editorial marking the 10th anniversary of the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, which I would like to place in the RECORD today. It follows:

TEN YEARS AFTER THE SEAWAY DREAM

When Britain's Queen Elizabeth came to Chicago in June, 1959, to mark the opening of the St. Lawrence seaway there was much optimistic talk about its effects on Chicago's future. Almost every city on the Great Lakes expected to become a port of the first magnitude.

The extravagant hopes were not realized immediately, and in recent years not much attention has been paid to the seaway by city planners and civic boosters. On the 10th anniversary of its opening, however, it should be noted that it has been a better than fair success and that its future is promising.

For one thing, the money spent on it—about a billion dollars, including power developments—was a bargain. The United States treasury supplied 131 million dollars for this country's share of the construction costs charged to navigation. These sums do not seem so large nowadays, especially when they are compared with the billion-dollar cost of the projected development of the Arkansas river. Unlike other American waterways, the seaway is required by law to pay for its operational costs and the debt charged to navigation. Income from tolls has been sufficient to meet operating expenses, but interest charges have been earned in only one year [1966] and the total debt has risen to 143 million dollars. Earnings declined in 1967 and 1968, primarily because of strikes.

One great benefit of the seaway has been the opening of iron ore deposits in Quebec and Labrador to midwest steel mills. Iron ore accounted for 37 per cent of the total traffic on the international section last year. About 85 per cent of all traffic consisted of bulk cargoes.

The disappointment of the seaway has been the failure to develop larger volumes of general merchandise cargo. This has resulted from the failure of the lake cities to provide adequate port facilities and to go after the general cargo business.

Chicago, which had more to gain than any other port, has been conspicuous in its failure to take advantage of its opportunities. Instead of consolidating port facilities into a single operation, it has two operating agencies—the city, which runs Navy pier, and the Chicago regional port district, which runs Calumet harbor.

Chicago also has failed to promote port business adequately, it has lagged in building container handling facilities, and it has neglected to develop equitable import-export rail and truck freight rates between the port and midwest importing and exporting companies.

In an editorial on April 27, 1959, when the first ships began moving thru the new seaway. The Tribune noted:

"Chicago has the largest, richest, and most diversified hinterland of any lake port. It is the only lake port with a major waterway [the Illinois-Mississippi system] leading into the hinterland. But the great growth in commerce expected from the seaway is not going to come overnight, and much of it is not going to come at all if Chicago fails to take the steps necessary to meet powerful competition. . . .

"If the Chicago area is to get all the benefits it should from the seaway, no time or energy can be wasted in squabbling between the various public and private port interests, or between the public officials charged with port developments."

The same advice is applicable today.

SENATE—*Tuesday, July 8, 1969*

The Senate met at 12 o' clock noon and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, may there fall upon us now a great sense of Thy presence and Thy power. Deliver the Members of this body from all personal worries and anxieties that they may give themselves wholly to the crucial issues of the day. Teach us how to speak, how to listen, how to wait, and how to work, holding ever before us the vision of the higher way and the more perfect order for which men strive, that we may be worthy workmen in Thy kingdom—for Thine alone is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE—A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

The best time to strengthen our unemployment insurance system is during a period of relatively full employment.

The Secretary of Labor is sending to the Congress today proposed legislation to extend unemployment insurance to 4,800,000 workers not now covered; to end the shortsighted restrictions that stand in the way of needed retraining efforts; and to add a Federal program automatically extending the duration of benefits in periods of high unemployment.

There are three principles to be considered as we move to make the unemployment insurance system responsive to our times.

Unemployment insurance is an earned benefit. When a man covered by unemployment insurance is working, the employer pays a tax on his wages to insure against the day when the employee may be between jobs. That insurance is like a mandatory fringe benefit; it is insurance bought in the employee's behalf, and the worker therefore is entitled to the benefits he receives when he is unemployed. Accordingly, there is no demeaning of human dignity, no feeling of being "on the dole," when the insured worker receives benefits due.

Unemployment insurance is one of the foremost examples of creative Federal-State partnership. Although the system was created by Federal law, most decisions about the nature of the program are left to the States, which administer the system with State employees. This makes the system far more flexible and attuned to local needs and special circumstances of local economies.

Unemployment insurance is an economic stabilizer. If, for example, the economy were ever to slow and unemployment were to rise, this program automatically would act to sustain personal income. This would help prevent a downturn from gathering momentum resulting from declines in purchasing power. When employment is at a high level, and greater stimulation of consumer demand is unwanted, relatively little money flows into the economy from unemployment insurance.

With these principles in mind, I am making these recommendations for both Federal and State action:

1. We should act together to extend unemployment protection to more employees, including many highly vulnerable to layoffs who are not now covered.

2. The States should make certain that workers throughout the United States receive enough money for a long enough period of time to sustain them while they seek new jobs.

3. We should end the restrictions imposed by almost half the States on payments to unemployed workers undergoing retraining and, instead, follow the lead of those States which encourage retraining.

4. We should better protect the investment made on behalf of the insured by seeing to it that the funds are paid only to those who should receive them.

5. We should increase the responsiveness of the system to major changes in national economic conditions.

6. We should strengthen the financing of the system which presently discriminates against the low-wage worker and the steady employer.

1. PROTECTING MORE EMPLOYEES

Over 57 million workers are protected by unemployment insurance. However, almost 17 million are not covered; more than half of these are employees of State and local governments. The last extension of coverage was enacted during the Eisenhower Administration, when 6 million additional workers were included; there is a clear social need today to cover as many more employees as we can.

I propose that an additional 4.8 million workers be covered by unemployment insurance. These include:

—1,600,000 workers in *small firms* with less than four employees;

—400,000 on large farms employing four or more workers in each of 20 weeks;

—200,000 in *agricultural processing* activities;

—1,800,000 in *non-profit organizations*;

—600,000 in *State hospitals* and *universities*;

—200,000 salesmen, delivery tradesmen, and others who are not currently defined as employees.

These 4,800,000 workers are in real need of protection against unemployment. Many of them are low wage workers with little job security and no prospect of termination pay if they are laid off.

The present gaps in coverage work a disproportionate hardship on minority workers, since a higher percentage of the 4,800,000 are non-white, compared to the entire labor force.

