of them post-graduate students varying in age from 21 to 30 years, and a number of chronic demonstrators who join their ranks although they are no longer in college.

By and large these groups have no constructive objective; their sole aim is to disrupt. Their leaders brag about being revolutionaries and anarchists. They state their purpose to be to close the schools. They openly and brazenly profess a desire to destroy the establishment.

Most prominent in major campus disorders today is the Students for a Democratic Society, although many disorders have occurred in which its members have not been present and a good many disorders have been instigated by other groups such as the Black Student Union. Often, however, in such cases, members of the SDS soon join in and eventually assume a leading role in the demonstration, press statements, and negotiations.

The influence of the SDS cannot always be measured by the small number of its members that engage in any particular campus violence. On occasion SDS with less than 50 members has been able to capitalize on the issues and climate on the campus and obtain large numbers of allies who compound its disruptive influence.

The student allies of SDS are frequently law abiding students who many times have honest and indeed justifiable criticism abount university administration and policies.

I recognize that the students of today are an "involved generation" which wish to tell us—as strongly as possible—that they are dissatisfied with many aspects of American life. I firmly believe that students on university campuses should enjoy the fullest and most vigorous debate guaranteed by the First Amendment. Indeed, it may even be advisable for some universities to permit even more dissent than the minimum guaranteed by the Constitution.

But I must draw the line at those actions which seriously disrupt a university and which involve a substantial denial of rights for those students who wish to pursue scholarship and civility.

The Students for a Democratic Society, despite a loose organizational structure, appears, through its local chapters, to carry out a national SDS policy keyed to widespread unrest among large segments of the otherwise peaceful student community. This organizational and operational relationship of the SDS leadership and some 250 local constituent chapters can best be illustrated by looking at the proposals and resolutions of the national leaders and the volume and frequency of the incidents following these national meetings.

For example, one of the resolutions approved at the SDS National Council meeting at Boulder, Colorado, in October 1968, entitled "Boulder and Boulder", called for the organization of a national strike of high school and college students on November 4 and 5, 1968, and the mobilization of large militant SDS regional demonstrations in major cities to protest the elections. Typical of the planned responses to this resolution were the strikes at the University of Michigan of November 4, at the University of Denver on November 5, and the demonstration at the Lincoln Memorial here in Washington on November 5.

One of the highlights of the SDS National Council meeting at the University of Michigan in December 1968 was a panel discussion on the need for a nationwide coordinated attack on military activities on campuses—ROTC units and military research grants. Significant is the fact that in the four months prior to that meeting our records reflect only six violent actions directed at ROTC installations on campuses. For the four and a half months since, we record 22 such incidents.

The most recent SDS National Council meeting was held at Austin, Texas, in late March of this year. Since that meeting the tempo of campus disorders has substantially increased. Examples are:

(1) Harvard, April 9: Students, led by the SDS, forcibly ejected officials from an administration building.

(2) American University, April 23: A group of members of the SDS occupied the administration building.

(3) George Washington University, April 24: Members of the SDS occupied the Institute for Sino-Soviet studies.

(4) University of Washington, April 24: The SDS participated in a demonstration which succeeded in halting the operation of the Student Placement Center.

(5) Columbia University, April 30: Members of the SDS took over two university buildings.

(6) Stanford University, May 1: SDS members occupied an administration building.

(7) Northeastern University, May 13: Some 40 students led by the SDS took over a meeting room and lounge.

As distressing as the SDS campus activities are, and although not the subject of specific inquiry by this Subcommittee, I do want to note in passing the projected expansion of violent SDS activities into the labor field, our high schools, and even our armed forces.

While the foregoing examples of the involvement of SDS in campus disorders are ominous, it would be an oversimplification to blame all of the trouble on campuses today on the SDS. While the SDS often furnishes the aggressive leadership to exploit campus problems, there are many frictions and difficulties which would probably cause unrest even without the SDS. It is important for school authorities to recognize these frictions and difficulties and to maintain communication with the students concerning them. It is equally important, however, for school authorities and student bodies to recognize the basic intransigence of the militants and to understand the goals which these militants are pursuing. School authorities must take prompt and effective action to resist disruption by the militants.

ROLE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

We must not lose sight of the fact that dealing with student unrest is, in the first instance, the responsibility of our college and university officials. When police authority is needed to restore law and order, the courts or the local police should be utilized immediately. The Federal Government does, however, have an important role and interest in the matter.

The fact that the student disorders are nationwide, that they disrupt Federally funded programs and that Federal criminal statutes may be violated gives the Federal government a substantial interest in the problem. A facet of this interest falls within the area of my responsibilities as Attorney General.

As I see it, the role of the Department of Justice is threefold—preventive, investigative and prosecutive.

PREVENTION AND CONTROL ACTIVITIES

As I have indicated, the first responsibility with respect to campus disorders rests with campus officials. When law enforcement authorities are required, these authorities should be state and local. On occasion, however, the Department of Justice Community Relations Service has been requested to send personnel to attempt to calm the storm. As you know, the Community Relations Service consists of persons skilled in establishing communication between conflicting factions. They are trained mediators, experienced in the art of dealing with emotionally charged situations which have racial overtones. Most recently, the Community Relations Service was called upon in connection with Berkeley disorders last week.

Another element of the Department of Justice which is active with respect to campus disorders is the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. As you know, this Administration was established by the enactment of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. Insofar as campus disorders are concerned, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration has been incorporating in seminars for police chiefs programs on campus disorders, their causes and control. The Administration is in the process now of planning a special conference on campus disorders to be held later this year. We expect that among approximately 300 conference participants, we will have college and university presidents and administrators, faculty members, state and local police and campus police.

INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES

Under its jurisdiction to investigate suspected violations of the Federal law, the Federal Bureau of Investigation is obtaining, and we are evaluating, information about campus disorders and those who cause them. Some of the background information stated earlier is the result of these efforts. In addition, we are making this information available to state and local law enforcement officials in jurisdictions where campus disorders may occur.

Through our investigative activities we hope to develop a full picture of the problem. We are looking for solid evidence to answer such vital questions as:

How serious is the problem and how best can responsible students, college authorities and government leaders deal with it?

Have those who lead or engage in student disorders violated Federal law and can they be successfully prosecuted?

Are existing Federal (and state) laws adequate to deal with the problem?

While our investigative efforts are intense, we must not be precipitous in our conclusions or actions. You may be assured, however, that these questions will be answered as quickly as our ability and resources permit. It would be inappropriate for me, of course, to discuss the specifics of our investigative activities.

FEDERAL CRIMINAL LAWS—PROSECUTIVE POWERS

The prosecutive powers of the Attorney General are limited—quite properly—by the scope of Federal criminal law. Since most illegal activity on college campuses is in violation of state and local laws—such as trespass, illegal entry, assault and malicious destruction of property—I believe that current Federal laws are adequate. I therefore do not recommend to Congress that additional legislation be enacted at this time. However, should our investigations or congressional hearings reveal a need for some additional authority to deal with this problem, I will at that time recommend appropriate legislation.

I would like to briefly outline for the Subcommittee the scope of existing Federal criminal laws that are available, should our investigations warrant their use.

First, Section 2121 of Title 18 of the United States Code prohibits travel in interstate commerce, or the use of any facility of interstate commerce, by any person with the intent to incite, organize or promote a riot or to commit any act of violence in furtherance of a riot, or to aid or abet any person in furthering a riot. Violators are subject to a maximum fine of $10,000 and 5 years imprisonment.

Second, Section 231 of Title 18 prohibits the teaching or demonstrating of the use of firearms or explosives or incendiary devices or techniques with the intent that the same will be used in a civil disorder which may obstruct commerce or the conduct of any Federally protected function. It prohibits the transportation, or manufacture for transportation, of any such devices with the intent that they be used in furtherance of a civil disorder. The section also proscribes attempts to obstruct firemen or law enforcement officers in the performance of their duties during a civil disorder. A fine of $10,000 and imprisonment for 5 years may be imposed upon a violator.

Third, Section 245 of Title 18 is designed to protect the civil rights of persons participating in or receiving benefits from various Federally protected activities. Such activities include receiving Federal financial assistance, as is the case of most institutions of higher learning and many students. Interference by force or threat of force with these rights, carries a range of penalties extending to life imprisonment if death results. This law, of course, would only be utilized in an unusual case where local law enforcement could not act.

In addition to the statutes to which I have referred, there are some other Federal laws, one or more of which might well come into play during the course of campus disorders, depending upon the facts in each particular case.

CONCLUSION

In summary, I share the Subcommittee's concern about the violence now taking place on our college campuses. In the first instance responsibility rests with the college and university administrators. They must recognize the difference between dissent and disorder. When law enforcement assistance is necessary to quell disorder, it should come primarily from the states and communities involved. Federal law enforcement assistance when appropriate, is the responsibility of the Department of Justice. In carrying out our role, we are working toward prevention and control, we are conducting investigations, and we will prosecute, when prosecution is indicated, those who seek to destroy our colleges and universities.

Let me close with a repetition of one optimistic observation I touched upon earlier—the vast bulk of our college youth know why they are in school and will not permit the minority to deprive them of their educational opportunities.

I would be pleased to answer any questions you may have.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment which would strike this section of the bill. Actually we have heard a great deal of discussion about piecemeal action on bills authorizing funds for various branches of the Government. I have before me—and I have not had a chance to do all the research on it—Public Law 90-550, authorizing appropriations for the independent offices, last year, which had this amendment in it. Also Public Law 90-575, the Higher Education Act, had this amendment in it. Public Law 90-557, appropriations for HEW—from the gentleman's own committee—had this in it. Public Law 90-580, appropriations for DOD, had it. They all contained similar provisions, similar to this section of the NASA authorization.

This provision was adopted in the commitee. I must say I was the author of the amendment. I think it was unanimously adopted. It merely provides the NASA organization—which expends approximately $9 million a year on student grants in our universities—could in case a graduate student gained his funds from NASA was involved in a riot and was convicted of the crime, cancel his money. It would cancel the money he received from the Federal Government for higher education.

I do not see anything so terrible about a provision of this kind. I hope this House will reject the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH) and allow this section to stay in the bill.

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have only the greatest respect for the author of section 7, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROUDEBUSH), who has just spoken.

However, Mr. Chairman, I do strongly support the pending amendment which would strike section 7 for a number or reasons. The first reason is because it has

been enacted in I think a rather hurried manner without due consideration given to the probable consequences. The other laws referred to by the gentleman—and there are other laws on the books that relate to the same subject—in my opinion provide additional reason for the cause today of trying to strike out section 7 at this time. This may be repetitive.

Even more important, I had a chance to take a trip to some college campuses with some of my colleagues. One of our purposes was to see if we could determine what are the causes of the student discontent and student unrest. I had the privilege of going to Harvard and MIT, as well as to Northeastern University. We met with the so-called radicals, including members of the SDS and the Afro-Americans and the student government leaders.

We met with the faculty, including two Nobel Prize winners, one of whom was George Wald, certainly one of the most respected professors on the Harvard campus. We met with President Pusey of Harvard. We met with President Mary Bunting of Radcliffe, who had had obscenities shouted at her. This was after the takeover at Harvard.

We went to listen. This is what we did. The very fact that all of the students, including the members of the SDS and the Afros, were willing to meet with us for a minimum sitting of 2 hours, at a time right before final examinations, and the very fact that we were the ones who had to go to a next appointment or they would have stayed all day, leads me to believe that we who are part of the so-called establishment or system, or whatever they call us, have not apparently been willing to listen, or even more important, to respond, to inquire, to recognize or to even consider the problems of the students. The college administrators have indeed been guilty of shirking their responsibility, as well as some of the faculty.

I believe it is important to note that all of the people with whom we met—the administrators including President Pusey and President Mary Bunting, who had been harassed, to the faculty members—all of them, moderates, liberals, and conservatives, and all of the students indicated that if we enact repressive legislation in this session of Congress then it will have the effect of driving the moderates, the well-intentioned, the people willing to work within the system, right over to the radical side.

That is why I strongly support the amendment to strike section 7.

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

Mr. RAILSBACK. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FREY. Does the gentleman think legislation such as this is just another step in getting the Federal Government further involved in the universities and in our educational system—which, from a personal viewpoint, is something I should like to see reversed.

Mr. RAILSBACK. I think it is another case of the Federal Government interceding where it has no business.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think the issue we are discussing in this rather casual fashion is one which should be discussed thoroughly and most thoughtfully by this body at the proper time.

The problem of student unrest, and the broader question of violations of first amendment rights anywhere in this country, must be a primary concern of all Americans. We ought to do better by so primary a concern than to tackle it as a footnote to a totally different problem.

In the first place, I cannot believe anyone seriously thinks that this kind of footnote will minimize or discourage student disruption. I have heard no argument to this effect.

In fact, if we are to note the testimony of educators—faculty, administrators, and college presidents alike—as well as of students themselves—in short, the testimony of almost everybody who is most concerned, the effect of this kind of legislation is likely to be the opposite of its alleged intent. If we are to believe what those most deeply involved in the effort to curb campus disorders have told us, this proposal is of no value in that effort. In fact, most of them think it will make their task more difficult.

One must suspect other fish are being fried, or perhaps that students are being fried to haul in other and more political fish. If we are really interested in trying to minimize student discontent, we might talk about how to do that instead of going off on political fishing expeditions.

Furthermore, I wonder if we really want to tell academic institutions that in order to continue working on space research, they have to take orders from the Federal Government about how to handle their internal affairs.

Many of us have supported Federal aid to education on the premise that such aid would not lead to Federal control. But some who have long proclaimed their hostility to big Government, to Federal control, seem eager to throw away their basic principles the moment they see a chance to install a kind of control that is to their liking. I wish they would think again. I think they would find their position on this matter inconsistent and dangerous.

It seems to me the last thing we should start doing now is to try to dictate to institutions how they should run themselves, using Federal economic reprisals to punish disobedience. Institutions of higher learning lose accreditation for succumbing to political influence or interference. Do we really want to institutionalize procedures that heretofore led to disaccreditation?

It is easy to deliver polemics here and easy to vote for legislation which will gain swift cheers from concerned people who have not thought out the consequences of the legislation. But if the price of such behavior is to increase the student discontent we are denouncing, and to further impede the work of those in the educational community who have been in the front lines of this battle, we act irresponsibly when we yield to these temptations.

I must add that I am startled to see so many rising against the recommendations of the administration on so many of these issues.

We override the President's view of how much money this bill should authorize. We dictate what he should do about flags on the moon. Now we are to ignore the views of the administration on this question too. We have no indication that the President, or the Cabinet officers most concerned with campus matters, wish further legislation at this time. We have, in fact, clear indications to the contrary.

Are we the only people on the floor prepared to pay any attention to the President's position on these matters? What is becoming of the Republican Party? Do they know something about the President's leadership that we do not? How self-indulgent must we be to vote one way when the evidence so heavily suggests that to do so is to make matters worse?

I would hope that instead of following this course, we will accept the Koch amendment today and then proceed in due course, and in a proper fashion, to consider student unrest as the major problem it is and to see what, if anything, could be done by Congress that would assist universities in their efforts to cope with their problems.

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

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I wonder if the gentleman would be good enough to advise us about something. If this particular language is stricken from this bill, would the gentleman be in a position to support a move which is now developing in the Committee on Education and Labor—and incidentally we had our first hearing on it this morning—to bring out a bill that would attempt to deal with this whole problem of student unrest? Would the gentleman be inclined to support an omnibus bill in this direction, or would you want to knock this out first?

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. No. As a matter of legislative procedure, I would much rather consider legislation from the proper committee, study the hearings, weigh the merits, debate the proposal, and then vote on it. I cannot support proposals I have not seen, but I assure the gentleman I would study his and other proposals carefully and with an open mind. Legislation by rider seems to me an especially limiting way to deal with campus unrest.

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

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. MILLER of California. I would like to make a distinction between what the gentleman is talking about, which is generic legislation, and the legislation in this bill. The legislation is in this bill because NASA is making an effort to replace into the bank of science the people it pulls out. There was great concern sometime ago that we were taking people out of the science field. We spend $10 million a year substantially for students to replace these people. We are not concerned with the function and are not

trying to solve the whole problem of student unrest nor are we trying to encroach on the work of the Committee on Education and Labor which Mr. PUCINSKI just referred to. This is merely to protect what we have already.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I think the House ought to be informed that our committee began marking up a bill this morning which attempts to deal with the overall problem of student unrest and addresses itself to the question of where the Federal responsibilities begin and where it ends.

This bill is carefully constructed to make sure that the Federal Government does not inject itself into the management or operation of institutions of higher learning in this country. The bill instead requires that the local board of the university, after consulting with the faculty, administrators, and students, would prepare and present to the Office of Education in its application for Federal funds its workable plan for dealing with student unrest at the particular university.

I believe unless the House does act on some such broad provision, we will continue to see provisions such as section 7 cropping up in every single bill that comes before this Congress.

I have the highest respect for the chairman of the Space Committee, and he seems to indicate that in the absence of any other legislation, he needs this legislation very urgently in this bill. I would not want to challenge his good judgment. I believe that the House will have to make a decision here very shortly as to whether or not we are going to deal with this problem piecemeal as we did in section 504 or address ourselves to the basic problem and run with the ball and establish some sensible criteria and guidelines in this country for all universities.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MILLER of California. I want to say that I would be very happy to support the principles you have set forth in the bill which you propose bringing out. In the meantime, however, there is no such legislation, and in order to protect the Government's investment we have seen fit to recommend legislation of this kind pending this other type of legislation.

I do think that perhaps your committee is a bit overdue in bringing out the legislation which you now discuss.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the distinguished chairman.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I am curious about what would happen under this proposed provision if, in fact, an instiution declined to carry out these requirements. Would it then be barred from participating further in research? If that is the case, whose nose are we chopping away at to spite whose face? And in any event, what is the rush? Is this matter not being studied by the Committee on Education and Labor? Is it not possible that we may be doing something that would be damaging not only to NASA in principle, but which would in fact actually do harm to the research itself?

Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Illinois will yield further, I think there has been any number of different times in the past where this has been included in legislation.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Illinois will yield further, my questions remain, What would be the impact of this section of the legislation? How would it be enforced?

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, one of the most disturbing crises of American society today is the crisis on our college campuses. The blatant disrespect by student radicals and sympathizers for law and order and the rights of other students threatens not only academic freedom but also our very system of higher education. The language of the university is reason, but what is the defense against the physical violence of individuals who do not speak this language. It is the rule of law, quickly and firmly executed.

The young people of our times are more committed, more concerned, and better informed than any previous generation. Unfortunately, some of them, perceiving what they consider to be injustices or faults in our society have taken it upon themselves to inflict their vision on the majority. Often that limited vision does not take the form of any constructive proposal of how the university could be restructured to meet better the needs of society. Rather it is a nihilist approach which has no goal but to destroy.

It is sad that those student dissenters who do have legitimate complaints and who are willing to participate in reasonable discussion allow themselves to be taken in by lawless radicals. It is sad that they aline themselves with the actions of these radicals and in the end become indistinguishable from them. But the college men and women of today are not children. They do not want to be treated that way and I, for one, do not think they should be. Whatever the intent of their actions they are responsible for them. I do not think we restore order to the college campus by attempting to dissect or excuse the motives of the dissenters.

I believe that we, the elected Representatives of the people, have a strict responsibility to oversee and account for the expenditure of public funds. There is no justification for the expenditure of tax moneys which enable student rebels, with the aim of closing down institutions of higher learning or perpetrating physical violence, to remain on our college campuses.

During the last session of Congress we took several steps to withhold Federal student aid from student law breakers. The fiscal year 1969 Appropriations Act for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, prohibits the use of such funds for grants or loans to any individual convicted by any court of any crime involving the use of force or the seizure of property of an institution of higher education. The Higher Education Amendments of 1968 provide that institutions of higher education, after a hearing, may deny for a 2-year period Federal student assistance under the National Defense Education Act and the Higher Education Act to individuals who are convicted of any crime involving the use of force, disruption or seizure of college property, or who willfully refuse to obey a lawful regulation or order of the institution of higher learning.

The college and university presidents and administrators have taken no action to implement the provisions of the Higher Education Amendments. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has taken no action to implement the provisions of the fiscal year 1969 Appropriations Act. Perhaps this is so because the law expires this June 30. H.R. 11271 provides us with another opportunity to express our strong intention that Federal funds will not be available to students who place themselves outside of the law. Last year's NASA Appropriation Act prohibited grants to institutions from whose campuses Armed Forces recruiters are barred. H.R. 11271 takes a stronger approach. It provides that institutions of higher learning may deny the payment of NASA funds to individuals who by willfully refusing to obey a lawful regulation of the institution contribute to the disruption of the institution or who have been convicted in any court of "inciting, promoting, or carrying on a riot, or convicted of any group activity resulting in material damage to property, or injury to persons, found to be in violation of Federal, State, or local laws designed to protect persons or property in the community concerned."

I am extremely pleased that New York has enacted a law which requires all colleges and universities in the State to adopt rules and regulations for "the maintenance of public order" which must be filed with the State within a 90-day period or be ineligible to receive any State aid until filed. I believe that it is this kind of resolution on the part of the colleges, the States and Congress which demonstrates our unwillingness to be intimidated by threats or to submit to the lawless demands of radicals. I give H.R. 11271 my wholehearted support and strongly solicit the support of my colleagues in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RYAN. Is it in order to ask for a division on the last amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Was the gentleman on his feet asking for recognition?

Mr. RYAN. The gentleman was on his feet asking for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RYAN) there were ayes—15, noes 83.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RAILSBACK

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAILSBACK: On page 8, line 24 through line 3 on page 9, strike out all of paragraph (a) and redesignate paragraph (b) as paragraph (a).

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Chairman, section 7 is really divided into two categories. Category (a) that I am trying to knock out would provide for the administration of the institution of higher education to make a determination whether an individual has wilfully refused to obey a lawful regulation or order of the college. It differs in that respect from subparagraph (b) which requires that an individual student actually be convicted in a Federal, State, or local court of competent jurisdiction.

Mr. Chairman, it is my belief that some of the grievances, in fact, many of the grievances expressed by the students are legitimate grievances and, unfortunately, some of their main grievances deal with the administration which we are giving the right to, in subparagraph (a), to make the determination as to whether Federal funds can be cut off from a particular student.

In other words, it seems to me that the Federal Government is getting involved in a particular dispute where both sides may have legitimate complaints, but I can tell the Members from my experience in the trips that I have taken to the college campuses that there is not any question but there has been an archaic relationship between the administration and the students. For that reason, I believe that this particular part of section 7 is even more repressive in character than is section (b), which at least requires a court determination instead of leaving it to the sole discretion of the college administration.

So I hope, Mr. Chairman, that at least we can knock out this one section which in my opinion would be extremely repressive, and for all of the other reasons that were given in the arguments that occurred earlier in respect to the amendments that were offered earlier.

I sincerely believe that the students want a voice, and I believe that they are entitled to have some kind of a voice. I believe the administrators have not listened to them. So I hope that we can adopt this particular amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RAILSBACK).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RYAN

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RYAN: On page 2, line 16, strike out "$50,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$36,500,000".

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would reduce the NASA authorization bill by $13.5 million. It relates to the fact that the Committee on Science and Astronautics has reported out an authorization for the NERVA nuclear rocket program of $50 million, whereas the Johnson administration and the Nixon administration requested $36.5 million for fiscal year 1970. Therefore, my amendment would set the figure at that requested in the budget submission.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to the views ably stated by our colleague from New York (Mr. WYDLER) on page 175 of the report, in which he pointed out that it is unnecessary to exceed the budget request for the nuclear rockets program. He said:

The proposed authorization of $50 million, $13.5 million in excess of the NASA request, appears to be an unnecessary addition of funds at this time. Therefore, it is my view that no more than $36.5 million should be authorized for nuclear rockets program for fiscal year 1970.

I believe that this increase should be evaluated in the light of the intent of the NERVA program.

On past occasions I have taken the floor of the House to discuss in detail the policy that is embraced in proceeding with the hardware development of a nuclear rocket engine, pointing out that NASA is determined to proceed with the full development of the NERVA nuclear rocket engine without having a specific mission approved for it.

It is perfectly clear from testimony year in and year out before the House Committee on Science and Astronautics that the NERVA program is related to the promotion of glamorous and clostly manned space flight, specifically a manned mission to Mars. Its purpose is interplanetary travel.

The NERVA program, which is expected to ultimately cost some $2 billion, is the forerunner of a manned Mars mission which I estimated last year would cost perhaps $200 billion into the 1980's.

Before authorizing more money for this program than even NASA requested, at least we should be aware of what NASA intends for the future. Although no specific decision may have been made, once the investment has been made, NASA will argue, "There is not much money invested in this program that the investment will be completely wasted if we do not continue."

The question of national priorities is at last becoming a subject of debate. Not only is it important to establish a rational allocation of our resources between our domestic social needs and the space and military budgets, but it is imperative to set priorities within the space program, to define objectives, and find a balance between manned and unmanned missions.

Once NERVA hardware is developed, at the very least Congress will be asked to support vastly expensive missions for the purpose of justifying its $2 billion development cost.

Unmanned planetary exploration missions are already underway with conventional hardware and propulsion systems. There is no reason to assume that it will be of interest repeatedly to send extremely heavy manned payloads into orbit or to the lunar surface until further data confirms that man contributes significantly more to space missions than simply additional cost factors and severe weight and safety problems. Earth-orbital and lunar missions, manned and unmanned, may be conducted with hardware that is currently on hand. Only the adoption of a manned planetary goal under current limitations in the state of the art would require a significant advance in propulsion capability. Such a goal has not yet been adopted. At a probable cost of $200 billion for a manned Mars mission should Congress permit such a goal to be quietly built into the system?

Despite repeated requests, NASA has not yet presented a detailed, technical comparison between weights and costs of nuclear and chemical propulsion upper stages for the review of my technical advisers.

NASA's argument in favor of developing a space nuclear propulsion capability rests on the determination to send increasingly heavier payloads into deep space. There is good reason to assume that in the future it may be possible to decrease rather than continually increase the weight of payloads—manned as well as unmanned. Further growth in the skills of microminiaturization would also have obvious and important application on our own planet. NASA should be encouraged to place more emphasis on developing these skills instead of continuing to project even heavier payloads.

An expensive long leadtime flight hardware development such as the NERVA nuclear rocket engine for which there is no mission requirement should not be pursued until such time as the Congress approves a national goal which would lead to such a requirement. Although the options provided by such a development may be desirable, it should be remembered that other options concerning allocation of resources are closed when such a costly and extensive development is undertaken.

Therefore, Congress at the least should keep the authorization at the level requested in the budget submission—not increase it.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman from New York I would say that his amendment would eliminate one of the most important parts of the space program. As I have said earlier today, the nuclear rocket will provide an across-the-board advance in space propulsion in the late 1970's and 1980's. Launch vehicle systems using a nuclear upper stage in combination with a variety of lower stages could perform many missions in considerably shorter times or carry much larger payloads than our present launch vehicles. For example, proceeding at a somewhat more rapid pace would provide NASA with an early cost effective means of using NERVA for round trip low earth orbit-to-synchro-

nous-orbit or low earth orbit-to-lunar-orbit of large space station modules being planned for the 1970's.

In testimony before the committee, it was evident that this potential high performance has been shown to be feasible. Over the past several years all significant milestones have been achieved very successfully in the extensive technology program—as I will show later. It was also evident from the testimony that the fiscal year 1970 budget request provided for a minimum program and that modest additional funding would allow for more efficient progress and enhance the possibility of earlier flight experience and use.

The added funds would be used for the following:

To increase the fabrication and procurement of development components—particularly in long leadtime items—and provide greater assurance of meeting the present schedule of delivering a flight-ready engine in late 1976.

To advance the procurement of a new exhaust duct and associated equipment required for the existing engine test stand in Nevada.

To provide some increases in contractor technical staffing.

To accelerate stage system design concepts and analysis studies leading toward the initiation of a stage development at a later date.

Within the nuclear rockets program it is recommended that the increase of $13.5 million be allocated approximately as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

Item	NASA request	Recommended changes	Recommended authorization
NERVA	27.5	+11.5	39.0
Nuclear rocket development station	1.0	+.1	1.5
Supporting research and technology	8.0	+1.5	9.5
Total	36.5	+13.5	50.0

The gentleman from New York may well have overlooked this important point: In any logically progressing space program, there will be a continuing growth in payload and energy requirements and in sophistication of operations. The advanced propulsion represented by the NERVA engine is an important element in such a program. History has shown us that propulsion has always been a pacing item in man's progress. Because of the leadtimes involved in the development of a new type of propulsion, it is necessary to proceed with such work well ahead of specific mission definitions.

The nuclear rocket is the next major advance in propulsion, but it will not be available until the late 1970's. By that time specific plans will have been established regarding the next generation of missions. We cannot now say with certainty what they will be, but we can indicate some of the likely choices.

One possible mission is the so-called Grand Tour mission to Jupiter-Saturn-Uranus-Neptune. The planet flyby geometry of the four-planet Grand Tour mission to Jupiter-Saturn-Uranus-Neptune requires a specific flyby velocity and hence a specific and invariable launch velocity. Hence, for any selected mission mode and launch opportunity, there is little if any saving in trip time to be gained with a larger launch vehicle.

While the trip times are fixed by flight geometry, the allowable payload is a function of the launch vehicle employed. For a typical four-planet Grand Tour to Jupiter - Saturn - Uranus - Neptune launched on October 6, 1978, and passing outside the rings of Saturn—trip time of 11 years to Neptune—rough estimates of the relative payload capabilities would be approximately as follows:

First. Titan/Centaur—assumed to be a Titan IIID/Centaur/Burner II—2,220 pounds.

Second. Titan/NERVA—Titan core must be increased in diameter to accommodate NERVA. Payload estimated for two 120-inch seven-segment strap-on solid motors with large diameter core first stage Titan+NERVA—6,000 pounds.

Third. Saturn IB/NERVA—single-engine NERVA stage on an S-I with four 120-inch, seven-segment solid strap-ons—19,000 pounds.

Fourth. Saturn IC/NERVA—single-engine NERVA stage on a four-engine S-IC—24,000 pounds.

Fifth. Saturn V/NERVA—single-engine NERVA on an S-II on an S-IC—70,000 pounds.

The very substantial performance capability of the Saturn V/NERVA would permit more comprehensive missions to the outer planets than would the smaller launch vehicles. But there are other missions which could use boosters including a NERVA stage.

The nuclear rocket is intended to be used in a wide specrtum of missions in the late 1970's and beyond, extending the capability of launch vehicles and enhancing the effectiveness of many major space programs. All of the prospective boosters with NERVA-powered upper stages could perform a large variety of unmanned missions in addition to the grand tour.

Furthermore, the Saturn V with a nuclear-rocket third stage or possibly some other intermediate booster with a nuclear upper stage, could beneficially perform advanced manned missions in lunar exploration and Earth-orbital operations. Among the candidate unmanned missions are a Mars surface sample return, a variety of outer planet orbiter/lander missions, a Mercury orbiter, a comet rendezvous, and many others as yet undefined.

Among the possible missions in manned space programs are lunar base logistics—manned or unmanned—single-launch manned lunar mission providing both mobility and staytime for exploration of any specified topographical feature or region; direct delivery of large payloads—manned or unmanned—to synchronous orbit; transfer of large orbiting payloads from low-altitude, medium-inclination orbit to other synchronous or polar orbit; and, perhaps, round-trip transportation of manned spacecraft from low altitude to synchronous orbit and back (with the possibility of reuse).

Payloads for typical missions are as follows:

[In thousands of pounds]

Missions	Nuclear Saturn V	All-chemical Saturn V
1. Lunar:		
Transfer	180	112
Landed	63	35
2. Synchronous, equatorial orbit	138	72
3. Polar orbit (from 52° Cape Kennedy launch orbit)	115	57
4. Jupiter probe (2-yr. trip)	84	32
5. Grand tour (1978)	52	[1] (30)
6. Solar probe (0.2 AU)	40	[1] (23)

[1] For these missions the all-chemical launch vehicle would have a 4th stage, such as the Centaur, with a resultant increase in costs for development and operations. In contrast, a nuclear Saturn V would not need a 4th stage.

[In thousands of pounds]

Missions	Launch vehicles			
	S-IC/ nuclear or solid/solid nuclear	S-IC/ S-IVB or solid/solid S-IVB	Solid/ nuclear	Solid/ S-IVB
1. Lunar, transfer	65–74	39–44	36–46	21–26
2. Synchronous, equatorial orbit	50–59	17–22	25–35	7–9
3. Polar orbit (from 52° Cape Kennedy launch orbit)	43–52	9–13	19–29	[1] (18–21)
4. Jupiter probe (2-yr. trip)	28–37	[1] (16)	7–17	[1] (11–13)
5. Grand tour (1978)	12–20	[1] (8)	0–6	[1] (5– 6)
6. Solar probe (0.2 AU)	7–15	[1] (6)	0–3	[1] (4)

[1] For these missions the all-chemical launch vehicles would have an additional stage, such as the Centaur, with a resultant increase in costs for development and operations. For very high energy missions, the nuclear booster could be used as shown here or with a Centaur added to give even greater payloads.

I have given these data in some detail to stress the versatility of nuclear-rocket propulsion and to avert a possible misconception that the NERVA engine is useful only with the Saturn V launch vehicle. The efficiency of nuclear propulsion results in large payload gains at velocities corresponding to lunar missions, synchronous-orbit missions, and a wide spectrum of deepspace missions for which all-chemical systems would at least require multiple launches or more stages.

As I said a moment ago, the NERVA stage can be usefully employed in Earth orbit missions. But it might be helpful to emphasize how much the improvements over chemical stages really are.

With the Saturn V it is possible, of course, to land men on the Moon. The initial Apollo capability provides for landing two men for on the order of 1 day stay time. By using a nuclear NERVA-type stage in place of the S-IVB stage we would be able to perform a lunar landing mission with substantially increased payloads, on the order of 70-percent increase or more. There is actually quite a leverage in that increase in payload in terms of useful capability. From studies it has

been indicated that, with this kind of addition in payload capability, the stay time on the Moon can be extended up to 100 man-days or more. Other possibilities are: larger automated payloads to the planets, moving large space stations in orbit, or some combination of these activities, in the late 1970's and 1980's.

A very important message emerges from what I have said so far:

Wherever the emphasis is placed in the space program by the late 1970's and the 1980's, the resulting need for improved performance can be met by one basic propulsion system, the NERVA nuclear rocket. Because of this versatility, the relatively modest investment the Nation is making in these years in the nuclear rocket will enable us to respond on relatively short notice to whatever directions the space program should take. No other single propulsion development will provide this capability and ability to respond.

Benefits from the use of nuclear rocket propulsion are many and great. It is important to recognize that fundamentally the nuclear rocket provides a large amount of propulsion energy for any of of a number of purposes. As I have said, the energy can be used to increase payloads, for example, doubling the payload of Saturn V and other possible high capacity launch vehicles for many applications. It can be used to shorten trip times. Substantial increases in payloads can permit more experiments, more redundancy or otherwise increase markedly the probability of mission success.

As we have continued to examine appropriate applications of nuclear propulsion, other potential advantages have been brought into clearer focus. They include high reliability, controlability and flexibility of operations. The NERVA development program is being directed to incorporate these advantages in the flight engine. Studies have also shown that nuclear rockets are compatible with a variety of possible large and intermediate class launch vehicles. These factors reinforce the prediction that the nuclear rocket will be a workhorse propulsion system in the late 1970's and thereafter for the types of missions I described a few moments ago. They also show that a visualization of the significance of NERVA solely in terms of individual missions inadequately represents the capability it offers.

To make this capability available, several steps are required. The first important step has been essentially completed, that is the establishment of basic feasibility and the basic knowledge and understanding required to proceed with the development of actual flight hardware. The next step is the reduction of this technology to practice. This step requires the design and development of flight engine hardware through component testing and integration, and through engine system qualification. That hardware once developed must then be proven in flight. Later flights will be operational missions in which the propulsion system must be completely dependable and compatible with mission objectives. Through all these steps, the propulsion system will be evolving toward its ultimate performance which will comprise even higher specific impulse, longer operating duration, and greater reliability.

These steps are a time consuming process and indicate one of the important reasons we are proceeding now with this next significant step. The leadtimes are such that, as I indicated, the nuclear stage will not become operational until the late 1970's when major increases in payload and available velocity will be appropriate. A second factor is that having such an advanced propulsion system in development provides our Nation with space program flexibility, keeping open many mission options without requiring other large commitments in the near term. Third, the introduction of nuclear propulsion will be economic in the overall space program due to both cost effective operations and its versatility.

In deciding on a program's future, it is instructive to look at its past. On the NERVA program there is a long history of the successful solving of many extremely difficult problems. During the past 5 years there has been the steady attainment of one important milestone after another. This kind of achievement builds confidence that the future will bring equal success. The following milestones show just what has happended since early 1964:

Kiwi-B4D, one power test, May 1964.

Kiwi-B4E, two power tests, August-September 1964.

NRX-A2, two power tests, September-October 1964.

Kiwi-TNT, January 1965.

NRX-A3, three power tests, April-May 1965.

Phoebus-1A, one power test, June 1965.

NRX/EST, 10 starts, December 1965-March 1966.

NRX-A5, two power tests, June 1966.

Phoebus-1B, one power test, February 1967.

Phoebus, two cold flow tests, July-August 1967.

NRX-A6, one power test, December 1967.

XECF, cold flow, February-April 1968.

Phoebus-2A, three power tests, June-July 1968.

Pewee-1, two power tests, November-December 1968.

From the information obtained in all of the above tests, the detailed definition of the NERVA engine has been initiated. In some cases, alternative conceptual designs are being analyzed. This process will allow rational design selections to be made in light of the requirements. Personnel of the AEC and the Marshall Space Flight Center, Kennedy Space Center, Lewis Research Center, as well as others are working to insure that the requirements and design choices are reasonable and justified.

It is expected that a comprehensive preliminary design will be achieved by late this year which will serve as a base line approach satisfying all of the stated functional requirements. Of course, there are and will be design changes after completing this preliminary design phase, but NASA and the AEC are proceeding with great care at the present to minimize such changes, since they become more difficult and expensive as the development program progresses.

In fiscal year 1970 then it is planned to be engaged in substantial fabrication of hardware for component test activities. The component tests are intended to substantiate the design solutions selected and will lead to the qualification of the components involved.

The presently estimated overall schedule for the NERVA development program leads to qualification of the engine for flight, or PFRT, in about 1977. The program of system design, component design, component development, and fabrication relating both to the reactor and nonreactor components will lead to a series of reactor and engine tests to prove out the system and demonstrate reliability. It is estimated that a total of four reactors and eight complete engine systems will be needed to conduct development and qualification testing leading to the availability of the engine for flight. Completion of this testing, together with the supporting analyses and documentation, will provide a propulsion system suitable for vehicle application.

The existing test cell C will be used to conduct all reactor testing. Engine test stand-1—ETS-1—will be used for engine tests. Modifications are required, and their design is being initiated, to the ETS-1 hot hydrogen exhaust system, propellant plumbing and altitude simulation system to allow full power testing of a flight configuration engine. It is planned to fund these modifications to ETS-1 out of NERVA research and development funds.

The total estimated cost to develop the NERVA engine is approximately $600 million. In addition, it is estimated that approximately $500 million will be required for stage development. The initiation date for the stage development program has not yet been determined, but will probably occur in the early 1970's.

As has been shown in the past, the development of this engine is solidly based upon a large accumulation of information and experience obtained in the technology phase of the work.

By way of summary I would say that the activity in the nuclear rocket program this past year has added to the foundation of knowledge and experience upon which flight-engine development will be based. The technology phase of the NERVA project is nearly complete; preliminary design of the 75,000-pound-thrust NERVA engine is underway. This technology promises an advancement in space propulsion of major importance—advancement in terms of high payloads and velocity increments, enhanced reliability and mission-success probability, and all-round operational versatility.

The benefits to be derived from the use of nuclear rockets are spread throughout the advanced space program of the late 1970's and beyond. Lunar exploration, Earth-orbit operations and deep-space scientific missions are still profitable areas for nuclear propulsion. Addition of a NERVA-powered stage to any of a variety of boosters in the Saturn V and intermediate-size range will be a major contribution to progress in this time period. Furthermore, by means of one such development with a variety of

applications, we maintain many options without having to pursue a large number of advanced developments and give the Nation the capability to respond on relatively short notice to new mission directions we might choose to take. This approach is particularly valuable in times of cost sensitivity and program definition. The nuclear rocket, therefore, will contribute strongly to our Nation's preeminence in space and, as a particularly valuable focus of advanced technology, contribute to our general technological strength.

For these many reasons I urge the defeat of the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment cease at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN).

The amendment was rejected.

TRANSPORTATION TO WHITE HOUSE

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to announce that following the vote on the bill there will be a bus outside the House wing of the Capitol for those Members of the House and their staff who wish to go to the White House to hear a few remarks by the President on his return from the conference at Midway.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I take this time only to announce some changes in the program.

The bill H.R. 6543, the Public Health Cigarette Smoking Act of 1969, will not be brought up this week as previously announced.

Tomorrow we expect to call up the bill—H.R. 1035—limiting the use for demonstration purposes of any federally owned property in the District of Columbia, which will be considered under an open rule providing for 2 hours of debate.