To cushion the immediate impact of this extension on employers, I recommend that States be permitted to lower the tax rates on newly covered employers until such time as a record of employment experience can be compiled to determine what their true rate should be.

With the passage of this legislation, the majority of those remaining uncovered will be employees of State and local governments. I urge the States and localities to take action, in the light of their local circumstances, to include their own employees in unemployment insurance coverage.

2. MAKING BENEFITS ADEQUATE

The basic purpose of the Unemployment Insurance Program is to pay weekly benefits high enough to prevent a severe cut in a worker's standard of living when he is between jobs. The principle is generally accepted that it takes at least 50% of the worker's wage to meet this purpose.

Almost every State subscribes to this general principle, but benefit ceilings in their legislation have in fact made this principle largely ineffective, especially for the family breadwinner. At least two out of five claimants currently fail to get a benefit equal to one-half their wages.

In 1954, President Eisenhower recommended to States that they provide a maximum high enough to permit the great majority of covered workers to receive one-half their wages. This means that at least 80% of insured workers should be able to receive a benefit of one-half their wages if unemployed.

Men are most adversely affected by the limit on weekly benefits. In one large industrial State, for example, only 23% of the men receive benefits equal to as much as one-half their weekly wages.

If the program is to fulfill its role, it is essential that the benefit maximum be raised. A maximum of two-thirds of the average wage in the State would result in benefits of 50% in wages to at least 80% of insured workers.

Up to now, the responsibility for determining benefit amounts has been the responsibility of the States. There are advantages in States having that freedom. However, the overriding consideration is that the objective of adequate benefits be achieved. I call upon the States to act within the next two years to meet this goal, thereby averting the need for Federal action.

3. ENCOURAGING RETRAINING

During the present decade, many manpower programs were launched in the United States. We have seen how unemployed workers can be equipped with new skills and started on new careers. When the decade began, only three States permitted workers who enrolled in retraining programs to continue to receive benefit payments. All the rest disqualified them upon entry into training.

During the early 1960's, many States recognized the potential of training for employment rehabilitation, and by 1969 twenty-five States, plus Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia, had removed such restrictive requirements.

However, twenty-five States continue to discourage retraining by denying benefits to workers in such programs on the theory that they are not "available for work." On the contrary, the workers are trying to keep themselves available by learning new techniques and technologies, and government should certainly stop penalizing them for doing something that government, business and labor all want to encourage.

I propose a requirement that the remaining States permit workers to continue to receive benefits while enrolled in training programs designed to increase their employability.

4. PROTECTING THE INSURANCE SYSTEM

We must also be sure that benefits are going only to those people the system is designed to protect. The funds must not be dissipated.

Attachment to the Labor Force. The unemployment insurance system is designed to protect workers whose attachment to the labor force is more than casual. A worker's attachment is measured by both his past employment history and his present situation. He must be ready, willing and able to work and trying to find work while he is claiming benefits; and he must have had at least a certain amount of employment in the recent past. Generally, from fourteen to twenty weeks of work is required, depending on the employment patterns of the State and the minimum duration of benefits.

A few States, however, measure past employment by a flat dollar amount. This discriminates against the low-wage worker, because it means he must work for a longer period to be eligible. Also, it permits other high wage workers to become eligible on the basis of very short seasonal work. *I recommend that a standard based on a minimum period of 15 weeks' employment be required as a condition of benefit eligibility, and that no flat dollar amount be permitted as the only yardstick.*

Workers on Strike. The unemployment tax we require employers to pay was never intended to supplement strike funds to be used against them. A worker who chooses to exercise his right to strike is not involuntarily unemployed.

In two States, workers on strike are paid unemployment insurance benefits after a certain period. This is not the purpose of the unemployment insurance system.

I propose a requirement that this practice of paying unemployment insurance benefits to workers directly engaged in a strike be discontinued.

5. IMPROVING RESPONSIVENESS TO ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

Difficult times are far less likely to occur in nations that take the trouble to prepare for them. The presence of a strong, anti-recessionary arsenal will in itself help prevent the need for its ever being used.

In normal times, the duration of benefit payments may be adequate. Most State programs now provide around twenty-six weeks of benefits; for the great majority of claimants, this is enough to see them through to another job. However, if the economy were ever to falter, the number of persons exhausting benefits would grow rapidly.

In each of the last two periods of high unemployment, the President proposed, and the Congress enacted, legislation to extend the duration of benefits temporarily. However, while this process was taking place, many workers were without income, and the economy was exposed to sharp declines in personal income due to unemployment.

I am proposing legislation that would automatically extend the length of time benefits are paid in all States when the national jobless rate of those covered by insurance equals or exceeds 4.5% for three consecutive months. If periods of high unemployment were ever to occur, individuals would receive benefits for an additional period up to 13 weeks; this extension would end when the national unemployment rate of those in the system (currently 2.2%) fell back below 4.5%, and when the number exhausting their benefits in a three-month period dropped below 1% of those covered. These additional payments would be financed out of that portion of the unemployment tax that is now retained by the Federal government.

6. STRENGTHENING AND REFORMING FINANCING

We must enable the Federal government to finance its share of the improvements proposed in this message, along with the costs of administering the Employment Security System. In addition, there will be a need to improve the ability of States to finance the higher benefit levels I am urging.

I propose that the taxable wage base be raised over a five-year period to $6,000 and thereafter be reviewed periodically to make certain the adequacy of financing.

In the majority of States, the taxable wage base for the Unemployment Insurance Tax is the first $3,000 of wages—exactly what it was three decades ago. In that same period, average wages in employment covered by the system have increased almost five-fold. The low tax base places obstacles in the way of hiring low-wage workers because a substantially higher proportion of their wage is taxed. In addition, the impact of the tax tends to encourage use of overtime rather than adding workers.

The higher base will have the desirable effect of allocating costs more equitably among employers. Particularly at the State level, overall benefit costs will represent a lower per cent of taxable wages, and allow rates to reflect employer experience more accurately.

An Anchor to Windward. Unemployment insurance was begun as an answer to the human need for sustenance of the unemployed workingman seeking another job. It was designed to reduce the element of economic panic in job-hunting.

But as we move now to extend that

insurance and meet that need more fully, we discover—not quite by accident—the bonus of serendipity. Here is insurance purchased through a tax on the employers of America in behalf of their employees that can be a potent counter to a downturn in the business cycle. This proves that well-conceived social legislation can be a great boon to business and to all Americans affected by the state of the economy.

The success of this system can be a great example of the relationship between the States and the Federal government.

The Federal government brought this unemployment insurance system into being—but the States have rightly adopted it as their own. The Federal government has traditionally established minimum coverage—but many States have expanded that coverage to fit their own needs.

Now the Federal-State system of unemployment insurance should move to provide adequate benefits in accordance with the goal that has been set and with full recognition of the diversity of economic conditions among States. Such action is most important to protect the individual and to achieve the anti-recessionary potential of unemployment insurance.

The Federal and State actions recommended will help advance the economy of each State and in protecting the economy of the nation. In human terms, the recommended changes will better enable a worker to weather the adversity of unemployment and to find a suitable job.

I urge that the Congress and the States enact the legislation proposed to carry out these improvements.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 8, 1969.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Vice President laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 671. An act to compensate the Indians of California for the value of land erroneously used as an offset in a judgment against the United States obtained by said Indians;

H.R. 2785. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Tennessee certain lands within Great Smoky Mountains National Park and certain lands comprising the Gatlinburg Spur of the Foothills Parkway, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4246. An act to discontinue the annual report to Congress as to the administrative settlement of personal property claims of military personnel and civilian employees; and

H.R. 4247. An act to amend section 2734 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary concerned to make partial payments on certain claims which are certified to Congress and to provide equivalent authority for administrative settlement and payment of claims under section 2733 of title 10 and section 715 of title 32, United States Code.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

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

H.R. 671. An act to compensate the Indians of California for the value of land erroneously used as an offset in a judgment against the United States obtained by said Indians; and

H.R. 2785. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Tennessee certain lands within Great Smoky Mountains National Park and certain lands comprising the Gatlinburg Spur of the Foothills Parkway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4246. An act to discontinue the annual report to Congress as to the administrative settlement of personal property claims of military personnel and civilian employees; and

H.R. 4247. An act to amend section 2734 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary concerned to make partial payments on certain claims which are certified to Congress and to provide equivalent authority for administrative settlement and payment of claims under section 2733 of title 10 and section 715 of title 32, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, July 7, 1969, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance, the Subcommittee on Education and the Subcommittee on Evaluation and Planning of Social Programs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RELEASE OF CERTAIN LEAD FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE AND SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 1647.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1647) an act to authorize the release of one hundred thousand short tons of lead from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of approximately one hundred thousand short tons of lead now held in the national stockpile established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h) and the supplemental stockpile established pursuant to section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 456, as amended by 73 Stat. 607). Such disposition may be made without regard to the requirements of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act: *Provided*, That the time and method of disposition shall be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets.

SEC. 2. (a) Disposals of the material covered by this Act may be made only after publicly advertising for bids, except as provided in subsection (b) of this section or as otherwise authorized by law. All bids may be rejected when it is in the public interest to do so.

(b) The material covered by this Act may be disposed of without advertising for bids if—

(1) the material is to be transferred to an agency of the United States;

(2) the Administrator determines that methods of disposal other than by advertising are necessary to protect the United States against avoidable loss or to protect producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets; or

(3) sales are to be made pursuant to requests received from other agencies of the United States in furtherance of authorized program objectives of such agencies.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered yesterday, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the House amendment to S. 1647. Under the agreement, the time on that amendment and all subsequent amendments will be limited to one-half hour, the time to be controlled equally by the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding that order, and with the approval of the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Delaware, I may at this time call up certain unobjected-to bills on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar, beginning with Calendar 274, S. 1583.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the first bill.

POSTMASTER APPOINTMENTS

The bill (S. 1583) to provide that appointments and promotions in the Post Office Department, including the postal service, be made on the basis of merit and fitness was considered, ordered to be

engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1583

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3311 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3311. Method of appointment

"The Postmaster General shall appoint postmasters in the competitive civil service."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall not affect the status or tenure of postmasters in office on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. (a) Chapter 41 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 3108 the following new section:

"§ 3109. Nonpolitical appointments and promotions

"(a) In the selection, appointment, and promotion of employees of the Department, no political test or qualification shall be permitted or given consideration, and all such personnel actions shall be taken on the basis of merit and fitness. Any officer or employee of the Department who violates this section shall be removed from office or otherwise disciplined in accordance with procedures for disciplinary action established pursuant to law.

"(b) This section does not apply to the selection and appointment of officers whose appointment is vested in the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, or to the selection, appointment, or promotion to a position designated by the Civil Service Commission as a position of a confidential or policy-determining character or as a position to be filled by a noncareer executive assignment."

(b) The analysis of chapter 41 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting after item 3108 the following new item:

"3109. Nonpolitical appointments and promotions."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–283), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

This legislation will eliminate Presidential nomination and Senate confirmation of postmasters at post offices of the first, second, and third class. In lieu of the present method of appointing postmasters, all appointments will be made by the Postmaster General. The bill contains language prohibiting political recommendations from being taken into account in the appointment of any person to any position in the Post Office Department other than Presidential nominees and policy-making employees.

STATEMENT

The bill is a recommendation of the Postmaster General to eliminate politics as a primary factor in the selection of some 25,000 postmasters throughout the Nation. The historic method of making these appointments has been that a political adviser (usually a Congressman or a Senator of the same political party as the administration in power) indicates his preference in filling a postmastership by choosing either the noncompetitive promotion of a qualified career employee in the postal service, or an open competitive examination administered by the Civil Service Commission and subject to civil service laws, rules, and regulations.

This system has produced many fine postmasters, but it has also proved to be a problem in some cases because of conflicting political pressures in the town where the postmaster vacancy exists. It has not contributed toward improving the career postal service because postal employees generally recognize that, regardless of their achievement, the opportunity for becoming postmaster is limited because politics is a primary factor in selecting the nominee.

Legislation to abolish the political system has been introduced in the Senate for many years. In 1967 the Senate approved a provision in S. 355, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967, eliminating the system, but the bill failed in the House of Representatives. In 1968, a provision similar to that included in S. 355 was favorably reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in the House of Representatives, but was not acted upon on the floor before adjournment of the 90th Congress. Earlier this year, President Nixon and Postmaster General Winton M. Blount announced that political recommendations would no longer be taken into account in the selection of nominees. To provide legislative sanction for this new policy, the committee recommends enactment of legislation doing away with Senate confirmation and vesting the authority for selecting postmasters in the Postmaster General exclusively.