On Thursday, we have programed the bill H.R. 4314, joint labor-management trust funds for scholarships and child care centers, subject to a rule being granted.

I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rules, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROONEY of New York, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11271) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 413, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third heading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 330, nays 52, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 78]

YEAS—330

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Alexander
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Baring
Beall, Md.
Belcher
Bell, Calif.
Bennett
Berry
Bevill
Biaggi
Bingham
Blackburn
Blanton
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brinkley
Brock
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Caffery
Cahill
Camp
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chappell
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collins
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Corbett
Corman
Coughlin
Cowger
Cramer
Culver
Daddario
Daniel, Va.
Daniels, N.J.
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Denney
Dennis
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Eckhardt
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Fascell
Findley
Fish
Fisher
Flood
Flowers
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Foreman
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Frey
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Gaydos
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Hagan
Haley
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammer-schmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Harvey
Hastings
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Helstoski
Hogan
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hunt
Ichord
Jacobs
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Tenn.
Karth
Kazen
King
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Koch
Landrum
Langen
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lujan
Lukens
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McEwen
McFall
McKneally
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
Mathias
May
Mayne
Meeds
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Mizell
Mollohan
Monagan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nichols
O'Hara
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Passman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Podell
Poff
Pollock
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor, Ark.
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Rarick
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Rhodes
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roudebush
Roybal
Ruth
St Germain
St. Onge
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schwengel
Sebelius
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Snyder
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Symington
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Weicker
Whalley
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wolff
Wright
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Yatron
Young
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—52

Barrett
Betts
Biester
Brown, Mich.
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Chisholm
Clay
Collier
Dellenback
Eilberg
Farbstein
Fraser
Goodling
Gross
Gude
Hall
Henderson
Hicks
Hungate
Hutchinson
Joelson
Jones, N.C.
Kastenmeier
Keith
Kyl
Landgrebe
Latta
Lowenstein
McCarthy
McDonald, Mich.
Mikva
Myers
Nix
Obey
Ottinger
Railsback
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rosenthal
Ruppe
Ryan
Scherle
Schneebeli
Skubitz
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stokes
Taft
Whalen
Wyatt

NOT VOTING 50

Anderson, Tenn.
Ashbrook
Ayres
Bates
Blatnik
Brasco
Brooks
Brown, Ohio
Carey
Celler
Conyers
Cunningham
Dawson
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Feighan
Garmatz
Gettys
Goldwater
Hébert
Heckler, Mass.
Holifield
Kee
Kirwan
Kuykendall
Kyros
Leggett
Lennon
McCloskey
Mann
Matsunaga
Mills
Nelsen
O'Konski
Patman
Pelly
Powell
Riegle
Ronan
Scheuer
Scott
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stuckey
Thompson, N.J.
Tunney
Udall
Wilson, Charles H.
Wold

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Scheuer against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Pelly.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Carey with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Riegle.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Bates.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Kyros with Mr. Springer.
Mr. Mann with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Ronan with Mr. Wold.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Leggett.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Tunney.
Mr. Udall with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Kee with Mr. Matsunaga.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Anderson of Tennessee.

Mr. HUNGATE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. RUPPE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOELSON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RAISE IN PRIME INTEREST RATE UNCONSCIONABLE

(Mr. HANLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, in one of the crassest examples of disregard for the public interest, several major banking institutions yesterday announced that they are raising their prime interest rate to an unconscionable 8½ percent. It is crass because it has all the earmarks of a grand conspiracy; it is unconscionable because it will force many of the little people of this country right to the wall.

The fact of the matter is that this will drive the effective interest rates on almost every type of loan, including home mortgages, beyond the limits of the usury laws in many States.

We all know that banks, like other financial enterprises, are in business to make money. This is the essence of the free, competitive marketplace. But they are governmentally chartered institutions with a distinct responsibility to the public, and their charters to lend should not and cannot be interpreted as licenses to gouge the people.

Mr. Speaker, this latest defiance of the public interest is the fourth increase in the prime rate since last December, a rise of 25 percent in 6 months. It is uncalled for. It could force many small enterprises out of business; it could cripple the homebuilding industry; it certainly will be a disaster for the average American home buyer.

As the distinguished chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee noted yesterday, Mr. Speaker, it seems rather strange to me that those major bankers all miraculously arrived at the same figure on the same morning. But then maybe it is not so strange, Mr. Speaker. Maybe it is just a plain, old-fashioned conspiracy, into which the Justice Department ought to look.

I urge the President to take strong actions to reverse this trend and I hope the House Banking Committee will convene as early as possible to examine the whole Federal Reserve System with a view to overhauling it and bringing it back to reality under closer congressional scrutiny. Unless Congress and the President act quickly and effectively, we are going to find ourselves in a credit crunch that will make 1966 look like a picnic.

THE HIKE IN INTEREST RATES

(Mr. HANNA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with the expressions which were just made by the gentleman from New York. I think that the newest hike in interest rates continues and increases the unfortunate game of bouncing off the borrower bench some of our healthiest and worthiest economic elements.

I believe we can safely predict that this new rise in interest rates will have no more lasting effect on inflation than have the previous increases. The Secretary of the Treasury, David Kennedy, stated correctly before this rise that a further increase in the prime rate at this time would not in itself effectively restrain the demand for credit.

By following this myopic, tunnel vision approach of interest rates as an effective restraint on inflation we are being at this point counterproductive and inordinately cruel—counterproductive because increased interest to the selective class of borrowers who can afford the interest rate now because of increases of prices which they can feed into the inflationary channel will keep them in the forefront of the borrowing bench. It is cruel because we are not intelligently being selective in the use of scarce capital. We are keeping it available to the borrower who is either born with the instincts of a crapshooter or a borrower who has some direct control over the market price so he can add on the interest cost. It is cruel because the higher interest rates go the surer it is the ultimate level of settling down will be higher. From a high of 7½ percent one can predict perhaps the rate would settle back to 6¼ percent, but from a high of 8½ percent one can only look for a settling back to about 7½ percent. This is called the rachet effect. It is easier to move up than down.

Interest rates represent a price. Price on any commodity serves as a rationing agent. Certain people at a given level because of the economic imperatives are priced out of the market. Unfortunately the market does not respond to the rational priorities of needs for our society so the scarcity of capital does not necessarily follow the most desirable or healthiest course.

At this time both expansion and inflation are working against the Government and in a way that is not responsive to higher interest restrictions. Because we are in a virtual war economy there is an expected profitability in new plant construction and higher inventory accumulation. With a level of unemployment down to near or below 3 percent, the consumer balances off his concern for stable credit with an expectation of higher income. Both business and consumers rush into a money market of escalating price as early as possible so that debt created at such time can be paid off in cheaper dollars later.

What this indicates, Mr. Speaker, is that under present circumstances higher interest rates are worse than neutral in the battle against inflation. Such additional increases can only fan the flames and at the same time continue to make unwise allocations of limited investment capital. There must be a better route to take. When will we realize that a war economy can only be controlled by the tougher medicine, of harsher but fairer measures to restrict areas of investment and to restrain price and wage policies?

OEO "EVALUATES" ITSELF

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have come across the most shocking instance of bias in "evaluations" of OEO projects I have ever heard of, and one which brings into question the basis for all project reviews.

An evaluation report on South Florida Migrant Legal Services Program, Inc., was submitted by Volt Information Sciences, Inc., by a man who lists himself as a "Volt consultant" and chairman of the evaluation team. In a letter to me, Volt says:

> Volt does not knowingly assign specialists to tasks in which the specialists have interests in the case.

Yet a report of the executive director, South Florida Migrant Legal Services Program, Inc., dated December 20, 1967, says that this same man "has agreed to act as the program's liaison man in Washington. His function will be to contact various Government agencies upon our request and forward to us such information as he may acquire from these agencies."

OEO set up what many Members of the Congress assumed was an independent evaluation of OEO projects by outside contractors. This particular evalu-

ation was conducted under OEO contract No. B-89-4391, to assess the value of an $800,000 2-year legal services program which had applied for a new 3-year $2,800,000 program. Needless to say, a full and proper evaluation of such a project would be valuable both to OEO and Congress.

When I asked Christopher Clancy, OEO Legal Services acting director, who selected the members of the evaluation team, he informed me that it had been done by Dan Bradley, OEO's legal services representative in Atlanta. I contacted Mr. Bradley, and he confirmed this, saying that he had picked the evaluators after asking the advice of others. I asked Volt if this was standard procedure to let OEO name Volt evaluators, and they replied that, "It is not Volt's policy or practice." Yet that is what has happened.

In addition to the chairman of the evaluation team, who is apparently both a project consultant, Volt consultant, as well as an evaluator of the same project, two other members of the team have the distinct opportunity for bias. One is the full-time paid director of another OEO funded legal services project. The other is a Washington attorney, associated with the law firm of Arnold & Porter. The deputy director of the program which was to be evaluated lists himself as a former associate of the same Washington law firm. The remaining panel member is a member of the American Bar Association's legal aid committee, apparently recommended to Mr. Bradley by the ABA's Washington office.

Here we have a shocking case of the selection of three men to evaluate an OEO program, not by the independent contractor who files the report, but by an OEO regional official. And that OEO official has selected as chairman of the team a man who is shown as the Washington representative of the program; a lawyer from the same law firm, out of the thousands of firms in the Nation, as the program's deputy director lists himself as being associated formerly; and the director of another OEO project who could hardly be expected to give an adverse report. Perhaps he had been or will be subject to a similar "evaluation" by the director of this program, if that is OEO's practice.

I do not bring this matter to the attention of the House without realizing the seriousness of the implications. This and other project evaluations are given wide distribution within OEO and other Government agencies, and to congressional committees to justify funding, refunding and appropriations and authorizations. The General Accounting Office, the congressional watchdog, itself makes extensive use of evaluation reports in reviewing the operations of OEO. In its recent report to Congress on OEO, in the section dealing with legal services, GAO says that they used as a partial basis for their investigation some 34 evaluation reports in OEO's files. Fortunately they sampled two of that number in depth, and were critical of the nature of evaluation efforts in general.

These evaluation reports, then, are important to OEO, to Congress, and to the projects themselves. If this one case is not an isolated one, and I rather doubt that it is, OEO's so-called independent contract evaluation setup is nothing more than a sham. It is merely a fraudulent way to produce a desired result through a contractor, while maintaining control over selection of evaluators. I believe this situation requires several immediate steps to be taken;

First. Congress should appropriate no additional funds to OEO until we are assured of an impartial and independent evaluation process, completely out of the hands of OEO.

Second. I am asking General Accounting Office to make a thorough investigation and report of OEO's contractors and evaluation process.

Third. Steps should be taken now to free project evaluations from OEO control.

Fourth. OEO should not refund the program which was evaluated by this particular handpicked team.

A full and complete investigation should be made into the activities of the South Florida Migrant Legal Services, Inc., to learn why such great pains were taken to insure a favorable evaluation report. Someone went to a great deal of time and effort to put together such an evaluation team subject to such great bias and the evaluation report itself stands as proof that a whitewash of all the charges against the program was to be the end product of the evaluation.

CORRECTING THE RECORD ON JUSTICE IN ALABAMA

(Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD a portion of a press release issued by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BUTTON) based on a speech which it is my understanding he delivered in his district last Sunday:

If you were a witness to a lynching, and you could help prevent a tragedy, you would not hesitate to help, would you? That is the opportunity that has been offered to me.

I am glad to be able to say that I did not hesitate to try to help one of the fine Americans of our time, Mr. Richmond Flowers.

For there is a lynch mob afoot, and they mascarade themselves in the guise of justice—an Alabama racist justice.

A lynching based on bitter hatred of a man who has stood up against the mob, against racism, for decency, and for the law—even when he had been warned that ruin, and though possible assassination, were ahead if he defied the racists—racists who bombed churches; who killed in their hoods under the cover of night; who held other Americans in subjection with threats, fear and violence; who sought to stand in the school house door, to stem the forward advance of human kind.

Because Richmond Flowers, as Attorney General of Alabama, did stand up courageously against these evils, be exposed himself not only to the haters, calumnies, but to the vile retributions. Ruin was threatened to him, but he went on—and now the haters are seeking to extract their pound of flesh, even at the cost of distorting the presumably even-handed system of justice in which we instinctively trust.

It is almost inconceivable to you that the Federal juries in Alabama could be so prejudiced; but for the man whom George Wallace has bitterly described as his worst enemy, nothing could be too bad. And so the lynching.

But the appellate courts do not depend on Alabama juries and are not in Wallace's hands, and so I believe there is real reason to hope and expect that actual justice will prevail for Richmond Flowers.

In the meantime, let me reiterate my position as stated when I announced my intention to employ Mr. Flowers, in the belief that his talents and his credentials could well serve the people of my District and the country:

"Richmond Flowers has served the people well in his distinguished career. He deserves as much in temporary adversity, and I am gratified to be able to have some part in trying to assure such for this fine man."

The feeling on my part has been well expressed by a lady who wrote to me from our area. This is what she said:

"My husband and I both applaud you for showing your faith in Mr. Richmond Flowers, and having the courage to do it. I am perfectly certain that Mr. Flowers has never done anything dishonest. He has always shown great courage in opposing injustice, and I felt sure that the time would come when he would be accused of some wrong doing, merely because he was unwilling to compromise his principals. Under no circumstances will I ever believe he has done anything dishonest; he is not that kind of person."

But to some people, who apparently lack this lady's insight, and who have not had the advantage—as I have—of being able to see, at first hand, spiteful hatred at work, the issues apparently are obscured. To them, I ask in all good will, do you question that Richmond Flowers was long ago prejudged and condemned in Alabama, long before an Alabama jury lynched him; do you really doubt that such a man would be crucified as a victim of racist politics?

I consider it impossible for Mr. Flowers to have received a fair trial under these circumstances. Until an appellate court reviews his case strictly on facts and law, it is urgent to withhold final judgment and I am confident the fair-minded people of Albany and Schenectady counties will do so.

When the gentleman saw fit to employ on his congressional staff a former Attorney General of Alabama who had just been convicted in a Federal court along with two other men on extortion charges, I was surprised that any Member should continue to presume a man's innocence immediately following his conviction in a Federal court, but felt that the hiring of staff personnel was an individual Member's own business and his own responsibility. When the gentleman, however, added to this an attack upon citizens of my district I felt compelled to take the floor to set the record straight.

On February 27, 1969, following a 5-week trial in the Federal court for the northern district of Alabama, Richmond Flowers was found guilty on two counts of conspiracy to commit extortion and two counts of extortion and received a $10,000 fine and an 8-year sentence in a Federal penitentiary. Two other individuals in this same trial were also found guilty. The cases are now on appeal to the Fifth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals.

The 12 citizens who composed the jury, the 23 citizens on the grand jury which indicted him, Justice Department officials who reviewed the case, and the Federal Judge who presided over the court and passed the sentence have all been swept aside by the gentleman from New

York as examples of "Alabama racist justice" who "lynched" Mr. Flowers.

Mr. Speaker, citizens do not volunteer to serve on juries in Alabama, as in any other State. Those who served on the grand jury which brought the indictment and those who served on the jury which convicted the individuals in this case were required by law to so serve as a duty of citizenship. The record will reflect that during a long trial voluminous evidence and testimony were presented in this case and that the rights of the defendants were fully protected by the presiding judge. The members of the biracial jury which returned a unanimous verdict of guilty sought only to render the fair and honest judgment which the law required of them in this case. The record will reveal it to be both a reasonable and responsible decision.

Mr. Speaker, I find highly unjustified the criticism of this jury by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BUTTON) who, in announcing his appointment of Mr. Flowers to his staff, said he knew nothing about the trial.

Attorneys for Mr. Flowers and the two other men had the opportunity and did, in fact, use all their strikes in selecting a jury. It is inconceivable to me that the gentleman should believe that out of a venire of more than 80 persons, not one was a fair, honest, responsible law-abiding American, as his statement implies.

As you know, it takes only one vote for acquittal to result in a mistrial in a Federal court. This was not the case with the Flowers trial. All the jurors, and they were polled, Mr. Speaker, said they were in agreement with the verdict submitted by the foreman of guilty on all four counts.

Mr. Flowers' trial took 5 weeks in Federal court. Prior to his indictment in August 1968, his case had been under investigation for several years. The case was reviewed by Justice Department officials here in Washington, including those in the Civil Rights Division.

Do you, Mr. Speaker, think it within the realm of possibility that had Civil Rights Division officials thought this case was based on racist politics they would have permitted its prosecution?

Mr. Speaker, a Federal grand jury indicted Mr. Flowers and a Federal jury convicted him after hearing the testimony. The gentleman from New York (Mr. BUTTON) I am sure, would be loath to convict someone after hearing only the prosecution's testimony, but that is what he has done. He has convicted an Alabama jury of rendering "racist justice" but he admittedly is not familiar with the testimony that jury heard.

The jury panel was selected at random by a system approved last year by the judges of the Fifth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals. That jury represented a cross section of the 31 counties in the northern district. I am absolutely confident it was a fair jury and that presiding Judge Clarence W. Allgood provided the same type of justice in his court in Alabama that Mr. Flowers would have received anywhere in the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents and fellow citizens over whom the gentleman has set himself up as judge and jury are innocent of doing anything other than their duty under the law.

REPRESENTATIVE LUJAN INTRODUCES LEGISLATION TO ESTABLISH EMERGENCY TAX ON EXCESS CORPORATE PROFITS

(Mr. LUJAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing, along with other of my colleagues, legislation to establish an emergency tax on excess corporate profits. If enacted, our program will raise enough funds to make the continuation of the 10-percent surtax on individual incomes unnecessary.

The need to raise moneys to pay for our expenditures in the Vietnam war is clear and unarguable. Our defense spending has risen by 59 percent since the original large scale escalations of 1965. Corporate profits during the same period have risen by 33 percent, and, of course, have risen much more than that in certain industries which are directly involved in the war effort. It seems to me far more equitable for those interests which have profited from the war to bear the major share of the financial burden than to place that burden on the individual taxpayer.

Taxes on excess wartime profits is the method we have traditionally employed to pay for our wars. We had one during World War I, and during World War II. Within 6 months after the Communist invasion of South Korea Congress had enacted such a tax. I think it is only logical that we at least seriously consider a similar measure for this war before continuing with the surtax.

I would like to point out that our legislation is in no way intended to hamper the growth of business, especially small businesses. Corporations whose net profits are $25,000 or less would be totally exempted from taxation under our proposal, and allowances are made for corporations in financial difficulties.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is an unfair measure. I think that Congress, and members of the key committees, are aware of the unpopularity of the surtax, and I therefore urge my colleagues to give this reasonable alternative the most careful consideration.

EVALUATION OF BENEFITS OF WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

(Mr. JONES of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Flood Control Subcommittee, Committee on Public Works, I have announced that the subcommittee will begin hearings shortly on the evaluation of benefits of water resource development projects.

Specific dates will be announced later after consultation with the gentleman from Maryland, Representative GEORGE H. FALLON, chairman of the Public Works Committee.

Many Members have expressed an interest in this important subject, and I want to include my statement at this point in my remarks:

STATEMENT BY MR. JONES OF ALABAMA

In the determination of our national priorities and goals, water resource development projects have been consistently and unjustly downgraded. This has occurred despite the fact that we cannot ever overstate the importance of water resources to the development of our Nation. Without full and proper attention to the water which we possess, we cannot help to reach successfully the levels of attainment to which this Nation is dedicated.

Water is an invaluable commodity. However, most people simply take it for granted until the supply runs low in quantity or quality.

But that lack of concern does not apply to everyone. There are many who share my belief that measures are urgently needed to carry forward vital programs for the protection of lives and property of our citizens against the ravages of floodwaters, for the protection of our valuable coastal resources from erosion, for the development and improvement of waterways and harbors as an essential element of the national transportation system, for the generation of low-cost hydroelectric power, for the development of water supplies of suitable quantity and quality to serve our Nation's cities, industries and farms, for the conservation and enhancement of wildlife resources, for providing increased opportunties for our citizenry to enjoy healthful outdoor recreational opportunities, and, in general, for inducing economic development as a means of enhancing the general welfare.

In the Flood Control Act of 1936, the Congress established for the first time a national flood control policy. Destructive floods obstructing navigation, highways, railroads and other channels were held to be a menace to national welfare. The law stated that the Federal Government should improve or participate in improvements of navigable waters or their tributaries for flood control "if the benefits to whomever they may accrue are in excess of the estimated costs, and the lives and social security of people are otherwise adversely affected." Over the years this criteria has been made applicable to almost all types of water resource development projects.

Despite this broadest possible statement of Congressional intent, the planners, economists and academicians have not been able to state with any degree of accuracy the true benefits brought about by water resource development projects. The Executive Branch has issued document after document on the various analytical procedures they considered acceptable in the evaluation of the benefits and costs of projects. In 1962, President Kennedy approved a memorandum from the Secretaries of the Army, Interior, Agriculture and Health, Education, and Welfare setting forth a statement of policies, standards, and procedures in the formulation, evaluation, and review of plans for the use and development of water and related land resources for use by all Federal agencies in their formulation of land and water resources development projects. That memorandum was subsequently printed as Senate Document No. 97, 89th Congress. However, it soon became apparent to all who were involved in this area that the agencies were not uniformly following the planning policies set forth in that document for the evaluation of benefits. The Corps of Engineers, in particular, was not taking into account the total benefits which were permissible under

Senate Document No. 97, and in many studies were obviously understating the true value of a proposed project.

In this time of highly competitive needs and limited budgets, we can no longer afford the luxury of understanding the total benefits of water resource development projects. We must recognize and compute all the benefits and all the costs properly. Without the knowledge of total benefits and costs, we cannot intelligently judge the alternatives available to us.

A recent study of a highly developed 10 mile section of the Tennessee River near Decatur, Alabama, indicated some 6,000 people have found employment in river-front manufacturing plants. But the benefits didn't stop at the waterline. These waterfront plants were responsible for 1,000 other new jobs in supplying industries away from the water and for 33,000 jobs in industries consuming products of the waterfront plants. Numerous other benefits are also inherent in this type of development.

The analyses which have been heretofore applied to projects are inadequate and outdated. Proper consideration and application of total benefits must be forthcoming.

For all of the reasons which I have stated, the Subcommittee on Flood Control will hold public hearings shortly in Washington on the entire matter of evaluation of benefits of water resource development projects with a view toward determining appropriate legislation setting forth the necessary criteria for use by the pertinent Federal agencies.

CAMPUS DISORDER—REPORT OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON THE CAUSES AND PREVENTION OF VIOLENCE

(Mr. McCULLOCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, Chairman of the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, issued the Commission's Interim Statement on Campus Disorder on Monday, June 9, 1969.

The statement is calm, factual, constructive and logical. I commend it to all Members of Congress, yes, to all citizens who are concerned about the causes and the cure of campus disorders.

The interim statement follows:

INTERIM STATEMENT ON CAMPUS DISORDER

The members of this Commission, along with most Americans, are deeply disturbed by the violence and disorder that have swept the nation's campuses. Our colleges and universities cannot perform their vital functions in an atmosphere that exalts the struggle for power over the search for truth, the rule of passion over the rule of reason, physical confrontation over rational discourse.

We are equally disturbed, however, by the direction of much public reaction to campus unrest. Those who would punish colleges and universities by reducing financial support, by passing restrictive legislation, or by political intervention in the affairs of educational institutions, may unwittingly be helping the very radical minority of students whose objective is to destroy our present institutions of higher education.

So threatening is the situation, so essential is the need for understanding and calm appraisal, that this Commission feels compelled to speak now rather than to remain silent until publication of its final report next fall. We offer our comments during the summer pause in the hope that they will contribute to constructive thought and action before the beginning of the new academic year in September.

The problem of campus unrest is more than a campus problem. Its roots lie deep in the larger society. There is no single cause, no single solution. We urge all Americans to reject hasty and simplistic answers. We urge them to distinguish between peaceful protest and violent disruption, between the non-conformity of youth and the terror tactics of the extremists. We counsel patience, understanding and support for those in the university community who are trying to preserve freedom and order on the campus. We do so in the conviction that our universities and colleges are beginning to learn how to achieve change without disorder or coercion.

I

During the past year, many of America's universities and colleges have been seriously wounded. These wounds arise from multiple causes. One is the increasingly violent expression of widespread student discontent. Although much of this discontent often focuses on grievances within the campus environment, it is rooted in dissatisfactions with the larger society that the campus can do little about.

Students are unwilling to accept the gaps between professed ideals and actual performance. They see afresh the injustices that remain unremedied. They are not impressed by the dangers that previous generations have overcome and the problems they have solved. It means little to them that the present adult generation found the way out of a major depression to unparalleled heights of economic abundance, or that it defeated a massive wave of vicious totalitarianism and preserved the essential elements of freedom for the youth of today. To students, these triumphs over serious dangers serve primarily to emphasize other problems we are just beginning to solve.

Today's intelligent, idealistic students see a nation which has achieved the physical ability to provide food, shelter and education for all, but has not yet devised social institutions that do so. They see a society, built on the principle that all men are created equal, that has not yet assured equal opportunity in life. They see a world of nation-states with the technical brilliance to harness the ultimate energy but without the common sense to agree on methods of preventing mutual destruction. With the fresh energy and idealism of the young, they are impatient with the progress that has been made but seems to them to be indefensibly slow.

At a time when students are eager to attack these and other key problems, they face the prospect of being compelled to fight in a war most of them believe is unjustified. This traumatic experience has precipitated an unprecedented mass tension and frustration.

In assessing the causes of student unrest, it would be a mistake to assume that all causes are external. There are undoubtedly internal emotional pressures and internal value conflicts in many students which contribute to their own dissatisfaction and thus to the tension and turmoil of campus life.

Students attribute the shortcomings they see to the smugness of their elders and the weaknesses of social institutions. They see the university, guardian of man's knowledge and source of his new ideas, as an engine for powering the reform of the larger society, and as the first institution they are in a position to reform.

We emphasize that most students, despite their views of society's failures, accept as valid the basic structure of our democratic system; their main desire is to improve its ability to live up to its stated values. Their efforts to do so are welcome when they take the form of petitions, demonstrations and protests that are peaceful and non-violent. Although many persons are unsettled by these activities (which are often of a bizarre nature), we must all remember that peaceful expression of disturbing ideas and petitions for the redress of grievances are fundamental rights safeguarded by the First Amendment of our Constitution. Methods of dealing with "campus unrest" must not confuse peaceful protest and petition with violent disruption. To do so will aggravate rather than solve the problem.

A small but determined minority, however, aims not at reform but at the destruction of existing institutions. These are the nihilists. They resort to violent disruption as the means best suited to achieve their ends. By dramatic tactics of terror, they have focused widespread public attention upon themselves and have often induced university authorities either to surrender or to meet force with force. When they have managed on occasion to provoke counter-force to an excessive degree, they have succeeded in enlisting the sympathies of the more moderate campus majority.

They are the agent that converts constructive student concern into mindless mob hysteria. They are the chief danger to the university and its basic values.

There is also a minority of students who are not nihilists, but who feel that violence and disruption may be the only effective way of achieving societal and university reform.

II

Forcible obstruction and violence are incompatible with the intellectual and personal freedom that lies at the core of campus values. In its recent *Declaration on Campus Unrest*, the American Council on Education noted that "there has developed among some of the young a cult of irrationality and incivility which severely strains attempts to maintain sensible and decent human communications. Within this cult is a minute group of destroyers who have abandoned hope in today's society, in today's university, and in the processes of orderly discussion to secure significant change." These "destroyers seek to persuade more moderate students that verbal expressions of grievance go unheeded, while forcible tactics bring affirmative results."

Despite some eloquent and subtle rationalizations for violent methods of protest, the record of experience is incontrovertible. While violent protest is sometimes followed by the concessions sought, it more often produces a degree of counter-violence and public dismay that may gravely damage the cause for which violence is invoked.

Even when violence succeeds in achieving immediate social gains, it tends frequently to feed on itself, with one power group imposing its will on another until repressive elements succeed in reestablishing order. The violent cycles of the French and Russian revolutions and of the decade resulting in the Third Reich are stark summits of history to ponder. All history teaches that as a conscious method of seeking social reform, violence is a very dangerous weapon to employ.

That is why our nation has sought to avoid violent methods of effecting social change, and to foster instead the principles of peaceful advocacy proclaimed in the Bill of Rights and the rule of law. As the President has just reminded us:

"The purpose of these restraints is not to protect an 'establishment,' but to establish the protection of liberty; not to prevent change, but to insure that change reflects the public will and respects the rights of all."

The university is the citadel of man's learning and of his hope for further self-improvement, and is the special guardian of this heritage. Those who work and study on the campus should think long before they risk its destruction by resorting to force as the quick way of reaching some immediate goal.

Father Theodore Hesburgh of Notre Dame has observed that the university, precisely because it is an open community that lives

by the power of reason, stands naked before those who would employ the power of force. It can survive only when the great majority of its members share its commitment to rational discourse, listen closely to those with conflicting views, and stand together against the few who would impose their will on everyone else.

Kingman Brewster of Yale has persuasively articulated this policy:

"Proposition one is the encouragement of controversy, no matter how fundamental; and the protection of dissent, no matter how extreme. This is not just to permit the 'letting off of steam' but because it will improve [the university] as a place to be educated. Proposition number two is a convincing intention to deal speedily and firmly with any forcible interference with student and faculty activities or the normal use of any [university] facilities. . . . I see no basis for compromise on the basic proposition that forcible coercion and violent intimidation are unacceptable means of persuasion and unacceptable techniques of change in a university community, as long as channels of communication and the chance for reasoned argument are available."

Several attitudes held by members of the university community have often interfered with the application of these sensible standards. One is the belief of many that the civil law should not apply to internal campus affairs. They feel that the academy is an enclave, sheltered from the law, that the forces of civil authority may not enter the campus, save by invitation. This is a serious misconception—a residue of the time when the academy served *in loco parentis*, making and enforcing its own rules for students' behavior and protecting them from the law outside, save for such extreme crimes as murder and arson. Now that students themselves have firmly discarded school authority over their personal lives, they must logically accept the jurisdiction of civil authority. They cannot argue that of all Americans they are uniquely beyond the reach of the law.

At the same time, the university is ill equipped to control violent and obstructive conduct on its own. Most institutions have few campus police; most of these are not deputized and thus do not possess true police power. Few schools have explicit rules either defining the boundaries of permissible protest or stating the consequences if the boundaries are crossed. Some have very loose rules for disciplinary proceedings; others have diffused disciplinary power so widely among students, faculty and administration that effective discipline is difficult to impose; and is seldom imposed quickly enough to meet an emergency. And in most institutions the ultimate internal disciplinary sanction of suspension or expulsion lies unused because the campus community shrinks from its probable consequence—exposure of dismissed students to the draft and what students call the "death sentence" of Vietnam.

III

Out of many discussions with faculty members, students and administrators, and with full appreciation that no two institutions are the same, we offer the campus community the following specific suggestions:

(1) A broad consensus should be achieved among students, faculty and administration concerning the permissible methods of presenting ideas, proposals and grievances and the consequences of going beyond them. Excellent guidelines have been provided by the American Council on Education's recent Declaration on Campus Protest. These could usefully be supplemented by more detailed statements developed by representatives of the American Association of University Professors, the American Association of Universities, the American Council on Education, the Association of Land Grant Colleges and State Universities, the National Student Association, and possibly others. Where agreed upon and explicit codes of student conduct and procedures for student discipline are lacking, they should be adopted; where they already exist they should be reviewed and, if necessary, improved.

Students have the right to due process and to participate in the making of decisions that directly affect them, but their right of participation should not be so extensive as to paralyze the disciplinary process itself. Codes for campus conduct should place primary reliance on the power of the institution to maintain order in its own house, and on its courage to apply its own punishment when deserved. These codes should also recognize the universal duty to obey the civil and criminal laws of the larger society, and the right of the civil authorities to act when laws are violated.

(2) Universities should prepare and currently review contingency plans for dealing with campus disorders. Advance plans should be made to determine, insofar as possible, the circumstances under which the university will use (i) campus disciplinary procedures, (ii) campus police, (iii) court injunctions, (iv) other court sanctions and (v) the civil police. A definite plan, flexibly employed at the moment of crisis, is essential. There have been enough violent and obstructive incidents on enough campuses to permit institutions to assess alternative courses of action and to anticipate both the varieties of disorder which might occur and the most appropriate response.

Most importantly, university authorities should make known in advance that they will not hesitate to call on civil police when circumstances dictate, and should review in advance with police officials the degrees of force suitable for particular situations. It is a melancholy fact that even in cases where the need for calling the civil police has been generally recognized, the degree of force actually employed has frequently been perceived as excessive by the majority of the campus community, whose sympathies then turned against the university authorities. Indeed, there is reason to believe that a primary objective of campus revolutionaries is to provoke the calling of police and the kinds of police conduct that will bring the majority over to their side.

(3) Procedures for campus governance and constructive reform should be developed to permit more rapid and effective decision-making. There is great misunderstanding and confusion as to where ultimate authority for campus decision-making lies. The fact is that the authority is shared among several elements.

By law, trustees are granted full authority over colleges and universities. But trustees cannot supervise the day-to-day affairs of a university; hence they delegate power to the president. The president, however, in addition to being the agent of the trustees, is the leader of the faculty. His effectiveness derives as much from campus consensus of faculty and students as it does from the power delegated to him by the trustees.

In the American system of higher education, the faculty plays the primary role in determining the educational program and all issues directly relevant to education and faculty research. Unlike the systems of some other countries, educational control in the American system is faculty-oriented; anything else is a deviation from the norm.

Faculty control of education and research is the best guarantee we have of academic freedom. It is a precious asset that must not under any circumstances be sacrificed. Most student demands for change pertain to educational and research matters and too often their efforts have been directed toward administrative officers who usually do not have the power which students assume they possess. And often, too, some faculty members have mistakenly joined with students in using coercive force against administrative officers when it is the faculty itself that should deal appropriately and effectively with the issues in question.

Most other powers in the university are diffused. For most purposes, shared power is an asset. But to prevent disorders, universities must be able to respond quickly. Campus protests are sometimes escalated to the level of force because legitimate grievances, peacefully urged, have been referred to university committees which were slow to respond. Scholars have the habit of examining any hypothesis, debating it exhaustively, deferring decision to await more evidence, and when something must be decided, shunning a consensus in favor of subtle shades of disagreement and dissent. For the process of education, these are admirable qualities. But for dealing with naked force, they can be a prescription for disaster. Faculties therefore have a special obligation to organize themselves more effectively, to create representative groups with power to act, and to maintain constant and systematic lines of communication with students. They should be ready to meet every challenge to the educational integrity of the institution. If this integrity is compromised, it will be the faculty that suffers the most.

Students should, of course, have a meaningful role in the governance of all non-educational, non-research functions. They should serve, too, on committees dealing with educational and related questions, exercising their right to be heard on these subjects, so long as the faculty remains paramount.

(4) Faculty leaders and administrative officers need to make greater efforts to improve communications both on the campus and with alumni and the general public. Campus difficulties are constantly aggravated by misinformation and misunderstanding. On campus, large numbers of faculty and students often act on the basis of rumor or incomplete information. Alumni and the general public receive incomplete, often distorted, accounts of campus developments. The communications media, on and off the campus, concentrate on controversy. Much of the peaceful progress of our colleges and universities is never communicated to the outside world. Campus authorities have the responsibility to see to it that a balanced picture is portrayed.

IV

To the larger society, we make these suggestions:

(1) The majority of the American people are justifiably angry at students who engage in violent and obstructive tactics. While the public varies widely in its desire for social change, it shares a common belief in the value of social order. It also regards university students as among the most privileged in society—among those who should understand best the importance of freedom and the dangers of anarchy. One outlet for this public resentment has been the support of legislation withholding financial aid both from students who engage in disruption and from colleges and universities that fail to control them.

There has also been a steady weakening of public sentiment in favor of the additional public funding that higher education so badly needs. Current appropriations for new facilities and for annual operating costs have been insufficient. Some private universities have faced a reduction in individual and corporate gifts.

Existing laws already withdraw financial aid from students who engage in disruptive acts. Additional laws along the same lines would not accomplish any useful purpose. Such efforts are likely to spread, not reduce the difficulty. More than seven million young Americans are enrolled in the nation's colleges and universities; the vast majority neither participate in nor sympathize with campus violence. If aid is withdrawn from even a few students in a manner that the

campus views as unjust, the result may be to radicalize a much larger number by convincing them that existing governmental institutions are as inhumane as the revolutionaries claim. If the law unjustly forces the university to cut off financial aid or to expel a student, the university as well may come under widespread campus condemnation.

(2) We believe that the urge to enact additional legislation should be turned into a channel that could assist the universities themselves to deal more effectively with the tactics of obstruction. State and municipal laws against trespass and disorderly conduct may not be wholly effective means of dealing with some acts of physical obstruction. They were not written to deal with such conduct, and they do not cope with the central issue—forcible interference with the First Amendment rights of others. We are presently considering whether there is a need for statutes authorizing universities, along with other affected persons, to obtain court injunctions against willful private acts of physical obstruction that prevent other persons from exercising their First Amendment rights of speech, peaceable assembly, and petition for the redress of grievances. Such laws would not be aimed at students exclusively, but at any willful interference with First Amendment rights, on or off the campus, by students or by non-students. They would also be available to uphold the First Amendment rights of students as well as other citizens.

(3) Finally, we urge the American people to recognize that the campus mirrors both the yearnings and the weaknesses of the wider society. Erik Erikson, a renowned student of youth, has noted that young and old achieve mutual respect when "society recognizes the young individual as a bearer of fresh energy, and he recognizes society as a living process which inspires loyalty as it receives it, maintains allegiance as it extracts it, honors confidence as it demands it."

One effective way for the rest of us to help reduce campus disorders is to focus on the unfinished task of striving toward the goals of human life that all of us share and that young people admire and respect.

THE ABM CONTROVERSY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURLESON), is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BURLESON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who may so desire, be permitted to extend their remarks on the subject I am about to discuss.

Mr. Speaker, on yesterday when requesting this special order, I made it clear that I questioned no man's sincerity or his motives, in opposing the so-called anti-ballistic-missile system, but I think it is my right to question judgment. As I said then and I repeat, the debate, beginning to rage and will be raging during the weeks ahead, involves not only the development of the ABM, but goes now into our very defense preparations.

The latter has recently come about, I presume, by reason of the stories about some defense contracts, exceeding in costs, original estimates, and of waste and extravagance. Of course, no one is going to stand up here and defend waste and extravagance although it is built into most anything the Government does. It always has been but that is no reason to permit unnecessary expenditures. In fact, I do not know of many things the Government does that should not be done for less. This applies to domestic as well as military programs.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, this issue is the greatest which will face this Congress. As a matter of fact, I think it is the greatest question which has faced this Congress in the last several years, because it vitally involves what could be our very survival.

Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird has declared it is his policy to consider Russia's capability rather than attempting to gear U.S. military readiness to estimates of Soviet intentions. It seems to me this is the crux of the whole question. It is matter of the kind of world in which we live. Are we willing to stake the future of this Nation on good intents of our potential adversaries in this world? We talk about all the other good things which this money could be used for, but what have we to gain, if all this is accomplished and leaves our Nation in peril? Are we to believe that in our weakness our adversaries will love us? The Secretary of Defense has warned against major and irretrievable miscalculations, if our judgment on intentions proves faulty. He further said that based upon the best information available to him, he concludes that the Soviet Union has the capability of achieving by the mid-1970's, a superiority over the presently authorized and programed forces of the United States in all areas, including offensive strategic forces, defensive strategic forces, and conventional forces. It is inconceivable that we should risk the grave peril to this Nation, if Russia or any other achieves this superiority.

Those who oppose the ABM have expressed skepticism that it will not work but equally prominent are those convinced that it will. Our potential enemies are unlikely to gamble on who is right. As one eminent scientist put it, "They will be deterred by the very fact that it might work," and deterrence, after all, is the name of the game.

Other critics of the program say that the ABM will endanger the arms control talks but the Kremlin, which already has an ABM of a sort around Moscow, has given no such indication.

I have a great deal of respect for the judgment of the Senator from the State of Washington, HENRY JACKSON. He is an informed expert on our defense posture and that of the Soviet Union, as well as Communist China. Recently, he authored an article entitled, "Five Dangerous Myths," and the first of these is that the Soviets are on a fixed course toward more peaceful and moderate policies and are ready to leave their neighbors alone. Well, Senator JACKSON concludes that the contrary is true of this reassuring notion and reminds us that a Czech citizen might be permitted some doubts.

The second myth, which the Senator mentions, is that the Soviet rulers are becoming progressively more liberal and civil rights conscious and are about to rejoin Western society. The plain fact is, says Senator JACKSON, that in the past year or two there have been increasing signs in the Soviet Union of a move to the right, a move toward the hardliners. And the third point is the idea that it is the United States who is responsible for heating up the arms buildup. Well, the evidence decisively refutes this notion. The Soviets acted first to develop long range, intercontinental, surface-to-surface missiles. They acted first to test-fire an ABM against an incoming nuclear-armed missile. This was back in 1962 and they are the only nation to have done this. The Soviets acted first to test a 60-megaton bomb. The only nation to possess anything like a bomb of that size. They were the first to develop and deploy a fractional, orbital bombardment system, a first strike oriented weapon and they are the only nation to have developed or deployed such a system. Next, the Russians have acted first to deploy an ABM setup and they have been testing, improving, and updating the system ever since. Today they have over 60 antiballistic missiles deployed on launch pads. We, on the other hand, have not yet deployed an ABM setup of any kind. Yet the critics of the ABM in today's debate say we are escalating the arms race. Well, the fourth point made by Senator JACKSON involves the notion in some quarters that the only way to manage our problems with the Soviets is instant negotiations. He sites many perils in this and says Moscow uses such negotiations to prolong conflict—not to end it.