The new procedure will be a very significant departure from past practice. The committee has carefully considered the impact of this legislation as well as alternatives to the administration's recommendations. Finally, however, the committee decided to approve the administration recommendations without guidelines written into law so that the Postmaster General will have a free hand in establishing the new system. The committee expects the Postmaster General to report on the success of the new system at the conclusion of the first session of the 91st Congress so that further consideration may be given in the event the program does not fulfill expectations.

THE CONCURRENT JURISDICTION (UNITED STATES AND STATE OF MONTANA) AT FORT HARRISON, MONT.

The bill (H.R. 3689) to cede to the State of Montana concurrent jurisdiction with the United States over the real property comprising the Veterans' Administration Center, Fort Harrison, Mont., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–284), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

The bill would cede to the State of Montana concurrent jurisdiction with the United States over the real property comprising the Veterans' Administration Center, Fort Harrison, Mont. The cession would be effective upon acceptance by that State.

Exclusive Federal jurisdiction has created difficulty in obtaining certain services adjunct to operation of the center. Local authorities have furnished various services even though there has been doubt expressed as to the legality of actions taken. For example, on one occasion it was necessary for a local deputy sheriff to come to the center to disarm a former patient who had returned to the center armed, threatening several employees. On another occasion a patient in the center apparently committed suicide and it became necessary to hold an inquest. The local authority held the inquest as a matter of courtesy, although expressing doubts as to its authority. The bill would remove that doubt by providing concurrent jurisdiction and authority in such cases.

The director of the center has advised that the matter has been discussed at the local level with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the U.S. attorney, the county attorney, county sheriff, and judges of the State court. All recommend concurrent jurisdiction.

Exclusive jurisdiction over the Fort William Harrison military reservation vested in the United States under the Montana General Act of Cession of February 14, 1891. Beginning April 29, 1922, the hospital on the reservation was operated by the then Veterans Bureau and later by the Veterans' Administration. On November 14, 1946, the then Secretary of War formally transferred approximately 180 acres of the reservation to the Veterans' Administration under the provisions of the act of June 22, 1944 (Public Law 346, 78th Cong.), as amended. The Veterans' Administration Center, which is composed of a regional office and a general medical and surgical hospital, is located on such acreage.

There would be no cost insofar as Federal expenditures are involved by the approval of this proposal.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1857) to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation pursuant to Public Law 87–507, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

CLEAN AIR ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1969

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2276) to extend for 1 year the authorization for research relating to fuels and vehicles under the provisions of the Clean Air Act.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, S. 2276, the pending measure, amends the Clean Air Act, as amended, and would extend for 1 year the authorization for research relating to fuels and vehicles at the current level of $90,000,000.

Mr. President, with the passage of the Air Quality Act of 1967, this Nation entered a new phase in the national effort to control and abate air pollution. In that legislation the Congress set forth a blueprint for a truly systematic effort to deal with the long-term threat of air pollution to public health and welfare.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the lead agency in this effort, has made substantial progress in implementing the provisions of the Air Quality Act. It was gratifying to note that Secretary Finch, as one of his first official tasks, issued air quality criteria, summarizing available medical and scientific knowledge on the effects on public health and welfare of two air contaminants—sulfur oxides and particulates. At the same time he also issued reports on the control techniques applicable to these atmospheric contaminants.

Thus, the stage has been set for the States to adopt regional air quality standards for sulfur oxides and particulate matter. In the next several months

State governments will begin adopting standards and plans for implementing sulfur oxides and particulate standards, in accordance with the provisions of the Air Quality Act of 1967.

Initial attention will be devoted to the air quality control regions designated by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. He has already designated several of the Nation's largest metropolitan areas, and is expected to designate 32 such regions before the end of the year and an additional 25 by the summer of 1970.

The total population of these 57 regions is 97 million persons, or 70 percent of the Nation's urban population. All 50 States are represented, as well as the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Once criteria and control data for a contaminant or group of contaminants are issued and an air quality control region is designated, the States represented have 90 days to signify their intent to set air quality standards for that contaminant and the designated area. They then have 180 days to hold public hearings and adopt standards, and another 180 days to adopt plans and schedules to implement and enforce these standards.

The objective of the Air Quality Act of 1967 clearly is to promote and encourage public participation in the development of public policies and air quality standards geared to the regional nature of air pollution problems. Whether or not the Air Quality Act is successful depends upon the degree of commitment and cooperation the Federal Government receives from State and local government, from industry, and from the taxpayer and citizen. As the knowledgeable junior Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE), chairman of the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, so eloquently stated at the New England Conference on Air Pollution:

> If the public welfare becomes in the future as it has so often been in the past, the concern on a daily basis of only those who are elected to public office or who hold appointive office in government, then we can indeed be concerned about the future of participatory politics in the American system.

Once public policies are established which reflect desired air qualities in terms of health, comfort, convenience, cleanliness, and beauty, they must be implemented. To do so requires control methods adequate to meet long-term needs. Current control technologies are insufficient to meet these long-term needs. Therefore, new and improved methods must be developed to insure the maintenance, and, where necessary or desirable, the enhancement of existing air quality.

Section 104 of the Air Pollution Act of 1967 is designed to meet this insufficiency by providing for research and development activities into new and improved methods for the prevention and control of air pollution resulting from the combustion of fuels.

Significant advancements have been made in the implementation of these research and development activities. System studies have been conducted to define needed research and development to cope with stationary sources. These activities should now be expanded into motor vehicle research and development to reduce emissions which account for over 60 percent of the current air pollution. Such activities should be designed to encourage industry to reduce the emissions from internal combustion engines, as well as to develop alternative methods of propulsion.

While program advances are encouraging, the committee is concerned about the inadequacies in funding. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 104, the Congress authorized $35 million for fiscal year 1968 and $90 million for fiscal year 1969. Unfortunately, programs and activities carried out under section 104 provisions have not been adequately funded, with approximately $9 million and $14 million have been expended for fiscal years 1968 and 1969, respectively.

The effect has been to delay severely the development of much needed control technologies. A typical example is the area of sulfur oxides control. The study of sulfur oxide control methods, developed with the assistance of the Stanford Research Institute, entitled "Sulfur Oxides Pollution Control, Federal Research and Development Planning and Programing, 1968–72," indicates that if the development of sulfur oxide control methods is to be phased to meet the abatement and control needs of the country in 5 years then Federal appropriations for this purpose should have been $41 million and $56 million for fiscal years 1969 and 1970. Yet the appropriation for all purposes was $23 million or $74 million short of meeting the need regarding sulfur oxides alone.

This failure, however, is not due solely to Government lethargy. The testimony of industry, in particular the electric utilities, coal and oil industries, on the Air Quality Act of 1967 indicated a desire to participate in joint Government-industry efforts in control technology development. To this end the Congress enacted section 104 of the Air Quality Act of 1967, the authorization of which would be extended by S. 2276 through fiscal year 1970.

This section contains two special features not contained in section 103, the general research provisions. First, funds made available under section 104 would remain available until expended. This flexibility is useful in the planning and scheduling of research and development and demonstration projects which may extend beyond the end of a fiscal year. Second, section 104 authorizes supporting projects which involve construction and installation of pollution control equipment on private property for the purpose of testing.

Section 104 is useful to both Government and industry, yet, it has been inadequately funded to meet the need defined by the Congress.

If private industry is truly interested in participating in this program, we have a right to expect more effective support for and interest in the provisions of section 104 of the Air Quality Act of 1969. The pending bill, S. 2276, provides for continuation of all of these vital activities for 1 year. The measure extends section 104 authorization through fiscal year 1970 at the currently authorized level of expenditure, $90 million, and is vital to the continuance of these joint Government-industry activities.

Later this year the committee will consider extending authorizations for all sections of the Air Quality Act beyond fiscal year 1970. The authorization for other than section 104 through fiscal year 1970 is provided for in current statutes.

At this time, as chairman of the Committee on Public Works, and on behalf of the committee's members, I recommend enactment of S. 2276.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am glad to join with Senator RANDOLPH, chairman of the Committee on Public Works, on which I serve as ranking minority member, in urging adoption by the Senate of S. 2276, to extend certain research provisions of the Clean Air Act.

Great and urgent environmental problems face this and other nations. The problems are real and we must look now to the development of adequate remedies. The bill before the Senate today represents a small portion of a legislative program designed to reverse the trend of deteriorating air quality. It is a simple extension for 1 fiscal year of research authority to continue this authorization through fiscal year 1970, when all the authorizations of the Air Quality Act are subject to review and reauthorization.

Although this bill is a simple extension of existing authority, it does illustrate a difficulty in developing control methods and techniques at a time when air pollution continues to increase. I refer to the gap between authorization and appropriation for the pollution control efforts.

Section 104 of the Clean Air Act, proposed to be extended by S. 2276, authorized for fiscal 1968 and 1969 appropriations, not to exceed $125 million. However, in those 2 years only $23 million has been appropriated for research into fuels combustion under section 104—less than one-fifth of the authorized amount. I urge the Senate to consider this fact as they pass upon this bill and, more importantly, when the several appropriation bills relating to environmental quality reach the Senate floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask uanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 286), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

I. GENERAL STATEMENT

With the passage of the Air Quality Act of 1967, this Nation entered a new phase in the national effort to control and abate air pollution. In that legislation the Congress set forth a blueprint for a truly systematic effort to deal with the long-term threat of air pollution to public health and welfare.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the lead agency in this effort, has made substantial progress in implementing the provisions of the Air Quality Act. It was gratifying to note that Secretary Finch, as one of his first official tasks, issued air quality criteria, summarizing available medical

and scientific knowledge on the effects on public health and welfare of two air contaminants—sulfur oxides and particulates. At the same time he also issued reports on the control techniques applicable to these atmospheric contaminants.

Thus, the stage has been set for the States to adopt regional air quality standards for sulfur oxides and particulate matter. In the next several months State governments will begin adopting standards for sulfur oxides and particulate and plans for their implementation in accordance with the provisions of the Air Quality Act of 1967.

Initial attention have been devoted to the air quality control regions designated by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. He has already designated several of the Nation's largest metropolitan areas, and is expected to designate 32 such regions before the end of the year and an additional 25 by the summer of 1970.

The total population of these 57 regions is 97 million persons, or 70 percent of the Nation's urban population. All 50 States are represented, as well as the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Once criteria and control data for a contaminant or group of contaminants are issued and an air quality control region is designated, the States represented have 90 days to signify their intent to set air quality standards for that contaminant and the designated area. They then have 180 days to hold public hearings and adopt standards, and another 180 days to adopt plans and schedules to implement and enforce these standards and requisite emission standards.

The success of this approach is contingent on the development of control technologies adequate to achieve established standards within a reasonable time. The report entitled "Control Techniques for Sulfur Oxide Air Pollutants" represents a vital, integral part in a program designed to assist the States. The report, however, reflects current control technologies which are insufficient to meet long-term needs. Therefore, new and improved methods must be developed to insure the maintenance and, where necessary or desirable, the enhancement of existing air quality.

Section 104 of the Air Quality Act of 1967 is designed to meet this objective and provides for research and development activities into new and improved methods for the prevention and control of air pollution resulting from the combustion of fuels. Much of this research could be accomplished under section 103, but there are two special features in section 104.

First, funds made available under section 104 can remain available until expended. This flexibility is useful in the planning and scheduling of research and development and demonstration projects which may extend beyond the end of a fiscal year.

Second, section 104 defines a legal basis for supporting projects involving construction and installation of pollution control equipment on private property for the purpose of testing. This is very useful since industrial plants often are the best possible sites for making a realistic evaluation of the economic and technological feasibility of new processes for the control of problems such as sulfur oxides pollution.

For this purpose the Congress authorized $35 million for fiscal year 1968 and $90 million for fiscal year 1969. Unfortunately, programs and activities carried out under section 104 provisions have not been adequately funded, with approximately $9 million and $14 million having been expended for fiscal years 1968 and 1969, respectively. This is considerably less than the $225 million authorization, for the same period, which passed the Senate unanimously on July 18, 1967, and the $125 million authorization contained in the act.