Now, in this connection, Mr. Speaker, some of those who would leave us bare of an ABM system and, as a matter of fact as I said in the beginning, who go even further and attack our defense preparation, seem to place their trust in doing nothing and say we should have time to talk to the Soviets about disarmament. If past experiences mean anything, the talks, even if and when started, are likely to drag on for years. Meanwhile, we cannot rationally ignore the potential peril represented by the continuing Soviet buildup in offensive missiles and missile-firing submarines.

The fifth point in Senator JACKSON's article refers to the latest version of the devil's theory of history. This has to do with the so-called military-industrial complex. Seemingly this is supposed to promote tensions known as the cold war. The Communist started and have sustained the cold war—not a conspiracy of some sort between the military and industry. The statements made by General Eisenhower in his departure from office warned of the military-industrial complex and it was a perfectly good admonition but his statements have been only partially quoted on many occasions. The President in his speech to the Air Force Academy just a few days ago called attention to the other part in which former President Eisenhower said there should be no overshadowing of the idea of the military-industrial complex, to the detriment of our military preparedness. Yes, there is no doubt we have in this Nation those who profit from war's preparation. This, of course, is a thing we must watch. As mistakes are made they should be corrected and even more, greatest care should be exercised to prevent mistakes. Be this as it may, it is not reason to take chances with our very survival.

Unfortunately, there is clearly manifested in the world today a weakening

in world alliances, an increasing reluctance on the part of hitherto friendly nations to closely cooperate with the United States as they did in the past. This should be a warning to the American people. The drawing away reflects a lack of confidence in America and in our readiness to defend ourselves and the free world. If free nations believe U.S. armed might is impaired, that America's strength is running down and that we no longer have the will to fight when challenged, serious fissures will open in the free world's front against Soviet expansionism. Moreover, if small nations fear that America's military strength is eroded, what is likely to be the judgment of the Soviet Union? The Soviets have a far greater capacity to gauge U.S. strength and combat readiness.

The changed strategic military balance embodies the grave danger of inviting the Soviets to take the type of risk which they have always avoided in the past. The Soviet attitude surely would be changed and the war risk reduced if the United States began to deploy the antiballistic-missile system which the President has said is essential to the safety of the American people. Finally, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that thus far discussions about the technical and financial aspects of the ABM proposal has caused the real point of the discussion to be obscured. That point, quite simply, is whether the United States of America should abandon the idea of defending itself from communist aggression or whether we should entrust our security to the willingness of the Soviet Union to abide by its many pledges on disarmament. As I understand, the opponents of the ABM system and, as I said earlier, a sentiment which spills over into keeping our defenses strong, want the United States to repose its hopes for survival in neither offense nor defense but in disarmament agreements with the Soviet Union. They want bridgebuilding, coexistence and phase cut-backs of offensive forces as well as defensive ones. They oppose the ABM because they believe it will upset the balance of terror and stand in the way of disarmament. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would not have it on my conscience if I did not oppose with all I have this philosophy and these conclusions. Again, it comes down to the proposition of what sort of world it is in which we live. I think we live in a terribly dangerous one and that the only answer, until there are better ones, is to be prepared.

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

Mr. BURLESON of Texas. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana, a ranking member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. BRAY. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Texas for bringing this very important matter to our attention.

I also read the article written by our former colleague, Senator JACKSON. I read that several times. Every time I read it I was most proud I served in the House with that gentleman from the State of Washington.

I well remember that in 1941 they were betting Hitler and Japan would never bother us. I remember in the service in 1941 they used stovepipes instead of mortars at that time to train the troops.

To me it is sad so many Americans today want to make a career out of weakening their own country. I am not questioning their sincerity. Just the same as the gentleman stated, I do not question their sincerity, but certainly in my opinion it is very poor judgment.

Russia already must think that the ABM is a good weapon, because they have already installed it.

Then there is the idea that many people propose that we in turn must not have the same type of weapon, because it would make Russia unhappy. The kindest word I have to say about that philosophy is it is stupid.

Mr. Speaker, I again wish to congratulate the gentleman from Texas for bringing this important matter before this body.

Mr. BURLESON of Texas. I thank the gentleman from Indiana for his comments.

I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI).

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in commending the gentleman from Texas for his very timely and much-needed statement here today. There is no question but what the American people have been very badly misled by the vociferous opponents of the ABM. One of the things which disturbs me is that among the most vociferous of these people are those who readily admit they have not even been briefed on the full intelligence situation regarding the need for the deployment of the ABM. I recall very recently Dr. Wiesner was here in Washington. Of course, Dr. Wiesner has been the leading opponent of this system. I asked him at that time if it was not rather strange that he takes this strong position in opposition to the ABM when the Atomic Energy Commission advises me that he has not been briefed on the nuclear warhead for the ABM and the Department of Defense advises me he has not been briefed on the ABM itself and on the latest intelligence situation. I must say that I listened with a somewhat heavy heart when this very distinguished scientist said that he had purposely removed himself from security briefings some months ago because he wanted to be free to criticize the ABM system. My observation then was, what if the briefings convinced him it was necessary? In other words, some of our good friends who oppose the ABM do not want to be confused by the facts.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman is making a very strong and very much needed statement here today. I would rather err on the side of strength than to be in a position where this country recognizes and realizes at some distant point in the future that we are not prepared for Soviet or Communist China's aggression. I have said in the well of the House that it is not a question of whether or not we are right but it is a question of whether we can afford to be wrong. This is so especially when we look down the range and recognize that if we were to break ground tomorrow on an ABM system it would take us 48 months or 4 years, if we got all of the breaks, to make the first ABM site operational. It so happens that we know for a fact—and this is not speculation or rumor or gossip—we know for a fact, and indisputable fact, that Red China is now completing her production capability and in 48 months or 4 years she will be capable of producing 200 nuclear warhead ballistic missiles ready and capable of waging an attack on the United States. Thereafter every 12 months Red China wil be producing another 200. So in my judgment it is absolute folly and literally playing Russian roulette with the future of this country for opponents of the ABM to delay deployment of that system and delay the work on the two Safeguard installations which President Nixon has recommended as a starter.

I hope that those gentlemen who believe we should not do it are prepared to suffer the consequences. The tragedy of this debate, though—and I think it is a great tragedy—is that if they are wrong, they will never have a chance to talk about it. So it seems to me that the gentleman in the well has made a most significant and most important contribution in this debate. I hope this message will get the widest coverage so that the American people will recognize there are in this Chamber, Members on both sides of the aisle who take a responsible position in support of the ABM.

To read some of the statements in our press and to look at some of the things in the other media, you would get the impression that everyone in the Congress, on both sides, is opposed to the ABM. The gentleman in the well has made it perfectly clear there are strong, responsible, capable voices who see the full danger and are willing to support us. I congratulate my colleague from Texas for taking this time.

Mr. BURLESON of Texas. I appreciate very much what the gentleman from Illinois has said. This is exactly the reason why I felt impelled to take the floor today in order that other voices be heard.

And, Mr. Speaker, I hope that some sentiment will be created around this country to offset the propaganda that is now being spewed out in all directions in opposition to the ABM proposal.

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

Mr. BURLESON of Texas. I shall be happy to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RIVERS).

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the splendid—splendid—speech of the gentleman from Texas. The gentleman is a responsible legislator. He has held many responsible positions in this House of Representatives. I wish to also acknowledge the contribution which has been made by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI), who indicates a great knowledge of the problems confronting this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the problems and the confusion which is gripping America today is exactly what the gentleman has characterized. Our side is not being told. However, I hope that this is the catalyst, the catalyst, that will bring to the well of the House other

knowledgeable, responsive and responsible voices on this vital, vital program which the President of the United States has elected to debate at this time. He did not have to do this. He had plenty money and plenty authorization to proceed with the basics of an ABM system. But he elected to bring the American people into his confidence. This debate is now raging and the only voices we have seen given prominence are those who are tiring of the war in Vietnam. This is a symptom. This is what the Communists want. They want us to tire. They want us to bring home all of the troops. They do not want to worry about the security of America. We see it in NATO where our so-called allies have not come up with their commitments. Their affluence has closed their eyes to reality, and Americans with three or four cars in every garage, despite the warning signals will not open their eyes to reality.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas has made a great contribution. We are getting it from the horse's mouth. Those Russians are working day and night to perfect their ABM system, and they have a large one.

Mr. Speaker, the only thing that compels the Russians to make this move now is their trembling fear of China. They have now turned most of their antennas and they are now aimed at Red China, not because they trust us, but because they fear China and they know that China is moving. One may ask, "How can we afford this?" Well, in response to that I reply that we are spending less money today percentagewise on our military posture than we did in the 1950's. We can afford this. Our GNP is the largest it has been in our history.

Mr. Speaker, the late Sam Rayburn, among other things, said this about America: "Now we can afford this."

He said, he would rather be a live American with an empty pocketbook than a dead one with a full one.

Now, we can delay this. We can take a calculated risk. We did that when we tried to arm our allies in the Pacific prior to World War II and there was a raging debate on this floor on the issue and it carried by only one vote. They did not put certain guns in emplacement out in the Pacific and the Japanese took this island. But in this conflict if we are wrong, no one will ever live to tell the tale.

This is a deterrent. If Russia has no wrong intentions the thing would not amount to anything in their plan. They have no problems. Only the Russians know whether or not they are going to attack us. This is a deterrent, protection, this is the thing which will positively bring retribution on these people.

Now we have the Polaris, the Poseidon, we have the AMSA coming up, we have the B-52s, which can get through any defense devised by man. We have those. But this is not enough. America is much too young to die. America has great promise. We have just begun to scratch the knowledge of what is up in the skies above us.

It is because of voices like those who have spoken today, and others who will come to the surface at the proper time, and who will come to the surface now to defend the position of the President of the United States to go forward with this program, that we will do so.

We have the MIRV system. The Russians are moving into the MIRV program with multiple warheads. We must be in a position to defend this country against this sort of surprise attack because, as the gentleman from Illinois has said, if it comes we will have only one opportunity; tomorrow will be too late.

The gentleman from Texas has performed a great service, as he always does, and I hope others will follow suit. I am confident that this House will pass an ABM system, but what we want is for America to have one. Without one—without one we are wide open, I can tell you that, because I know whereof I speak.

Mr. Speaker, again I congratulate the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for his contribution and his able comments. The gentleman has referred to our multiple weapon system. I have here a clipping out of the morning Washington Post which says in part:

> Opposition to continued U.S. testing of missiles with clustered warheads increased yesterday despite indications that Russia may be improving its capabilities with the same type of weaponry.

Now, listen to this:

> Russian capability in the field of MIRV—Multiple independently targetable re-entry vehicles—

I believe is what that stands for—are being used by Nixon administration officials in the Pentagon and elsewhere to persuade Congress to support continued U.S. testing of similar weapons.

Well, now, I do not need any persuasion from anybody, as the gentleman from Illinois, the gentleman from South Carolina, and the gentleman from Indiana have indicated. This is not a time when we can be wrong.

This article continues:

> A bipartisan group of 56 Senators and Representatives, however, urged President Nixon to postpone flight testing of MIRVs until the United States has had the opportunity to assess the intentions of the Soviet Union to reach agreements on the control of strategic armaments.

I hope there will be 479 remaining Members of the House and Senate who will oppose this action of 56.

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

Mr. BURLESON of Texas. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding, and for affording me the opportunity of joining with those who have preceded me here in congratulating the gentleman from Texas for the much-needed and most valuable support for the defense of our country.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me from watching the newspapers and reading the syndicated press that in many, many of our news magazines, or so-called independent news services, that there is a deliberate and concentrated effort to discredit the military of this country and all those who seek to defend this country and its traditional institutions. It seems to me just recently I saw, I believe, the night before last one of the so-called news programs and I was really shocked that they would spend almost 15 minutes of an entire news conference giving slanted and distorted views of the news—never well balanced—never presenting both sides—but always with the slur or the innuendo and the slant that they want to give to it.

The ABM system just happens to be one of the targets of the twisted news that so many of us are subjected to.

The fact is that we do need more research and development for our antiballistic-missile system. I join in the facts that have been brought forth by the gentleman from Texas and with those who have spoken on it because these facts are true. But the fact is that all this administration has asked for is to go into a prototype of the ABM and not for a full deployment. They keep talking about the need for research and development. They want more research and development—that is fine—but we have had research and development for years now. It is time that we do something with the end results of this research and development.

It is not unreasonable then to assume that the time has come if the administration thinks so to at least go to a prototype. That is all we are asking for, two deployments of the ABM system.

There is one thing that has been overlooked today in the discussion and that is the colors that are so easily shifted by those who are decrying or many of those who are decrying and opposing the ABM system when just recently in the last administration they were for it and even in the last two administrations—they were proposing it or they were silent. They were lending their support either by their presence or by their words. This goes for elected officials on both sides as well as those who were appointed and serving in official capacities within previous administrations.

Now they are coming out of the woodwork and saying, "I am against it." But they were not against it before. So how can they take one position now and the opposite position before?

I think those who speak out of ignorance do a disservice to the country. The gentleman from Texas I think is performing a great service for our country. I speak as a member of the Committee on Armed Services who has gone through extensive hearings on this. I do not say who is right and who is wrong on this. But I join with those who have spoken before in saying that we cannot afford to take the chance that we might be wrong.

Mr. BURLESON of Texas. I thank the gentleman and appreciate his fine contribution to this discussion.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my distinguished colleague from Texas in support of the implementation of a system of antiballistic missiles for the protection of this Nation. In the Armed Services Committee we have heard much information on this subject, and at this time, unless compelling contrary evidence is presented, I must support the deployment of the ABM system for these reasons:

First. It is a defense weapon, and will not serve to escalate the arms race.

Second. It is feasible. Russia has installed such a system, and relies upon it. Our tests of the various components corroborate the effectiveness of the entire system.

Third. Without the ABM, once Red China develops a vehicle for its nuclear weapons, under an irresponsible and militant leadership, it could make demands on the United States and even hold an American city as hostage.

Fourth. We need an ABM system as our defense against an accidental launching of an enemy ballistic missile. Once launched, they cannot be recalled. Do we want our only defense to be retaliation?

Fifth. If we are to deter a potential enemy, the United States must protect its deterrent power. A nation hostile to our form of government and our way of life must know that this country is defending a destructive power that would cause unacceptable damage if an attack were launched against us. To be realistic in the world today, we must recognize that readiness serves to prevent war, and weakness and unpreparedness serve to invite it.

Sixth. There is discussion that this money for ABM should be diverted to building houses and domestic programs. Without ABM for defense it is conceivable that such houses would be wiped off the earth in the event of attack.

Mr. Speaker, these represent my opinions based on the best information I have been able to obtain. I feel this matter is of great urgency, and in the absence of compelling contrary evidence, we must proceed at once with the deployment of the ABM Safeguard missile.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the so-called military-industrial complex has been under heavy fire from the academic-journalistic complex. In this barrage of criticism the first casualties have been truth and reason.

Critics of the military have escalated their attacks from pinpoint fire to area bombardment taking as their target anything that wears a uniform. This undiscriminating assault on all things military poses a serious threat both to the continued strength of our Nation's defenses and to their continued credibility.

We must bear constantly in mind that the primary purpose of our Armed Forces is not to fight wars but to prevent wars; and their effectiveness as a preventive force depends in large measure on the assessment our adversaries make of public support and maintaining an adequate defense. If the only voices our adversaries hear are those clamoring constantly against every military expenditure, against every new weapons system, against the ROTC, for a unilateral reduction in arms—then the dangers mount that those adversaries will miscalculate our wills and be tempted to put it to the most dangerous kind of test.

Therefore, I think the President should be applauded vigorously for his attempt at Colorado Springs to put the debate over our military posture back in rational perspective. He recognized explicitly the continuing need for civilian controls, for a close watch on expenditures, and a constant balancing of priorities. But he also gave eloquent voice to some basic truths that have been so often lost sight of—especially to the importance of military strength in the maintenance of peace.

In his inaugural address, the President pledged that—

> we will be as strong as we need to be for as long as we need to be.

His address at the Air Force Academy was a timely reminder that that pledge still stands. His announcement that we will begin to withdraw U.S. troops from Vietnam is evidence that we will do as much as we need to do but for no longer than it needs to be done.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BURLESON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks on the subject of the ABM system.

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

There was no objection.

U.S. SUPREME COURT

(Mr. BEVILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, over the past several weeks the U.S. Supreme Court has received much notoriety in the press.

I believe this would be a most appropriate time for Congress to see that the U.S. Supreme Court removes itself from a policymaking role.

Through a persistent and calculated drive over the past several years, the U.S. Supreme Court has been seizing more and more of the power that belongs to Congress. It has succeeded in doing this by declaring much of the legislation passed by Congress as unconstitutional.

Mr. Speaker, no longer does the U.S. Supreme Court merely react to the initiatives of the other branches of our Government, but it has assumed the initiative itself. The leading of reforms is not the proper function of the Court. Its primary role is that of impartial and objective arbiter of our constitutional system. It should not be the reformer. It should not be the protagonist. It should not be the primary lawmaker. These are the assigned roles of Congress.

When the U.S. Supreme Court, in effect, enters the legislative field, the result is legislation without the customary safeguards as provided in the Constitution by way of checks and balances. The singular voice of the Court replaces the orderly legislative process requiring approval of the two Houses of Congress, the executive approval or veto, the accountability of the legislators to the voters, and the opportunity for legislative appeal.

Judicial finality can be autocratic and oppressive. It is government by a committee of nine. Controversial positions, such as the decision which, in effect, outlawed prayers in public schools, assumed by the Court, have imposed upon the Nation new standards of conduct. These positions have been taken on the initiative of the Supreme Court without congressional support.

Mr. Speaker, I say the time has come for a sharp reduction in the U.S. Supreme Court's initiative in political and social matters. Abnegation rather than activism is the proper posture for the highest tribunal of the land.

Elections are the hallmark of democracy and responsibility. Since Supreme Court Justices are not elected, other restrictions should be placed on their office. Their term should be limited to 10 years, subject to reconfirmation by the U.S. Senate. There should be mandatory retirement at age 70.

With these tangible controls, and with a realistic adoption of the Justices of the proper role of the Court, the Court will remove itself from a policymaking position. It can then remove itself from its total absorption with the rights of the individual lawbreaker that now infringes on the public's right—the right of all to protection of life and property. We can then return to the proper separation of powers by the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of Government as our Founding Fathers so masterfully conceived.

PAYMENT LIMITATION TO FARMERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOELSON). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, when the House considered the Agriculture appropriations bill, it attached an amendment which limits to $20,000 the total annual payments which any one farmer could receive from the Government under the agriculture program. This measure has now gone over to the Senate for its consideration, and I have received a number of requests for information on the subject of payments limitation as it affects existing farm programs. In the belief that this information might be useful to the Congress as well as other concerned citizens, I have summarized below some of the data which led me to conclude that a farm payments limitation is justified and desirable. As indicated, this information has been placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for easy reference. Item No. 4, which I am placing in today's RECORD, is a study conducted recently at Louisiana State University and furnished to me by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. This study concludes that for the same acre of land, "soybeans are not competitive with cotton under present price, yield, and cost relationships."

Following is the summary of material referred to:

First. "Schnittker" study of payment limitations: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 30, 1969, page 10867.

This study was made last fall by USDA experts at the request of President Johnson. Because its findings did not conform with policy positions of former Agriculture Secretary Freeman, it was suppressed until the new administration took office. This entry in the RECORD includes the full text of the study. Its prin-

cipal findings: the limitation—even more restrictive than the one just voted by the House—would yield budget savings as high as $300 million annually, would not have "serious adverse effect" on present programs, and problems of administration are not good reasons for opposing it. It is important to note that Secretary Hardin's recent criticism of limitations was based almost entirely on the assumption that the "snap-back" provision would remain in effect.

Second. Listing of individual payments: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 21, 1969, page 13287.

This shows name, address, and amount received by each farmer in the United States whose aggregate 1968 payments for cotton, wheat, and feed grains exceeded $25,000.

Third. Hunger and farm payments in non-food-aid counties: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 12, 1969, page 11978.

This gives sobering data about each of the 428 U.S. counties which on March 31 had not taken the initiative to institute a Federal food-aid program—food stamps or direct distribution—for needy families. Curiously the very counties where wealthy farmers get the biggest payments for not growing crops deliberately exclude food-aid to the poor.

The text of the Louisiana State University study follows:

SOYBEAN-COTTON COMPETITION

(By Clyde St. Clergy, farm management specialist, Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service, LSU, Baton Rouge, La.)

True competition between cotton and soybeans for the same acre of land had not been a reality until announcement of the 1969 Cotton Program. Previous competition between the two crops for the cotton diverted acreage was normally weighted in favor of soybeans by the level of support for beans and the amount of payment made for diverting cotton acreage. The net income derived from beans, plus the direct payments for diverting the acreage, was pitted against the income cotton could generate from the open market.

This year soybeans must compete directly with cotton without benefit of cotton diversion payments. Thus, the amount of beans planted on non-supported cotton acreage will be directly dependent upon the soybean support level.

While we do not know the soybean support level, the simple algebraic equation presented below will help estimate at what level it must be set to be competitive with cotton.

The equation is as follows:

$$Y_s(P_s) - C_s = Y_c(P_c) - C_c$$

Where:

Y_s=Estimated yield of soybeans per acre.

P_s=Price of soybeans (unknown).

C_s=Variable cost of soybeans per acre.

Y_c=Estimated yield of cotton per acre.

P_c=Price of cotton per pound of lint (.2025).

C_c=Variable cost of cotton per acre less cost of ginning (ginning cost assumed to be offset by sale of seed).

Louisiana average variable costs for soybeans and cotton and the three-year average yield for the two crops are as follows:

Variable cost per acre:	
Cotton (does not include ginning cost)	$81
Soybeans	27
Three-year average yield:	
Cotton (pounds)	622
Soybeans (bushels)	24

Inserting these into the equation and solving for P_s we find:

$$24(P_s) - 27 = 622(.2025) - 81$$

$$24(P_s) = 622(.2025) - 81 + 27$$

$$P_s = \frac{622(.2025) - 81 + 27}{24}$$

$$P_s = \frac{71.96}{24}$$

$$P_s = \$2.99 \text{ per bushel}$$

Assuming a support level of $2.25; a solution for the yield level of soybeans is as follows:

$$Y_s(2.25) - 27 = 622(.2025) - 81$$

$$Y_s(2.25) = 622(.2025) - 81 + 27$$

$$Y_s = \frac{622(.2025) - 81 + 27}{2.25}$$

$$Y_s = \frac{71.96}{2.25}$$

$$Y_s = 32 \text{ bushels}$$

Normally land consistently capable of yielding 32 bushels of soybeans will yield 750 pounds or more of lint cotton per acre. Assuming this yield level for cotton and beans, a competitive bean price would be as follows:

$$32(P_s) - 27 = 750(.2025) - 81$$

$$32(P_s) = 750(.2025) - 81 + 27$$

$$P_s = 750(.2025) - 81 + 27$$

$$P_s = \frac{750(.2025) - 81 + 27}{32}$$

$$P_s = \frac{97.88}{32}$$

$$P_s = \$3.62 \text{ per bushel}$$

It would appear, on the basis of these calculations, that soybeans are not competitive with cotton under present price, yield and cost relationships.

SENSITIVITY TRAINING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the accelerated use of "sensitivity training" as a tool to indoctrinate the masses for a "planned change" in the United States has resulted in confusion, frustration, and wholesale disorientation among our unsuspecting people.

Sensitivity training has been successfully used by the Bolsheviks as a brainwashing technique to erode an individual's will to resist, to destroy moral values, and as a method of controlling enslaved millions.

Why would free men utilize sensitivity training tactics, by whatever name or label, on their fellow Americans?

Think it over the next time you are watching a one-sided panel discussion or an emotional public service broadcast on TV; a slanted newscast or even reading the weighted editorials in your newspaper. It all boils down to whether we are to be groups or individuals, robots or free men.

For research reading:

"Brainwashing in Red China," by Edward Hunter, 1951.

"Battle for the Mind," by William Sargant, 1957.

"Brainwashing," by Edward Hunter, 1962.

"Manipulation of Human Behavior," by Biderman and Zimmer, 1961.

"Thought Reform and the Psychology of Totalism," by Robert Jay Lifton, 1961.

So that our colleagues may have the benefit of a documented research paper on the subject, I include a report prepared by SOS—Series on Sensitivity, box 20698, Long Beach, Calif., as follows:

SENSITIVITY TRAINING FOR PLANNED CHANGE

Legislators, educators and law enforcement officials are deeply concerned about the anarchy and rebellion taking place across the length and breadth of our land. In the churches, leaders and laymen, alike, are apprehensive about the revolutionary changes taking place within their denominations which would replace our Christian-Judaic concepts with a Humanist philosophy. Parents are fearful that the schools and volunteer organizations, to which they entrust the development of their youth, are not only failing to reinforce those principles which have provided the foundation of our country, but, in some cases, are undermining these very ideals. Unfortunately, most of these concerned individuals are not aware that tax money, tuition, tithing and contributions are all being used to promote and perpetuate programs which are helping to bring about the very conditions which they fear. Some of these programs come under the general heading of sensitivity training.

Sensitivity training programs, in their various forms, are being adopted for use by many groups and organizations throughout the nation. These groups include churches, public and parochial school administrators, teachers and students, businessmen, government employees and youth groups, including YMCA's, etc.

After reading this material we hope you will share our concern about the following facts: In spite of the claimed goals of sensitivity training, which are love, trust, openness of communication, leadership and a better understanding of others, these programs have been proven to cause distrust and the breakdown of communication between participants. Sensitivity programs incorporate the use of criticism, undermine authority and encourage permissiveness. These programs downgrade, rather than uplift the individual, and dwell on the negative, instead of the positive. They discourage individual responsibility and promote "fellowship" instead of leadership.

Undoubtedly, most people presenting or participating in such programs are convinced that they serve a needed and worthwhile purpose in helping individuals to adjust to society's problems. However, many specialists in the field of psychiatry recognize criticism to be an integral part of the brainwashing technique used so destructively by the Chinese Communists on our military men in Korea and even now being used by the Viet Cong on captured American servicemen. Because sensitivity training programs incorporate the use of criticism and emotion-manipulating non-verbal and body-awareness exercises, we question the advisability of voluntary adult participation, and strongly object to its mandatory use with public employees and school children. We question even the voluntary use of such training in youth groups such as the YMCA's.

Personal feelings and political attitudes disclosed in sensitivity training sessions often become a part of a permanent file on each individual. Included in the file are evaluations by the Trainer or Group Leader, who is usually associated with psychiatry, mental health or the behavioral sciences. From these records can be found those who are "deemed" to be "maladjusted", "neurotic" or "psychotic" in educational, social, occupational or religious fields.

Those American psychiatrists and psychologists who are attempting to make sick minds well have earned public respect for proper efforts in this field of endeavor. It is difficult for us to comprehend that there does exist a mis-use of psychology. Communist and Nazi psychopolitics (the art of asserting and maintaining dominion over the thoughts and loyalties of individuals, officers, bureaus, and masses, and the effecting of the conquest of enemy nations through 'mental healing') was designed to use psychology to subvert respect for parental authority, loyalty to country, religious and moral convictions and the worth of the individual in making his own decisions—in other words, to make well minds sick. Unfortunately, conscientious workers in the field of mental health have sometimes worked to promote techniques and programs which, unknown to them, were purposely designed to accomplish these last-named results.

Presentation of this material is not intended to imply a subversive element in all group psychology programs. It is important to realize that psychiatry has been used for good purposes, as well as mis-used for bad. This material has been compiled in order that you may more easily recognize procedures used in sensitivity training and similar programs which you, as an individual may wish to avoid.

Sensitivity training, in its various forms is but one type of many programs in use to change the attitudes and behavior of the American public. In this report we have touched on a few of these "change" programs. In doing so we have included information and references from many and varied sources—both those who support this theory of "planned change" and those who do not. Material was chosen for its pertinence to this particular question, and assembled for consecutive reading.

EXAMPLES OF CLASSIFIED ADS APPEARING IN UNDERGROUND NEWPAPERS

Hippies: sell underground papers: Free Press, Countdown, Oracle. Come to the Paper House behind the Blue Grotto, 1010 N. Fairfax.

Sensitivity training: A series of social sensitivity training sessions conducted by a qualified practitioner in the field of mental health beginning on 24th May. Separate 12 hour marathons will also be continued and the next will be on 13 May. For reservations call WE 1-0332.

Social sensitivity games: Evening group encounters for self understanding, increased social awareness and the personal search for authenticity. Weekly 2½ hour sessions conducted by qualified specialists in Beverly Hills area. Membership $25 per month after first complimentary session. Telephone 476-1949 and ask for "Games."

Group therapy for couples—married or not. Ambivalent about remaining together? Improve communication and enhance enjoyment through this daring, swinging approach. Sat. Eves. from 9. For information call Irv Rich, therapist, 386-8171.

Marathon encounter: For deeper Sensitivity and Self Understanding, $20 per 24 hour session. Special Student fee. Westwood area. Reservations for May 26-27 & June 2-3 session, 474-6313 for information.

Sex Hang-Ups? Just "normal"? We need you! Write giving phone & "sketchy" details to: Behavioral Research Associates—720 N. Brand 105C Glendale, Calif.

Male scientist 35, wants scientific girl. Do you prefer the workshop when others dance and play? Rather perform experiments than run in the fast-moving crowd? Prefer lab to a party? I'm like that. I would like to get to know you. Sincere girl please reply. No men. Steve, POB 967, Lawndale.

Marathons: A series of social sensitivity marathons conducted by qualified specialists in the field of mental health. An opportunity to increase self awareness and see yourself as others see you. $25 per 12-hour session. Phone WE10332 for reservation. Next meetings May 13 and 27.

Where are you at? Find out explore yourself thru 4th dimensional therapy. Jon Sikes, 393-0636.

Sexual discussion group forming. No subjects taboo. Limited enrollment. Send $1.00 for details to Behavioral Research Assoc. 720 W Brand Blvd. Glendale, Calif.

Group therapy for young adults. New group now forming, limit of 12. Fri 8-11 pm. Emphasis of group interaction, focusing on the 'here and now.' For reservations call Irv Rich, therapist. 386-8171.

Drama Class: Creativity & Joy Sensitivity, sensory & fantasy experiences: Emotional honesty found & used. Tu. $4 Th. $3, Berghoff, GL 4-5465.

Psychodrama: Every Friday 9 pm. 411 S. Ardmore L.A. Between Wilshire & 4th 387-2851.

Free self awareness group. Self run. Mostly current & former college students. Hollywood Hills. Sat. eves. 737-1082.

The sexualization education: The Organic-Historic reality of consciousness-expansion. Inventive experimental approach to learning, problem-solving, communication. Blake College 342 E 10 Eugene, Oregon 97401.

[From the Police Chief's Manual, November 1967]

SENSITIVITY TRAINING: A WORD OF CAUTION

(By W. Cleon Skousen)

Recently there has developed a rapidly growing fad among behavioral scientists (recently adopted name for sociologists) to urge police departments and other public officials to take "sensitivity training." It is described as the latest method of improving "interpersonal relations." This means getting a better understanding of other people, catching their point of view and appreciating their aspirations or frustrations. It is also designed to discover their attitude toward you so you can change where necessary.

It is easily understood why such a program had a strong initial appeal to the police. If the law enforcement profession could develop a sound understanding and a wholesome working relationship with the public it would be the fulfillment of the policeman's greatest dream.

From the first, however, one thing disturbed police administrators. It looked as though this sensitivity training was too much like a one-way street. They found that the police were going to be trained to be sensitive to the feelings, aspirations and frustrations of hoodlums, narcotics addicts, alcoholics, riot-makers and ex-convicts, but, from all the police could tell, a comparable effort was not going to be made to get criminals, looters, junkies and rioters to be sensitive to the havoc they were creating in the community. What about that?

And there was another problem. Since the major police departments and many of the minor ones had already set up rather elaborate training programs in public and interpersonal relations, why not concentrate on the criminals, the third-generation welfare recipients, the hippies, beatniks, riot-inciters and other off-beat citizens to see if, by some happy miraculous development, they might not meet the police halfway? But the behavioral scientists said no.

Gradually the awful truth crept out. It was the *police*, the behavioral scientists said, who were failing to come half-way! Admit this to be a fact, take sensitivity training to correct it, and the behavioral scientists promised that the police would discover the molotov-cocktailers, the psychedelic set, the ex-convict fraternity, and all the other misunderstood mentalities could be converted into a friendly, cooperative, responsive and ever-loving cadre of sensitive citizenry. Altogether, it was a rather amazing line of logic. They were saying, in effect, "Criminals and mob-makers are the problem, therefore let's have the police take remedial training so the criminal and mob-makers will change."

Nevertheless, some of the police decided to take a look. What they discovered was not at all reassuring. Studies of sensitivity training revealed that instead of producing harmony, understanding, reconciliation and feelings of mutual adjustment, too often the very opposite occurred.

WHAT IS SENSITIVITY TRAINING?

Police officials discovered that sensitivity training was not all what they had expected. They were already familiar with the conference method of discussing and ventilating problems. They were also familiar with traditional group therapy where alcoholics, hardened criminals or psycho-neurotics sit together to share their mutual problems and seek group support for individual improvement. However, "sensitivity training" seemed to be deliberately designed to achieve something entirely different.

As a rule, somewhere between fifteen to twenty people are assigned to each training unit. These units are called "T-Groups"—Training Groups. The object is to explore feelings and attitudes. Everyone meets on a first-name basis. The participants are instructed to tell the absolute truth as to their personal feelings on any and all subjects, describe their weaknesses, ventilate personal problems, expose hostilities and define frustrations. They are also instructed to disclose their beliefs, state their moral values, describe their attitudes and see if they can defend the convictions which they express.

In summary, it is a session of group confession and group criticism.

It is the task of the behavioral psychologist who leads the group to see that the participants probe their most sensitive feelings on the most sensitive subjects. He will also lead out where necessary in challenging the beliefs, attitudes and moral values which the various group members may express.

It will be recognized immediately that the purpose of sensitivity training is focussed in the opposite direction from group therapy. Group therapy takes a person with an acute problem such as alcohol, drugs, or a criminal-prone personality and utilizes the strength of group interaction to fortify an individual in seeking to rise above his problem. Sensitivity training, on the other hand, focusses the scrutiny of the group on the personal convictions already established by the individual and seeks to undermine them if possible.

A study of logs of numerous sensitivity or T-Group training sessions would lead one to believe that the promoters of these programs are trying to homogenize the members of the group. Individualism must be sacrificed. Group dependency must be established. When one member holds out for a conviction or moral value which is above the norm of the group, the tendency is for the group to gang up on that member in an attempt to justify their own lower values. Ridicule, sarcasm and other "honest" feelings are expressed against the hold-out. At sensitivity "marathons" where the sessions are usually twenty-four hours without food or sleep, the person with individualistic views may be under verbal attack for two or three hours at a time. Since very few people have taken the time to construct a complete brief and thereby justify their various beliefs, such a procedure tends to destroy even shallow roots which the individual may have developed. If this happens, then he commences to feel very dependent upon the group. He begins seeking "consensus" before he dares take a position. Approval can become more important to him than truth.

RESULTS OF GROUP CONFESSIONALS

The group confessionals also have their impact. A psychological climate is nurtured in

the T-Group so the members will open up their hearts and memories to disclose some of their most delicate feelings and private problems. The logs show that there is an obvious pre-occupation with sex problems during this phase of the T-Group session. In this temporary climate of intimacy, each participant is inclined to go far beyond personal propriety or normal restraint. As a result, when the climate has cooled off the various members often feel a sense of shame and isolation for regurgitating such intimate matters. When the group meets again there are often feelings of hostility. Those who have stripped their souls during the public confessional begin to get feelings of abject debasement. As they look around the group each one becomes a secret accuser. Normal feelings of gregarious companionship are replaced by suspicion and restraint. All of this can have a highly traumatic effect on the individual participant.

A Long Beach paper published excerpts from the log of a YMCA T-Group to demonstrate what an emotional gauntlet the participants had passed through. After "interacting" for a considerable period of time, the log read: ". . . Mary Kay arrived crying . . . she said, 'I'm glad I'm Burt's friend—this whole mess makes me sick!' Martha got too involved. Bobbie nudged her to be quiet. Rick told Mary Kay to shut her mouth . . . Mary Kay said, 'I feel for him (Burt).' . . . she told Martha 'I hate you . . .'" (Long Beach Independent, December 16, 1966, in an article by George Robeson entitled, "Dynamite: To Be Handled With Care.")

As complaints from parents began to pile up, a Long Beach psychiatrist warned, "There is danger of serious psychological damage rather than benefit from this type of group therapy meeting. . . ." Actually, this was not a "group therapy" meeting but a session in sensitivity training. The difference between the two is one of emphasis. Group therapy emphasizes strengthening convictions and attitudes, sensitivity training is to manipulate, alter or destroy attitudes.

WHY WAS T-GROUP TRAINING USED ON U.S. PRISONERS BY THE RED CHINESE?

Although the Behavioral Science faction officially adopted these techniques of group confession and group criticism in 1946, the Government exposed it as a psychological warfare device utilized by the Red Chinese against U.S. prisoners during the Korean War.

Major William E. Mayer, a medical doctor and psychiatrist for the Army, interviewed every single prisoner of war upon his return. It was discovered that these prisoners had been subjected to extensive T-Group training as a means of dividing them, destroying their esprit de corps, eliminating respect between officers and enlisted men, and causing them to become informers against fellow Americans. Never in the annals of U.S. military service was there such a complete breakdown among captured prisoners.

Major Mayer described the results of the group confessions and group criticism seminars: ". . . The Chinese couldn't have cared less about what you talked, really. It was the function of talking, because very rapidly other soldiers begin to stop smiling and start listening. Very rapidly the soldier who was talking gets the feeling that . . . he had gone too far; he had exposed himself too much. . . . So when ten men would walk out of a self-criticism group, they would walk out in ten separate directions, divided like sticks in the Old Testament that you can break so easily when they are apart but are so strong if they're together." (A direct quote from the film "The Ultimate Weapon—Brainwashing," narrated by Major William E. Mayer, M.C., U.S. Army.)

Therefore what American soldiers went through in the Communist Chinese prisoners-of-war camps, American citizens are now being asked to go through in sensitivity T-Group Training.

What are the so-called Behavioral Scientists attempting to accomplish?

BASIC CONCEPTS OF "BEHAVIORAL SCIENTISTS"

The advocates of behavioral science operate on the principle that human behavior is fixed and determined by material circumstances (inheritance and environment) and that if you could computerize all the factors you would find that what we call "free will" is not voluntary at all but a mechanical reaction to measurable forces which need to be discovered and catalogued. In other words, the code of Judaic Christian morality is cruel and unfair. People do what they do because of forces working upon them which need to be understood and accommodated. Each person should decide what is right for him and insofar as possible forget about the law, morals, religion, and so forth.

Of course, it naturally follows that if people do not really have a choice in their actions then the whole basis for the American penal code is untenable. This will explain the fight which the behavioral scientists have carried on for years to treat criminals as "sick" people. They would wipe out the system of penalties in the legal code. They view a criminal as someone who is responding to compulsory forces for which he should not be held responsible but should be "treated."

In the *Scientific American* for November, 1963, Edward J. Sachar wrote an article entitled, "Behavioral Science and Criminal Law." Said he: "The behavioral sciences proceed from premises diametrically opposed to the moral premises of the law. . . . The goals of the behavioral sciences are the understanding and the manipulation of behavior. For these ends the concept of free will . . . is of no use. On the contrary it is necessary to postulate that the behavior and the thought of men are determined in accordance with discoverable laws. Only with this working premise can the determinants—social, psychological, physiological and cultural—be identified and their workings analyzed." (pp. 40–41)

This will help explain why so much of sensitivity training is devoted to challenging and discrediting the Judaic-Christian value-system of any who may participate in a T-Group. At the base of this sensitivity training technique lies an ideological war against the entire warp and woof of the American culture.

It deserves to be recognized for what it is.

A WARNING TO ORANGE COUNTY PARENTS

(By State Senator John G. Schmitz)

The most familiar duty of an elected representative of the people is to express their will in the making and carrying out of laws. But an elected representative has a further duty. When, from his point of vantage at the seat of government, he learns of a grave danger to the people he represents, he can be the first to sound a warning.

For several months I have been receiving reports from well-informed and reliable sources about a practice called "Sensitivity Training" which has been used here in California in the State Department of Corrections, in certain large business corporations, and in YMCA groups of high school students. Sensitivity training has already been made mandatory on a continuing basis for many California parole officers and their office staff.

These reports aroused my deep concern from the beginning, because this "sensitivity training" employs almost exactly the same method that was used to brainwash American prisoners of war in Korea—organized "group criticism."

Group criticism compels the participant to bare his soul before 10 to 15 other persons who are required to do likewise, under the direction of a group leader. The individual is pressed to seek out real or imagined shortcomings in his personality and in his thinking, to humble himself and give up his independence of mind and judgment, to make himself utterly dependent on the good opinion of the others in the group and the leader of the group.

In time this eats away the very foundations of individual resistance to indoctrination and outside control. Group criticism is used regularly and scientifically for this purpose in every communist country. In the North Korean prison camps it systematically broke down the self-confidence of American prisoners and their trust in one another as individuals and as Americans.

On March 27th a newspaper report revealed that a sensitivity training program, financed in part by the U.S. Office of Education, has been proposed for the schools of Garden Grove. The group criticism sessions will include teachers, school counselors, *and individual children whom they select and compel to attend.* Over 7500 seventh-grade and eighth-grade boys and girls in Garden Grove schools are thus to be exposed to the same kind of psychological pressures which broke strong men in Korea and have driven seasoned parole agents in Los Angeles to the verge of nervous breakdown.

The news story stated that Garden Grove school officials expect "routine approval" of this plan.

I am confident that Orange County parents will not submit so tamely to so great a threat to their children. For if your child thinks for himself and takes pride in himself, if he respects sound moral values, if he dares to be right when the majority is wrong—then "sensitivity training" is like a gun aimed at his head.

This vicious program can be blocked if only enough Orange County people know what is happening and tell their friends and neighbors. Many might write to our fine Orange County School Superintendent, Dr. Robert Peterson, and ask his help in the fight against it. Those who live in Garden Grove should write, phone or visit their school officials and demand that they never introduce "sensitivity training." To the best of my knowledge this is the first attempt to require group criticism for children at any public school in America. We must crush it under the weight of a united public opinion before it has become a rooted destroyer of the best in our children.

SELECTED QUOTATIONS

From: *"Brainwashing"*, by Major William E. Mayer, M.D. Based on his experiences as chief neuro-psychiatrist of the U.S. Army in charge of the Task Force in Tokyo responsible for rehabilitation of returned American Prisoners of War from Korea:

"The students (American prisoners) were all divided into guided discussion groups, the seminar method. In such groups of twelve or fifteen at the very most, you were not required to agree with the few simple points that had been presented and then reiterated again and again in the morning's lecture. You were merely required to put them into your own words and comment upon them any way that you wanted. You did not have to take part in the discussion. The penalty for not doing so was that your discussion group wasn't allowed to have supper until you did, which meant that the pressures, of course, became internal."

"Well, this was the formal structure of the education, but the thing that made it work so well for the overall objective was the little gimmicks that were connected with it; the informing, the self-criticism, and the control of the soldier's mail. Informing is a way of life in the people's democracy and if you are to understand anything about Communism, you must understand this. Informing as it is done in the Communist state can only be

done when you reject our basic premise that the individual is an entity, that he has dignity and worth, that he is entitled to certain things like privacy. And once you abandon this concept of the individual and visualize him as does the Marxist as a fragment of a class in that greatest of all realities, the struggle between the classes, then of course informing becomes not a miserable, mean, nasty renunciation of individual loyalties, it becomes an exercise in social responsibility which is exactly the way it was encouraged and exactly the way it grew even among Americans."

"Confession is terribly important in the Communist state. Confess that it's wrong and analyze your confession. Analyze why it's wrong, why it's destructive. Assert your determination not to do it again in the future, and preferably, write this down and sign it . . ."

"The Chinese weren't interested at all in what you told them and they could care less about anti-social activities. What they were interested in is what happens between you and the man who informs after he informs, even though it doesn't hurt you at all."

"What the Communists are doing with their informing and their self-criticism and their revaluation of their basic relationship between individuals is the. are preventing the counter-revolution, because every revolution has got to begin with a conspiracy between you and me, between two men. If you can divide on this individual level, if you can drive a wedge between each of the first two men, you've got no revolution."

"Now self-criticism helped this and that's why it's done not only in the Chinese army and in their prison camps, but it is even done in the Kremlin. It's done in the cells of the party here in the U.S. It's a collectivized group religious confessional, sort of . . ."

"And again, the Chinese couldn't have cared less about what you talked, really. It was the function of talking, because very rapidly other soldiers begin to stop smiling and start listening. Very rapidly the soldier who was talking gets the feeling that somehow, somehow, he couldn't think just now, he had gone too far; he had exposed himself too much. . . ."

"So when ten men would walk out of a self-criticism group, they would walk out in ten separate directions, divided like those sticks in the Old Testament that you can break so easily when they are apart and they are so strong if they're together."

NOTE.—This complete testimony is given in a film entitled "The Ultimate Weapon," produced by Film Associates of California.

From: "Communist Psychological Warfare (Brainwashing)," by Edward Hunter, foreign correspondent and author of "Brainwashing In Red China" and "Brainwashing—The Story of the Men Who Defied It." Following are excerpts from his consultation with the Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, 85th Congress.

"I spent 30 years, a little bit more perhaps, in countries under various forms of Communist pressure and attack. What I am witnessing in America is no different from what I saw in these other countries."

"I see, primarily, as part of this softening up process in America, the liquidation of our attitudes on what we used to accept as absolute moral standards. We now confuse moral standards with the sophistication of dialectical materialism, with a Communist crackpot, theology which teaches that everything changes, and that what is right or wrong, good or bad, changes as well. So nothing they say is really good or bad. There is no such thing as truth or a lie; and any belief we actually held was simply our being unsophisticated. They don't say this in so many words, except to those who are already indoctrinated in communism. What they do say to the rest of us is to be objective . . ."

"The Communists are being abetted in their brainwashing program in the U.S. by the collapse of traditional American ideals of self-reliance and individual integrity."

"The basis for modern psychological warfare, which makes it different from whatever was done in the past, are the findings of the Russian psychologist, Pavlov. He was not a Communist. He had completed his most important discoveries before the Communists took power. His first discovery was the effectiveness of using a living animal in experiments, rather than a dead animal. His second great discovery was that the instincts of an animal, that we call reflexes, were of 2 kinds. One was the reflexes which the animal was born with, its unconditioned reflexes. The other was its conditioned reflexes, which man can train into the animal. Most of us have heard of Pavlov's experiments with dogs and lights. He first provided a bowl of food and turned on a light of a certain color, then an empty bowl and turned on a different colored light. After he had done this a number of times, he turned on the light that accompanied the food, but presented an empty bowl to the animal, and the dog deposited just as much saliva as when the bowl was full. When he switched the lights and the bowls of food, the animal became neurotic, barked, was driven into a state which among human beings we call insanity."

"When the Communist hierarchy in Moscow discovered that it was unable to persuade people willingly to follow communism, when they found that they could not create what they wanted, the 'new Soviet man' in which human nature would be changed, they turned to Pavlov and his experiments. They considered people the same as animals anyway, and refused to recognize the role of reason or divinity in a human being. They took over the Pavlovian experiments on animals and extended them to people. They did so with the objectives of changing human nature and creating a 'new Soviet man'. People, they anticipated, would react voluntarily under Pavlovian pressures, in a way the dog does, to Communist orders, exactly as ants do in their collectivized society."

NOTE.—Complete text of "Communist Psychological Warfare (Brainwashing)" available for 15¢ from Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Gov't. Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

From: "Brainwashing—The Story of the Men Who Defied It", by Edward Hunter, Pyrmid Publications, New York.

"All or most of the techniques used therapeutically by neuropsychiatrists and psychiatrists for the rehabilitation of mentally ill persons are employed by the communist hierarchy to produce hysterical and obsessive delusional states in the population under their domination."

"If brainwashing can make a single individual neurotic, what about the inhabitants of a village, or a city, or even a country, when subjected to these same pressures? There is no doubt any longer that this type of mind attack is being waged against entire populations . . . The only possible conclusion is that a long-range program is being pursued which, if left unhindered over a long period, will make whole populations just as neurotic as a single individual . . . The identical process of brainwashing, as imposed on civilian or military prisoners, is being applied to the inhabitants of whole villages, towns, and cities, by 'group discussions' and 'learning' meetings, frequent demonstrations . . . They are undergoing what the disciples of Pavlov callously term 'mental hygiene'. The process is a parody of 'group therapy' . . . (It is) applied with particular intensity to the very young and the teenagers. If this manipulation of minds is able to continue unhampered, within a comparatively few years a 'new youth' will be produced with blind spots in their minds, making them oblivious to anything not acceptable to Pavlovian symbolism."

A COMPARISON

COMMUNIST USE OF SELF-GROUP CRITICISM BRAINWASHING

Communist Self-Group Criticism originated in Russia in 1929 with the Communist slogan: "Through Bolshevist self-criticism we will enforce the dictatorship of the proletariat". This method of thought control and mind-manipulation, sometimes called brainwashing, in based on the Pavlovian theory of conditioning, and is used to control all the peoples behind the Iron Curtain, and to create The New Soviet Man. The populace is divided into communes and then into small groups of 10–15, forced to meet regularly and participate in Self-Group Criticism. This spotlights the agitators or potential troublemakers, who are then brought into the "correct" line of thinking. This procedure has created the most effective tyranny ever devised. Through Self-Group Criticism (divulging their innermost thoughts and informing on themselves and others) the people create their own police state and control one another.

AMERICAN USE OF SELF-GROUP CRITICISM SENSITIVITY TRAINING

American Self-Group Criticism originated in Connecticut in 1946 to bring about Human Change. Participants are divided into small groups of 10–15 and employ Self-Group Criticism for the purpose of acquiring "appropriate" attitudes and behavior. Participants are pressed to seek out real or imagined shortcomings in their personality and thinking, to criticize themselves and others in the group. This spotlights the individualists, who are then taught "new", "improved" and "appropriate" behavior and attitudes. Group standards are developed which give rewards to an individual as he changes his actions from less to more group-centered behavior. Through Self-Group Criticism an atmosphere of doubt and dissatisfaction is created in which participants are conditioned to accept the idea that our social system must be changed.

BRAINWASHING

Mandatory.
8 to 16 Group Members—1 Leader.
Seminar, large group indoctrination.
Relax personal defenses.
Group conformity.
Self-Group Criticism.
Confessions.
Pressures, tension, anxieties, fatigue.
3 Steps: Unlearn, change, re-learn.
Favors and rewards for change.
Uncover reactionaries.
Uncover information.
Undermines authority, leadership.
Realigns loyalties.
Changes individuals and society.

"Conscientious practice of self-criticism is still another hallmark distinguishing our Party from all other political parties"—Mao-Tse-Tung.

SENSITIVITY TRAINING

Mandatory and voluntary.
8 to 16 Trainees—1 Trainer.
Seminar, large group indoctrination.
Permissive Atmosphere.
Interdependence.
Self-Group Criticism.
Open, Honest, Truthful.
Pressures, tension, anxieties, fatigue.
3 Steps: Unfreeze, change, re-freeze.
Supports and rewards for change.
Uncover individualists.
Uncover information.
Undermines authority, leadership.
Realigns loyalties.
Changes individuals and society.

"Sensitivity Training is a means for altering the basic personality structure of an individual"—Carl Rogers, Western Behavioral Sciences Institute.

After hearing others confess their wrongdoings, one is apt to feel his own weren't so bad after all, thus causing one to accept

lower moral standards. After discovering that one's own family standards are far different from those of "the group", one is apt to doubt whose standards are correct. After receiving impressions that one's church teachings are out of step with current times, according to the background of the trainer, or "the group", one is apt to doubt church doctrine. After criticizing one's home, family, friends, church attitude, beliefs and ideas, one is apt to doubt that he has any values, ideals or beliefs worth keeping or defending. Programs of this nature can and do realign loyalties away from family, home, church and co-workers. After being discouraged from individual decision-making, in favor of "the group decision", one is apt to feel inadequate and unable to make decisions without approval of the group. Guilt feelings may result from having knowingly hurt someone. Having disclosed attitudes that differ from the group norm, and knowing that this information may be put into an individual profile record, one is apt to feel apprehensive for fear this information may be used against him.

WHAT IS SENSITIVITY TRAINING?

Origin and history: The National Training Laboratories in Group Development had its beginning in 1946, comprising members from the Connecticut Interracial Commission (concerned with problems of Negro-White relations), the Connecticut Staff of National Conference of Christians and Jews (concerned with problems of Jewish-non-Jewish relations and interreligious problems), and Connecticut Department of Education (concerned with citizenship programs and practices). Kurt Lewin headed the Research Staff which included Ronald Lippitt of the Research Center for Group Dynamics; Kenneth Benne, Teachers College, Columbia University and later at Boston University; and Leland Bradford of the Division of Adult Education Services of the NEA (National Education Association). These three were the founders of Sensitivity Training (Laboratory Training) and carried on the work of Kurt Lewin who died in 1947. In 1954 the name was changed to the National Training Laboratories in order to symbolize the growing involvement of different disciplines of social science and practice, including business administration, political science, anthropology and psychiatry.

The interest of these Behavioral Scientists lay in human change and how to bring it about. In 1956 the National Training Laboratories held its first workshop for industrial administrators and National church executives, and in 1958 sponsored its first laboratory for educational administrators and key executives of volunteer organizations. In 1960 they conducted an intensive eight week program to teach selected young social scientists the skills of human relations and have kept this program in continuous operation. A program to train trainers for within-organizations was also established.

Extent: The National Education Association (NEA), from its National Training Laboratories in Bethel, Maine, coordinates the work of several hundred trainers in training centers and universities in the United States. This includes training for heterogeneous groups and for social groups of business executives, school executives, community leaders, teachers, college students and faculty, juvenile court judges, wives of young executives, governmental officials, professional church workers, supervisory personnel in local school districts and national voluntary association executives. In order to acquire professional trainers, the National Education Association (NEA) works with, and obtains assistance from, the National Institute of Mental Health. These programs are funded by foundations, government agencies and private donors. In addition, regional centers, stressing Sensitivity or Laboratory Training have been developed at Boston University, Temple University, The George Washington University, University of Texas, University of Chicago, Rocky Mountain Laboratory, Intermountain Laboratory, sponsored by University of Utah, University of California, Northwest Laboratory, initiated by the Seattle Public Schools and aided by the University of Washington, and others.

Training programs are being conducted in Puerto Rico, Nigeria, India, England, France, Belgium, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Australia, Germany, Netherlands. Proponents claim that cross-national T-Groups appear to be an excellent medium in which to examine "culture shock," inter-nation conflict and the idea of a common "human nature".

Behavioral Scientists and educators, by "merging science and democracy" have created a planned change potential for the "total personality system" and the "total social system". One of the methods in widespread use is Sensitivity Training. Sensitivity Training is conducted under various titles, such as: Sensitivity Training, Group Dynamics, Leadership Training, Group Confession, Group Discussion, Interpersonal Competence, Interpersonal Relations, Self-Evaluation, Human Potential Workshop, T-Group Training, Auto-Criticism, Operant Conditioning, Self-Honesty Sessions, Human Relations Lab, Class in Group Counseling Synanon Games Clubs, Management Development, Basic Encounter Group.

Trends in training: Sensitivity Training programs have been in almost constant transition regarding objectives, designs and methods. Early training groups dealt with "on-the-job" problems and "then-and-there" matters. These were objective programs, independent of the mind, covering external matters. Later, the involvement turned to "gut-level" "here-and-now" events and attention focused upon matters such as "central life values" and personal attitudes toward home, friends, family, politics, sex and religion. These are subjective programs, relating to, proceeding from or taking place within the individual's mind or emotions.

Purposes of laboratory training: The laboratory attempts to recruit for its training those who are already leaders in various organizations—those who are in a position to encourage change in the group life of their organizations or communities. Since changed behavior, as well as increased knowledge is the aim of such training, participants must become more deeply involved than would be necessary if gaining knowledge were the only aim. Only by deeper involvement can resistance to change be overcome. Trainers stress the importance of participants permanently maintaining their change of attitudes and behavior. Unless there is an equivalent change in the attitudes and expectations and reactions of those to whom the trainee relates, in the back-home situation, changed behavior will be maintained only with difficulty. For this reason, the Lab encourages organizations to send teams rather than individuals. Team members are able to reinforce one another, to encourage continual self-training and collaborate on "improving" the "back-home" situation. Follow-up sessions are usually provided. One of the easiest ways to be sure that a given change will be thoroughly "internalized" is to get the trainee to become a trainer. In the "back-home" situation he may then become an effective Change Agent.

Change agents: Persuading persons or organizations to put into practice new ideas of behavior patterns is the purpose of a Change Agent. Some Change Agents are used for the constructive purpose of increasing production or efficiency in management. Through the use of Sensitivity Training or similar techniques, however, some Change Agents attempt to bring about a change in political, moral and religious values when working in churches, universities, volunteer organizations, youth groups, etc.

Methods used in training: The learner is involved in the training situation to a point where he feels it vital to become an accepted member of the group and to help work out group problems. An attempt is made to develop an atmosphere of permissiveness in which it is possible for individuals to examine their own behavior, ideas, motives and values, and to accept criticism from others without defensiveness. Group standards are developed which give rewards to an individual as he changes his actions from less to more group-centered behavior. Opportunities are created for each learner to test and practice "new," "improved," and "appropriate" behavior.

Anxieties: Participants can become easily aroused in the training situation for several reasons: (1) Failure to measure up to expectations of others. (2) Rejection by the group or trainer. (3) Attacks from others. (4) Loss of status. (5) Fear of ridicule or hurt. (6) The consequences of changing.

The individual is open to a variety of threatening experiences. It becomes the duty of the trainer to dispel these anxieties without making it easy for the trainee to escape from the change process. Proponents maintain this is one of the most crucial points of training and at this point the responsibility of the trainer closely parallels that of the therapist. Training situations where the target is behavioral change do violence to the expectations of those who come for training, expecting one kind of situation and find another in which their behavior, attitudes, values, standards and ideas are being probed.

Role of trainer: The role of the trainer is a complex one. He is an initiator, agenda planner, mediator, a source of new values, behavior model and a facilitator of the learning process. The trainer has no alternative but to manipulate; his job is to plan and produce behavior in order to create changes in other people. The victim of mind-manipulation does not know he is a victim. Results occurring from training would naturally depend upon the trainer's intelligence, emotional reactions, anxieties, imaginative capacity, political attitudes, religious beliefs, moral standards and general character traits.

DEVICES USED IN TRAINING

1. Ground rules: Agreed upon by trainer and trainees at opening session. As one helps to formulate these rules one feels "committed" to abide by them. Some often used are: agreeing to stay the entire time; agreeing to be open and honest with the group; no talking during non-verbal exercises; no side conversations because thoughts, feelings, ideas, etc. become "group property"; physical violence prohibited because if anger could be released through physical expression it would not be so likely to be expressed verbally. Use of language normally thought objectionable is encouraged for free expression.

2. Self and group criticism: For the purpose of discovering personality changes that need to be made. Sometimes encouraged under the guise of "giving perceptions".

3. Testing: Written tests are often administered at the beginning and end of training as an instrument for measuring the degree of change accomplished.

4. Periods of silence: This technique coupled with the call to close one's eyes is used when a member's defense mechanisms have stifled the group from attaining the "Lab" goals.

5. Trainer's record: Trainers record in writing their most potent feelings. This gives the trainer further insight as to trainee's reactions at different stages of training.

6. Non-verbal exercises: During a specified amount of time, participants are to convey their feelings by means other than the spoken word. They may use their eyes, facial

expressions, body movements, etc. At times these exercises are accompanied by music.

7. Body awareness exercises: These, along with the non-verbal exercises, are intended to more readily bring about a "feeling level". In one example, everyone lies on the floor and all push in toward the center. The purpose is to achieve a "psychological unity". Another, often used, is to "push" a person to the ground in order for him to "feel" hostility. Then "the group" hastens to help him up, offering "love" and solace to assure this individual that he is "loved" and cared about. These procedures supply the feeling of support necessary in order to be able to "trust" the group members, and to be able to accept the ideas, standards and judgments of "the group".

8. Marathon sessions: A marathon is an extremely intensive experience. Participants meet for a period of several days to a week or more, during which time they do not sleep except for an occasional nap and do not leave the rest of the group except to freshen up or get a bite to eat. This uninterrupted pressure is intended to lower the defenses and drive participants to interact truthfully, authentically and transparently. They are urged to talk "gut-level" to be totally honest, intimate and "authentic". For some it is a way of "turning on", or "recharging emotional batteries".

9. Nude marathons: The newest innovation in interpersonal honesty is the Nude Marathon. Proponents justify this experiment by rationalizing that man has hidden his emotional conflicts behind numerous masks. In our society clothing is a mask which we traditionally remove only in the presence of persons with whom we are intimate. In this situation, clothing is removed as a facilitator of emotional transparency and interpersonal honesty.

10. Wrapup: The wrap-up is a device used by trainers to summarize what the trainees were supposed to have learned in the "lab." One frequently reported wrap-up message is that "in the outside world, they are not on the same wave lengths you are. You have reached a wave length that not many others have achieved. They can't possibly understand unless they've been in a group."

Psychodelic effect: Some forms of "group therapy" result in "consciousness expansion" and have been known to bring about an effect similar to that of LSD. For many it is a new fad and a way of "dropping out" or "blowing their mind". Some people, who might be termed "change agents" seem to become "hooked" on these procedures. Sensitivity Training becomes an obsession and nothing else in life has much meaning for them.

Is sensitivity training brainwashing? "Human relations fits into a context of institutional influence procedure which includes coercive persuasion in the form of thought reform or brainwashing as well as a multitude of less coercive, informal patterns." This quote appears on page 47 of "Issues In Training" from the National Training Lab of the National Education Association. The chapter goes on to explain the 3 steps to bring about the integration of attitudes: (1) Unfreezing—force acting on an individual motivating him to change, either by increasing pressure or by reducing some of the threats of resistance to change. (2) Changing—the actual process of learning new attitudes. (3) Refreezing—the integration of changed attitudes into the rest of the personality. The essential elements to original Unfreezing are: 1. Removal of supports for old attitudes. 2. Saturation of environment with the attitudes to be acquired. 3. A minimizing of threat. 4. Maximum support for the desired change.

Is sensitivity training therapy? Proponents of these programs agree that major similarities exist between Sensitivity Training programs and some forms of group psychotherapy. The rather distinct differences that existed a few years ago appear to be coming more and more blurred. These proponents feel it unnecessary to draw clear-cut distinctions between them and seem to agree that what is needed now is a general theory which would bring under one *conceptual scheme* the various psychotherapies, sensitivity training, psychiatric case work, counseling, guidance, and existential psychology into the *preventative mental health field.*

"Issue in Human Relations Training," 1962, National Training Laboratory, National Education Association (NEA), in promoting Sensitivity Training programs, says that "ill" persons reach out for help while relatively "well" individuals find themselves in a dilemma. Although they *appear* to behave appropriately and *seem* "normal" by most cultural standards, they may actually be in need of mental health care in order to help them change, adapt and conform to the *planned society* in which there will be no conflict of attitudes or beliefs.

"Concepts of Community Psychiatry—a Framework for Training," U.S. Dept. of Health, Education & Welfare (HEW) Document 1319, National Institute of Mental Health ($1.75, Gov't Printing Office, Wash., D.C.) recommends that psychiatrists treat whole communities instead of individuals. It also advises not to wait for patients to come to them because the psychiatrist "carries equal responsibility for all those who do not come." Thus he will be "dealing with those who are not yet sick" but Those who have been "defined as maladjusted in the educational, social, occupational or religious fields and may be struggling on their own. . . ."

GROWTH CENTERS FOR HUMAN POTENTIAL

Western Behavioral Sciences Institute, 1150 Silverado, LaJolla, Calif. 92037. . . . One of the leading psychologists is Carl Rogers who, in "2000 A.D." (published in the Oracle, an underground newspaper), set forth the thesis that: in the future there will be a greater freedom of sexual relationships in adolescents and adults; prurience is dying out; possessiveness of another individual will be diminished; by the year 2000 each individual will be assured of infertility in early adolescence; it will take positive action to re-establish fertility; most unions will be childless; temporary unions may be legalized as a type of marriage with no permanent commitments, no children and no alimony. From a Western Behavioral Sciences Institute brochure we read: "Our work is supported by grants and contracts from government agencies (e.g., Office of Education, Vocational Rehabilitation Admin., Office of Naval Research, Office of Economic Opportunity) and from philanthropic organizations (e.g., the Charles Kettering, Babcock, Eli Lilly and Ford Foundations.) In addition, some of our research is underwritten by gifts from private donors. Our budget for the fiscal year 1967–68 is $750,000. . . . Among our 13 current projects are studies on attitudes and values of youth elite groups in more than a dozen countries; new uses of mass media; the development of programmed (audio-taped) instructions for small, basic encounter groups; the designing and testing of simulation "games" as a classroom technique; the use of the intensive group experience as an aid to educational innovation in an entire school system; a large-scale evaluation of San Diego's Community Action Program (the "war on poverty") and the development of a policy-research program to aid educational planning for the future."

Esalen Institute, Big Sur, California. Richard Farson, advisor at Esalen and former director of Western Behavioral Sciences Institute, travels throughout the U.S., lecturing before college, business and church groups. Among his proposals is the establishment of networks of families who would monitor each other's marriages. His predictions of the Year 2000 closely parallel those of Carl Rogers, briefly outlined above. Bob Crist, one of three leaders of the Stanford University branch of Esalen, also executive director of the Mid-peninsula "Free" University, was quoted in the San Francisco Chronicle March 10, 1968 as saying: "I'm a living experiment in community sexuality. We believe that in today's climate of sexual permissiveness, traditional moral questions are no longer even questions." Paul Bindrim, Hollywood psychologist, a member of Esalen, conducts nude therapy sessions and marathon encounters. George Leonard, Sr., Editor of Look Magazine's West Coast office, is Vice President of Esalen Institute. His "Utopian" educational ideas are exposed in his book, "Education and Ecstasy." Michael Murphy, President and co-founder of Esalen, in his article, "Growth of A Growth Center," in Newsletter, American Assoc. of Humanist Psychology, said: "50,000 from all walks of life have participated in our program at Big Sur. We have also worked with groups from the Peace Corps, Calif. Teachers Assoc., various schools, colleges, clinics and major American corporations . . . Educators are increasingly aware that life's important lessons are learned early in a child's development, and many teachers are trying to reach children with sensitivity training before their creativity and spontaneity are stifled entirely in the classrooms . . ." Esalen, Big Sur received a $21,000 grant for a project at University of Calif. at Santa Barbara to experiment with Sensitivity Training in all levels of elementary and high schools. Last year a series of Esalen programs were broadcast over 40 educational radio stations, distributed by National Education Radio.

SCHOOLS

In 1958 the National Education Association initiated Sensitivity Training workshops for Educational Administrators. Since then, "Change Agents", by using various entry strategies, have implemented these techniques into many of our schools. Title III of the Elementary-Secondard Education Act, funded by the U.S. Office of Education for "The exploratory development of models of planned change in education", provides the link between the behavioral scientists and the schools. Programs for interdependence among universities and school systems (private and parochial) were created through grants from the U.S. Office of Education and the Fund For The Advancement Of Education Of The Ford Foundation. These programs allow the Federal Government to serve as a catalyst for bringing about educational change. Two of the programs are Cooperative Project For Educational Development (COPED) and Projects To Accelerate Creativity In Education (PACE).

Since Sensitivity Training techniques can be incorporated into almost any class of instruction, teachers trained in these procedures often use them in the classroom without the knowledge or consent of principals or other school officials. A permissive atmosphere is created in which students are free to express themselves. Psychodrama and role-playing require students to divulge home-family situations, and family authority is undermined by student acceptance of peer judgments. Assignments may include diaries of innermost feelings or essays incorporating self-criticism or confessions. Students may volunteer for Peer Analysis (criticism by classmates) and encouraged to make personality changes deemed by the class to be necessary. Debates involving topics such as legalizing narcotics, prostitution or abortion, study of the "sexual revolution", the generation gap, hippies, etc., can be directed toward student acceptance of the "objective" view. Some Gym and Drama classes include body-awareness exercises. The San Francisco Chronicle 9–7–68, as well as Eastern papers,

have reported protests by irate parents because high school students were encouraged to touch and embrace each other in a darkened room and then asked to write a theme on the sensations they experienced. The "experimental colleges" push Sensitivity Training, usually led by students. One such course at the University of California at Davis evolved into nude sensitivity.

Instructors using Sensitivity Training formats are convinced that in this "new technological age" students must be equipped with new visions and that traditional eduaction, culture, economics, politics, etc., must undergo drastic changes. Their message to the students usually develops along the following lines: We are building a new social architecture. Education today is not relevant. Students today should be educated in their senses instead of their intellect. Youth has more to teach than has the older generation. Students have the right to their own influences; students can teach students better, just as convicts can work with convicts better and mental patients can help mental patients better. There should be no examinations, grades, terms or credits. The only meaningful changes in education will come through rebellion, when the students take over the design of their own education as they are doing now.

"Major Educational Revolution Yet To Come", by Dr. T. M. Stinnett, former NEA official, NEA Reporter ". . . tomorrow's teacher is going to be a director of learning instead of a ladler of facts or alleged facts . . . education for the future must be humanistic and humanizing." "The Dual Purpose Education" by Frank H. Bowles, Ford Foundation, NEA Journal, December 1966: ". . . The goals, in short, are behavioral. If we claim that they are intellectual, we fool ourselves . . . Our colleges and universities are the board of strategy for the intellectual and social revolution in education . . ." In the NEA Reporter of 11-10-67 we read from Dr. Stinnett: ". . . In the U.S. today, education has gained the power to change society against the will of the politicians. It has become the key to economic progress and to the constant renewal of society. In other words, it is now master as all as servant and this for the first time in history."

"Learning and teaching in the future," by John I. Goodlad, NEA Journal, February 1968: "The most controversial issues of the 21st century . . . will pertain to the ends and means of modifying human behavior and who shall determine them. The first educational question will not be 'What knowledge is of most worth?', but 'What kinds of human beings do we wish to produce?" The possibilities virtually defy our imagination . . . Sedatives, barbiturates, tranquilizers and various psychedelics provide powerful ways of controlling behavior by direct action on the brain. Similarly, we can manipulate behavior by applying electric currents to regions of the brain. Experiments are now under way with drugs and brain extracts designed to enhance learning or memory. Aldous Huxley long ago introduced us to the possibilities of genetic selectivity through the availability of sperm and ovum banks. The means of drastically altering the course of human development through artificial insemination, chemical treatment and electric manipulation are with us. We are already tampering with human evolution . . ." The Valuator, Calif. Teachers Assoc., Fall 1968 issue: Robert Maynard Hutchins, President of the Center For the Study of Democratic Institutions, Santa Barbara, Calif., says: ". . . the teachers must control the educational programs. They must have organizations which will attempt to resist the impositions placed on the teaching vocation by superintendents, by school boards, the legislature and the governors."

Those dedicated educators, school board members and legislators who value and defend our Judaic-Christian culture would agree with Professor E. Merrill Root who said: "Our real war is not a battle of bullets, but of brains; not of space, but of spirit; not of missiles, but of minds; not of weapons, but of wills. . . . Thus, our greatest danger today is not atomic fission, but academic fission; our greatest peril is not nuclear fallout, but scholastic falldown. Teachers and texts that accentuate the negative can be of far greater danger to America than the loosing of a hundred panzer divisions or the launching of a thousand missiles. . . ."

HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 233

A resolution relative to a study of sensitivity training

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Assembly Committee on Rules refer to an appropriate committee the study of sensitivity training, or any of its variants, including, but not limited to, its origin, methods, operation and goals, and to direct such committee to report its findings and recommendations thereon to the Assembly not later than the fifth legislative day of the 1969 Regular Session of the Legislature.

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union, Dec. 6, 1968]

SENSITIVITY TRAINING GETS SHARP SCRUTINY

(By Charles Davis)

A panel of state assemblymen yesterday heard "sensitivity training" extolled as a mind-stretching technique of improving personalities and condemned as a debased of morals and individuality.

Six hours of hearings by the Assembly Interim Committee on Education produced these conclusions:

1. There is no uniformly understood definition of sensitivity training.

2. Whatever it is, it is either very, very good or very, very bad.

"This is something," committee chairman Leroy F. Greene, D-Sacramento, said at the close of the day, "that's not going to be easily resolved."

The committee convened in the State Building as the outgrowth of a resolution authored by Assemblyman John Stull, R-Leucadia, for a study of sensitivity training, particularly in the public schools.

Donald Shealor, a county Department of Education Guidance coordinator, denied that the subject matter is "brainwashing," as some speakers contended, or that it is required in any school in the county.

Parents from Poway, Lakeside, Ramona and Coronado—nearly all of them voicing frames of reference that varied from Shealor's—disagreed. They said it is being conducted in schools in their communities.

GRADUATE'S REPORT

One direct confrontation was between Shealor and Pamela Bunn; a 1968 Poway High School graduate. Miss Bunn said that in one of her classes, students were encouraged to talk about boy-friend-girlfriend relationships and marital backgrounds of their parents.

Greene told Shealor that if Miss Bunn is accurate, "she is telling you quite a bit." Shealor replied he will check into Miss Bunn's account of activities at the school.

Dr. Layne Longfellow, a post-doctoral fellow at the Center for Studies of the Person and the Western Behavioral Sciences Institute, both in La Jolla, was one of several speakers offering definitions.

In "encounter groups" of sensitivity programs, Longfellow said, "people simply sit around in a room and attempt to develop an atmosphere where they can say anything they feel like saying."

NUDITY COURSE STIRS UPROAR AT UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA CAMPUS

DAVIS.—Chancellor Emil M. Mrak of the University of California campus here confirmed today UC ties were being cut with an off-campus course in which men and women students reportedly disrobed and joined hands in a ring for a "sensitivity training" experience.

A university spokesman said "sensitivity training" encouraged the participants to speak freely and fully in an attempt to better understand themselves.

He said such training is a form of group therapy gaining wide acceptance in education and business, though the participants were fully clothed.

The nudity issue was the second controvery to involve the Davis campus' series "48" courses. Last year, a storm erupted over a class which studied protests and demonstrations.

The chancellor said the class was one of the so-called series "48" experimental courses for lower division students which permit professors to give from one to four units of university credit for individualized study and research.

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union November 1968]

DR. BARBOUR'S COLUMN: ENCOUNTER GROUP

Q—"My son is 17. Last night he returned from church in tears. He had attended an 'encounter group' meeting for 'sensitivity training.' The members meet twice a week. They pick a victim for each meeting. Then the members tell him what they don't like about him. My son's friends criticized his manners, haircut, eye color, acne scars, intelligence, vocational plans, clothes, car, and even his parents. They were brutal and extremely unfair. An assistant minister leads the group. He has had no training in counseling or psychology. The man publicly called my son 'chicken,' for getting upset. Do you approve of encounter groups, Dr. Barbour?"

A—I do not approve of the type of encounter group your son attended.

"Sensitivity training" is a fad just now. I've worked with a few groups. Where I was responsible I saw to it that the group members were carefully chosen. I had psychiatrists lead the meetings. They were familiar with the case histories of each person present. When things began to get rough, the psychiatrists stepped in. The meetings seemed to be helpful. However poorly led encounter groups can destroy mental health. They have caused suicides. Tell your son to drop out of his group immediately. People who value their sanity should stay away from the encounter groups unless they are led by qualified psychiatrists.

COMMUNICATION NEED REPORTED

"Sensitivity training" is a type of therapy which has been somewhat surreptitiously, replacing education in Marin County schools (because, its proponents say, "civilization is sick").

Tamalpais Union High School District has a committee studying this matter, not really to investigate it but with an eye to procuring a federal grant to finance its expanded use. All members of the committee are people already involved in its promotion.

Their report says some interesting things.

One "ultimate goal" of sensitivity training, it states, is development of "communication skills."

Let's have a look at some of the communication skills of the committee itself.

"In the sensitivity training group," they write, "attention is focused upon the 'process' (as opposed to a content orientation) and 'feeling' (as opposed to intellectual, theoretical, or cognitive) aspects for the group's interaction. This focus is on the 'here and now' (as opposed to the 'then and there') experiences of the participating individuals, and participation is focused upon the specific and personal (as opposed to the vague and general) experience and interaction."

This is communication?

CARL HEPP.

MILL VALLEY.

[From the Belvedere-Tiburon (Calif.) Ebb Tide, Dec. 11, 1968]

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

EDITOR: In the November 25 issue, your feature article concerned "Sensitivity Training" presently being proposed for incorporation into the curriculum of Tamalpais High School.

Not having been present, I cannot say whether or not your reporter accurately presents an explanation of sensitivity training given by Dr. Walter Lee, Drake High School Psychologist. In any event, in my opinion, Dr. Lee presents only some truths, known by almost everyone, and a number of assumptions. And it seems that he presents sensitivity training as a kind of panacea for man's mental ills and specifically as a prophylactic measure to protect adolescents. Certainly he overstates himself and the value of so-called "Sensitivity Training". He considers it science; that is open to question. No psychologist who is worth listening to would consider psychology as science in the literal sense. To be sure there are some scientific principles utilized in the field of psychology as well as in the field of sociology; however, the term science applies an exactness, a measurability, and definite laws which ensure predictability. I feel that he utilized a number of scientific terms little understood, if at all, by the lay community. Further, he makes many assertions which are half-truths and based, it seems to me, on wishful thinking. One such wish is his implication that adolescents will respond as adults do. They cannot.

When Dr. Lee said, "our society teaches us to control or repress our emotions rather than to deal honestly with them or authenticate" he is in gross error. Society does not teach us to repress our emotions; experience and our perceptions lead us to do so. Furthermore, controlling our emotions is actually to deal honestly with them rather than the reverse, as implied by Dr. Lee. What he means by authenticate, I am not sure.

Certainly there is value in some of the methods utilized by this school of psychology as attested by man's use of them for ages; used PER SE in a high school curriculum, in my opinion, is a very dangerous and destructive program. It is destructive in its usurpation of the prerogatives of the parents by implying that the parents are incapable of raising their children. And even if the parents were incapable, it is not the business of psychologists to usurp authority, but to recommend a remedy for the incompetent and to deal with the parents. The danger of the program was recognized by some of the participants of the meeting who questioned about a possible risk. A person who is willing to take a risk is willing to lose. Are these psychologists, teachers, and parents willing to have their children hurt? Apparently a great number of parents do not really care, or don't trust their own common sense enough to object openly in the face of the opinions of the authorities who have PhD's, or master's degrees or are professionally trained in the field of education. Furthermore the privacy of the child, his right, is threatened. No adult would permit himself to be forced to participate, and no responsible psychologist would force himself on others.

Your article indicates early that a Study Group was formed to produce some guidelines to be presented to the parents. It was noted that there were no parents or members of the community on the professional study committee. To me that kind of situation is insulting, arrogant, and presumptious, and suspicious.

I have a question, as a psychiatrist newly arrived in California. Why were no psychiatrists invited by the school administrations and by this group to comment on an approach which deals with the feelings and thoughts, conscious or otherwise, of adolescents (particularly of adolescents)? If a psychiatrist were to invite himself into the schools to express expert opinion in regard to the problems of youth as well as to offer suggestions on how to solve them, he would be asked to leave. Yet the teachers, laymen in psychology, and phychologists, who are not allowed to practice psychotherapy without the supervision of a physician, have the temerity to meddle with the thoughts, behavior and feelings, of young people and to imply that these methods will increase "man's humanness and help him deal with his emotions." Adolescent behavior is already very human, and adolescent inhibition is a natural defense mechanism, normal in the young individual. Not all adolescents are emotionally disturbed or ill.

In their zeal for the welfare of mankind, these educators thrust themselves into the role of what I call the superficial pseudo-intellectual. And we don't need any more of them.

There is much to be said in connection with all of the ideas expressed by this group that a letter is not sufficient. But it is certain that the importance of healthy parenthood is far greater than the importance of any school system that exists. Dealing with the feelings of children and adolescents in a direct manner in the schools is just as much out of place as dealing with sexual matters by the schools; Hence, parents should not surrender, nor shirk their responsibilities in these matters. Likewise the schools should not accept the responsibilities belonging to the parents. To be sure, many parents are far from adequate, but a poor parent is better than a non-parent (by far) in the majority of cases. It is time that the parents took a better look, not only at the thoughts and opinions of those whom they consider authorities, but also at the great fund of knowledge which they themselves have, but which they do not feel they can express confidently. Is it because they are unable to use such words as Cybernetics, genetics, theosophy, and scientology? If so, we should all submit.

JOHN C. MORRIS, M.D.

BELVEDERE.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—If we had an award for the best community oriented letter of the year, we would give it to Dr. Morris for this one.)

[From National Review, December 1968]

EDUCATION AND ECSTASY

Jeffrey Hart's review of George Leonard's *Education and Ecstasy* [NR, Nov. 19] may be to some a delightful balm in which to bask, like a tingling suntan lotion. We, however, must let loose one loud, long, despairing shriek, as of someone about to sink in icy undertow for the third time: Help! Beware!

Leonard's view of McLuhan's global village—the eradication of Western Culture, literacy, religion, sports, reason, conscience, and the death of the book—all these are not mere fruity Southern California figments of a psychedelic moon trip. *They are here*—in Northern California, in Orange County, in Our Schools, in yours (Madison Heights, Mich.—who knows where else?)—seeded, metastasized throughout our public educational system by its national organization, the NEA.