Despite inadequacies in funding, the National Air Pollution Control Administration has moved forward in a concerted effort to improve air pollution control technology. Programs to develop the large-scale equipment studies necessary to firmly evaluate first-generation processes for control of pollution from combustion have been given continued high priority, and programs to develop new processes have been expanded to give increased attention to pollutants other than sulfur oxides originating from combustion of fuels.

The committee is encouraged by the increased emphasis being devoted to systems studies to provide better definition of the research and development needed to cope with any major segment of the air pollution problem presented by stationary sources.

These studies include:

(1) Industrywide surveys of basic industries such as primary smelters, pulp and paper, iron and steel, etc. In all these surveys, combustion processes will be given special attention.

(2) Devise oriented studies to assess problems that must be solved to permit wider application of electrostatic precipitators, fabric filters, scrubbers, and afterburners.

(3) Pollutant oriented studies to provide better definition of the relative contributions of and control problems associated with important pollutants such as nitrogen oxides, particulates, and odors on a nationwide basis.

The study of sulfur oxide control methods, developed with the assistance of the Stanford Research Institute, entitled "Sulfur Oxides Pollution Control, Federal Research and Development Planning and Programing, 1968–72," was impressive. This report should prove an invaluable assistance in the development of control technologies for sulfur oxides.

All these systems studies involve certain common characteristics, whether they are pollutant oriented, device oriented, or industry oriented. In all, the intent is to accumulate the best possible data to provide a broad base of information that can be used by any groups interested in analysis of any segment of the problems. The availability of such information will eliminate the need for considerable duplication of effort.

These plans and similar plans and programs are needed for other problem areas. For example, national research and development plans should be developed to control nitrogen oxides emissions, to control particulate materials that are so small they elude current control efforts, and to reduce the emissions from moving sources such as automobiles, buses, trucks, ships, and airplanes.

The committee believes that increased emphasis is needed on motor vehicle research. Motor vehicles contribute to the general levels of noise in urban areas, as well as, 60 percent of the atmospheric pollution. A balanced research and development program is needed on alternatives to the internal combustion engine; a program which stimulates industry to more rapidly develop low-pollution vehicles.

This bill, S. 2276, provides for continuation of all of these vital activities. The bill extends section 104 authorization through fiscal year 1970 at the currently authorized level of expenditure, and is vital to the continuance of these joint Government-industry activities. Passage of this legislation is a necessity. Later this year the committee will look to extending authorizations for all sections of the Air Quality Act beyond fiscal year 1970. The authorization for other than section 104 through fiscal year 1970 is provided for in current statutes.

II. NEED FOR LEGISLATION

The successful implementation of this national effort to control and abate air pollution depends on the development of adequate control technology. Adequate control technology is necessary not only to reduce the atmospheric emissions from existing sources, but also to counteract the increasing number of new sources.

There is already knowledge to reduce air pollution by a significant degree, but there are many control problems for which long-term solutions do not exist. In particular, the effective control of air pollution emissions from motor vehicles and sulfur oxides pollution from the combustion of fossil fuels will require intensive research and development over the next several years. Section 104 of the Air Quality Act of 1967 is designed to meet these needs.

This section directs the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to—

(1) Conduct and accelerate research programs directed toward development of improved, low-cost techniques for control of combustion byproducts of fuels, for removal of potential pollutants from fuels, and for control of emissions from evaporation of fuels;

(2) Provide for Federal grants or contract with public or private agencies, institutions, or persons for (A) part of the cost of acquiring, constructing, or otherwise securing for research and development purposes, new or improved devices or methods having industrywide application of preventing or controlling discharges into the air of various types of pollutants; and (B) carrying out the other provisions of this section, without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529; 41 U.S.C. 5);

(3) Determine, by laboratory and pilot plant testing, the results of air pollution research and studies in order to develop new or improved processes and plant designs to the point where they can be demonstrated on a large and practical scale;

(4) Construct, operate, and maintain, or participate in the construction, operation, and maintenance of new or improved demonstration plants or processes which have promise of accomplishing the purposes of this act;

(5) Study new or improved methods for the recovery and marketing of commercially valuable byproducts resulting from the removal of pollutions; and

(6) Establish technical advisory committees composed of recognized experts in various aspects of air pollution and its control to assist in the examination and evaluation of research progress and of all research proposals and contracts and to insure the avoidance of duplication of research.

For this purpose the Congress authorized $35 million for fiscal year 1968 and $90 million for fiscal year 1969, with the appropriated sums for section 104 to remain available until expended. In this way projects initiated for more than 1-year terms would be assured of continuing support. However, the authorization for the research and development activities under section 104 expire at the end of fiscal year 1969.

Among all the provisions of the Clean Air Act, section 104 most clearly reflects the Nation's pressing need for practical solutions to the very serious air pollution problems associated with fuel combustion and motor vehicles. This section also reflects the need for involvement of the private sector in the search for solutions to these complex problems. Section 104 provides authorities contained nowhere else in the Clean Air Act.

First, funds appropriated under section 104 remain available until expended. This flexibility is important in the planning and operation of large-scale research and development projects. Permitting funds to be carried over from one year to the next allows the National Air Pollution Control Administration to select the most promising projects and the best qualified contractors and grantees and to initiate projects at the times most advantageous to the Government.

Second, section 104 allows for the construction and testing of demonstration control equipment on private property. The consequence is to ease the legal problems

associated with supporting large-scale development and demonstration projects involving construction on private property. The construction and operation of demonstration plants at industrial sites is often the best means of making a realistic evaluation of the economic and technical feasibility of new processes, for example, sulfur oxides control methods. Two such projects are scheduled to get underway in fiscal 1970.

For these reasons it is important that the funding under section 104 be uninterrupted, as provided for in S. 2276.

REVIEW OF PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Despite inadequacies in funding, the administration has moved forward in implementing the provisions of section 104. A description of these activities has been provided by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to the Congress in two reports entitled "Progress in the Prevention and Control of Air Pollution," on June 28, 1968 (S. Doc. 90–22), and March 4, 1969 (S. Doc. 91–11).

The National Air Pollution Control Administration's research and development program for dealing with stationary sources consists of a three-pronged attack:

1. The development of systems and processes to control specific pollutants; for example, sulfur oxides, nitrogen oxides, and particulates.