We first knew of this last May, when 35 high school teachers came down out of the hills after a weekend retreat of sensitivity-training encounter groups, and some began using Esalen techniques in English classes. Body-awareness games such as Passing in a Circle, Blind Walk, Group Lift replaced spelling, composition, literature. Group criticism sessions singled out the most obnoxious class members and shattered their complacency. Weeping students stood before the class revealing their hideous home life. Some classes meditated or formed boy-girl pairs (dyads, in the lingo) to sit knee-to-knee, discussing their "here-and-now feelings."

In our daughter's freshman English class, students formed a close standing circle, took turns going into the center to be passed limply around. As one girl fell toward a boy, he stepped back, seeing that to catch her he would have to touch her breasts. "She would have fallen if I hadn't grabbed her," said our fourteen-year-old.

Since then, research has established that these techniques come from various Behavioral Science centers, such as George Leonard's own Esalen Institute, the Western Behavioral Science Institute, and National Training Laboratories, an arm of the National Education Association.

Therefore, do not smile in amusement at the latest antics in the land of palm trees, prophets and peyote. Instead, go down to your own school, turn on the lights, and see if your own children are slithering across the floor to lie in piles like alligators, or shouting and crying in a group confessional like unholy rollers. They just might be.

CARL AND NAN HEPP.

MILL VALLEY, CALIF.

Your reviewer of *Education and Ecstasy* finds the book great fun. Unfortunately, I can't because I'm living in a university where "T-groups" are the great fad and where young and middle-aged students are acting as though the Second Coming had happened at their last mini-encounter. The whole mad fad may be over by 1970 but the damage it has done will be with us for a long time.

I say damage because I've seen some of the problems the T-group concept can bring. Before your reviewer tosses off the Esalen Institute and its twins he should look into the extent of their influence on one university.

E. L. DAWSON.

EGGERTSVILLE, N.Y.

A "SENSITIVE" SUBJECT FOR EVERYONE—SEX EDUCATION IN THE SCHOOLS

The Washington Post, 2-21-69 and the Long Beach Press Telegram, 2-28-69, both dateline New York, reported that Sensitivity Training is a major part of a new course designed to release teachers from their anxieties and help them to be better teachers of Sex Education in the elementary schools. Dr. Tom McGinnis, New York psychotherapist, led teachers through a 15-hour marathon, during which they were broken down by fatigue and the constant prodding of the instructor, to cry and expose their areas of self-doubt and fear, following which the instructor rocked them in his arms, like babies until they had regained their composure.

Sex Education has already been implemented into many school districts and, reportedly, parents are combatting SIECUS sex programs in such cities as: El Paso, Tomball, Wichita Falls and Fort Worth, Texas; Seattle, Renton and Mount Vernon, Washington; Wichita, Kansas; Grants Pass Sutherlin and Forest Grove, Oregon; Maiden Rock and Oconomowoc, Wisconsin; Roseland and Berkeley Heights, New Jersey; Chickasha, Tulsa, Lawton and Oklahoma City, Oklahoma; North Haven, Connecticut; Louisville and Ashland, Kentucky; Miamisburg, Ohio; Huntington, West Virginia; New Orleans, Louisiana; and most cities throughout Minnesota and California.

Many child psychologists have testified against the advisability of some of these Sex Education programs now being used in the schools—programs in which ALL school children may soon be involved. You owe it to these children and to yourselves to search out the facts.

CHANGES IN EDUCATION

Excerpts from "Sixteenth Report, Senate Investigating Committee on Education," published by the Senate of the State of California, 1957:

"The Committee has thought it worthwhile to bring to the attention of the Legislature the sources of some of the current

changes in the educational policy and methods. These sources are not ordinarily publicized to lay citizens and parents. Children may be greatly affected by these ideas and the committee believes they should be known to the Legislature and the parents and thoroughly discussed in public."

Honorable Carroll Reese: "The National Education Association went far further than a mere education program in the book (Education for International Understanding In American Schools). The general tone of the volume is that we must sacrifice considerable of our national independence in order to create a stable and peaceful world. The goal is set as producing citizens who might be called World-minded Americans. We cannot escape the conclusion that what is meant is the production of advocating a world state. Again, we say that some day a world state may be desirable and possible. However, we are living in a very realistic era in which "One World" could only be accomplished by succumbing to Communism. There is a definite call to political action or at least to a promotion of the idea that we must surrender some of our political independence." . . . "Although the current (teachers) Guides present the program as something new, the theories are not new at all." "As in 1930 and 1936 Teachers' Guides, the current Guides cite such educators as John Dewey, Wm. Heard Kilpatrick, Boyd H. Bode and George S. Counts. However, other names have been added such as Fritz Redl, Gordon W. Allport, Harold Benjamin, Kenneth Benne, Theodore Brameld, Ronald Lippit, Ernest O. Melby, and many others."

"Section 13230 of the California State Education Code Specifically states that instruction must be given in patriotism. The word patriotism was not found in checking through the Guides. As far as could be identified, there was no material especially directed to stir a child's love of or loyalty to his country or native land. Because of the continual pressure for consideration of group welfare, a child is instructed in world-mindedness, he may be inclined to forget that his first loyalty is to his country."

"Religion is treated as a factor which contributes to bias or prejudice."

"The group philosophy in the Guides appears to be a collective philosophy, in which the welfare of the group is considered above all personal ambitions, desires, and incentives. . . . this philosophy would have a tendency to weaken the American tradition of individual freedom. . . . Children are to contribute to the group and merge their identity within the groups." "In the group philosophy, such personal ambitions as seeking to improve one's status, or striving for success, ambitions which are generally attributed to the middle classes by the Guides, would interfere with the proper functioning of the group. The child is not to work primarily for personal improvement or personal gain but for group acceptance and group welfare. It is also possible that children will be forced to conform to group standards, and have proper group attitudes, or they will be suspected of poor mental health." "Mental health pertains to attitudes, behavior and social and group adjustment." "There are many methods recommended in the Guides to assist children in developing proper attitudes and behavior and in overcoming poor "mental health". In solving children's problems or poor "mental health", the teacher is to take an active part." "In the modern school, every act, every attitude, every incident portraying the child's behavior will be subject to a thorough inspection and judgment by the teacher, and may be recorded in the child's permanent record."

"Teachers Guide to Education in Early Childhood, Page 8 says: Learning is changed behavior. The test of learning is in the changed behavior of the learner. Little meaningful learning takes place on a purely verbal level; meaningful learning results in changed feelings, understanding and behavior of the child . . ."

"The committee wanted to learn more about Dr. Moreno. . . . (He is) a New York mental expert famed as discoverer of psychodrama, group therapy and sociometric techniques in psycho-therapy . . . born in Bucharest, Rumania in 1892 . . . came to the United States in 1927 . . . naturalized in 1935. . . . He did his first psycho-dramatic work at Hunter College in 1929 and was responsible for the first psychometric conference at Philadelphia in 1932. Dr. Moreno's technique is vast and covers many areas: education, veterans, industry, hospitals, mental health, UNESCO and Government. . . . Many educators and others have credited Dr. Moreno with some of the techniques used currently in the classrooms of America. . . . Current sociometric terms coined by J. L. Moreno are: Psychodrama, group therapy, group psychotherapy, role playing, racial cleavages & saturation, social-emotional expansiveness, hypnodrama, interpersonal situation, interpersonal therapy and dynamics.

"Dr. Moreno, in his book, 'Who Shall Survive,' says: 'If God would come into the world again he would not come into it as an individual, but as a group, as a collective . . . I have heard that a form of socio-psychodrama is used for Communist propaganda in the Philippines, India and China, in order to convert people to communism . . . This is an illustration in point that highly directive sociodramas can be used for the indoctrination of any set of values, religious, communistic or fascistic . . .'

"Dr. Moreno says, in his book, 'Sociometry, Experimental Method and Science of Society, an Approach to a New Political Orientation—Sociometry and Marxism.' 'The idea of communism must and can be halted. It can only be halted by an idea which is superior to it . . . He (Marx) raised the question as to who should govern the means of production in order to assure society from uneven and unjust distribution of income. Thus far Marx was correct. But the conclusions he drew from it have not stood up in the crucial test of reality . . . He (Marx) did not permit himself to doubt the value and veracity of the social revolution itself. The sociometrist, however much the idea to change the world may burn in him, entertains a different point of view. What may be of little significance to the practical revolutionary Marxist is of the greatest importance to him—the sociometrist is interested in the social revolution as a 'social experiment.' It is to an extent immaterial to him whether it succeeds or fails . . . he is interested in it primarily as an exploratory experiment and not as a social crusade what one learns from it and not only whether society improves through it . . . socialism is the revolution of one class, the economic proletariat; sociometric revolution is a revolution of all classes, of total mankind . . . The sociometric proletariat has its victims in all classes.

Sociometric revolutions do not promise violent and rapid results . . . their success depends upon a new learning process applied to small groups . . . it tries to encourage the masses to insist on change of the legal, social, political and cultural order . . . At last we sociometrists . . . developed 'psychological and social shock methods' which may well become scientific instruments of social action. . . . As human society is ailing we can expect a psychiatric empire to emerge gradually and spread over the globe. Politicians and diplomats will move into second status. Social scientists, sociatrists and sociometrically oriented socialists will move into first. The mentor in the White House, a future President of the United States may well be a psychiatrist before another century has passed. . . .' "

"Psychodrama and Sociodrama in American Education", edited by Dr. Robert Bartlett Haas, with an introduction by J. L. Moreno. . . . Subsection 6 of Section 1, "Psychodrama and the Philosophy of Cultural Education" by Ronald B. Levy: ". . . 'psychodrama' includes the whole family of the techniques and processes which are involved in the 'unrehearsed' but not unplanned, dramatization of human problems for the purpose of dealing with them effectively. . . . The diagnostic psychodrama is intended as a kind of research tool. It offers a method whereby individuals and groups may by analyzed with respect to their potentialities for some type of future action . . . while the therapeutic psychodrama is concerned with pathological behavior and maladjustment, the educational psychodrama is concerned with the control and direction of normal behavior toward desired goals. Like all psychodrama it is a group process by which we seek to modify existing behavior . . ."

From: "Report of the Joint Interim Committee on the Public Education System," published by the Senate of the State of California, 1961:

"The beliefs of children which are to be changed by the schools to suit the State Dept. of Education are filtered through all of their publications."

"We find no evidence that the State Dept. of Education was authorized at any time by the Legislature to change the beliefs or loyalties of children in the public schools. Furthermore, we do not consider 'changed behavior' as a proper purpose or goal for education."

"Listed below are some of the beliefs on democracy and good citizenship which will be changed:

"From: The democratic principles defined in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

"To: Constantly changing democratic principles.

"From: Fixed ideals of the American way of life.

"To: The developing American way of life.

"From: Independence.

"To: Interdependence.

"From: Individualism.

"To: The group or collectivism.

"From: Individual achievement.

"To: Group participation.

"From: Respect for adult authority.

"To: Respect for the group.

"From: Love of freedom.

"To: Love of security.

"From: Loyalty to this nation.

"To: Loyalty to the world.

"From: Competition between individuals.

"To: Conformity in the group.

"From: Recognition for work well done.

"To: Equal recognition for unequal work.

"From: The parents are responsible for the whole child.

"To: The schools are responsible for the whole child."

The public schools in the State of California use many different devices to test the attitudes and beliefs of school children, given without the consent or knowledge of the parents . . . it seems strange to us that tests on such intangibles as attitudes and beliefs are considered reliable and helpful, whereas, tests on tangible knowledge acquired by a student in a certain subject are considered unreliable and harmful. . . . These (psychological) tests would compel a child to expose his secret thoughts, snoop into a student's beliefs on spiritual values and religion; would lead the student to question his beliefs; direct the child's mind toward criticism of his home, parents and teachers; undermine America and our way of life; encourage students to spy and report on those for whom they should have the highest respect; direct the children's minds into the garbage pit of human thought; force the child to testify against himself."

(NOTE.—The above reports are available at the main branches of California Public Libraries.)

Industrial administrators, since 1956, have attended National Education Association workshops and thus Sensitivity Training has been implemented into many of our large businesses and corporations. Self and group criticism procedures used in the programs are known to cause dissension, turmoil and distrust among co-workers.

In "What Price Human Relations?", appearing in Harvard Business Review, March-April 1957, the author, M. D. McNair says: "Too much emphasis on Human Relations encourages people to feel sorry for themselves, makes it easier for them to slough off responsibility, to find excuses for failure, to act like children . . . There is a de-emphasis of analysis, judgment and decision making . . ."

In "Yourself as Others See You", Business Week, March 16, 1963, the author, George Odiorne says: (Sensitivity Training) sets up nothing but a stress situation . . . This is nothing more than an experiment to test your toleration for frustration . . . In such an emotional binge courtesy goes by the board.

In "The Future of Sex," Look Magazine, 7-25-67, by George Leonard, Sr. Editor of Look and Marshall McLuhan, we are informed that in the future we will all participate in communal living and all love one another equally, even those of the same sex; also, that we will not have a well-rounded personality until we have experienced everything This includes homosexuality and hallucinatory drugs. Included in the article is that paragraph: "Many forward-looking corporations, especially in the Aerospace Industry, already are engaged in Sensitivity Training sessions for their male executives. The behavior encouraged in these sessions would make a John Wayne character wince; manly males learn how to reveal their emotions; to become sensitive to others, to weep openly if that is what they feel like doing—all this in the pursuit of higher profits—Sensitivity works!

In "It's OK To Cry in the Office," Look Magazine 7-19-68, written by John Poppy, one of Look's Sr. Editors: "You don't just dip a few executives into encounter groups. You change the world, company or town, they live in."

Selected young social scientists, since 1960, have attended National Education Association workshops and have implemented Sensitivity Training techniques into Civil Rights and poverty programs, in order to create better human relations. Unfortunately, since Sensitivity Training centers on Criticism, the so-called "better human relations" often turn to increased antagonism and greater division in understanding. Human Relations Commissions often recommend Sensitivity Training.

Public employees of the Peace Corps, Internal Revenue Service, Office of Economic Opportunity, U.S. State Department, probation and parole departments, to name but a few, have been subjected to Sensitivity Training techniques, channeled originally from the National Training Lab of the National Education Association.

MRA—Moral Re-Armament (Sing-Out, Up With People) operates for the purported purpose of promoting a message of love, brotherhood and universal understanding. Universal understanding, possibly, can only be acquired by rejecting attitudes and beliefs which may be in conflict with others throughout the world. While seeming to reject absolutes of a religious or national nature, MRA does direct its members toward absolute honesty, absolute purity, absolute unselfishness and absolue love. Group Confessionals are used to help members correct any deviation from the absolutes elevating them to a unique "feeling level" which further establishes group conformity.

Key executives of volunteer organizations, since 1958, have attended NEA workshops to acquire the technique of directing human change within their organizations. Through promotion of group-ism and interdependence, changes are made in personal attitudes, behavior patterns and value systems.

In "Examining Sensitivity Training and the Laboratory Method", May 1968 issue of Forum of the Association of Secretaries of the YMCA it states: ". . . YMCA personnel became involved in these techniques, first as participants and later as trainers. The impact of these new techniques became widespread in the YMCA starting in 1961, when they were incorporated into the Organization Development Project (ODP) . . ."

"Do You Know Who You Are?", Parade Section, Long Beach, Calif. Independent, Press-Telegram 9-15-68, reports that nearly 1000 YMCA high school students from throughout the U.S. assembled at St. Olaf College in Minnesota recently to "pour out their innermost feelings and frankly criticize one another". A YMCA official from Arlington, Texas commented: "These kids have been changing right before eyes, and theirs."

"Joy", July 1968 Redbook Magazine, By Dr. Wm. C. Schutz, associate in residence at The Esalen Institute, Big Sur, Calif. (last paragraph): "The person attending one of our (Esalen) workshops is taking the risk of changing his life. A married person in a workshop may be forced to acknowledge real feelings of desperation and decide not to stay married. When a Christian organization like the YMCA puts its boys through an encounter group to develop their independence, they may find some of the boys questioning Christian principles. These are not only possibilities, they happen. But they are necessary risks for individual development . . ."

[From the Long Beach (Calif.) Independent, Dec. 9, 1966]

YMCA PROBES TEENAGE PSYCHE

(By George Robeson)

I had heard of Synanon, the group-therapy home for narcotics addicts, but I hadn't heard of "T-Groups" until they were formed at the Los Altos YMCA. Some parents in the eastern and northeastern sections of the city wish the groups hadn't been formed at all, and are trying to keep "T-Grouping" out of the Los Altos YMCA program.

At Synanon, addicts form small groups to reveal their personal problems, admit their needs, expose their emotional conflicts, and criticize each other.

It may work well for tortured junkies who have little left to lose by trying, but some of the parents associated with the Los Altos "Y" think a similar program is a bit too heady for the average teenager.

The Los Altos "T-Groupers" (it stands for "Training Group") have held several "retreats," often in the mountains. At the retreats, 8 to 12 teenagers attempt to air all their feelings, all their problems, and explore all their shortcomings. One or two adults serve as moderators. It's been going on for about a year now, but never has been officially authorized as a part of the program by the Y's executive board.

One 19-year-old boy said he thought he was a pretty stable individual until he attended a 5-day "retreat." Since then, he says, he has suffered recurring emotional distress—and the group-session was held almost a year ago.

An 18-year-old girl reports that she was advised by her fellow teenage T-Groupers to leave home because she couldn't get along with her father.

I have a "log" of a T-Group session held in Oregon last July by a YMCA group from San Mateo. It's about 42 pages long. All the way through it, youngsters are bursting into tears. Maybe that's good for them. I don't know. I'm not a psychiatrist.

But neither are the adults supervising the sessions, and that's what disturbs some of the parents.

In a "To Whom it May Concern" letter, Dr. Michael J. Singer, a Long Beach psychiatrist, has this to say of T-Group or "sensitivity group" sessions:

They should be conducted by a group leader who is either a physician, preferably a psychiatrist; or a doctor of clinical psychology licensed to do psychotherapy; or a psychiatric social worker, licensed by the state; or a person with a master's degree in psychology, licensed by the state for psychotherapy work.

"Any other individual assuming the role of group leader . . . is not fully trained or qualified to handle the problems that might arise if there were emotionally disturbed youngsters in a group 'airing their feelings and problems'," Dr. Singer said. "There is danger of serious psychological damage rather than benefit from this type of group-therapy meetings, particularly if an emotionally disturbed person in this group is not being treated by a fully qualified and trained psychotherapist."

The Los Altos Y Staff says that T-Grouping will "establish a climate of trust and openness which allows young people to experience acceptance, support, love and appreciation for their self-worth, as well as democratic processes. It is not group therapy."

The parents with whom I talked are fearful that one disputed program may disrupt the entire Los Altos YMCA program, which they feel is an excellent one. But their greater fear is that T-Group retreats, such as one now planned in Long Beach this month with 30 local youngsters and 30 from a YMCA in Port Angeles, Wash., may open emotional valves that group leaders can neither close nor control.

[From the Long Beach (Calif.) Independent, Dec. 16, 1966]

DYNAMITE: TO BE HANDLED WITH CARE

(By George Robeson)

The Los Altos YMCA has answered this column on their proposed "T-Groups" or "sensitivity training" for teenagers. The Y's answer was a letter sent to members of the organization. It's signed by a member, Mrs. Charles Orcutt, but it's mimeographed, and the envelopes are addressed on a machine and are stamped by the Y's postage meter as mail from a non-profit organization, so it is a letter from the organization, not from Mrs. Orcutt.

The letter says that "sensitivity training"—groups of 8 to 12 youngsters gathering at "retreats" to bare their feelings and emotions and criticize each other—is "learning how your feelings and thoughts are transmitted and picked up by others through your tone of voice, eye contact and body movements, as well as words. There are opportunities to experiment with communication so that you develop confidence in the ways that reveal what you feel, thereby discarding things that misinterpret what you want to say. It helps you to be honest about what you feel."

The letter says the program is not group psychotherapy. But, as the earlier column said, at least one prominent Long Beach psychiatrist has said that it is psychotherapy, of a sort that must be under the direction of a psychotherapist—not a "group leader" from the Y. Dr. Michael J. Singer calls the program "dangerous." I suppose a psychiatrist knows about those things, after all those years of schooling and specialized training. And he says the danger to teenagers is one of "serious psychological damage."

The letter from the Y makes the point that I have not been involved in sensitivity-sessions. They have me there. I've never been involved in a murder, either, but like other reporters I've written a number of murder stories by interviewing the people who possessed what seemed to be the best knowledge of the crime.

In addition to the reports of some disturbed teenagers who have participated in

these sessions, I have a 42-page log of a sensitivity-retreat, written by the group-leaders themselves.

Some excerpts: "Bob and Rick wondered why Marcia liked her parents. She became increasingly nervous, in motion, tapping her foot, wiggling her arms, squeezing her hands . . . She is unhappy with her mother, for she works. Her brother bothers her for he drinks and smokes. Robbie, sitting next to Marcia, asked her to close her eyes and relax for five minutes . . . Robbie put his hand on her knee to stop the motion of her foot, and while he did this he spoke softly and gently to her . . . gradually she started to relax. There was total silence. When she opened her eyes she said, 'Everything looks different.' She thought a piece of cement was crushing her and then it went away."

"Mary Kay arrived, crying . . . she said, 'I'm glad I'm Burt's friend—this whole mess makes me sick' . . . Martha got too involved. Robbie nudged her to be quiet. Rick told Mary Kay to shut her mouth. . . . Mary Kay said, 'I feel for him (Burt)' . . . she told Martha, 'I hate you' . . ."

Well, it's all pretty heady stuff, what with kids crying and baring their souls to other kids.

Under the proper conditions, with highly-trained and licensed psychotherapists, this type of program can be a valuable tool in smoothing the jagged edges of a torn personality. But it has its inherent dangers, magnified many times when the personality belongs to a youngster. That's not my opinion. That's medical opinion.

My opinion in this matter isn't worth much. And neither is the opinion of anyone else without an M.D. after his name.

SUMMARY SHEET ON SENSITIVITY TRAINING

Legislators, educators and law enforcement officials are deeply concerned about the anarchy and rebellion taking place throughout the nation. In the churches, leaders and laymen, alike, are apprehensive about the revolutionary changes taking place within their denominations. Parents are fearful that the schools and volunteer organizations, to which they entrust the development of their youth, are not only failing to reinforce those principles which have provided the foundation of our country, but, in some cases, are undermining these very ideals. Unfortunately, most of those concerned individuals are not aware that tax money, tuition, tithing, and contributions are all being used to promote and perpetuate programs which are helping to bring about the very conditions which they fear. Some of these programs come under the general heading of Sensitivity Training, a controversial, experimental procedure intended to create a "new culture" through re-education.

Sensitivity Training programs, in their various forms, are being adopted for use by many groups and organizations throughout the nation. These groups include churches, public and parochial schools, administrators, teachers and students, businessmen, government employees and youth groups, including YMCA's, etc.

In spite of the claimed goals of Sensitivity Training, which are love, trust, openness of communication, leadership and a better understanding of others, these programs have been proven to cause distrust and the breakdown of communication between participants. Sensitivity Training Programs incorporate the use of Criticism, undermine authority and encourage permissiveness. These programs downgrade, rather than uplift, and dwell on the negative, instead of the positive. Individual decision-making is sacrificed in favor of the group consensus, thereby promoting "followship" instead of leadership. Decisions reached in such a setting are often based on emotion, rather than reason. Emotion-manipulating non-verbal and body-awareness exercises create a "new feeling level" in which inhibitions are "thrown to the winds".

Undoubtedly, most people presenting or participating in such programs are convinced that they serve a needed and worthwhile purpose. But Sensitivity Training is based on Self and Group Criticism, and many specialists in the field of mental health recognize Self and Group Criticism to be an integral part of the brainwashing technique used so destructively by the Chinese Communists on our military men in Korea and even now being used by the Viet Cong on captured American servicemen.

Communist Self and Group Criticism originated in Russia in 1929 with the Communist Party slogan: "Through Bolshevist Self-Criticism we will enforce the dictatorship of the proletariat". This method of thought control and mind-manipulation, sometimes called brainwashing, is based on the Pavlovian theory of conditioning, and is used to control all the peoples now behind the Iron Curtain. The populace is divided into communes and then into small groups of 10–15, forced to meet regularly and participate in Self and Group Criticism. This spotlights the agitators or potential trouble-makers, who are then brought into the "correct" line of thinking. This procedure has created the most effective tyranny ever devised. Through Self and Group Criticism (informing and divulging their inner-most thoughts) the people create their own police state and control one another.

Sensitivity Training participants (in the small group structure) are also divided into groups of 10–15, meet on a regular basis and employ Self and Group Criticism for the purpose of acquiring "appropriate" attitudes and behavior pattern and to discover one's "identity". A participant is pressed to seek out real or imagined shortcomings in his personality and thinking, to Criticize himself and others. In an atmosphere of permissiveness, attitudes and old standards of behavior are probed and criticized by others.

Proponents claim that "Sensitivity Training is a means to alter the basic personality structure of an individual". Participants are manipulated by group pressure and by the scientific techniques of the trainer, whose job is to plan and produce behavior in order to create changes in other people. Results occurring from training would naturally depend upon the intelligence, emotions, anxieties, religious beliefs, moral standards and general character traits of the trainer and group members. Much of Sensitivity Training is devoted to challenging and discrediting the Judaic-Christian value system. After Criticizing church, home, friends, family and moral and political convictions, one is apt to doubt he has any standards or ideals worth keeping or defending. Programs of this nature can and do realign loyalties away from family, home, church and co-workers.

Sensitivity Training is conducted under various titles, such as: Human potential Workshop, Self-evaluation, Interpersonal Relations, Group Confessional, Leadership Training, T-Group Training, Operant Conditioning, Human Relations Lab, Basic Encounter Groups, Self-Actualization, etc.

Behaviorial scientists and educators, by merging science and democracy, have developed a planned change potential for the "total personality system" and the "total social system." One of the methods in widespread use is Sensitivity Training. This program was developed in 1946 at the National Training Laboratory. In 1952, the Lab became an official arm of the National Education Association (NEA). The National Training Lab and its affiliates across the nation recruit for training those who are already leaders, those who are in a position to encourage change in their "back-home" organizations or communities. Upon completion of training, these persons may then become "Change Agents", who persuade persons or organizations to put into practice new ideas or behavior patterns not naturally developed. The NEA works with and obtains help from the National Institute of Mental Health. The programs are funded by foundations, government agencies and private donors.

In 1956 the National Training Laboratories of the NEA held its first workshop for Industrial Administrators and National Church Executives, and in 1958 sponsored its first laboratory for Educational Administrators and key Executives of Volunteer Organizations. Industrial Administrators are finding that Sensitivity Training, implemented into many large businesses and organizations, are causing turmoil, dissension and distrust among co-workers. Churches are using Sensitivity Training techniques at retreats, through prayer therapy and in leadership training. Change Agents work to neutralize differences and to encourage unification of churches in order to more easily fit into the "New Society". Members are often encouraged to participate in protest demonstrations. The U.S. Office of Education is channeling trial Sensitivity Training programs into church schools. Educational systems are being influenced by Change Agents using Sensitivity Training procedures, which can be incorporated into almost any class of instruction. Students are conditioned to become less dependent on authority figures such as parents and teachers, to look to those of their own age level to clarify and solve problems. Title III of the Elementary-Secondary Education Act funded by the U.S. Office of Education for "the exploratory development of models of planned change in education" provides the link between the behavioral scientists and the schools. Volunteer organizations, all across the nation, employ Sensitivity Training. YMCA personnel became involved in these techniques, first as participants and later as trainers. The impact of these techniques became widespread in YMCA starting in 1961, when they were incorporated into the Organization Development Project (ODP). Dr. William Shutz of Esalen Institute, famous for its Sensitivity Training sessions, says: ". . . When a Christian organization like the YMCA sends its boys through an encounter group to develop their independence, they may find some of the boys questioning Christian principles. These are not only possibilities, they happen. But they are necessary risks for individual development."

Selected young social scientists, since 1960, have attended workshops sponsored by the National Training Lab of the National Education Association and have implemented Sensitivity Training into civil rights and poverty programs, in order to create better human relations. Unfortunately, since Sensitivity Training centers on Criticism, the so-called "better human relations" often turn to increased antagonism and greater division in understanding. Employees of the Peace Corps, Internal Revenue Service, Office of Economic Opportunity, U.S. State Dept., to name but a few, have been subjected to Sensitivity Training. Police are being given Sensitivity Training. Cleon Skousen points out in his November 1967 issue of "Law and Order" that police are being trained to be sensitive to the feelings and aspirations of the narcotic addicts, riot-makers and ex-convicts, but that no comparable effort is being made to make the law-breakers sensitive to the havoc they are creating. Judges, parole and probation officers, through Sensitivity training, have become so "sensitive" to the attitudes of the law-breaker that they are hesitant to exert the authority necessary to protect the law-abiding citizen. Newspapers sensitive to the hippie movement heavily advertise Sensitivity Training for: mind-expansion effects, sensory and fantasy experiences, sex hang-ups, 4th dimensional therapy, marathons, psychodrama, sociodrama, sexualization education, etc.

Summary: The widespread use of planned change programs throughout our society is creating the climate which conditions individuals and groups to make the changes deemed necessary be behaviorial scientists and other unelected planners. These changes call for a new culture and all that it implies: New education in which we educate the senses and emotions, instead of the intellect; new religion, a humanist philosophy in which man replaces God as the supreme being. This, in turn, calls for a new morality, "situational ethics", which encourages individuals to do whatever seems right to them at the moment. World planners have long felt that war can be eliminated with the hemogenization of societies into a common human nature, devoid of a belief in absolutes and a concept of right and wrong, with no specific loyalties or allegiances. They reason that with no conflict of interests, there will be no cause for war. Sensitivity training and similar "change" programs discredit these absolutes, debase the individual and destroy the foundations of our Judaic-Christian heritage. At the base of this training lies an ideological war against our entire American culture.

SELECTED QUOTATIONS

From: "Mental Robots" by Lewis Albert Alesen, M.D., Past President of the Los Angeles County Medical Association and California Medical Association, Past Chief of Staff, Los Angeles County General Hospital Published in 1962 by the Caxton Printers Caldwell, Idaho:

"Americans today are being deluged with a cleverly planned and skillfully executed barrage of propaganda designed to achieve adoption of a somewhat nebulous group of proposals by federal, state, and local governments classified under the broad, general and disarmingly innocent title of 'The Mental Health, Program.' "

"The American citizen is by birth, early training, and tradition a believer in fair play, and one who is compassionate and sympathetic with the troubles of his fellows. When an appeal is made to his finer emotions, he is apt to respond in the manner suggested by that appeal and with very little, if any, thought to the underlying reasons and the ultimate results. Sponsors of all manner of causes—both good and evil—have been quick to recognize this trait of American character and to capitalize upon it by fair means or foul."

"Herbert Philbrick has been recently quoted as stressing Soviet psychiatry is the psychiatry of Pavlov, upon whose original work on dogs the theory of the conditioned reflex is based. This conditioned reflex is the principle underlying all of the procedures employed by the Soviets in their brainwashing and brain-changing techniques. Under its skillful use the human can be, and has been in countless instances, so altered as completely to transform the concepts previously held and to prepare the individual so treated for a docile acceptance of all manner of authoritarian controls."

"Its objectives may be concisely and accurately described as the ultimate destruction of the human individual as a person; the eradication of all the traditions, ideals, and moral concepts which he has learned from home, church and school; the transformation of the individual from any bourgeoisie notions of self-reliance, independence and individual initiative to just another number in the master record book who has been bred, reared and taught by every device and artifice wherever possible to deny and reject responsibility for himself, and to transfer that reasonsibility to the group, that is, the State."

"The master plan under which it works has been the result of the efforts of countless thousands of individuals, most of whom were and are so busily engaged in the narrow confines of their own special interests that they have not had the time, the inclination, or the ability to gain a perspective of the ultimate aims of the plans which they have so actively aided in bringing to fruition."

"During the past ten or fifteen years there have been conducted summer sessions in group dynamics on the campus of Gould Academy at Bethel, Maine, under the direction of the National Training Laboratory in Group Development, a subdivision of the National Education Association. At these summer sessions there are found in attendance teachers, students, and business and professional men and women among others. The fundamental objective of this training is to prepare those so trained in the subtle art of propagandizing without seeming so to do. Here among academic surroundings a carefully arranged schedule of indoctrination has been prepared by the National Education Association, highlighted by a quaint patois in which the words 'work shop' and 'buzz sessions' are used to designate the means and the ends at the same time."

From: "Brainwashing, a Synthesis of the Russian Textbook on Psychopolitics" (The Communist Manual of Instructions on Psychopolitical Warfare) Excerpts taken from the book, "Mental Robots" by Lew Albert Alesen, M.D., and from the complete text of the synthesis:

"In rearranging loyalties we must have a command of their values. In the animal the first loyalty is to himself. The second loyalty is to his family unit, his parents and brothers and sisters. This is destroyed by making a family unit economically nondependent, by lessening the value of marriage, by making an easiness of divorce and by raising the children wherever possible by the State. The next loyalty is to his friends and local environment. This is destroyed by lowering his trust and bringing about reportings upon him allegedly by his fellows. . . ."

"If we could effectively kill the national pride and patriotism of just one generation we will have won that country. Therefore there must be continual propaganda abroad to undermine the loyalty of the citizens in general and the teenager in particular."

"Mass neo-hypnotism can accomplish more or less the same results when guided by an experienced psychopolitical operator. An end goal in such a procedure would be the alteration of the loyalties of an entire nation in a short period of time by mass neo-hypnotism, a thing which has been effectively accomplished among the less-usable states of Russia."

"The educational program of Psychopolitics must, at every hand, seek out the levels of youth who will become the leaders in the country's future, and educate them into the belief of the animalistic nature of Man. . . . They must be taught, above all things, that the salvation of Man is to be found only by his adjusting thoroughly to this environment."

"The realm of defamation and degradation, of the psychopolitician, is Man himself, and by bringing about, through contamination of youth, a general degraded feeling, command of the populace is facilitated to a very marked degree."

"If a psychiatric ward could be established in every hospital in every city in a nation, it is certain that, at one time or another, every prominent citizen of that nation could come under the ministrations of psychopolitical operatives or their dupes." . . . "The cooperation of the government to obtain these vast sums of money is best obtained by the organization of mental health groups composed of leading citizens and those who bring their lobbying abilities to bear against the nation's government. Thus can be financed many programs, which might otherwise have to be laid aside by the psychopolitician."

"Any man who cannot be persuaded into Communist rationale is, of course, to be regarded as somewhat less than sane, and it is, therefore completely justified to use the technique of insanity upon the non-Communist." . . . "One of the first and foremost missions of the psychopolitician is to make an attack upon Communism and insanity synonymous. It should become the definition of insanity, of a paranoid variety, that 'A paranoid believes he is being attacked by Communists.' Thus, at once the support of the individual so attacking Communism will fall away and wither."

"*Psychopolitics* is the art and science of asserting and maintaining dominion over the thoughts and loyalties of individuals, officers, bureaus, and masses, and the effecting of the conquest of enemy nations through 'mental healing'."

(NOTE.—Complete text of this Communist Manual available for $1.00 from Truth, Inc., P.O. Box 10188, Fort Worth 14, Texas.)

From: Lavrenti P. Beria, former head of the Soviet Secret Police. "Psychopolitics is an important if less known division of Geopoltics."

From: "Encyclopedic dictionary": Geo-Politics: 'A doctrine, of Nazi Germany, advocating aggressive expansion.' "

From: "Encyclopedia Americana": "Geo-Politics: 'For this university of education . . . modern Germany—The Third Reich—is primarily responsible. The war which blocked Germany's initial drive for world dominion and the revolution which put into power the Nazis who were to launch the second drive gave us Geo-Politics. German Geopolitik is the logical product of a materialistic and deterministic school of thought which, through more than two centuries, has progressively gained sway over the German mind until it reduced man to a status of biochemical entity . . . Geopolotics, in its quest for an invincible brand of power politics has taken unto itself such varied fields as economics, jurisprudence, the social sciences, medicine, psychology and military strategy.' "

"CHANGE" PROGRAMS IN THE CHURCHES

Church executives, across the nation, since 1956, have attended workshops sponsored by the National Education Association's National Training Laboratory. Sensitivity Training techniques are used by church members at retreats, through prayer therapy (meditation, thanksgiving, self-criticism, group criticism) and in leadership training, in order to neutralize differences and encourage unification into a one-world church. Many churches openly promote Sensitivity Training programs and use the techniques in their organizations. In other churches CHANGE AGENTS, who have taken this training, are working to alter existing standards, values and beliefs. This is accomplished through self-group criticism and criticism of doctrine and authority. Changes in moral standards are being brought about through group participation in body and sensory experiences.

Readers Digest, September 1967 and Psychology Today, December 1967 reveal that the U.S. Office of Education granted $110,000 to the Western Behavioral Sciences Institute at La Jolla, California to conduct education research. The Institute, one of five national centers for research, is one of the leading promoters of Sensitivity Training. Dr. Carl Rogers, internationally known psychologist at the Institute reveals that, in addition to the federal grant, they were given a Babcock Foundation grant to implement basic encounter techniques for "self-directed change" into the Roman Catholic schools, Immaculate Heart College, Los Angeles.

In April and May of 1968 a "13th Annual Spring Training Laboratory" was conducted at Green Lake, Wisconsin, sponsored by the Dept. of Educational Development of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. Many laboratories of this nature are in periodic progress throughout the

nation. At this particular lab, two sessions concentrated on T-Group training in "Human Relations" and "Personal Growth." The third lab dealt with "Innovation and Change" and was for the purpose of enrolling "24 national or regional staff persons responsible for change in congregations, regional committees, etc., pastors and church workers who want to initiate change in congregations or their organizations; and persons who want to initiate community change."

In working to bring about change in the church and social structure, three steps are always apparent: First: Identify the problem and create in the participants a feeling of guilt, fear, insecurity and doubt. Second: Approach the problem by encouraging group discussion, group confession and self-group criticism. Third: Solve the problem by creating a dependence upon the decisions of "the group", instead of independent judgment. It has been proven that there is a reflex action of submission to the group with every act of verbal confession in a group structure. When a "manipulated" group consensus is arrived at in this manner, more often than not the decisions arrived at are based upon emotion, rather than reason. Commitment to action follows, and often calls for participation in protest demonstrations.

Twin Circle, 4-14-68, reports on a Catholic Liturgy in Oklahoma designed to "sensitize" the mass-goers. Music by the Beatles was played and films were shown depicting poverty throughout the world. Summonses were handed out at the end, charging the members with theft and neglect, and they were told to return the following Sunday with a plea of "Guilty" if the total effect of the Liturgy had been felt.

In many instances, Change Agents are not only encouraging a compromise of beliefs, but some are working to completely erase our Judaic-Christian concepts. An example is reported in The Sign magazine of January 1968 in an article entitled "Religion For A One-Story Universe" by Arthur McNally, C.P. The author issues a warning and reveals the following: In the "new theology" of "The Church of Tomorrow" there will be no Heaven to hope for, no Hell to fear and no Divine Providence to trust. Man will no longer need a belief in the "myth" of God. God is just "the on-going-ness of things" and those who cling to the old concept of God as a Father will be exhibiting regressive behavior. It is a full-blown religion perilously close to atheistic humanism, but few people see it for what it is. Last year, 16,000 people of many religious denominations were brain-washed in programs of this nature given at the Ecumenical Institute in Chicago. The institute normally teaches between two and three hundred per weekend on the Chicago campus, and another nine thousand attend courses around the nation. The Ecumenical Institute originated in 1954 when the World Council of Churches decided to establish a center for education to deal with church and social renewal. The liturgy services at the Institute seem like exercises in group dynamics; lots of swaying, handclapping and foot-stamping, interlaced with oriental gongs and sing-song recitations. "Let any church send us thirty laymen for a weekend, and we will send back twenty-nine awakened, revolutionary people", says Joe Matthews, Dean of the Institute.

SELECTED QUOTATIONS

From: "The Impact of Science on Society" by Bertrand Russell, published by Simon & Schuster, New York, 1953:

"I think the subject which will be of most importance politically is Mass Psychology. Mass Psychology is, scientifically speaking, not a very advanced study, and so far its professors have not been in universities; they have been advertisers, politicians, and above all, dictators. This study is immensely useful to practical men, whether they wish to become rich or to acquire the government. . . . Its importance has been enormously increased by the growth of modern methods of propaganda. . . . It may be hoped that in time anybody (p. 29) will be able to persuade anybody of anything, if he can catch the patient young and is provided by the State with money and equipment. This subject will make great strides when it is taken up by scientists under a scientific dictatorship. . . ."

"Various results will soon be arrived at. First, that the influence of home is obstructive. Second, that not much can be done unless indoctrination begins before the age of ten. Third, that verses set to music and repeatedly intoned are very effective. Fourth, that the opinion that snow is white must be held to show a morbid taste for eccentricity. It is for future scientists to make these maxims precise and discover exactly how much it costs per head to make children believe that snow is black, and how much less it would cost to make them believe it is dark gray."

"Although this science will be diligently studied, it will be rigidly confined to the governing class. The populace will not be allowed to know how its convictions were generated. When the technique has been perfected, every government that has been in charge of education for a generation will be able to control its subjects securely without the need of armies or policemen. As yet there is only one country which has succeeded in creating this politician's paradise." (p. 30)

"Fichte laid it down that education should aim at destroying free will, so that, after pupils left school, they shall be incapable, throughout the rest of their lives, of thinking or acting otherwise than as their schoolmasters would have wished. But in his day this was an unattainable idea; what he regarded as the best system in existence produced Karl Marx. In the future such failures are not likely to occur when there is dictatorship. Diet, injections, and injunctions will combine from a very early age to produce the sort of character and the sort of beliefs that the authorities consider desirable, and any serious criticism of the powers that be will become psychologically impossible. Even if all are miserable, all will believe themselves happy, because the government will tell them that they are so."

(NOTE.—Bertrand Russell is a world-renowned atheist and one of six such atheists selected by UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) to rewrite the history of the world. Reference: "Mental Robots" by Lewis Albert Alesen, M.D. Bertrand Russell received the Nobel Peace Price in 1950 for literature defending humanity and freedom of thought. Bertrand Russell created the International War Crimes Tribunal which met in Stockholm, Sweden, April and May of 1967 and found President Johnson and the United States guilty of war crimes because of the U.S. involvement in the war in South Viet Nam.)

From: "The Psychiatry of Enduring Peace and Social Progress," a series of lectures appearing in Psychiatry Journal of the Biology and the Pathology of Interpersonal Relations, Volume No. 9, February 1946, published by the Wm. A. White Psychiatric Foundation, District of Columbia . . . (The Restablishment of Peacetime Society). Speaker: G. Brock Chisholm, C.B.E., M.D., Deputy Minister of Health, Dept. of National Health and Welfare, Canada. Major General, Canadian Army. (Later, in 1948, elected Director General of WHO—United Nations World Health Organization):

"We are all now, perforce, citizens of the world, whether we are sufficiently mature adequately to carry that responsibility or not. In the face of this new status as world citizens, we must accept the uncomfortable fact that we are the kind of people who fight wars every fifteen or twenty years. We always have, for as far back as we know anything of the race, and if we go on being the same kinds of people, it is to be supposed that we will continue to fight each other."

"The responsibility for charting the necessary changes in human behavior rests clearly on the sciences working in that field. Psychologists, psychiatrists, sociologists, economists and politicians must face this responsibility. It cannot be avoided. Certainly the psychiatrists are not in the least backward in staking out their claim to possessing superior intelligence and know-how with which to alter materially and permanently human behavior."

"We have swallowed all manner of poisonous certainties fed us by our parents, our Sunday and day school teachers, our politicians, our priests, our newspapers and others with a vested interest in controlling us . . ."

"The re-interpretation and eventually eradication of the concept of right and wrong which has been the basis of child training, the substitution of intelligent and rational thinking for faith in the certainties of the old people, these are the belated objectives of practically all effective psychotherapy . . ."

"The suggestion that we should stop teaching children moralities and rights and wrongs and instead protect their original intellectual integrity has of course to be met by an outcry of heretic or iconoclast . . . We all recognize these reactions as those of the immature, the inferior, the guilty, which are not found in the mature, integrated personality. Freedom from moralities means freedom to observe, to think and behave sensibly, to the advantage of the person and the group, free from outmoded types of loyalties and from the magic fears of our ancestors."

"If the race is to be freed from its crippling burden of good and evil it must be psychiatrists who take the original responsibility . . ."

"Should discounts be offered for treatment of whole families? Should attempts be made by the profession to induce governments to institute compulsory treatment for the neuroses as for other infectious diseases?"

"There are indeed areas of hope. Some help may well be found in possible developments of shorter, more effective techniques of treatment. Shock, chemotherapy, group therapy, hypno and narco-analysis, psycho-drama and even surgery can all be used, and some of these methods may be employed by other than trained psychiatrists."

"There is something to be said for taking charge of our own destiny, for gently putting aside the mistaken old ways of our elders if that is possible. If it cannot be done gently, it may have to be done roughly or even violently—that has happened before."

"Let us discard the bromides which have kept us drugged, obedient to the old people and afraid of their displeasure. Let us accept our own responsibility to remodel the world in bolder, clearer and more honest lines."

Speaker: Abe Fortas, Washington Lawyer and Under Secretary of Interior. (Later in 1965, appointed by President Johnson to the U.S. Supreme Court.):

"General Chisholm's remarkable lecture on the the Re-Establishment of Peacetime Society will undoubtedly startle many people . . . He not only pleads for mature men and women, but the nature of his plea discloses that he himself is that extraordinary creature: a man of maturity."

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Examiner and Chronicle, Aug. 27, 1967]

SCIENTISTS PREDICT END OF INDIVIDUALISM

WIESBADEN (West Germany).—Society may well become depersonalized and desexualized within the next 50 years, two New York scientists said yesterday.

And anyone who tries to be an individual "will be looked upon as odd, reactionary and antigroup."

Prof. Stanley Less of Columbia University read the thesis yesterday to the International Congress of Psychiatry. Prof. William Wolf, secretary of the American Society for the Advancement of Psychotherapy, was the coauthor.

Failure to adapt to the "group" is likely to be a prime source of psychic stress in the new society, the scientists held.

"Preoccupation with romantic love may well become diluted and many interactions between men and women may change considerably," their paper said. "Our future society might be far less sexualized as compared to our current civilization."

They added that "unanimity of thinking would be seen as the normal pattern."

Psychotherapists, Less and Wolf declared, would have to deal with the question of "what the sources of pride and pleasure will be for the man of the future when labor will no longer be the prime motivation for his existence."

SUMMARY

On the preceding pages it has been attempted to show:

1. The new Soviet man is being created in Red China, Communist Russia, all the captive nations, and is being attempted in the free nations, through the use of Communist psychopolitical warfare.

Communist Psychopolitical Warfare is: "The art and science of asserting and maintaining dominion over the thoughts and loyalties of individuals, officers, bureaus and masses, and the effecting of the conquest of enemy nations through 'mental healing.'" It is accomplished by thought control, destruction of moralities and individual thinking, directed group conformity, informing and self-criticism.

2. The Aryan super race which Hitler attempted to build through mass annihilation depended also upon massive *thought control.* The Third Reich was responsible for *Geopolitiks*—in this case the control of the populace through "education"—(control of the press, burning and re-writing of books). *Informing* on one another brought about the elimination of those who, either by reason of their race or their attitudes, did not "conform." These are part of the tactics being used in Communist-controlled countries today to build *the new Soviet man.*

3. A new American man, whose thoughts can be controlled is anticipated through the use of mass psychology.

4. The new world citizen, who will be freed from the dangers of war, may be developed through education and mass psychology. According to some leaders this can be accomplished by ridding individuals of all set standards of behavior and all moral guidelines. With no conflict of ideas or attitudes, there will be no war.

In the War For Survival the bow and arrow was once considered the ultimate weapon.

Much later we considered the Atomic Bomb to be the ultimate weapon.

Today we know the ultimate weapon is: control of the minds of men.

RELATED READING

SENSITIVITY TRAINING AND PROGRAMS FOR PLANNED CHANGE

1. "Inhibitions Thrown to the Winds," Life Magazine, July 12, 1968.
2. "The Great Group Binge," by Hoover, West Sect., L.A. Times, January 1967.
3. "2000 A.D., A Symposium," by Carl Rogers, Alan Watts, Herman Kahn, ORACLE newspaper, Vol. 1, #12; 1371 Haight St., San Francisco, Calif. 94117.
4. "Issues in Human Relations Training," by Irving Weschler and E. H. Schein, National Training Laboratories of the National Education Association, 1962.
5. "The Dynamics of Planned Change," Lippit, Watson and Westly, 1958.
6. "Science and Human Behavior," by B. F. Skinner, McMillan Co., N.Y., 1965.
7. "Self-Renewal: The Individual and the Innovative Society," John W. Gardner, 1965.
8. "Introduction to Western Behavioral Sciences Institute," Richard Farson, Mimeo.
9. "T-Group Theory and Laboratory Method," by Bradford, Gibb, Benne and Berenson.
10. "Examining Sensitivity Training and the Laboratory Method," by James M. Hardy, Executive, and Richard L. Batchelder, Associate, Research & Development Division, National Board of YMCA. May 1968 issue of Forum of the Association of Secretaries of the YMCA.

EDUCATION

1. "Guidance and Counselling in Groups," NEA Journal, October 1966.
2. "Sensitivity Training in the Classroom," NEA Journal, January 1967.
3. "Change in School Systems," by National Training Laboratories of NEA.
4. "Peer Analysis, A Way to Help Adolescents," by Dr. Allen Hasson, California Teachers' Association Journal, January 1968.
5. "Concepts for Social Change," by Goodwin Watson for COPED, Nat'l. Tr. Lab., NEA.
6. "Education and Ecstasy," by George B. Leonard, Sr., Editor, Look magazine, three-part series, September 17, October 1 and October 15, 1968.

CHURCHES

1. "How," by Sister Gertrude J. Donnelly, Catholic Action Office, Notre Dame, Ind.
2. "Communicating Love Through Prayer," by Rosalyn Rinker, Zondervan Pub., Mich.
3. "Taste of New Wine" (and Workbook) by Keith Miller, Word Book Publishers.

COMMUNIST USE OF THOUGHT CONTROL AND BRAINWASHING

1. "Brainwashing (The Story of the Men Who Defied it)" by Edward Hunter with Dr. Leon Freedom, Pyramid Books, 1962.
2. "Brainwashing in Red China—The Calculated Destruction of Men's Minds," by Edward Hunter, Vanguard Press, New York.
3. "In Every War But One," by Eugene Kinkead, Norton Co., New York, 1959.
4. "In the Presence of my Enemies," by John W. Clifford; Norton, 1963.
5. "Rape of the Mind," by J. A. M. Meerloo, M.D., World Publishers, N.Y., 1956.
6 "The Communist Persuasion," by Father E. Winance; Kenedy, 1959.
7. "Battle for the Mind," by Wm. W. Sargant, Doubleday, 1957.

PUBLICATIONS EXPOSING SENSITIVITY TRAINING, SIECUS, AND MIND MANIPULATION

1. "Sensitivity Training, the Trojan Horse," by Marie Heller Paul, California Educators, Associated Box 1129, Long Beach, Calif., 90801, 25¢.
2. "Sensitivity Training," by Dr. W. S. McBirnie, Voice of Americanism, P.O. Box 90, Glendale, California, $1.
3. "The Truth About the New Sex Education in the Schools," by Dr. W. S. McBirnie, Voice of Americanism, P.O. Box 90, Glendale, California, $1.
4. "Sensitivity Training," Church League of America, 422 N. Prospect St., Wheaton, Illinois, October 1968, 50¢
5. "To Deceive the Elect—Cursillo," by Dr. DeTar, Athanasius Press, Reno, Nevada, $1.
6. "The Church and Group Mania," by The Methodist Laymen, Box 323, Hollywood, Calif.
7. "Brainwashing in the High Schools," and "Collectivism on Campus," both by E. M. Root.
8. "Education for Survival in the Struggle Against Communism," Senate Document 93, 87th Congress. (Supt. of Documents, Government Printing Office, Wash., D.C., 35¢).
9. "Sex Education Fad," from the Congressional Record, volume 114, part 14, page 19027, 10¢ each, $7.50 per 100 from Congressman John Rarick, House Office Bldg., Washington, D.C. 20515.

(NOTE.—Congressional Records should be available for reading at the main branch of your public library.)

10. "NEA—Blackboard Power," by Gordon Drake, Sacramento County Families United, P.O. Box 20294, Sacramento, California 95820, 75¢.
11. "Sensitivity Training—Hearings Conducted by the California State Legislature," (pro and con presentations) $2.50 from Assembly Committee on Rules, Room 3173, State Capitol, Sacramento, California 95814.

THE INCOME TAX SURCHARGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the administration is going all out in urging Congress to extend the 10-percent surtax on the moderate-income taxpayer, due to expire on June 30.

As so many times in the past, the wise sayings of European central bankers are being invoked to give plausibility to the administration's request. Unless this surtax on the average moderate-income taxpayer is continued, say the central bankers, inflation in the United States will be uncontrollable, and the dollar will be "devalued"—whatever that means.

Parenthetically, the central bankers, in advising the United States that it ought to be running a budgetary surplus nowadays, never seem to advise us to attain that surplus by cutting our swollen military expenditure. Neither do they advise us to attain that surplus by plugging the billions of dollars worth of tax loopholes which benefit wealthy beneficiaries. Instead, the only road to fiscal morality that they hold out before us is further socking it to the average moderate-income taxpayer.

I do not quarrel with the European central bankers' general thesis that we need, as part of our anti-inflational arsenal, a budget that is balanced or even in surplus.

There are several ways of achieving this end. Let us look at those ways in terms of the political configuration of the House of Representatives.

There are 192 Republicans in the House. About 20 of these are sufficiently conservative so that they cannot be counted on by their own President if he takes a liberal stand on tax reform. About five or 10 are so liberal that they will from time to time vote with the liberal Democrats despite their President. But by and large, around 170 of the 192 Republicans can be said to be in Mr. Nixon's corner if he really wants them.

Among the 247 Democrats are some 60 or 70 conservatives, mostly from the South, who are available for a conservative coalition with the Republicans. The remaining 170-odd Democrats are more or less in the liberal-progressive spectrum, though as one moves from the more liberal-progressive 100 through the

remaining 70, the liberality-progressiveness obviously diminishes.

Now, let us apply this arithmetic to various ways of securing a budget surplus.

What about securing a budget surplus by cutting back on the most swollen item in the budget, military expenditures? Some $5 billion or so could be cut from this without in any way weakening our security. If President Nixon would give the lead, he could take his 170 Republican votes and add to them close to 100 Democratic votes, for a clear majority of some 270. Unfortunately, President Nixon has elected to do just the opposite. Digging himself in behind the Pentagon's swollen budget, he took occasion last week at the Air Force Academy commencement to denounce "new isolationsts" and "unilateral disarmers." So, while a fight will be made, as a realistic method of restoring or creating a budget surplus, we must apparently forget important cuts in military expenditures.

What about a straight continuation of the surtax, to yield $9 billion in the next fiscal year, as the administration urges? By putting on the screws, the administration, let us assume, could line up its 170 surefire Republican votes for continuing this surtax on the moderate-income taxpayer. He would have trouble getting many Democratic votes, either liberal or conservative. Therefore, a realistic guess is about 30 Democrats, or a total of 200 votes, for the naked extension of the surtax—clearly not enough.

This leaves us with a third possibility—an administration-liberal Democratic congressional coalition for the purpose of damping down inflation, in a just equitable way, by tax loophole plugging, with the surtax continued only at the level needed to take care of the transitional period while the loophole-plugging program is taking hold. Let us suppose that President Nixon came up to Congress this afternoon and requested the kind of loophole-plugging tax program, yielding around $9 billion annually once it gets going, that 100 or so of us liberal-progressive Democrats have been calling for for more than a year.

As threescore of us said in our letter a couple of weeks ago to the Ways and Means Committee, such a loophole-plugging package should include "not only the 7-percent investment tax credit, but action on such loopholes as oil depletion, capital gains property untaxed at death, the unlimited charitable deduction, special treatment for stock options, the multiple corporation loophole, the provision permitting payment of estate taxes by the redemption of government bonds at par, hobby farms, accelerated depreciation on speculative real estate, foundations, and conglomerate mergers."

President Nixon could show us the way to fiscal responsibility, at home and abroad, by coming up before Congress with such a loophole-plugging program, accompanied by a continuation of the surtax for so long, and only so long, as it was necessary for this loophole-plugging program to have its revenue effect. For such a package, Mr. Nixon could have the votes of his 170 Republicans plus, I would judge, 100 of us Democrats, for a clear majority of 270. The Republicans would vote for the package because they believed in it, or because their leader had staked his reputation on it. The Democrats would vote for the package because it applies fiscal responsibility in a way that is fair to the average moderate-income taxpayer by plugging tax loopholes.

What we are not going to do is vote blindly in a few days to extend the surtax for another year on the administration's representation that it will produce a tax-reform program in the sweet-by-and-by, perhaps next November. Swallowing that bait could well mean that we use our votes now to saddle a further tough tax burden on the average moderate-income taxpayer, yet find ourselves in November, even assuming a genuine tax-reform program is presented, without enough Republican votes to pass it.

So let me be very clear. If President Nixon wants to fight inflation—if he wants to protect the international value of the dollar—let him form here and now a coalition with the liberal Democrats to enact a prompt and meaningful loophole-plugging tax program, with the surtax continued only insofar as it is needed to permit the phasing in of such a program. We Democrats will give him the votes he needs.

So the question is: Will Mr. Nixon fight inflation and defend the dollar? I hope he will—and I will help him do it.

THE ANGLO-FRENCH CONCORDE OBSERVED

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, last week I had the opportunity to cast my famished eyeballs upon a working SST at the Paris Air Show. The aircraft in question was the Anglo-French Concorde, which I saw both in flight and on exhibit at the exposition. To say the least, the experience was enlightening and utterly convincing. Surviving it is an experience in itself.

Previously, when I expressed opposition to the SST and its subsidization by our Government as a commercial enterprise, the reaction of its proponents was strong. Beating their chests and baring their souls, they resurrected the Wright brothers and questioned my devotion to motherhood, blueberry pie, and the Emancipation Proclamation. When I questioned the effects of the sonic boom and our order of social priorities, many bellows of outrage were heard. I was against progress. I was helping put America into second place in the commerical aircraft field. We would learn to love the sonic boom in time. Thomas Jefferson would have been for it. So what if we sent people across oceans and continents in a few fleeting hours. Traffic jams of several hours on your way from airport to final destination would also be beneficial to sweet humor and business.

In Paris I saw and heard the Concorde, and it was unforgettable, indeed. To begin with, as thousands of observers can attest, the noise of this aircraft, even at minimal speeds, is outrageous, intolerable, and hideous. Its noise assaults the eardrums like a combination of a brass band, Custer's last charge, and your neighbors' children tooting on Christmas bugles.

After observing the aircraft in flight, I inspected it at the air show, conducting a series of interviews with high-ranking officials of our military, our Embassy in Paris, and leaders in the aerospace field. All of these individuals were unanimous in that they felt that Government subsidization of the SST was quite low on our order of national priorities. They felt that the Concorde was still in its technological infancy, and did not justify substantial government investment on such a high-risk item at this point.

A Reuters dispatch from Paris on June 2 substantiates my personal observations. The roof of an apartment house near Le Bourget Airfield was significantly damaged as the Concorde passed over it. Reports said that the backwash from the craft might have blown off parts of the roof as it passed overhead. I can only say that, when it is in full flight, life and property, in massive quantities and proportions and for many, many miles, would find themselves in instant, severe jeopardy. Any debate over the SST would be solved instantly by allowing the craft to fly in a manner so as to fulfill its promised goals.

So I therefore reiterate my opposition to this monstrous assault upon tranquillity, privacy, environmental and personal property. There is absolutely no reason for the U.S. Government, particularly at this time, to subsidize such a private commercial venture. We require urban mass transit, aid to housing, pollution-fighting programs, and other forms of domestic social programs. The last thing this Nation must have is a federally subsidized SST. It may take only 2 hours to get from Kennedy Airport to London. I live 15 miles from Kennedy Airport and it takes me that long to get from home to Kennedy. Meanwhile, must I settle for traffic jams of 2 to 3 hours after or before jet flights across continents and oceans?

ROGERS INTRODUCES BILL TO CREATE FEDERAL COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL QUALIFICATIONS

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which would establish a Federal Commission on Judicial Qualifications. The purpose of this bill is to establish machinery to deal with Federal judges who, through their actions, have failed to meet the standard of good behavior required by article III of the Constitution, or who are unable to execute their duties and responsibilities due to mental or physical disability, intemperance, laziness, or incompetence.

The Judicial Conference is meeting today, and I hope that the Conference will consider the matter of judicial qualifications.

I think that most would agree that the performance of the Federal judiciary has been exemplary, and in the overwhelming majority of instances, above reproach.

But there are over 500 Federal judges in the United States, and with this number, it is almost inevitable that some will fail to act as they should in executing their duties and responsibilities.

Instances of senility, laziness, alcoholism, and incompetence are rare, but provisions should be made to deal with such matters.

Historically, impeachment has been the only method by which Federal judges have been removed from office, and experience shows that this method simply does not work well.

Only eight impeachments have been attempted in the history of this Nation, and four ended in acquittals after congressional trials.

Moreover, as a remedy for judicial unfitness, impeachment suffers from several serious defects. First, it lies only for treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors, and it is unclear whether some of the conditions that clearly warrant corrective action—senility, disability, laziness, incompetence, and alcoholism—fall within this category.

But, even if these are impeachable offenses, one questions whether it is sensible or humane to remove a senile or alcoholic judge through the public spectacle of impeachment.

Second, impeachment is a cumbersome process. An impeachment trial, properly conducted, would require the constant presence of 100 Senators to hear testimony for a period of several weeks, for the average length of trials has been 16 to 17 days.

Mr. Speaker, this is not due process of law. During the last impeachment trial, some 30 years ago, it was observed that at one point only three Senators were present and that one of them was writing letters and not listening to the testimony at all.

A better method for dealing with the problem is needed, and I believe that the Commission which would be created in this legislation is the best solution.

The Commission would be composed of 11 members appointed by the President. It would include two judges of the U.S. district courts, two judges of the U.S. circuit courts, two attorneys who have practiced law for at least 10 years, and five citizens from the general public.

It would be empowered to investigate the conduct, or physical or mental ability of judges only upon the formal complaint or report of a citizen.

Should such investigation give the Commission cause to believe that the conduct of the judge is or has been inconsistent with the good behavior required by article III, or that his mental or physical disability prevents him from carrying out his duties, the Commission shall then order a hearing concerning the conduct or ability of such judge.

At the hearing, the accused judge may be represented by counsel, offer evidence in his own behalf, and confront and cross-examine witnesses against him.

If the Commission, nine of the 11 members concurring, determines that the conduct of such judge has been or is inconsistent with the good behavior required by article III of the Constitution, or that his disability prevents him from executing his duties, it then reports its findings to the Judicial Conference of the United States, recommending that the judge be removed from office.

Following such recommendation, the Commission shall also order the judge to cease the exercise of any judicial powers or prerogatives pending disposition of the Commission's recommendation by the Judicial Conference.

It is then incumbent upon the Judical Conference to review the record, the findings, and the determination of the Commission both on the law and on the facts.

Should the Conference accept the recommendation of the Commission, the aggrieved judge may seek review of the Conference's action by writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court.

Upon affirmance by the Supreme Court, the Conference shall certify to the President its determination that the conduct of the judge has been inconsistent with the good behavior required by article III of the Constitution, or that his disability prevents him from performing his duties, and the President shall then remove the judge from office.

The removal provisions of this bill have been founded upon the tenure requirements of article III of the Constitution.

Article III, section 1 reads:

> The judicial Power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The Judges, both of the supreme and inferior Courts, shall hold their Offices during good Behaviour, and shall, at stated Times, receive for their Services, a Compensation, which shall not be diminished during their Continuance in Office.

Article III, section 1 says nothing at all about what the term "good behavior" shall or shall not cover, who shall make the determination that a judge's behavior has or has not been good, or how a termination of tenure for that reason should be accomplished.

Article II, section 4, states:

> The President, Vice President and all civil Officers of the United States, shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors.

This language offers the procedure of impeachment and trial for removal of all civil officers, including judges, but with a far different list of offenses, and no mention of "good behavior."

Moreover, that the impeachment procedure was not intended to be the exclusive method of removing "civil officers" is borne out by the fact that members of the executive branch who also are civil officers are subject to removal by the President, or in the case of inferior officers, by the heads of departments—article II, section 2, clause 2. The eligibility of the latter group of civil officers to such summary removal operates to negative any conclusion that the constitutional provision for impeachment was intended by the framers to serve as the sole means for removing civil officers endowed with a special form of tenure; that is, Federal judges who hold their offices, not for life, but "during good behavior."

Therefore, if civil officers enjoying a tenure limited to a period of years may be removed, not only by invocation of the impeachment provision but also by an alternative procedure, it does not logically follow that Federal judges, solely by reason of the fact that they hold during good behavior, are subject to removal exclusively by recourse to the impeachment procedure.

In short, there is no positive correlation between tenure during good behavior and the impeachment process, for if the "good behavior" clause were deleted from article III, section 1, the impeachment provision would survive and Federal judges would remain subject thereto in the same manner as all other civil officers independently of variations in the duration of tenure. Stated in the alternative, judges are removable by impeachment proceedings because they are civil officers and not because they are judges.

In addition, the impeachment process may be regarded as one of the checks and balances designed to vest in the legislative branch a particular measure of restraint over the remaining two branches, executive and judicial. But, this should in no way deny to each of those branches the retention of a wherewithal for disciplining and removing its own personnel.

Mr. Speaker, the eight impeachments of Federal judges in our history have been for offenses within the enumeration of article II. However, there continues to be a gap in the judicial system with respect to means for dealing with judicial conduct or behavior that is not "good," but yet cannot be classed as "high crimes and misdemeanors."

Other States, including my own State of Florida, have enacted such commissions to deal with similar problems experienced in the State judiciary, and the results in those States have been well received.

I think that the time has come for us to act at the Federal level.

Past indiscretions and the suspicion of present misdeeds cast a black cloud over the image of the Federal judiciary in the minds of many citizens.

To insure the good health of our judicial institutions, this cloud must be removed.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO PROMOTE SERIOUS DIALOG ON MULTIDISCIPLINARY APPROACH TO OPERATIONS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

(Mr. DADDARIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill, on behalf of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MOSHER), and myself, which we hope will promote serious dialog and something more than lipservice concerning the systems—or multidisciplinary—approach to the operations of the Federal Government.

In essence, this bill would reorient the Department of the Interior, but retain its functions and expand it into a department of resources, environment, and population. It would, further, transfer

to the new department the functions or subunits from six existing departments or independent agencies.

There is no question in my mind that this bill represents the kind of operational reorganization which the Congress will be compelled to negotiate in the future.

It must be obvious by now that the problems of our society cannot be handled by simply treating the symptoms here and there—and then only when they reach alarming proportions. The reason we cannot is very simple: we do not have the time any more and the magnitude of the problems is far too great. The dilemmas of society are snowballing today, picking up frightening speed and momentum.

We act as though we were at the turn of the 20th century. We try to solve our difficulties as though each were an isolated sore spot that a little financial salve, judiciously applied, will heal. And we keep assuming next year, or the one after, is soon enough. In short, we do not look at the interrelationships of the various problems and treat the whole syndrome. I think we are going to have to adopt the systems approach and adopt it soon. Time is running out.

Hence this bill—which recognizes the inseparability of natural resources, environment, and population, and treats them as constituent elements of a source of trouble which is creating half a hundred individual problems ranging from the annoying to the critical.

It is not necessary for me to enumerate the problems at this point. They have been identified and bandied about vocally for some years. Many Members of Congress and many committees, including my own Committee on Science and Astronautics, have treated some of their facets comprehensively. Hundreds of bills have been introduced in the past two Congresses dealing with conservation, scores dealing with pollution, about 40 dealing with population or family planning—about a half dozen dealing with the systematic treatment of the environment.

I am unaware, however, of any major legislative effort made to link our resources, our environmental, and our population problems together. In my view this is mandatory for they are all part of the same ball of wax.

This viewpoint is subscribed to, let me add, by the distinguished committee on resources and man—a blue-ribbon unit of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, headed by Dr. Preston E. Cloud of UCLA.

Under the sponsorship of three Federal agencies and a private foundation, Dr. Cloud's committee has for some time been working on a special study which treats precisely the three elements of the new bill, together with their numerous subdivisions.

The report of the committee, to be called "Resources and Man," will be released in the near future—and it will emphasize strongly the necessity for considering problems of resources and environment within the population context. The report notes:

> Birth rates over most of the world cannot be brought to control-levels by presently acceptable measures . . . (yet) . . . it is our judgment that a population less than the present one would offer the best hope for comfortable living for our descendants and long duration for the species.

The committee adds that—

> The Malthusian limits are more likely to be extended by recognizing their validity and doing something about them than by thoughtless ridicule.

Among the committee's more stringent recommendations is one:

> To intensify efforts to limit population increase in the nation and the world by whatever means are practicable, working toward a goal of *zero rate of growth by the end of the century.*

Mr. Speaker, it has been the privilege of both Mr. MOSHER and myself to serve not only on subcommittees dealing with substantive science and technology, but on those directly concerned with our national space program as well.

We feel there is one great lesson—among many—to be learned from that program; namely, if we are going to solve intricate modern problems, whether physical or social, we had better adjust our thinking to a systems approach.

In spite of the outcries against the space program, what we have learned from it in terms of multidisciplinary management is worth every dollar we have spent.

One wearies of those who like to say: "We can go to the moon, but we can't clear up our traffic jams; or we can go to the moon, but we can't curb crime or build model cities, or if we can spend billions on space, why can't we spend enough to educate our unemployed and provide everyone with adequate housing?"

There are many answers to these questions, including the fact that the moon program involves only scientific and technological factors which are simple compared to the social, economic, and political ramifications arising from automation and congested living. Beyond this, however, while the space program has been expensive in terms of planning, management research, and cerebral effort, it has been cheap in terms of natural resources. In regard to the latter, our entire space program has probably consumed less in 10 years than the housing industry uses up in a week, or the paper industry in a day, or the auto-oil industry in a couple of hours. Put another way, the space program is easy on resources and environment but it uses, relatively, a lot of people. That is precisly the combination we want—rather than the reverse situation which is the source of so many of society's current plagues.

So, from this standpoint, we must separate our thinking about programs such as NASA's from those involving our needs for more housing, new cities, rapid transits, highways, and consumer goods. In the long-run we are going to have to continue to develop low-resource interests and industries which require the efforts of many people widely dispersed. In this context, the space program is a genuine prototype of rare significance.

At any rate, it is because we have made liberal use of brainpower and developed the systems technique to a high degree that we have achieved first-class results from our space program.

Mr. Speaker, it is this trial, I think, which we must follow in our approach to the many severe social challenges now facing us. We will, it seems to me, have to organize our Federal activities in just this way in order to cope with them.

It is no longer adequate that our Government be geared to single purpose missions. The cross currents and connecting ties are too intense and too numerous. This seems particularly true in the case of those agencies whose original charters have altered so much over the years as to become almost unrecognizable.

The Department of the Interior is surely one of these—and yet its functions as they have evolved, together with others which might reasonably be assigned to it, could be among the most meaningful, most useful and most exciting of any Government endeavor if subjected to proper reorientation. The Department is already heavily committed to the stewardship of natural resources. It is but a step from there to the general environment—the two cannot be divorced—and beyond a doubt "environment" is rapidly becoming a function of Government no less important than Defense, Justice, Agriculture, Treasury or any other Federal charge. At the same time, it is totally unrealistic to attempt to deal with the conservation of resources and the environment without relating them to population trends.

It is easy to see why, politically speaking, few of us want to deal with human procreation as the central issue which it is. Governmental activity in this area is still unpopular and for good reason, for it carries with it great dangers and the gruesome potentialities so clearly outlined by Huxley and Orwell.

But we are reaching the point where we have no choice but to curb and disperse, somehow, the accelerating crush of a crawling, sprawling humanity which is voraciously stuffing its collective maw with more and more of the irreplaceable resources of this planet. And doing so in a way which seldom permits the regeneration of those resources.

Attempting to deal with our resources, environment, urban problems, crime, educational crises, unemployment, or any other major social ill without simultaneously dealing with the population factor simply means we are racing an engine that has no transmission. The power train is broken and the wheels just do not turn. We will get nowhere.

Nor is there much comfort to be drawn from an occasional national downswing in the increase of birth rates. They are so little as to be unimportant, especially when considered in worldwide perspective; and unless overall trends are soon stabilized or actually reversed, they are also going to be too late.

Those who today shake their heads over the behavior of humanity, and who advance this or that theory of why people and nations act as they do, might think about all this. Any scientist who has observed the reactions of mammals to overcrowding is not surprised by the

disturbing convolutions of our contemporary civilization.

The answers to the severe problems we face, I am convinced, no longer lie in the traditional vein we have all been taught to revere—growth. Throughout history, and especially in America, growth—ipso facto—has been held good. The great healer and dilemma-solver. The fountainhead of abundance and well-being. The mainspring of a "viable" and "vigorous" economy. The source of national security. For the short run, it still seems that way. But many thoughtful people are now becoming uncomfortably aware that, for the long run, uncontrolled growth means extinction.

Mr. Speaker, the functions spelled out in the bill for the new department should have widespread, expert consultation. The agencies which the bill suggests be transferred should be carefully scrutinized to ascertain their most effective arrangement. But, most of all, the bill should create some hard thought concerning the need for multidisciplinary government techniques in the solution of national problems.

I should add, finally, that I believe this trend sooner or later must surface in the legislative branch as well as the executive. Our branch, too, is not geared to systems action. It is my intention to have concrete suggestions to make in this regard in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, I request that the remarks of the cosponsor, Mr. MOSHER, be included in the RECORD at this point, and that they be followed by the text of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES A. MOSHER

I thoroughly agree with the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. Daddario, that our national efforts in the effective development of natural resources, and to combat those forces that are polluting our environment, and to control the voracious trends in our population—I agree that our efforts to date in these areas are much too piecemeal and occasional.

I also agree that environmental, natural resource and population problems are intimately interrelated, so that policy making and management, including support of research and technological development should be coordinated for all three of those areas.

So crucial have become these problems, genuine coordination is now imperative. The need is immediate.

And that need obviously implies some very significant restructuring and reassignment of missions in our federal agencies.

Therefore, I gladly join with Mr. Daddario to introduce a bill which would concentrate responsibility for environmental, natural resource and population problems in a renamed and reorganized Department of the Interior.

As my colleague from Connecticut has just indicated, we propose the transfer of several existing functional units to the new, enlarged Department of Resources, Environment, and Population, in addition to those functions already being performed by the Interior Department.

Those which our bill would transfer to the new department are: the Bureau of the Census; the Environmental Science Services Administration; the Forest Service; the Soil Conservation Service; the Appalachian Regional Commission; the Atlantic-Pacific Oceanic Canal Study Commission; the Tennessee Valley Authority; the Environmental Control Administration; and the National Air Pollution Control Administration.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, we recognize that adequate hearings and discussion may indicate why there should be other transfers, or that some of these changes we are proposing may not be necessary, to achieve the ultimate purpose of the bill we are introducing today.

Thus, we do not pretend that this legislation is perfectly conceived in its introductory form.

Moreover, we fully recognize the many, many difficulties always faced in any such major reorganization proposal. We obviously may be stirring up a bureaucratic hornets nest, and we are raising very difficult questions as to consolidation of congressional committee jurisdictions.

So be it! I repeat that the need for some such coordination is imperative in the Nation's interest. It is already past due.

And I suggest that need was in part recognized by President Nixon in his very important and welcome message to the Congress on May 29, in which he announced the establishment of a new cabinet-rank Environmental Quality Council, and a new Citizens' Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality.

The bill Mr. Daddario and I are introducing today appropriately supplements, but also greatly augments that initiative by the President.

I say it augments, because we insist that Environmental Quality control must also be intimately linked with the management of natural resources and population trends.

In these brief remarks I want to emphasize that I associated myself completely with the longer statement previously entered in the RECORD today by Mr. DADDARIO. Our immediate purpose is to trigger a very lively consideration in the Congress and in the Executive Branch, of the imperative need to reorganize and consolidate our government's functions in the entire, interrelated areas of population, natural resources and environmental development.

Our bill may not be the precise or final answer to this crucial need, but we submit it is an important, necessary first step.

H.R. 12000

A bill to redesignate the Department of the Interior as the Department of Resources, Environment, and Population, and to transfer to such department certain programs and functions currently being carried out by other Federal departments and agencies

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

REDESIGNATION OF DEPARTMENT

SECTION 1. (a) The Department of the Interior shall, on and after the effective date of this Act, be known and designated as the Department of Resources, Environment, and Population. The Secretary of the Interior, the Under Secretary of the Interior, and the Assistant Secretaries of the Interior shall, on and after such date, be known as designated as the Secretary of Resources, Environment, and Population, the Under Secretary of Resources, Environment, and Population, and the Assistant Secretaries of Resources, Environment, and Population, respectively.

(b) Such changes shall be made in the titles of other officers and activities of the Department of Resources, Environment, and Population as the Secretary of Resources, Environment, and Population may determine to be necessary by reason of the enactment of this Act.

(c) Any reference in a law, regulation, document, or record to the Department of the Interior or to an officer or activity the title of which is redesignated by subsection (a) or under subsection (b) shall be held and considered to be a reference to the Department of Resources, Environment, and Population or to such officer or activity as so redesignated.

DUTIES AND FUNCTIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT

SEC. 2. The duties and functions of the Department of Resources, Environment, and Population (hereinafter referred to as the "Department"), in addition to those assumed by or transferred to the Department or the Secretary of Resources, Environment, and Population (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") under this Act or specifically vested in the Department or the Secretary by other provisions of law, shall be essentially as follows:

(1) to monitor all the Nation's natural resources, including marine resources, to develop or support programs for their use and conservation, and to recommend to the President appropriate actions or regulations to achieve these ends;

(2) to be responsible for the continued or improved quality of the Nation's physical environment, for the necessary accumulation and dissemination of information with respect thereto, and for the carrying out of national policies promulgated toward this end; and

(3) to develop plans and be responsible for such policies on population management as may be devised by the Government of the United States, including ways and means of effecting voluntary limitations on population and programs for encouraging the even distribution of population throughout the Nation.

TRANSFERS TO DEPARTMENT

SEC. 3. (a) There are hereby transferred to the Secretary all of the following organizational entities and all functions with respect thereto:

(1) The Bureau of the Census.

(2) The Environmental Science Services Administration.

(3) The Forest Service.

(4) The Soil Conservation Service.

(5) The Appalachian Regional Commission.

(6) The Atlantic-Pacific Oceanic Canal Study Commission.

(7) The Tennessee Valley Authority.

(8) The Environmental Control Administration.

(9) The National Air Pollution Control Administration.

(b) Within 180 days after the effective date of this Act the President may transfer to the Secretary any function, being exercised by a department, agency, or officer of the Federal Government and not transferred to the Secretary by subsection (a), upon a determination that such function is integrally related to the broad objectives of the Department under this Act or is primarily related to one or more of the programs or functions transferred to the Secretary by subsection (a).

(c)(1) All of the personnel, assets, liabilities, contracts, property, records, authorizations, allocations, and other funds employed, held, used, arising from, available or to be made available, of the entities transferred under subsection (a) are hereby transferred to the Secretary.

(2) So much of the positions, personnel, assets, liabilities, contracts, property, records, authorizations, allocations, and other funds employed, held, used, arising from, available or to be made available, in connection with any functions transferred under subsection (b) as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine shall be transferred to the Secretary.

(3) Personnel engaged in functions transferred under this section shall be transferred in accordance with applicable laws and regulations relating to transfer of functions; except that any transfer of personnel shall be without reduction in classification

or compensation for one year after such transfer.

(d) In any case where all of the functions of any office or agency are transferred pursuant to this section, such office or agency shall lapse.

(e) Nothing in this section shall affect the performance by the Secretary on a continuing basis of functions being performed by the Secretary of the Interior immediately prior to the effective date of this Act and assumed by the Secretary under this Act.

AMENDMENTS TO OTHER LAWS

SEC. 4. (a) Section 10(d)(1) of title 3, United States Code, is hereby amended by striking out "Secretary of the Interior" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Resources, Environment, and Population".

(b) Section 101 of title 5 of the United States Code is amended by striking out "the Interior" and inserting in lieu thereof "Resources, Environment, and Population".

(c) Subchapter II (relating to executive schedule pay rates) of chapter 53 of title 5 of the United States Code is amended as follows:

(1) Section 5312 is amended by striking out "the Interior" in paragraph (6) and inserting in lieu thereof "Resources, Environment, and Population".

(2) Section 5314 is amended by striking out "the Interior" in paragraph (8) and inserting in lieu thereof "Resources, Environment, and Population".

(3) Section 5315 is amended by striking out "the Interior" in paragraphs (18) and (42) and inserting in lieu thereof "Resources, Environment, and Population".

(4) Section 5316 is amended by striking out "the Interior" in paragraphs (25), (30), (42), (45), (50), (57), (59), (107), and (108) and inserting in lieu thereof "Resources, Environment, and Population".

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 5. The Secretary shall, as soon as is practicable after the end of each fiscal year, make a report in writing to the President for submission to the Congress on the activities of the Department during the preceding fiscal year.

SAVINGS PROVISIONS

SEC. 6. (a) All orders, determinations, rules, regulations, permits, contracts, certificates, licenses, and privileges—

(1) which have been issued, made, granted, or allowed to become effective in the exercise of duties, powers, or functions which are transferred by or under section 3 of this Act by (A) any department or agency, any functions of which are transferred by or under such section 3, or (B) any court of competent jurisdiction, and

(2) which are in effect at the time this Act takes effect,

shall continue in effect according to their terms until modified, terminated, superseded, set aside, or repealed by the Secretary, by any court of competent jurisdiction, or by operation of law.

(b) The provisions of this Act shall not affect any proceedings pending at the time this Act takes effect before any department or agency (or component thereof) any functions of which are transferred by or under section 3 of this Act; but such proceedings, to the extent that they relate to functions so transferred, shall be continued before the Department. Such proceedings, to the extent they do not relate to functions so transferred, shall be continued before the department or agency before which they were pending at the time of such transfer. In either case orders shall be issued in such proceedings, appeals shall be taken therefrom, and payments shall be made pursuant to such orders, as if this Act had not been enacted; and orders issued in any such proceedings shall continue in effect until modified, terminated, superseded, or repealed by the Secretary, by a court of competent jurisdiction, or by operation of law.