2. Systems surveys to define the pollution problems of specific industries and to cooperatively develop control approaches for these industries; for example, primary smelters, pulp and paper manufacturers, and waste disposal plants.

3. The continuous development of new and improved control devices for use in the various control systems.

In achieving these goals the NAPCA has moved forward in a number of areas. An outline of these areas is presented below. Details are given in the two progress reports cited earlier.

I. Control of Sulfur Oxide Pollution:
A. Removal of sulfur from coal.
1. Coal washing studies.
B. Removal of sulfur from fuel oil.
C. Removal of sulfur from flue gas:
1. Limestone-injection process.
2. Alkalized alumina process.
D. New process development:
1. Aqueous scrubbing.
2. Solid metal oxides.
3. Inorganic liquids.
4. Organic liquids.
5. Inorganic solids excluding metal oxides.
6. Organic solids.
7. Catalytic oxidation to sulfuric acid.
8. Reduction to sulfur.
9. Physical methods of separation.
II. Control of nitrogen oxides pollution.
III. Control of particulate pollution.
IV. Control of pollution from specific industries.
V. Control of pollution from solid waste disposal.
VI. Control device improvement studies.

Of these areas, two deserve particular attention: The first is fuel combustion research; the second is motor vehicle research and development.

FUEL COMBUSTION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Efforts to develop and demonstrate techniques for the prevention and control of sulfur oxides pollution constitute a major part of the National Air Pollution Control Administration's research and development on air pollution problems arising from fuel combustion.

Over the past 2 years, NAPCA has completed the development of a comprehensive 5-year plan for sulfur oxides research and development and has moved ahead on implementation of the plan to the extent permitted by available funds. Thus, NAPCA is now managing a national program involving the participation of several other Federal agencies and more than 70 groups in the private sector and in universities. The program also includes cooperative activities with organizations in several foreign countries.

This program encompasses basic and applied research, laboratory testing, studies of economic and technical feasibility, and pilot-plant and prototype testing of sulfux oxides control techniques. NAPCA is placing increasing emphasis on full-scale prototype testing of techniques which have reached advanced stages of development. A substantial portion of the program is supported by NAPCA contracts with non-Federal organizations, but it is expected that projects involving cost sharing by industry will account for an increasing share of the program in the months and years ahead, particularly in the area of prototype testing.

The development and demonstration of techniques for removing sulfur oxides from combustion gases represent one of the principal work areas of the program. Availability of such techniques would help to pave the way for achieving effective control of sulfur oxides pollution without imposing widespread restrictions on fuel use. NAPCA has initiated work leading to full-scale prototype testing of limestone injection processes, which potentially are applicable to many existing steam-electric powerplants. Prototype testing of the dry limestone process is scheduled to begin in fiscal 1970 at a Tennessee Valley Authority plant. A site for testing of the limestone injection-and-wet scrubbing process has not been selected as yet. Agreements regarding the handling of proprietary information have been negotiated to pave the way for evaluation of flue-gas treatment processes developed by Wellman-Lord and the Monsanto Co.

Also with respect to flue-gas treatment, NAPCA has begun work on techniques that previously have not been applied to the control of air pollution but have potential for such application. Emphasis in this work is being placed on techniques that would permit recovery of sulfur byproducts. NAPCA already has initiated work on design of a small pilot plant for testing of one such process—the molten carbonate process; construction of the pilot plant is scheduled to begin in fiscal 1970. Early initiation of work on three other new processes is under consideration.

The application of techniques for removing sulfur from fuels before they are burned offers another satisfactory way of dealing with the sulfur oxides problem. In the past 2 years, in cooperation with the Bureau of Mines and other organizations, NAPCA has initiated studies of the extent to which sulfur can be removed from coals mined in various parts of the country, and in fiscal 1969, two studies were initiated to establish design parameters for prototype sulfur-removal plants.

The amount of coal lost when sulfur-containing pyrites are removed from coal constitutes an economic limitation on the extent to which sulfur can be removed. A process that would permit burning of the pyrite-coal mixtures to produce heat and sulfur byproducts is being inevstigated by NAPCA as an approach to maximizing the extent to which coal can be economically desulfurized.

Exploration of new combustion processes that might drastically reduce the release of sulfur oxides is an important part of NAPCA's program. One of the most promising of such processes is fluidized bed combustion. The Bureau of Mines has been evaluating the basic technology of fluidized bed combustion. NAPCA's efforts are focused on evaluating its potential for sulfur-oxides reduction. NAPCA's work on this process includes cooperative activity with several foreign groups; just recently an agreement was reached with the National Coal Board of Great Britain for exchanges of information on fluidized bed combustion.

New energy conversion techniques offer still another approach to dealing with the sulfur oxides problem. NAPCA is beginning to explore the extent to which such techniques, possibly coupled with fuel conversion-desulfurization processes, can make a contribution to future implementation of sulfur oxides control programs.

Motor vehicle research and development

The National Air Pollution Control Administration has initiated development of a comprehensive 5-year plan for research and development on motor vehicle pollution control. This plan will define specific goals and outline alternative pathways toward those goals. It will encompass not only NAPCA's research and development activities but also the related work of other Federal agencies. In addition, it will define the relationship between Federal and industry research and development work on the motor vehicle pollution problem.

Over the past 2 years, NAPCA has initiated or intensified its research and development on many aspects of motor vehicle pollution control. Areas in which significant new or intensified activity is underway include advanced control systems applicable to carbon monoxide and hydrocarbon emissions from internal combustion engines; nitrogen oxides control systems; techniques for controlling emissions of particulate matter, particularly lead; alternative fuels for internal combustion engines; nature and control of diesel odors; and unconventional engines for use in passenger cars.

Examples of specific projects initiated under section 104 include:

1. A cooperative project with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to develop a thermal afterburner for the control of carbon monoxide and hydrocarbon emissions. The project takes advantage of NASA's experience in the development and use of materials capable of withstanding extremely high temperatures. Progress in this work has a direct bearing on the technical feasibility of compliance with increasingly stringent emission standards for motor vehicles.

2. Two projects to test the feasibility of first-generation, exhaust-gas recirculation devices for the control of nitrogen oxides emissions. A demonstration grant has been awarded to the State of California to support road testing of one type of device. Tests of another type are underway in NAPCA's own laboratories; this one was developed by Esso Research and Engineering under a contract with NAPCA. NAPCA also has initiated studies of the potential value of catalytic afterburners for control of nitrogen oxides emissions and of ways to minimize nitrogen oxides formation in designing engines.