(c)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2)—

(A) the provisions of this Act shall not affect suits commenced prior to the effective date of this Act, and

(B) in all such suits proceedings shall be had, appeals taken, and judgments rendered, in the same manner and effect as if this Act had not been enacted.

No suit, action, or other proceeding commenced by or against any officer in his official capacity as an officer of any department or agency any functions of which are transferred by this Act shall abate by reason of the enactment of this Act. No cause of action by or against any department or agency, functions of which are transferred by or under section 3 of this Act, or by or against any officer thereof in his official capacity, shall abate by reason of the enactment of this Act. Causes of actions, suits, actions, or other proceedings may be asserted by or against the United States or such official of the Department as may be appropriate and, in any litigation pending when this Act takes effect, the court may at any time, on its own motion or that of any party, enter an order which will give effect to the provisions of this subsection.

(2) If before the date on which this Act takes effect, any department or agency, or officer thereof in his official capacity, is a party to a suit, and under section 3 of this Act—

(A) such department or agency (or a component thereof) is transferred to the Secretary, or

(B) any function of such department, agency, component, or office is transferred to the Secretary,

then such suit shall be continued by the Secretary (except in the case of a suit not involving functions transferred to the Secretary, in which case the suit shall be continued by the department, agency, or officer which was a party to the suit prior to the effective date of this Act).

(d) With respect to any function, power, or duty transferred by or under section 3 of this Act and exercised after the effective date of this Act, reference in any other Federal law to any department or agency (or component thereof) or officer or office which is so transferred, or the functions of which are transferred, shall be deemed to be a reference to the officer or agency in which this Act vests such functions after such transfer.

(e) Orders and actions of the Secretary in the exercise of functions transferred by or under section 3 of this Act shall be subject to judicial review to the same extent and in the same manner as if such order and actions had been by the department or agency exercising such functions immediately preceding their transfer. Any statutory requirements relating to notice, hearings, action upon the record, or administrative review that apply to any function transferred by or under section 3 of this Act shall apply to the exercise of such function by the Secretary.

(f) In the exercise of the functions transferred by or under section 3 of this Act, the Secretary shall have the same authority as that vested in the department or agency exercising such functions immediately preceding their transfer, and his actions in exercising such functions shall have the same force and effect as when exercised by such department or agency.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 7. This Act shall take effect ninety days after the enactment of this Act, or on such prior date after the enactment of this Act as the President shall prescribe and publish in the Federal Register.

SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE PROBLEMS OF OUR TIME: THE CAMPUS REVOLUTION—PART III

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, continuing escalations of dissent, confrontation, and resulting violence on American campuses lead me to offer my own contribution to the increasing efforts to analyze, explain, and solve the problem. However, this contribution will not take the form of a solution.

I expect the campus revolution to become worse, and I foresee it spreading to other institutional settings. Yet I can think of no way to prevent this course from occuring except through rapid and major changes in basic goals and values of our culture.

I do not expect changes to take place with sufficient rapidity to satisfy the young. For if they did, the resulting changes required of most adults would cause even larger problems, as a "backlash" against change grew to greater proportions.

What I hope to bring about, therefore, is an improvement in general understanding of the overall problem, not a solution to it.

I picture our human situation today as that of passengers on a great ship embarked on a long voyage. The ship is now entering stormy seas. It cannot turn back, and it is impossible to tell the storm to dissiplate. We passengers must proceed to suffer through a storm such as we have never encountered before. We may emerge safely. Or the ship may sink with all aboard.

The campus revolution is a part of that storm. Understanding it may help us to weather the storm and emerge safely. Disregarding or suppressing the campus revolution may indicate that our navigational gear is inadequate to steer us through the storm.

Usually voices heard first, most frequently and most loudly after every campus incident condemn the use of violence by students, and offer as a solution, prompt employment of all necessary force. If force does not succeed, stiff sanctions for any violations of establishment rules are next proposed.

The conventional wisdom—generally voiced by conservatives and liberals alike—requires condemnation of violence and exhortation for adherence to rules.

The special liberal contribution to this dialog, if any, generally, is an addendum; after the ritual condemnation of violence and plea for law and order liberals call for improved communication and understanding of dissenters. The extreme establishment liberal may even suggest that some student demands are reasonable; and, even though student tactics are wrong, undue violence by the forces of law and order should be condemned.

I do not mean to derogate these reactions, whether by conservatives or liberals. I consider, however, that such reactions tend to avoid the problem rather

than approach a solution. Human institutions and rules can be stable and satisfying to those who live under them when there exists widespread agreement as to the underlying values and purposes. When such agreement exists, rules are obeyed, institutions fostered. Whenever agreement does not exist, rules become disregarded and institutions undermined, and such collapse applies equally to educational institutions, religious institutions, economic institutions, and governmental institutions.

Today, here in America, in all these institutions, no widespread agreement prevails regarding their values and purposes. Our youth, and the campuses merely reflect that fact first.

Holders of institutional power almost invariably see their role as one of protecting the status quo. Political-power figures are particularly prone to identify both their continuation in power and their preserving of existing political institutions as synonymous with the good of society. This leads such leaders to encourage public reaction favoring this conservative posture, and opposing the threats and uncertainties of change.

It is not at all surprising that there should be an almost unanimous outcry from the political power structure condemning campus dissent and violence and favoring repression by increased use of the police power and legal sanctions. The general belief is that the conservative posture on all political issues becomes strengthened by continued campus dissent and confrontation—confrontation generally classified as liberal or radical.

I must take issue with almost all of this reaction. If it is not actually wrong, I see it as at least largely irrelevant to analysis and solution of the total problem.

In every major period of change in human society the then-existing structure of law and regulation is disrupted. Use of violence is normal, not unusual. This has been true in the United States from the American Revolution—which we proudly acclaim—through the Civil War and more recently the civil rights struggle. During this latter struggle both sides have found it necessary to engage in all forms of dissent, where it was felt that such action contributed to the cause.

Violence has been a consequence of such dissent in all too many instances, and blame for that violence can be assessed against both sides. Those who violate existing laws invariably, in such revolutionary situations, contend that the laws no longer reflect values of society, that existing mechanisms for change in the structure of the law no longer are adequate or sufficiently rapid. Those who defend the law contend either that it does represent the values of society, or that if it fails to do so perfectly, that until it is changed, sufficient legal, peaceful, and rapid processes exist to justify all necessary efforts to uphold the law.

If it is true that the system of conventional social values represented by existing law, and the institutional power relationships inherent in that structure, are no longer in accordance with strongly felt needs of large segments of society, then inevitably there will be periods of social turmoil.

We have experienced many disruptions ranging from peaceful and legal political action, public dissent and protest, demonstrations—both peaceful and violent—to extreme, planned, and organized violence aimed directly at society's most sacred institutions, including the state itself. Generally such unrest is accompanied by other manifestations of societal rejection, such as new styles in dress and appearance, the rise of bizarre cults, increased use of drugs and other stimulants, the rejection of language and sex taboos, and higher rates of criminality, suicide, and welfare.

Throughout the long history of the orient, whenever such periods of turmoil occurred, the dynasty in power was said to have lost the mandate of Heaven. Now the question facing us today in this country is fundamentally the problem whether or not our existing value system and institutional structures have indeed lost the mandate of Heaven.

I find it almost pointless to condemn tactics of either side in a true revolutionary confrontation, since each side is firmly convinced that it is morally right. Each side claims the tide of history is with it, that the Almighty has blessed its cause. Spokesmen for the power structure tend to condemn dissent, protest, passive or violent civil disobedience, and organized and violent destruction of social institutions. Leaders of the dissenters may, in turn, condemn refusal by spokesmen of power structures to talk, to negotiate, to share their power, to change this rule or that regulation, to grant amnesty to trespassers. Or dissenters condemn them for using force, bringing in the police, calling up the National Guard, or using guns and gas to quell what is described as a peaceful demonstration.

Each side naturally uses tactics it sees as helping best to achieve immediate goals. But all will avoid excesses which are seen weakening the cause. Both sides fight for allegiance of the uncommitted middle, generally citing—as evidence of the virtue of their own side—unreasonableness, and abuses and excesses of the other side. And there will be many cases of unplanned and accidental violence.

When the establishment condemns dissent, protest, confrontation and violence it asserts that the existing values, existing institutional structures and existing mechanisms of change are good and require no alteration. When the dissenters condemn the establishment's use of force it becomes an assertion that the establishment itself is evil and should recognize that evil and change voluntarily. Yet both courses are sterile in terms of producing a solution to more fundamental problems.

Instead of mutual condemnation and escalation of force, we need to examine the real questions at stake:

Is society in whole or in part going through a period of revolutionary change?

Are the commonly accepted values of society adequate to today's needs? Can we formulate and examine these values? Are the values changing? Should they change?

Are contemporary institutional structures—Government, corporation, church, school, and so forth—serving the human purpose which caused their creation and growth?

Is the distribution of power in society just? Does it satisfy the needs of human beings? Do all races and classes have equal opportunity for achieving power?

Are relationships between our society and other societies in the world just? Do relationships get carried out properly and fairly by the national government? Is nuclear war between nations inevitable? Is the Vietnam war morally right?

Does the system of law under which we live produce justice? Does our economic system best meet human needs?

How do you achieve radical change in human societies? Can it be done without violence? How do you organize a revolution?

Although this list of questions may seem to be random, and sometimes irrelevant to campus conflict, the queries are intended to be representative of those that need to be asked—and are being asked—about conditions of man in the world today. Questions are being asked by college students, and by intelligent adults of all ages. And they are questions that have always been asked by a few people in every age. Today these questions are being asked by a much larger number of people.

Why today should so many more college students be asking those particular questions, and others like them? For one thing, there are a lot more college students today than ever before. For another, most of those college students are from the more affluent families of the most affluent society ever in human history. It seems quite likely that whenever young people are unconstrained by necessity to think first of economic well-being, then these are the kinds of questions and problems to which they are attracted.

Probably the most important reason students ask these questions is that they live in a new era of the global village which appears to be situated on a path leading to its own destruction if no one comes up with better answers to these questions.

Therefore we should not be surprised that such questions are asked by intelligent youth in every part of the world. And once the questions have been asked, we also should not be so surprised at the answers which youth give. If adults—the power holders, the decisionmakers—were not so wrapped up in institutional cocoons and bound by trappings of the past, I think they would be reaching many of the same answers. But change is so painful to the old, and it is easier altogether to avoid the questions.

Having asked the questions and having reached different answers than those reached by power holders, students now are moving to take action. The campus leaders generally perceive their role as one seeking revolutionary change. They are not averse to using their own brand of revolutionary tactics. Can the adult world, particularly the holders of power, understand these tactics and deal with them? Or will we use the old shibboleths to avoid understanding? Again I must ex-

press my own feelings that we must understand before we act, if we are to achieve successful passage through the storm.

Campus violence almost always results from confrontation between students and authority over some unresolved issue. Increasingly a militant minority of an entire generation plans and leads such confrontations on issues of their own selection and increasingly, the militant minority are being joined by a small fraction of the faculty, and by the leaders of noncampus organizations of many types. The range of issues is so broad that it covers almost the entire scope of society's present values, and the institutional framework which expresses those values. The issues spring from questions such as I listed earlier.

While the large majority of campus students are initially passive, tactics of the militant minority seek to radicalize this passive majority and involve it within the confrontation. In this effort, militants capitalize on all of their advantages. They speak the language and they share the life styles of the passive majority; they select issues which the majority can easily support with enthusiasm. Such issues generally find the establishment—at a disadvantage because of strong inner-contradictions in its position.

An example of such an issue, that of a university lagging in efforts to enroll minority students, but at the same time spending large sums to acquire adjoining property occupied by minorities and forcing those people to move.

Confrontations, as sought by militants, takes place in various ways—tailored to both the issue and to the circumstances. It involves demands, petition, protest, demonstration, strike, peaceful civil disobedience or violent civil disobedience.

In most cases, normal institutional methods of securing change become rejected as futile or too slow; such normal methods are considered futile when no accepted and workable channel exists for expression of student positions; too slow if it requires time running beyond the student's annual school cycle.

In most cases, militants—even when they do not deliberately use violence—use methods which they expect may provoke violence. A major thesis of the militants is that society is violent, authoritarian and coercive in much of its operation. Militants therefore make part of their general strategy for radicalizing the passive majority, an effort to involve the majority in situations where the establishment will react with violence and coercion. When the establishment can be provoked to use authority in an illegal or unnecessarily violent manner, militants reap large benefits among the passive majority.

There are many parallels between the turmoil on campuses and the practice of guerrilla warfare in a revolutionary setting. The intense interest of college students in the copious literature of modern revolution is not just a scholarly coincidence. It would be highly erroneous, however, to assume that the militant minority are captive of any particular revolutionary dogma. In most cases they are much too sophisticated to accept any of the competing and fragmented Marxist ideologies.

The modern student militant may be a graduate student of politics, economics, sociology, or philosophy. He has studied Marx, Lenin, Mao, Castro, Che Guevara, Ho Chi Minh, Giap, Fanon, Debray, Marcuse and dozens of other revolutionary theorists and activists. He may be widely traveled in Europe, Asia, or Latin America, and know at first hand the problems of revolutionary societies. He will probably be capable of making an independent analysis of any particular situation to determine if the objective conditions for revolution are present or can be developed. And he is capable of planning a course to exploit to the fullest any weaknesses he may be able to observe within the Establishment.

This is a far cry from the picture of the 1930 style Communist agitator who infiltrated some labor union or civic organization.

It is characteristic of most revolutionary attitudes that there is a strong feeling of the moral righteousness of revolutionary goals. This is characteristic of today's student militants. They perceive themselves as rejecting the shoddy hypocrisy of the older generation as they seek to establish a more humane, just, and moral society. To the extent that this is true, it becomes another strong attraction in winning the passive majority over to the militants. In successful revolutions, it is frequently the moral superiority of the revolutionaries and their goals as compared with the moral decadence and corruption of the Establishment, which provides the key to victory.

While the militant minority of students are not adverse to provoking violent confrontations with authority, their purpose is not the overthrow of that authority, but as I have said above, the winning of new adherents among the passive majority. In a true revolutionary situation—and in many ways we are close to this today—each side feels that whatever violence it may use is justified by the importance and rightness of its goals. But the militants, generally recognize that they cannot match the raw power of the established authority. Their aim therefore is to subvert and demoralize that power—to cause it to over-react, and to ultimately take over the authority structure through democratic processes.

Instead of lamenting the existing level of violence on the campuses we perhaps should consider ourselves fortunate that it is not greater. Certainly it is far less than has been the case in most ghetto uprisings.

Objectively speaking, if the militant minority's most extreme criticism of the status quo on the campuses is perceived by the passive majority as being justified then an increasing radicalization of this majority will take place. Campus confrontations will spread and increase in intensity. With each year a new generation of militants will move out into the institutions of the adult society. And as the number of these militants increase, they will seek ways of confrontation within the Government, the corporation, the labor unions and other social institutions. To a considerable extent this is just beginning to happen now.

Since the young militants' criticism is grounded to a considerable extent in a new system of values—and in the contradictions which they observe in the present value system—dialog between the old and the young must involve these value systems. Channels for achieving this dialog must be greatly expanded, not only within the institutions of higher education, but throughout society.

A move in this direction, one which reduces situations involving violent confrontation strictly on issues chosen by the militants, will decrease the rate of radicalization of the passive majority. Just as violent conflicts have been reduced in labor-management situations by establishing a framework within which a good-faith bargaining takes place, so will violence on campus and in other institutional settings be reduced if a process of good-faith bargaining on values and goals can be established.

While it will be difficult, the establishment must be willing to subject itself to self-analysis and to make changes whenever this analysis indicates the need to do so. Reduced reliance on force and coercion, while speeding the process of dialog, self-analysis and constructive changes, in the long run will protect the stability of social organization better than any alternative course.

By the same token, depriving the militant minority of their most effective tool for confrontation and for expansion—their believable assertion that the establishment is immoral, unjust, coercive, violent, materialistic and unchanging—will substantially reduce the possibility of violent revolutionary change.

I am not sufficiently dogmatic or perceptive to be able to prescribe the values and goals of the next generation, or the institutional framework for implementing them. I know that they will be vastly different from today. I want to achieve them with the least resort to violence and coercion. To do this requires a new level of sensitivity to the changing needs of humanity and a willingness to examine our own rigid preconceptions in the light of those new needs. The younger generation may be further ahead of us than we have ever thought possible.

HIGHWAY SAFETY—COMMENTARY NO. 2

(Mr. CLEVELAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, June 5, I began the first in a series of commentaries on highway safety and the needless slaughter and maiming of people on our Nation's roads. My remarks can be found on page 15015 of the RECORD for that day. During the period which will elapse between the time that I express these words and the time they are read by my colleagues and the other followers of the RECORD, approximately 165 people will lose their lives in traffic accidents. The Subcommittee on Roads of the House Public Works Committee, of which I am a member, is pres-

ently involved in hearings and investigations regarding the progress of the Highway Safety Act of 1966. Our findings to this date have left me deeply concerned.

Some have indicated that the statistics for the first 3 months of 1969 showing a fatality increase of only 2 percent over the first 3 months of 1968 are encouraging. They submit such findings by noting that each year 2 million more drivers and 2 million more motor vehicles are being fed into the traffic stream; thus statistically, fewer are being either maimed or killed. I disagree. Since 1960 the traffic death toll has increased from 37,910 to a record of 55,200 in 1968; 55,000 deaths a year is too many. We must do something to stop such needless slaughter; not to mention those who are physically or mentally impaired for life.

During our hearings on the Highway Safety Act, Mr. Albert B. Kelly, vice president of the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, testified that—

> The program has been severely jeopardized by budgetary restrictions, staffing limitations, and generally inadequate levels of resources.

He went on to say:

> Programs under the Highway Safety Act already have been so severely weakened that it would take few additional setbacks to assure their disablement.

He added that because the National Highway Safety Bureau, which administers the Highway Safety Act, is without a Director—and has been for nearly 3 months—it is vulnerable to the problems of "sinking morale and high staff turnover" which afflict leaderless Government programs. This is a regrettable commentary on an almost incredible indifference.

Mr. Speaker, other witnesses have testified that the problems of highway safety are great and continuing. I shall have more to say regarding this major issue in the future.

NEW ENGLAND COLLEGE AND OTHERS FACE DIFFICULTIES BECAUSE OF CUTBACKS IN FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

(Mr. CLEVELAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago I received a letter from a Mr. Donald Woodrow, vice president of administrative affairs of New England College in Henniker, N.H. His letter dealt with the proposed cutbacks in many Federal aid-to-education programs. He also included some charts—which, unfortunately, cannot be reproduced in the RECORD—which display graphically the quandry that many colleges and universities, particularly the smaller ones, find themselves in as a result. Other important education leaders have also called these matters to my attention.

I offer only a few comments on Mr. Woodrow's letter, since it speaks for itself. Unfortunately many of these cutbacks will be necessary, even at a time when we should be increasing our commitment to education. The Nixon administration and the Congress are trapped between inflation on the one hand and a shortage of funds on the other.

Clearly we cannot continue the deficit spending of past years. The results of that experiment are already painfully clear, and to continue would only make the situation worse. The Congress and the administration must establish strict priorities in spending, and get the Government back on a sound financial footing.

I hope my colleagues will take the time to read Mr. Woodrow's letter, and realize that many of the problems which New England College and others are facing today are the direct result of the Government policies of yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add on a personal note that it has been my pleasure to know Don Woodrow well. The fine reputation which New England College has today as one of the outstanding small, liberal arts colleges in the country, is in no small part the result of his efforts together with others. The enthusiasm and constructive attitude which he has devoted to his duties is helping guide the destinies of this promising institution of higher learning to yet greater achievements.

The material referred to follows:

JUNE 3, 1969.

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: For some time now I have been very concerned about federal aid to education and, more specifically, how it relates to New England College. I am enclosing a number of charts which reflect rising costs and tuition fees, as plotted against the National Defense Student Loan maximum allowance which has remained stable. Also enclosed is a chart indicating total expenditures at New England College and the rise and fall of federal aid to our students. Not only does the maximum NDSL allowance (which once was well above tuition costs) fall considerably below our current tuition charge but the number of students applying for aid has risen from approximately 50 students to 300, thus making it necessary to divide less money among more people. We are in a serious situation and have cut aid to each student and are seriously considering cutting back our Upward Bound program which the Government has urged upon us.

My additional concern is that the Federal Government is scrutinizing the ratio of black to white enrollment and I fear a college such as ours, which has unsuccessfully tried to attract black students, will further be cut because of an unfavorable ratio. In our attempts to attract black students on scholarships, our Admission Director has indicated that the "bidder's" market is high because other wealthier colleges are offering a more attractive package than we can afford. However, I think it is wonderful that finally a serious attempt is being made to educate our black population and I am wholeheartedly in favor of this mass attempt to correct a hundred years of abuse. Conversely, I hope we are not going to be penalized because our financial aids are insufficient to enable us to offer top dollar in the educational market place to our black brothers and thereby lose additional federal aid because of our unsuccessful efforts.

It would appear that the federal budget for financial aid to education has been severely cut, not only in bricks and mortar but in student aid. I would still hope that the idea of loaning money to students, with subsequent repayment under the income tax plan, is not lost in Congress and that a serious look be given to the federal aid to education program in general.

With best regards.

Sincerely,

DONALD P. WOODROW,
Vice President, Administrative Affairs.

MAY 16, 1969.

Memo from: Dr. Martin.
To: Don Woodrow.
Subject: Decrease in Financial Aid to Students.

The recent cut-back in the three major federal aid programs for 1969–70 will have a definite effect on the New England College student assistance program. As shown in the table below, New England College has received significant cuts in the NDSL program and the College Work Study program. The EOGs remain about the same as last year.

	NDSL	College work study	E.O.G.
1968–69	$53,544	$30,272	$25,770
1969–70	44,325	13,896	25,574
Reduction in aid	9,219	16,376	196

It should be noted that this reduction in aid comes at a time when our students costs for board, room, tuition and fees have reached an all-time high. As shown in Graph No. 1, these costs for the year 1969–70 will be $2900. When the estimated costs of books, personal expenses and travel are added to the above figure, the typical student at New England College will be spending about $3500 for a college education.

Assuming that we have as many applications for financial aid in the year 1969–70 as we had in the year 1968–69, we will have to reduce our aid to each student by approximately 24%. If we choose to keep the level of aid at about the same amount, we will have to reduce the number of students receiving aid by 24%.

It is interesting to note that the $1,000 maximum NDSL allowance which was established in 1959–60 represented approximately two-thirds of our total student costs at that time. In 1969–70 the $1,000 maximum student loan allowance represents less than one-third of the total student costs.

Graph No. 2 shows the accumulated total for the NDSL, the College Work Study program and EOG program. You will note that the total for all these programs is $83,795, which is $25,791 less than last year.

Our student aid program will be further handicapped in 1969–70 by the fact that the so-called Grants in Aid (scholarships granted by the college from student income) will be reduced from $55,000 in 1968–69 to $40,000 in 1969–70, as shown on Graph No. 3. Apparently other pressures on the college budget necessitated this reduction in the college's scholarship budget for Grants in Aid. I am sure you are aware of the fact that we have only one endowed scholarship in the amount of $5,000.

As the student fees at New England College have increased, there has been some tendency to enroll more students from well-to-do families. There is no accurate index of family income. However, in the Admissions Office we watch the percentage of students enrolled from private schools each year. Families who can afford a private secondary school education are often from a higher income bracket than the families who send their sons or daughters to a public school. In 1968–69 27% of our entering class came from private schools. This year the Admissions Committee has been able to reduce the percentage of students enrolled from private schools to 16%.

The availability of the three major government student aid programs and of the college Grants in Aid has made it possible to

enroll a reasonable number of students from the lower income bracket. The cut-back in scholarships in our college budget and the cut-back in government funds will certainly reduce our ability to assist students from families with low incomes.

Because of our location and costs, we have enrolled very few students from economic and culturally deprived areas. However, we do participate in conferences sponsored by National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students (NSSFNS) and the College Board Project Access. If our funds for financial aid continue to decrease, I believe that we will be unable to actively seek students from deprived areas.

You will be interested to know that during the current year one black student received a $850 scholarship and a $500 loan. For the coming year we have granted a student from India a $2,000 scholarship and a $600 college job. Also for next year we are providing one deprived students with a $1,000 E.O.G., $400 College Work Study, a $400 scholarship and a $600 loan.

As the college grows older and as college costs become greater, the natural selectivity of students from higher income brackets will be unavoidable. If we are to retain a respectable percentage of students from the lower income brackets, we must see that the amount of money available for financial aids is substantially increased.

From 1960–61 to 1968–69 the total number of students receiving aid increased from 54 to 300, as shown in Chart 4. During this time the average aid from all sources, including government aid, increased from $377 to $549.

PRIME LENDING RATES

(Mr. WIDNALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the unprecedented increase in the prime lending rate by the country's major banks yesterday signals the end of calm acceptance of the banks interest policies.

This increase is unjustified. It comes at a time when the economy is beginning to slow down. It comes at a time when mortgage funds are needed. Despite this, the banks have raised their lending rate to the highest in history.

The banks have not been willing to say "no" to corporate borrowers. They do not have to raise interest rates to cut down on borrowing. They have to refuse to make the loans. Recent history has shown that higher interest rates will not stop corporate demand for funds.

If the banks are unwilling to discipline themselves, then the Federal Reserve Board might have to by not raising its discount rate, and then tightening up on the lending of funds to banks through the discount window.

The banks also seem to ignore the impact this decision will have on borrowers other than large corporations. Many of the banks have said that the increase will not affect mortgages, small business loans, or consumer loans. It is difficult to see how this will be true.

Homebuilding, a very major part of our economy, will be seriously hampered. Funds for all types of housing are needed. This increase will materially reduce the availability of such funds.

Finally, this increase could have a serious effect on the chances for the extension of the surtax. It is difficult for the administration to argue that the surtax is deflationary and its continuation necessary, while the banks have boosted the prime rate four times since December.

MARY ANN VENEZIA, SPELLING BEE FINALIST

(Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud at this time to extend my congratulations to the 73 bright boys and girls from all parts of this Nation who took part in the 42d annual National Spelling Bee, sponsored by the Scripps Howard and other newspapers.

In the 14th District of New Jersey, the contest was sponsored by the Jersey Journal, a leading newspaper in Northern New Jersey, and the winner was a delightful 13 year old, Miss Mary Ann Venezia, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas A. Venezia, of 31 Beacon Avenue, Jersey City, N.J., a student at St. Nicholas School.

All of us in Hudson County are very proud of Mary Ann, who finished eighth in the finals. This is no small feat when you consider that several million youngsters competed in local contests throughout the United States.

At a time when young America seems to be getting more than its share of criticism it is good to see decent youngsters like Mary Ann come to the fore. Unfortunately, it is only rarely that we read in the newspapers about the decent majority. The Jersey Journal deserves the thanks of a grateful community for sponsoring this event and for emphasizing the positive.

Mary Ann Venezia is a worthy representative of our community. She is a credit to her family, the sisters at St. Nicholas School and above all to herself. I know that her recent success is only the first of many.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I would like to insert an editorial from the Jersey Journal on June 6, 1969, which puts into words how Hudson County feels about Mary Ann Venezia.

The editorial follows:

SHE DID US PROUD

Mary Ann Venezia, the spelling champion of Hudson County, made it to eighth place in the national tournament before she missed a word. It is a remarkable record of which she, her family, her teachers and schoolmates at St. Nicholas, and the whole county can be proud. Only once before had a Hudson champion got so far in the national standings. To our new champion, Mary Ann Venezia: Congratulations and well done!

CHARLES S. JOELSON

(Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today members of Local 1270, of the United Federation of Postal Clerks, Passaic, N.J., presented a resolution of thanks to our good friend and esteemed colleague, the Honorable CHARLES S. JOELSON, who will soon be leaving this House.

Mr. JOELSON has been nominated by Gov. Richard J. Hughes and confirmed by the senate of our State as judge of the superior court of New Jersey, and he is expected to take his seat on the bench later this year.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution was presented today by President Charles G. Porretta, Vice President John F. Eenennaam, Miss Minnie P. McNeal, secretary, and Amady Rossman, treasurer. I include this resolution following my remarks and I should like to associate myself with the authors of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to see Mr. JOELSON move to the bench because I know of his knowledge of and devotion to the law. Yet, this House will miss his great talents, his sense of humor, and, above all, his compassion and basic decency. I shall miss him and I know that all Members on both sides of the aisle share this same view.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION BY UNITED FEDERATION OF POSTAL CLERKS, LOCAL NO. 1270, PASSAIC, N.J.

Whereas: Charles S. Joelson has served the Eighth Congressional District with honor and distinction as a Member of the House of Representatives since January, 1961, and

Whereas: Charles S. Joelson has been nominated by Governor Richard J. Hughes and confirmed by the Senate of the State of New Jersey as a Judge of the Superior Court of the State of New Jersey, and

Whereas: Charles S. Joelson by his performance in supporting legislation beneficial to postal employees in the Eighth Congressional District, has been our good and true friend, Now therefore be it

Resolved: That Local 1270, United Federation of Postal Clerks, at a regular meeting held on May 25, 1969, at Passaic, New Jersey, extend to Congressman Charles S. Joelson, our warmest regard and heartfelt thanks for his previous services to the members of Local 1270, and wishes him good health and long years of service in his new endeavor as Judge; and be it further

Resolved: That as an expression of our friendship for him, that a copy of this resolution be presented in Washington, D.C. by officers of Local 1270, to our friend, Charles S. Joelson.

32D ANNUAL INTERFAITH DINNER HELD IN BOSTON

(Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on May 15, 1969, the 32d annual dinner of the Massachusetts Committee, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, took place in Boston, Mass., with over 1,200 persons in attendance.

This organization, an outstanding one, is dedicated to the furtherance and strengthening of understanding and of the American spirit among our people. The organization consists of outstanding citizens of all races, colors, and creeds.

It has a notable record of effectively stimulating areas of understanding on the deeper and nobler qualities of life, and sharply reducing areas of misunderstanding, tension, and disagreement.

It is also unusual in that it operates

effectively without paid quarters, or any paid officers or employees, depending entirely on voluntary contributions.

At its yearly banquet, three persons noted for their rich qualities that constitute nobility of character are selected as the recipients of the organization's award, a distinctive one. While the members of this organization are too numerous to mention, it is recognized by all members there is one who is deserving of special commendations, whose dedication to the organization and its purposes, and whose untiring work and unselfish leadership throughout the years, has played a most important part in its success. I refer to Mr. Ben G. Shapiro, the secretary since the inception of this splendid committee.

For 32 years leaders of the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish faiths have worked together with this committee to improve group relations, engaging in many outstanding activities, too numerous to mention but among which are: the good citizenship program of the Boston Park Department; Tufts University civic education project; Brandeis University three chapels program; Human Relations Center at Boston University; Boston College Institute of Human Sciences. In addition, the committee has distributed many thousands of copies of educational material to schoolteachers and heads of educational institutions throughout the United States.

Each year the committee sponsors an annual junior good will dinner in cooperation with the Boston Red Sox, bringing together boys of the Boston public and parochial schools. The 18th annual junior good will dinner was held at Fenway Park, on January 29, 1955. The general aims and purposes are to sponsor good will work in the general Greater Boston community; to serve as a medium through which representative citizens can endorse the basic democratic principle of good will among men of different faiths and different racial origins; to bring out and emphasize the many fine things which citizens of different faiths have in common; and to encourage and support those forces in the community which generate in the individual a respect for the validity and dignity of the particular religious faiths of others, with no qualifications or reservations, based upon racial origins, or the color of a person's skin.

The toastmaster of this year's dinner was Mr. Peter Fuller, treasurer of Fuller Foundations, and former chairman, Massachusetts Cancer Crusade. The chairman of the dinner was Oscar W. Haussermann, an outstanding citizen.

The recipients of the awards and citations were: Hon. Carl B. Stokes, mayor of Cleveland, Ohio; Dr. Sidney Farber, director of research, Children's Cancer Research Foundations; and, Mr. Wayne Newton, distinguished recording artist and humanitarian.

In my remarks, I include—

Remarks of Oscar W. Haussermann, general chairman;

Remarks of Peter Fuller, toastmaster;

Remarks of Hon. Kevin H. White, mayor of Boston, Mass.;

Remarks of John I. Ahern;

Remarks of David A. Thurm;

Remarks of Hon. Francis W. Sargent, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts;

Remarks of Ben G. Shapiro, secretary of the committee;

Citation to Hon. Carl B. Stokes, presented by Sidney R. Rabb;

Citation to Dr. Sidney Farber, presented by Louis R. Perini;

Citation to Mr. Wayne Newton, presented by Mr. H. D. Hodgkinson;

Remarks of Dr. Sidney Farber;

Remarks of Mr. Wayne Newton, delivered by Mr. John Kahane.

Remarks of Hon. Carl B. Stokes; and

Citation of Honor presented to Station WNAC–TV, by Mr. Peter Fuller and accepted by Mr. William M. McCormick, vice president and general manager of WNAC–TV.

The material follows:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN OSCAR W. HAUSSERMANN, AT THE 32D ANNUAL DINNER OF THE MASSACHUSETTS COMMITTEE OF CATHOLICS, PROTESTANTS, AND JEWS, MAY 15, 1969

Reverend Clergy; Your Excellency, Governor Sargent; Your Honor, Mayor White; Distinguished Guests; Ladies and Gentlemen:

This, as our notices have said, is the Thirty-Second Annual Senior Good Will Dinner of our Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants and Jews.

Our Toastmaster this year is Peter Fuller. Envy leaves me—a broken-down Hoosier catcher—silent as to his impressive achievements as a champion athlete; and our time schedule precludes me from doing justice to his adult career after his graduation from Milton Academy and Harvard College.

As many of you know, he is the Treasurer of the Fuller Foundation; a regent of Boston College; a Trustee of the Dexter School; a Director of the American Cancer Society; a Trustee of "The Jimmy Fund"; and a member of the Corporation of Massachusetts General Hospital.

Two years ago the American Cancer Society awarded him a medal for his record-breaking achievement as Chairman of the Massachusetts Cancer Crusade, and last year he received a citation from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People for his work in founding The Positive Program for Boston, a Roxbury based service organization.

Ladies and gentlemen, your Toastmaster, Mr. Peter Fuller.

REMARKS BY PETER FULLER, TOASTMASTER

It is a great privilege for me to be a small part of the Massachusetts Committee, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews program honoring three distinguished gentlemen who by their actions and their very lives have personified the meaning of the word brotherhood. All of you that are here tonight of course know the meaning of the word brotherhood—if you didn't, you wouldn't be here. I don't presume to lecture you in any way, but rather to try to put into words, however inadequate my idea, as to why we are here.

People have said to me in the past, "What do you accomplish by these dinners?" Well, this dinner started 32 years ago by Ben Shapiro . . . in the old Boston City Club. Two-hundred twenty-one people attended, and for those days it was a smashing success because at that time the idea of universal brotherhood united for the common good was not accepted by the majority of citizens. The Bible says we must be our brother's keeper. The words are familiar, but the actions—even today when we have all made great strides towards that precept—these actions are not always in keeping with the words. The men that are being honored tonight, by their actions, have made the phrase "my brother's keeper" a reality. You are going to hear in detail about these men on an individual basis, so I shall not speak of them again except to reiterate my pride at being able to share the dais with them and the rest of our distinguished head table and all of you good friends.

So then if we all know what we are here for and what the meaning of brotherhood is, what is the purpose of the dinner? I look at it in this way. The Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews benefits the following affairs: Boston University Human Relations Center, Tufts University Civic Education Project, Good Citizenship Program of the Boston Park Department, Brandeis University Three Chapels Program, and the Massachusetts Department of Education.

But of even greater importance I believe is that when we go out tonight from this dinner, hopefully our vigor and purpose will be renewed to spread the word of brotherhood in our business, in our social contacts, to our children, in our travels, wherever we may go and under whatever circumstances. It is easy to proclaim brotherhood and understanding in the comfey and friendly environs of the Statler Hilton Hotel among friends. But if we are not willing, each one of us, to go out from this dinner and spread the word and live the life, no matter where we are, of brotherhood, then in my opinion we are hypocrites and this dinner and my words are "as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal—signifying nothing." I am suggesting, and do not be misled, although we can all think of parts of our country where things are a good deal worse than they are in Boston, that here in Boston, indeed without our own individual affairs, there is a great deal of room for improvement. If I may be pardoned for speaking of myself, I am not known for my meekness and lack of aggressiveness because all my life I have striven, as a result of childhood illness, to be stronger, but I have found in recent years that it takes a good deal more courage and understanding not to react as your human instincts might impel you to react, both physically, mentally, or idealistically if you prefer. Simplistic answers, easy, quick sounding, beautiful to the ear, do not solve today's problems which have arisen over the centuries and will not be wiped out over a fortnight. So then I really think that what I want to say to all of you is, let us join again in brotherhood at this dinner; let us pledge ourselves again to carry this message throughout our lives and throughout the world regardless of rebuff, hard words, cold shoulders, and yes, perhaps even physical abuse that we may encounter. Let's never get our eyes off the Shining Grail that is at the end of the long journey. This Shining Grail that is the reward for a life that is well lived and has been dedicated at least in part to helping those less fortunate than ourselves to achieve a measure of happiness and dignity on this earth. Let us have the courage of the convictions we express here tonight.

And now it is a pleasure for me to introduce the man who for the last 32 years has labored, and this is the correct word for it, to make this dinner the success that it is, to blend the diverse elements in our city together so that we can have the experience that we are going to have here tonight in the honoring of three great Americans. I consider that Ben Shapiro, by dint of his great energy, his willingness to take the buffets and continue to press forward, his deep feeling for his fellow man, has rightfully earned the success that this dinner has achieved under his guidance. He has not been deterred by ingratitude or failure to appreciate his good services, which are sometimes more the rule than the exception. Instead he comes back strongly like Anteaus of fabled yore whose vigor was renewed with each fall to his mother earth.

I thank, on behalf of the committee, the press, radio, television WNAC-TV, newspapers of Metropolitan Boston, airlines who have provided their hostesses who served as ushers here tonight, and the following individuals who assisted in the arrangement of the dinner:

Mr. Louis Miller, who assisted with reservations.

Mr. Isadore Zack, publicity.

Mr. Benjamin Bartzoff, television and general arrangements.

Mr Jerry Hayes, arrangements for airline hostesses.

The Boston Edison Company, lighting and decorations.

John Donnelly Company, for making the poster which provides the background of our stage tonight.

Commissioner McNamara and the Boston Police Department for courtesies extended to our guests of honor.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I give you your indefatigable secretary of this committee and the Commissioner of the Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination, Mr. Ben G. Shapiro.

REMARKS BY MAYOR KEVIN H. WHITE

I want to congratulate Mr. Ben Shapiro and his committee for the choice of three such outstanding men for this year's highest honor:

Dr. Farber, who has dedicated his life and his scientific talent to the fight against one of the terrible killers of children;

Wayne Newton, who has not only achieved brilliant success in his professional career but has found time to render real help to young people who are less fortunate;

And, my good friend Carl Stokes who shares with me one of the most hazardous of occupations, and one with the shortest life-expectancy—Mayor of a large city.

Now Dr. Farber, secure in his distinguished profession, does not need the limelight; and Wayne Newton cannot be made any more popular that he is by any words of mine. But my friend Carl Stokes is in politics and he needs all the help he can get; so I want to say a few words about Carl and his city.

Carl Stokes is the Mayor of Cleveland—a city with 800,000 people and a million problems. Like all big cities, it has high buildings and even higher taxes; cold winters and long hot summers. In coping with his problems, Carl indulges in his favorite hobby; walking. He gets out there on those hot summer nights and walks through his city.

(This is getting to be so useful a tactic for mayors that there is some question whether older men can serve in the job: they may not be able to cover enough ground.)

Seriously, I think Carl Stokes is one of the truly great men in public life today. The city of Cleveland is fortunate to have him as Mayor, and I am fortunate to have him as my friend. Each time I see Carl I find new reasons to admire him. The most recent occasion was the meeting at the White House two weeks ago between a delegation of big city mayors and the president and vice-president. Mayor Stokes headed the Mayors' delegation and his presentation of the problems of the cities was the most forceful and eloquent that I have ever heard. If more federal aid to the cities, which we need so soon comes, I am sure that Carl Stokes will have played an important role in achieving it. And until that help does start coming through, he is going to be one of the most articulate reminders to the nation of the problems—and the potential—of the American City. I know that Carl will have something to say tonight which will be worth hearing.

It is not my role tonight to make a lengthy speech on the topic which brings us here—brotherhood. But I do want to say that at the present point in our history nothing is more important to the future of Boston than the promotion of respect and understanding among the people of our city.

It is not the brotherhood of the past that we require—the brotherhood which sought to break down barriers between religious groups—but it is the brotherhood which seeks to break down the much greater barriers which separate black and white; rich and poor; the downtown businessman and the neighborhood resident.

There is a new dimension now in the concept of brotherhood. We must accept the challenge and we must win the victory. We are grateful to Mr. Ben Shapiro and to all who endorse and support his efforts. Now it is up to all of us to make the spirit that enables this evening permeate the life of our city. Nothing we do—as individuals, as professionals, as citizens—can be more important.

REMARKS BY JOHN I. AHERN

Thank you Mr. Fuller, and good evening ladies and gentlemen, one of the nice and continuing by-products of the Massachusetts Committee, Catholics, Protestants and Jews is the junior good will dinner sponsored by the committee each year in the press headquarters at Boston's Fenway Park. This activity has been going on for nearly two-thirds of the life of the committee. It was conceived some 18 years ago by the late and beloved Michael T. Kelleher and our own secretary Ben Shapiro. Its sole purpose was, and is, to provide a plausible vehicle for indoctrinating young men in the spirit of brotherhood and love of his fellow man.

I well recall the first junior good will dinner. It was held in the spring of 1951 in the heart of Chinatown at a site known as the Chinese City Hall. It was purely experimental in nature. The guests of honor, selected for the most part from the athletic world, included Lou Boudreau, then manager of the Red Sox, and Tommy Holmes, manager of the old Boston Braves, also included was the late, great Harry Agganis who, after an amazing athletic career at Boston University where he excelled in every sport, went on to be a major league first baseman for the Red Sox until his untimely death so early in life.

From that early beginning, the program became more formalized and bigger. Joe Cronin and Tom Yawkey of the Red Sox organization saw the merit of this undertaking and the next year through their kind invitation, it was moved to the press room at Fenway Park where some 130 public and parochial school students, chosen by their headmasters, were the guests of the committee.

To my mind, this junior good will dinner is the best and most interesting dinner of the year. Outstanding leaders in our community act as sponsors of these boys and four young men are chosen to give talks on brotherhood and what brotherhood means to them.

All of us may take great pride in the fact that during these 18 years more than 3,000 boys have been our guests and to the best of my knowledge no lad who has attended these annual dinners has ever, in any way, been involved in juvenile delinquency or has he done anything to discredit himself, his school or his family.

I only wish that all of you had an opportunity to sit in and mix with these young men at the junior good will dinner. While they represent a broad cross section of the greater Boston high schools, each, in his own way is individualistic and different.

The young man seated next to you could well be the captain of the football team and an excellent student as well, or he could be the outstanding debater in his school and a member of the track squad, or a musician in the band and a hockey star. Whoever he is, you can bet he will be a well-rounded boy. healthy of body and mind, active in several phases of his educational life, determined and eager to be successful in his chosen field but, most importantly, he will have a great and a consuming interest in fair play and in spreading the good will of brotherhood among his fellow students. He is the type of a lad you would love to have as your own son.

Tonight we are going to reenact one portion of the program held last January at Fenway Park, and as spokesman for all of the boys, we have, as our speaker, a young man who possesses all the credentials to be their representative.

A resident of Brighton and a sophomore at Boston Latin, his extra curricular activities read like a young man's "Who's Who." Let me present them to you.

He is: A member of the debating squad; a member of the Junior Electronics and Technological Society; an editor of the school's literary magazine; a member of the Leaders Training Fellowship; president of the Senior United Synagogue Youth Chapter at his temple; a participant in the honors course at Boston Latin; a volunteer for the Massachusetts Association for the Blind; a participant in regional and State science fairs; a participant at the model United Nations program at Harvard University; a competitor in the State finals of the Knights of Pythias speech contest; a 1968 Ford Future Scientist Award winner; and an excellent student as his participation in the honors course attests.

With all of these accomplishments, he is but 15 years of age. After completion of his studies and his undergraduate college course, he hopes to go to either law or medical school.

It is a distinct pleasure and a privilege to present to this vast audience the Junior Good Will Young Man of the Year and the symbolic spokesman for 3000 good, young men of the past, present and future, who not only believe in the spirit of brotherhood, but work at it—here is David A. Thurm, of Boston Latin School.

REMARKS OF DAVID A. THURM, BOSTON LATIN HIGH SCHOOL

Each and every person in the world whether he be a farmer in the Tibetan hills or a scientist working on ingenious devices, each feels the problems that face society today. And each yearns for peace and a solution to the drastic dilemmas facing our world.

This solution isn't easy and it's going to be a long and hard road before we reach the end of our problems. This road is there for us to take but there is one factor that keeps us from making any forward progress. And this hinderance is the general attitude of the people. They see things only when the event affects them directly. They walk around in a trance-like state, each entirely engulfed in his own problems and each thinking of the world only in relation to himself. The people are so wrapped up in their own concerns that they never find time to consider the rights of others.

When you walk down the street or ride on the trolley, look about you and see the attitudes reflected on the faces of the people. Only on a rare occasion will you see a man with a contented expression or a smile. Very few times is the mournful, echoing trend of the faceless crowd broken by a peal of laughter or gay talk.

Another interesting event comes when you see the response of the people to the common courtesy of a "thank you," "please" or "excuse me." Some will eye you suspiciously wondering what devious plot you are scheming by saying those trick words. Some glance at you as if you were crazy. And still others will for a brief moment crack a smile as if some ray of happiness and decency had broken through their shield of apathy.

It is almost paradoxical that when a baby is born he knows only two facial expressions: the blank stare and the smile, all other expressions are learned by watching the nameless mass's looks and habits. Somewhere in the struggle to gain maturity one forgets how to smile or be concerned.

You wake up in the morning, hurry to get dressed; eat breakfast and catch the bus. Then you quickly review the test material in your head. In school you race into your homeroom and hurriedly arrange your books for the next class. One continues at this break-neck speed all day long. It is this jet-set pace that is partially responsible for the apathy and negative attitude of humanity. How do you expect to help a person in need if you can't even take time out to notice the presence of others?

As you run to catch the bus just stop, look and listen to the world before it passes you by. Maybe in this instant of rest you'll take note of the crippled man, struggling across the street, or the blind man, lost in a neverending expanse of darkness. Then it's off again—running, running, running—stop, take hold, and assess the people around you. Maybe the boy that you called an idiot yesterday will somehow appear different today and you might even see some good in him. Look at the beauty of nature surrounding you. But most of all look at your fellow man. Guide him in his struggles; feel his pain; help him with his problems. Care about the child, the wanderer and the human race. So stop, look around you and care about your fellow man.

And it is through this simple formula that you can change your attitude and the attitudes of those around you so as to make yourself more able to understand others. With this assessment of your actions and attitudes comes the first step toward world peace and brotherhood.

As I read the previous remarks at the junior goodwill dinner, I looked about and saw not blank apathy but rather healthy optimism.

For there I was fortunate to meet my peers who had risen to not only defeat the existing evils but also to shatter the attitude of indifference that surround them.

They have risen to the challenge and have taken the first step but before any further progress can be made we must all join hands and free ourselves from the bonds of apathy so that we can see the light of freedom and peace.

I feel deeply honored that I am able to talk with the leaders here at the head table for it is from them that my comrades and I have gotten the spark and initiative to start on the road toward peace and world brotherhood.

STATEMENT BY GOV. FRANCIS W. SARGENT

What has made this organization what it is, what has made this gathering what it is, comes down to the single word "Brotherhood".

That word once was narrowly defined to mean the absence of racial and religious prejudice.

I would suggest to you tonight a broader concept for the word—rather than a brotherhood based on tolerance, I suggest a brotherhood based on understanding and even on love.

We have all around us a season of discontent that is marked by disorder, dissent, even violence.

I would suggest a brotherhood of mankind that permits each of us to listen to—and to hear—the voice and the thoughts of the other man.

That means we must not stifle dissent.

I did not say tolerant dissent—I said permit it, welcome it, even encourage it.

But I did not say permit, welcome or encourage disorder, or the violence that often follows disorder.

We must permit dissent. It is our heritage and even our hope.

But we cannot condone disorder. That will be our undoing.

REMARKS BY BEN G. SHAPIRO, SECRETARY

Gentlemen of the clergy, Governor Sargent, Mayor White, our guests of honor, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, since this is the thirty-second annual dinner of the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants and Jews, I suppose that someone could infer that anyone over 30, or any organization over 30 years, should be suffering from what is popularly known as the generation gap. Oftentimes in instant definitions and slogans there is a brightness and a slickness to them that, first, makes them acceptable in everyday speech, and secondly, because they are acceptable, they bear an aura of infallibility. But I would like to make some observations tonight about a few of the activities of our committee that are attempts to nullify this thing called the generation gap. Tonight in our audience are forty-five young men and women from fifteen colleges and universities. Over the past 31 previous dinners, it has always been our custom and, more than that our belief, that the younger people of the community should be part of our audience. At this dinner, and at other dinners, the collegians have witnessed the awards and have heard the talks of the men and women who have won our citations. I fully and firmly believe that the 1500 college students who have been our guests over the years have learned something from the people who have spoken here; I am sure they learned something for their own benefit from the lives of the people who have been honored here. These collegians have come to our institutions of higher learning from every State in the Nation; some have come from foreign lands. The letters your committee have received over the past three decades have told us the dinners have been an inspiration to them. I like to feel that they have served a worthwhile purpose.

Your committee annually sponsors the junior good will dinners at Fenway Park. And through the cooperation of Dick O'Connell and Tom Yawkey the dinners have been highlighted by the attendance of many of the Red Sox players over the years. These dinners are now in their 18th season; the average attendance of youngsters has been 150 young men each year. So, nearly 3000 lads have been influenced in a small way by our committee on the ideas and ideals of good will.

And, although our committee is over 30, we are continually keeping alive our interest in youth through our association with programs on the college and university campuses. At Boston College we are involved with the Institute of Human Sciences; at Tufts University we are supporting the work of the Civic Education Center; at Brandeis University the three-chapel program of the Catholic, Protestant and Jewish faiths has our support, and at Boston University our support of fellowships for young scholars helps us to participate in their programs for civil rights.

I must confess to you that at these dinners most of the head table guests and, indeed, the award recipients are and have been over 30. But year after year the program has been "stolen"—and I mean that in the nicest sense of the word—by the young orators from the Boston high schools. Their poise, their diction, their profound thoughts have been lessons for all of us. You all know that we have had some of America's outstanding personalities at these dinners over the years; yet I must say that the speakers from our local schools have made us sit up straighter as we listened to them; some of us who are sentimentalists have had tears in our eyes as we have listened to them with pride. We have heard them. They have taught us. And we have had a sense of pride in ourselves that we have been smart enough to have them speak to us.

May I end on this note: there never should have been a legitimate reason for such a thing as the so-called "generation gap." To solve all differences of opinions between not only the generations, but of people in every strata of society, we must make a beginning toward understanding. That beginning comes with what is called "good will." For all the logic, for all the intellectualism, for all the marshalling of opinions, I am convinced that nothing can be achieved until, first, there is good will on every side of every question facing society.

CITATION TO HON. CARL B. STOKES PRESENTED BY SIDNEY R. RABB

The Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, at its Thirty-second Annual Dinner, presents this citation and testimonial to the Honorable Carl B. Stokes, Mayor of Cleveland, who has faced the difficult social and economic problems of our roiled new day with an understanding and a wise sense of direction that have heartened men of good will throughout our land.

His student years (interrupted shortly after his eighteenth birthday by service in the Army of Occupation in Germany) developed inborn qualities of character that distinguish him today. As a schoolboy he contributed to the family income by delivering newspapers and working in neighborhood stores. In his law school days in Minnesota he worked weekends as a dining car waiter on a de luxe Minneapolis to Dallas train.

After Government service in various appointive offices in Ohio, he was elected three successive times as a member of the Ohio Legislature. His outstanding performance in that body led to his election in 1967 as Cleveland's Mayor.

Since earning his Bachelor of Science in Law degree at the University of Minnesota and his LL.B. degree at the Cleveland Marshall Law School, he has received the National Award of the Fellowship Committee of Philadelphia and honorary degrees from a half dozen institutions of learning, including Tufts University.

In recognition of his dynamic civic leadership, the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants and Jews presents to Mayor Stokes this citation and award.

Dated at Boston, Massachusetts, this fifteenth day of May, 1969.

CITATION TO DR. SIDNEY FARBER, PRESENTED BY LOUIS R. PERINI

The Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, at its Thirty-second Annual Dinner, presents this citation and testimonial to Dr. Sidney Farber, physician, educator, President of the American Cancer Society whose compassion as a healer, skill as a pathologist, acumen as a teacher, and commitment as a founder of medical research organizations and Boston's Jimmy Fund have made him a leader in the ageless struggle against disease, especially cancer and cerebral palsy in the very young. The most modest of men, he bears with charm and dignity the testimonials of esteem of universities, learned societies and grateful governments. Professionally and personally he exemplifies Schweitzer's ideal, the man who practices "reverence for life" in his dedication to eliminating man's malignant enemies.

In recognition of his distinguished service to mankind, the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants and Jews presents to Dr. Farber this citation and award.

Dated at Boston, Massachusetts, this fifteenth day of May, 1969.

CITATION TO WAYNE NEWTON, PRESENTED BY H. D. HODGKINSON

The Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants and Jews, at its Thirty-second Annual Dinner, presents this citation and testimonial to Wayne Newton, gifted, gracious stage and television star who has cheered and charmed vast audiences within and far beyond the borders of our land. His status as a balladeer is indicated by the fact that more than nine million records of his songs have been distributed here and abroad.

A native of Norfolk, Virginia, he is remembered there as an excellent student, President of his high school class, Student Body President and talented performer at sociables in school and church.

His quiet social service has been in varied fields. He is the sole support of St. John's Indian Mission and School in Arizona; has helped the Nat King Cole Cancer Foundation and the establishment of its Medical Library; and has contributed in various ways to men and institutions in need of aid. On a tour in South Vietnam, he visited isolated bases and hospitals, collected soldiers' messages to folks back home and faithfully delivered them on his return.

In warm appreciation of the example he has set for young Americans in dealing with their fellow men in this modern age of stress and strain, the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants and Jews presents to Wayne Newton this citation and award.

Dated at Boston, Massachusetts, this fifteenth day of May, 1969.

REMARKS OF DR. SIDNEY FARBER

It is with gratitude that I acknowledge the honor that you are conferring upon me tonight. It is with particular pleasure that I find myself joined with the distinguished Mayor of the City of Cleveland, whose leadership will help to carry his City and so the country, toward a more happy era, and with a young man who has not waited for more advanced age to share with some of his far less fortunate fellowmen, the fruits of his talent and hardwork. The program of your Committee expresses in easily understood language the spirit of this community to which I owe so much. I congratulate you on your conception, and your achievements in your dedication.

It is part of being a doctor to work in behalf of one's fellowman. This is implied in the Oath of Hippocrates and is founded upon the centuries of tradition handed down from the priests of old. This occasion permits me to pay honor to the community which has given me the precious opportunity, as a doctor, to work in behalf of patients, with no restrictions, not only as to race, creed or color, but also as to ability to pay. You have given my colleagues and me the opportunities these past 21 years, to work in this manner in behalf of children with cancer, and their parents and families, and now of patients of all ages in accordance with our plans for the immediate future. For this reason, I ask that the trustees and staff of our Children's Cancer Research Foundation share with me this honor tonight, and join with me in this expression of gratitude to our community and to you.

I have traveled widely to participate in the planning and acceleration of research programs against the dread diseases still responsible for sickness, misery, suffering and death. Wherever I have gone, I have seen human beings react in much the same way, whatever the claims of nationality, the peculiarities of skin pigment, philosophical or theological traditions, or of political practices. The cry of anguish of a mother who has lost a child, or the grief of a marriage partner may vary in tonality, or in the proportion of visible to controlled grief, but the reaction to the loss of a loved one is everywhere basically the same. Children with leukemia in relapse beyond medical control, everywhere cling to their parents and respond to the tender and warm ministrations of doctors and nurses with mute appreciation for skillful and affectionate care so freely given.

Doctors and medical scientists are accustomed to sharing their observations and the fruit of their research without delay with all other doctors and scientists throughout the world. There are no secret remedies in the world of medicine. This they do by publication of their findings in medical and scientific journals, by announcing the results of their research at professional meetings, and by joining together in small groups in special conferences containing representatives from almost all, but unhappily not yet all the nations of the world, the better to plan further research on a world-wide basis and to apply what has been learned for the benefit of patients everywhere. It should be heartwarming for you to know that the sharing of knowledge has increased enormously since the end of World War II, despite cold wars, actual wars, political upheavals, disturbances throughout the world of many different kinds, and even horrifying evidences of man's ability to take life on a greater and greater scale with the aid of modern technology.

Let us take heart as we are able to see, through the clouds of war and the pollution of the air, evidences of many different kinds of a better future for all of us. May I take but one example from my own experience. The world of medicine and science is now perfecting techniques borrowed from the achievements of technology to bring to every patient with cancer in the country, and hopefully the world, the results of research from the laboratories as rapidly as is consistent with safety and proof of the effectiveness of new treatments. This calls for the voluntary cooperation of scientists throughout the world who are willing to record on central machinery set up for the purpose, the progress of their own research for the evaluation of their peers, even before definitive completion of studies. Scientists everywhere will be able to move more quickly toward the solution of life threatening problems. Such a plan calls for international cooperation and selflessness, as well as for expertise in the use of modern means of communication, of data collection and retrieval. Our contribution to this achievement is being perfected here now as part of a world enterprise, without restriction, for the good of patients of all nationalities, of all colors, and of all manner of worship, and political and economic practice.

May I leave you with a note of personal optimism—in these very disturbing times there should be no glossing over the enormity of our problems, no easy solutions offered for the eradication of the cancers of our society, no hasty assignment of blame.

Let society, which includes all of us, grapple with these and other world concerns as objectively, thoroughly and dispassionately as we investigate the causes, the methods of cure, and the possibility of total control of the many diseases we call cancer. I have no doubt that the achievement of this goal, the control of cancer, as will be the case with all the dread diseases, will one day be a reality. The solution of the social and economic problems of the greater world will depend equally upon honesty and courage, the precise definition of causes and the discovery of methods of their eradication, and the determination that there will be created by the efforts of all a better world for all mankind.

REMARKS DELIVERED BY MR. JACKIE KAHANE

Wayne Newton has written a brief message which he has asked me to read:

"My dear friends, I regret that I cannot be with you tonight on this great occasion. It is humanly impossible and I regret this more than I can tell you, but may I tell you that I'm deeply touched by this tribute of yours so gracefully tendered.

"Even though I could not be with you in person tonight, I have a good picture of the audience. It's the greatest assemblage of diverse religious, ethnic and minority groups, ever brought together in one body. With the possible exception of when Sammy Davis, Jr. dines alone.

"This brotherhood award means a great deal to me personally. For those of you who know me, and know my background, know that I'm of Indian ancestry, my wife is Japanese-American, my manager is Catholic, my drummer is Protestant, my road secretary is a Negro, my comedian is Jewish, and I raise Arab horses. I've often been referred to as the U Thant of show business.

"It's a happy accident that I'm surrounded by these people of various ethnic and religious origins. They weren't hired for any other reason than ability. Show business has always been one industry where a man or woman is judged only by talent, and ability, and never by color or religion, and I'm proud to represent a business such as show business. One of the biggest thrills of my life was going to Viet Nam recently to entertain the troops. There I saw true brotherhood in action. Americans of every religion, race and color working together.

"It made me proud to be an American. Because never has a country given as much of its food, as much of its money, and as many of its sons, to protect the lives of people around the world.

"As I was entertaining the boys, and looked out into their faces, I knew that many of these boys, returning home, would find greater roadblocks to dignity in peace, than they knew in war.

"It is up to every person, especially those of my generation, to strive to create a world of true peace, and equality. The battlefield is here, and the victory for humanity must be won.

"I am doubly honored because I was informed that I'm the youngest man ever to receive the brotherhood award. Being young, I accept this award on behalf of my generation, a generation that despite all its turmoil is working to close not only the generation gap but also the prejudice gap.

"It is true that the young generation is confused and restless, but we are also idealistic and spirited. And we are all well aware that youth holds the lease on this country's future.

"And while a small minority may be trying to weaken the foundation of the establishment, the great majority are trying to establish stronger foundations, foundations which are based upon brotherhood, equality and humanitarianism.

"My generation believes as Booker T. Washington said: 'You can't keep a good man down without staying down with him.' And, ladies and gentlemen, the last direction my generation wants to go is down.

"I'm especially sorry that I couldn't be in Boston with you tonight, because Boston holds a special place in my heart.

"The people of Boston in the past have given me many testimonials of their affection, but this far exceeds them all.

"In the record business it's considered a great honor to be awarded a gold record, but it's a much greater honor to live by the golden rule.

"As I said before, my wife is Japanese, and her people have many beautiful and meaningful proverbs. My favorite is, 'One can stand still in a flowing stream, but not in a world of men.' And I'm not going to stand still after winning this award. I will continue to live and work for the time when awards for brotherhood will no longer be necessary. It will be a way of life.

"Until that time, may I congratulate you all on your great work and thank you again for this honor."

Ladies and gentlemen, I think that all will agree that in this day of singing idols, with long hair and loose morals, Wayne Newton stands out as a shining example to our Nation's youth.

I am proud to accept this award for a young man that I watched grow and mature to a great star. It is a tribute to his character that, with all his early fame and success, he still feels the responsibility, and the social conscience, to earn and deserve an award such as this.

ADDRESS BY MAYOR CARL B. STOKES, CLEVELAND

I am with you tonight to be honored, and while some degree of sophistication might reasonably be expected of a big-city mayor, I'm still new enough in the role to be surprised and delighted to find myself in such distinguished company on such an illustrious occasion.

In fact, as I look about me at the men and women of influence, power and of prestige and position gathered here—it strikes me as a perfect opportunity to demand reparations for my fellow Clevelanders.

We Clevelanders are still somewhat put out by the fact that our city's founder, General Moses Cleaveland, took one look at our place back in 1796, gave it his name, and left immediately for civilized home and hearth in his native New England, never to be seen again on the shores of Lake Erie.

So we had to go it alone, and while we did make it. it has been pretty embarrassing to have had a founding father who barely stayed long enough for a cup of coffee.

But I suppose we can call it even, now. After all, we captured the "Hawk" from the Red Sox. And now that I think about it, General Cleaveland was from Connecticut anyway.

I always enjoy visiting Boston. A great sense of history fills your city and your State, and it turns my thought to those who helped make that history, but how many of these names do you know?

Crispus Attucks, first to fall in the American Revolution.

Peter Salem, who killed the British commander at Bunker Hill.

Phillis Wheatley, the second American woman to write a book.

Cuff Whittemore, Cato Wood, Cambridge Moore, Caesar Prescott, Caesar Jones, who helped defend "The bridge that arched the flood" at Concord on that April day nearly 200 years ago.

Lewis Temple, inventor of the "Temple Iron", the harpoon which led to vast wealth in the whaling industry—and who died in poverty.

Paul Cuffee, spirited sailing captain who refused to pay his property tax because he was denied the full rights of citizenship, and who thereby became the first Negro to enjoy all the legal privileges granted to the white citizens of Massachusetts.

All were black. All helped write the history of this great State, as my distinguished friend Senator Edward Brooke is doing today.

Every American boy and girl learns the dates, the names, the place of history. They learn that on April 6, 1909: Admiral Robert E. Peary discovered the North Pole.

But all of us would have to admit that the same school lesson did not tell us that Peary's dedicated Negro assistant, Matthew Henson, was the first man to actually reach the pole. Peary, unable to walk, arrived by dogsled less than an hour later to confirm Henson's reading of their position.

Someone recently complained in a letter to a newspaper that he saw Negro cowboys depicted in a TV western, and everyone knew there were no Negro cowboys in the old West.

The sad thing is that our mind's eye—conditioned by gaps in our history—does see white cowboys.

I don't expect to make headlines in this day and time by observing that the black American has been erased from the pages of American history. You know that. You know what that sort of practice has contributed to.

Now, after three centuries of his own personal dark ages, the American Negro is filling in the gaps of history. He is rediscovering his long-ago-lost heritage. He has weighed the words on America's documents and marble monuments against America's deeds, and his anger, finally, at what has been done to him is echoing across our land.

Black power!

Black studies!

Reparations from the racist hands of white America!

Alexis de Tocqueville summed it up when he said, "A grievance patiently endured, so long as it seemed beyond redress, becomes intolerable once the possibility of remedy crosses men's minds."

The cries of the rebels are going to have to be responded to; their genuine grievances must be redressed.

Every American—that is, every American who understands this pluralistic society of ours—ought to be part of the Negroes struggle to develop: black identity; black pride; black culture; black economic and political power.

But none of these vital elements to one's sense of worth and peer-level in American society justifies or rationalizes the efficacy of a separate black nation within our nation.

I believe with Winston Churchill that "Democracy is the worst form of government—except for every other kind." I believe in "the system."

For the system can be made to work.

Not through anarchy. Not through nonnegotiable demands. Not through senseless destruction.

On that point I agree with Bayard Rustin, who said recently: "I am very much opposed to violence as a means of protest—the appearance of youngsters on campuses carrying guns and attempting to get decisions while holding guns at the heads of administrators is first of all very bad for the students. Because they are being systematically taught in college that social change takes place at the point of a gun. This is not true. And they're going to be very much disabused." Today's youth is too intelligent not to learn this eventually, hard though the lesson is, on them and on us.

But I would warn: You cannot condemn the oppressed for the means by which they seek freedom and justice and at the same time continue the denial of freedom and justice! You cannot have it both ways.

Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, that great Bostonian, said: "Life is action and passion. I think it is required of a man that he should share the action and passion of his time at peril of being judged not to have lived."

There is the story told about Pericles of Ancient Greece, who, in his later years, came across a young lawyer of Athens who was involved in the actions and passions of his time.

Pericles upbraided the young man for being too bold and brash, for concerning himself with things better left to older men.

Partronizingly, the older man said, "Of course, I understand, for I too was overeager in my youth. But now that I am older I have learned better. Take my advice and do not become so involved."

To which the young man replied: "I regret, sir, I did not have the privilege of knowing you when you were at your best."

America, then, is in that very challenging and dangerous stage of involvement.

In the words of former Health, Education and Welfare Secretary John W. Gardner: "Extremists of the right and of the left work with purposeful enthusiasm to deepen our suspicion and fear of one another and to loosen the bonds that hold society together. The trouble, of course, is that they may succeed in pulling the society apart. And will anyone really know how to put it together again?"

I believe that the fabric of America, weakened thought it may be, will hold; that those who seek to pull our society apart will fail, although we may not see it for a time and we may have doubts and good reason for doubting.

For the first time in history a nation has almost within its grasp the ability and the means to banish the age-old terrors of hunger, disease, poverty, and ignorance—but to implement that potential our society must reach an unprecedented level of political and social awareness and of political and social activism.

In that fact lies the seed of the paradoxical hope I want to hold out to you this evening: that from today's unwanted crucible of dissent and unrest will emerge a nation more concerned about human values and more effective in caring for human needs than any the world has known.

You may ask: was it necessary to follow this badly built pathway to our goal, with its terrible strains on our nation? Leave the answer to history. We *are* on that pathway, and even if we did not choose it, never forget that it is here and that you and I helped build it.

I believe that America will emerge from the journey knowing in its collective conscience, for the first time, that this is not going to be a decent society for any of us until it is for all of us.

I want to conclude with an epitaph on a Concord gravestone, marking the last resting place of one John Jack, a black slave who earned his freedom and became a successful farmer and respected citizen. It was written by Daniel Bliss, a great-uncle of Ralph Waldo Emerson, and it reads:

"God wills us free, man wills us slaves. I will as God wills, God's will be done. Here lies the body of John Jack, a native of Africa who died March 1773 aged about sixty years.

"Tho' born in a land of liberty, he lived a slave. Till by his honest, tho' stolen labors, he acquired the source of slavery, which gave him his freedom, tho' not long before death the great tyrant, gave him his final emancipation, and set him on a footing with kings.

"Tho' a slave to vice, he practiced those virtues without which kings are but slaves."

John Jack: Born in a land of liberty, enslaved, freed again by his own labors.

John Jack made it, and so will America.

CITATION TO WNAC-TV, PRESENTED BY PETER FULLER AND ACCEPTED BY WILLIAM M. MCCORMICK

Citation of honor presented to WNAC-TV, for the most outstanding public service in the cause of good will and better understanding on the occasion of the 15th consecutive telecast of our dinner proceedings by the Massachusetts Committee, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, at its 32d annual dinner, May 15, 1969.

OSCAR W. HAUSSERMANN,
Chairman.

BEN G. SHAPIRO,
Secretary.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. PATMAN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. MATSUNAGA (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today through Friday, June 13, 1969, on account of official business.

Mr. MANN (at the request of Mr. GARMATZ), for Tuesday, June 10, and Wednesday, June 11, on account of official business.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. PERKINS), on June 10 and 11, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. RIVERS, for 1 hour, on Thursday, June 12; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HUNT), to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter to:)

Mr. FINDLEY, today, for 5 minutes.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. NICHOLS) to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RARICK, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. REUSS, for 30 minutes, today.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. JONES of Alabama and to include an editorial.

Mr. FALLON (at the request of Mr. JONES of Alabama) and to include a news item.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama and to include extraneous material.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania to include extraneous matter in the remarks he made today on H.R. 11271.

Messrs. WYDLER, WINN, and WEICKER (at the request of Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania) to extend their remarks in the general debate on the NASA authorization.

Mr. DADDARIO immediately following Mr. TEAGUE of Texas during debate.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania to revise and extend his remarks just prior to motion by Mr. MILLER of California to close debate on the Ryan amendment.

Mr. BIAGGI before the vote on the Koch amendment.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey in two instances and to include extraneous materials.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HUNT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. CLEVELAND in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois in two instances.

Mr. CEDERBERG.

Mr. GUDE.

Mr. ROBISON.

Mr. MINSHALL.

Mr. BOB WILSON in four instances.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

Mr. WYMAN in three instances.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. LANGEN.

Mr. ARENDS.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. CARTER.

Mr. LUKENS.

Mr. MCDONALD of Michigan.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.

Mr. HORTON in two instances.

Mr. BELL of California.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. NICHOLS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. O'HARA in two instances.

Mr. LONG of Maryland.

Mr. STEED in two instances.

Mr. OTTINGER in five instances.

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. OBEY in four instances.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee.

Mr. RARICK in four instances.

Mr. ICHORD.

Mr. BLANTON in two instances.

Mr. WOLFF in three instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.

Mr. HANNA.

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS.

Mr. HELSTOSKI.

Mr. JACOBS in two instances.

Mr. BIAGGI in two instances.

Mr. NICHOLS.

Mr. PUCINSKI in six instances.

Mr. NIX in two instances.

Mr. KASTENMEIER in two instances.

Mr. MOORHEAD in three instances.

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri.

Mr. PICKLE in two instances.

Mr. BINGHAM in two instances.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 35. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of Thomas J. Watson, Jr., as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 11, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COLMER. Committee on Rules. H. Res. 436. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 1035. A bill limiting the use for demonstration purposes of any federally owned property in the District of Columbia, requiring the posting of a bond, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-301). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 11972. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to deny Federal assistance to institutions of higher education which lower their academic standards in the case of particular groups or categories of students; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HANNA, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HICKS, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCCULLOCH, Mr. MCKNEALLY, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. MINISH, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. NIX, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. REES, Mr. RODINO, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SHIPLEY, and Mr. STEIGER of Arizona):

H.R. 11973. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to make crime protection insurance available to small-business concerns; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 11974. A bill to impose an excess-profits tax on the income of corporations during the present emergency; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOW:

H.R. 11975. A bill to create a body corporate known as Daughters of Union Veterans of the Civil War, 1861-65; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 11976. A bill to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of certain materials to minors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11977. A bill to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of salacious advertising; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENNEY:

H.R. 11978. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 11979. A bill to provide for the compilation by the Secretary of the Interior of a National Land and Water Inventory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 11980. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 11981. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 11982. A bill to amend subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 11983. A bill to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, relating to enrollment charges for Federal employees' health benefits; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ESHLEMAN:

H.R. 11984. A bill to adjust agricultural production, to provide a transitional program for farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GALIFIANAKIS:

H.R. 11985. A bill to provide for the more efficient development and improved management of national forest commercial timberlands, to establish a high-timber-yield fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 11986. A bill to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to relieve congestion at certain airports having a high density of air traffic by designating the specific airport to be utilized by air carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 11987. A bill to reclassify certain key positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 11988. A bill to establish and develop the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 11989. A bill to prohibit tampering with speedometers on motor vehicles used in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 11990. A bill to amend titles, I, X, XIV, XVI, and XIX of the Social Security

Act, and part A of title IV of such act, to increase the Federal share of a State's public assistance expenditures to 90 percent, to provide for the establishment of nationally uniform minimum standards for aid or assistance thereunder, and to repeal the freeze on the number of children with respect to whom Federal payments may be made under the AFDC program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUJAN (for himself, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. KYROS, Mr. MIKVA, Mrs. MINK, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PIKE, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. TIERNAN):

H.R. 11991. A bill to impose an excess-profits tax on the income of corporations during the present emergency; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 11992. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MESKILL:

H.R. 11993. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron and steel mill products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 11994. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 11995. A bill to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 and the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to define the equitable standards governing relationships between investment companies and their investment advisers and principal underwriters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 11996. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code in order to prohibit the use of Armed Forces members and equipment in the making of certain motion pictures; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 11997. A bill to expedite delivery of special delivery mail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 11998. A bill to reclassify certain key positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H.R. 11999. A bill to promote public health and welfare by expanding, improving, and better coordinating the family planning services and population research activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DADDARIO (for himself and Mr. MOSHER):

H.R. 12000. A bill to redesignate the Department of the Interior as the Department of Resources, Environment, and Population, and to transfer to such Department certain programs and functions currently being carried on by other Federal departments and agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas:

H.R. 12001. A bill to amend the Agriculture Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 12002. A bill to establish a Federal Commission on Judicial Qualifications for improvements in the administration of the Courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 12003. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Lincoln Homestead National Recreation Area; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 12004. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to exempt ammunition from Federal regulation under the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin:

H.R. 12005. A bill to provide that the flag of the United States of America may be flown for 24 hours of each day at certain shrines in Fredonia and Waubeka, Wis.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California (by request):

H.R. 12006. A bill to provide for the more efficient development and improved management of national forest commercial forest land, to establish a high-timber-yield fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHALEN:

H.R. 12007. A bill relating to withholding, for purposes of the income tax imposed by certain cities, on the compensation of Federal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 12008. A bill to amend section 23 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 to make it clear that certain specified requirements (including the workable program requirement) do not apply to low-rent housing in private accommodations which is or will be assisted (or purchased for resale) under that section; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 12009. A bill to set forth a congressional statement on a national educational policy and to direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to initiate a comprehensive study on the formulation of a plan to implement such policy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 12010. A bill to provide an improved and enforcible procedure for the notification of defects in tires; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 12011. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12012. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to prohibit the mailing of unsolicited sample drug products and other potentially harmful items, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12013. A bill to provide for the elimination, over a 5-year period, of the mandatory oil import control program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN (for himself, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, and Mr. WRIGHT):

H.R. 12014. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to authorize the United States to cooperate in the construction of the Darien Gap Highway to connect the Inter-American Highway with the Pan American Highway System of South America; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 12015. A bill to provide for orderly trade in footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 12016. A bill to amend section 165(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which provides for treatment of losses on worthless securities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 12017. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $3,600 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 12018. A bill to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of certain materials to minors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12019. A bill to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of salacious advertising; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 12020. A bill to provide workmen's compensation protection to coal miners and their surviving dependents denied benefits under State law for disability or death from pneumoconiosis caused by exposure to coal-dust during their employment; to authorize the Secretary of Labor to provide or make provision for payment of supplementary compensation to persons receiving workmen's compensation benefits under State law for such disability or death; to reimburse States for the payment of certain workmen's compensation claims; to provide grants to States for research and planning with respect to occupational injuries and diseases in coal mines; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 12021. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to make disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze more readily available to coal miners and other individuals suffering from pneumoconiosis, and to amend titles II and XVIII of such act to make health insurance benefits available without regard to age to all individuals receiving cash benefits based on disability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANLEY (for himself, Mr. ASHLEY, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. ST GERMAIN, and Mr. WRIGHT):

H.R. 12022. A bill to assure an opportunity for employment to every American seeking work and to make available the education and training needed by any persons to qualify for employment consistent with his highest potential and capability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 12023. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 12024. A bill to amend the joint resolution designating June 14 of each year as Flag Day (37 U.S.C. 157) to provide appropriate recognition of the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag, and its author, Francis Bellamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN (for himself, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. WYATT, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. MARTIN, Mrs. MAY, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GETTYS, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. ULLMAN, Mr. WOLD, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. MORTON, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. KARTH, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. OLSEN, and Mr. RHODES):

H.R. 12025. A bill to provide for the more efficient development and improved management of national forest commercial forest land, to establish a high-timber-yield fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MIKVA:

H.R. 12026. A bill to provide for the improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 12027. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly pro-

cedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 12028. A bill to provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station and to permit the entry therein of animals from any country and the subsequent movement of such animals into other parts of the United States for purposes of improving livestock breeds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 12029. A bill to prohibit the issuance of any license, permit, or other authority by the Federal Governor with respect to the submerged lands beneath Lake Okeechobee, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 12030. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to exclude from the U.S. mails as a special category of nonmailable matter certain obscene material sold or offered for sale to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.J. Res. 769. Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of age to persons who are 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H.J. Res. 770. Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.J. Res. 771. Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.J. Res. 772. Resolution supporting the establishment of a national cemetery at Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. MATSUNAGA, and Mr. ST GERMAIN):

H. Con. Res. 287. Concurrent resolution relating to an Atlantic Union delegation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLANTON:

H.R. 12031. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rodrigo Tiongson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 12032. A bill for the relief of the Holley Carburetor Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 12033. A bill for the relief of Hector Enrique Gonzales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 12034. A bill for the relief of Donald C. Goewey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 12035. A bill for the relief of Francesco Parinisi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MIKVA:

H.R. 12036. A bill for the relief of Nevenka Opacic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12037. A bill for the relief of Ali Somay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OBEY:

H.R. 12038. A bill for the relief of Stanley Wronski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

140. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Homere Rousseau, New York, N.Y., relative to a proposal for the elimination of air pollution; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

141. Also, petition of the Okinawa Teachers Association, Naha, Okinawa, relative to the return of Okinawa to Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

142. Also, petition of the Village Assembly, Tomigusuku, Okinawa, relative to the return of Okinawa to Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE DARIEN GAP, FINAL LINK IN THE PAN AMERICAN HIGHWAY SYSTEM

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, the closing of the 249-mile highway gap between Panama and Colombia is a project of highest emotional value to all Latin American countries. For over 15 years this project has been given top priority over all highways in Latin America by the Pan American Highway Congresses of the Organization of American States. The surveys to close the gap, undertaken by the OAS under the direction of the Bureau of Public Roads, have been financed by a $3 million special fund, two-thirds contributed by the United States and one-third contributed by all Latin American countries. These surveys are just being completed and the recent breakthrough by the Bureau of Public Roads, which was cited as one of the 10 outstanding engineering achievements of 1968 by the National Society of Professional Engineers, has proven the feasibility of a route 212 miles shorter and $116 million less costly than that previously designated for linking North and South America. By a formal international agreement signed on May 1, 1969, in Bogotá, the public works ministers of Panama and Colombia gave the highest priority to the construction of this short route.

Since the early 1930's the United States has appropriated over $170 million to assist in the construction of the Inter-American Highway through the countries of Central America and Panama. Each of these countries furnished at least one-third matching funds, though Mexico constructed their 1,587 miles without U.S. participation. The entire highway, extending 3,100 miles from Texas to the Panama Canal, has been open for 6 years and the final few unpaved miles in Costa Rica are now under contract for asphalt surfacing. However, the highway ends at Panama, and there is no road connecting Central America and Panama with South America.

This Inter-American Highway has been an outstanding example of international cooperation and highlights the importance of major interconnecting highways in a country's development. Without question it has been the most important single factor in the success of the Central American common market. Where only a few years ago practically no commerce crossed between these countries, and the borders were the scenes of armed conflict, now the traffic flow over the highway has broken down the barriers and resulted in rapidly increasing industrial exchange and social integration.

The benefits already evident from the increasing use of the Inter-American Highway could be greatly enhanced by extending it through the Darien Gap to connect with the highway system of South America. There is sound economic justification for the construction of the highway in Panama and Colombia alone, and the projected advantage to all of Latin America stirs the imagination. As a result this program has unanimous political and emotional support of all the countries of the OAS.

Three years ago the Inter-American Development Bank issued a comprehensive report entitled "Multinational Investment Programs and Latin American Integration," which was prepared by the Development and Resources Corporation of New York—the so-called "Lilienthal Report." This report recommended the closing of the Darien Gap as an outstanding project for highlighting the importance of multinational integration and as being fundamental to Latin American progress. The report pointed out that the Darien project could well prove to be the cornerstone for a new structure of international cooperation in the whole field of transport and communication.

The Pan American Highway Congresses, recognizing the success of the Inter-American Highway, have urged that the Darien program be authorized as a continuation of the U.S. Inter-American Highway Authority under the Bureau of Public Roads. Closing the Darien Gap by following the policies and procedures which have worked so well throughout Central America would result in crediting the overall Alliance for Progress program.

Studies undertaken in connection with the long route, originally proposed in