3. Particulate matter emitted from motor vehicles includes lead, smoke, and polynuclear hydrocarbons. Fuel modification may be the most direct way to reduce or eliminate lead emissions, but NAPCA also is exploring the potential value of devices that would remove all types of particulate matter from automobile exhaust gases. NAPCA has established specifications for acceptable devices and, following review of various proposals, is negotiating a research and development contract in this area. This project will be the first step in a 3- to 4-year program of laboratory work, prototype hardware development, and on-the-road demonstrations.

4. NAPCA is participating in a 3-year, Government-industry research program to develop new knowledge of factors that have a bearing on the nature, effects, and control of motor vehicle pollution. This program is sponsored by the Coordinating Research Council; the other participants are the Automobile Manufacturers Association and the American Petroleum Institute. NAPCA pro-

vides funding for selected projects on the basis of their relationship to its own program. Projects for which NAPCA is contributing funds include studies of fuel volatility, gasoline additives, diesel odor composition, urban driving patterns, and maintenance of exhaust control systems.

5. NAPCA is contributing to the support of research by the Bureau of Mines on the relationship of fuel composition to total emissions from gasoline-fueled engines and the photochemical reactivity of such emissions. This work includes studies of fuel-emission relationships in both gasoline-fueled and diesel engines.

6. NAPCA's efforts relating to unconventional engines began more than 2 years ago with contract-supported studies to evaluate the potential of a variety of possible propulsion systems for motor vehicles. These studies identified the Rankine-cycle (steam) engine as one of the most promising. Accordingly, NAPCA currently is negotiating a contract for the development of a conceptual design of a Rankine-cycle engine intended specifically for use in passenger cars.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2276

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 104(c) of the Clean Air Act is amended by striking out "the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969" and inserting in lieu thereof "each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1969, and June 30, 1970".

TO AMEND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BAIL AGENCY ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 545) to amend section 9 of the District of Columbia Bail Agency Act which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 4 of the District of Columbia Bail Agency Act (80 Stat. 327) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(g) The Agency shall assume the responsibility for supervising all persons released on nonsurety release, including but not limited to, release on personal recognizance, personal bond, other nonfinancial conditions, cash deposit with the registry of the court or percentage deposit with the registry of the court, and shall receive written notice of such releases from and by the appropriate court. Such supervision may include but not be limited to that necessary to maintain adequate contact with the release to insure notification as provided in subsection (h) of this section and compliance with other conditions of release, and the Agency shall report where applicable noncompliance with such other conditions of release to the appropriate court.

"(h) The Agency shall assume the responsibility for notifying all persons released on nonsurety releases, including but not limited to, release on personal recognizance, personal bond, other nonfinancial conditions, cash deposit with the registry of the court or percentage deposit with the registry of the court, of their next required court appearance date which shall be made available to the Agency within a reasonable time not less than five working days prior to such appearance date by the court having the responsibility for the next required court appearance date. In addition to the above this section shall apply to those persons indicted as Grand Jury Originals for whom no release condition has yet been determined."

SEC. 2. Section 9 of the District of Columbia Bail Agency Act is amended by deleting "$130,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$360,000".

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to amend the District of Columbia Bail Agency Act (80 Stat. 327)."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–287), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to require the District of Columbia Bail Agency to supervise criminal defendants released under the Bail Agency Act to insure that they conform to the conditions of their release and actually appear for trial. In addition, the bill requires courts in the District of Columbia to notify the Bail Agency when defendants are released and whenever a court appearance date is set for such a defendant. The bill would increase the Bail Agency's authorization from the present $130,000 per year to $360,000 a year in order to provide sufficient personnel to carry out the purposes of that act and this bill.

BACKGROUND OF THE LEGISLATION

S. 545 would fill a critical gap in the District of Columbia Bail Agency procedures. The District of Columbia Bail Agency was created in 1966 to prepare prebail reports to any judicial officer in the District concerning defendants seeking release under nonmoney bail conditions.

Presently, however, the agency has no authority to supervise anyone who is actually released subsequent to such a report. As it now stands in the District, no one is required to follow up on defendants on nonfinancial pretrial release to assure they conform to the release conditions imposed by the judge, or even that they show up for trial.

S. 545 would help remedy this gap. It would increase from $130,000 to $360,000 the authorization for employing bail agency personnel. The present bail agency staff of 15 includes 10 field workers. This bill would permit, as funds were appropriated, adequate increases in the Agency staff to meet the new requirements imposed by this bill.

S. 545 would require the Bail Agency to supervise all persons released under the Bail Act to assure they conform to the conditions of their release and appear for trial. Last year, about 3,800 defendants were released on nonmoney bail. These are the defendants this bill authorizes the Bail Agency to supervise.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

As introduced, S. 545 merely increases the Agency authorization from $130,000 to $360,000. The hearing adduced the need for a substantive amendment which the committee has made to the Bail Act to authorize the Agency to use the additional funds for post release supervision of defendants prior to trial.

PROHIBITING THE BUSINESS OF DEBT ADJUSTING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 1458) to prohibit the business of debt adjusting in the District of Columbia except as an incident to the lawful practice of law or as an activity engaged in by a nonprofit corporation or association was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1458

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, as used in this Act, the term—

(1) "Debt adjusting" means an activity whether referred to by the term "budget counseling", "budget planning", budget service", "credit advising", "debt adjusting", "debt counseling", "debt help", "financial adjusting", "financial arranging", "prorating", or some other term of like import, which involves a particular debtor's entering into an express or implied contract whereby the debtor agrees to pay an amount or amounts of money periodically or otherwise to a person who agrees, for a consideration, to distribute such money among specified creditors in accordance with a plan agreed upon between the debtor and the person to whom the debtor makes or agrees to make such payments.

(2) "Person" does not include an individual admitted to the bar of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

(3) "Partnership" does not include a partnership all the members of which are admitted to the bar of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. Except as provided in section 3, no person, partnership, association, or corporation shall engage in the business of debt adjusting in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. The provisions of this Act shall not apply to those situations involving debt adjusting incurred incidentally in the lawful practice of law in the District of Columbia nor shall anything in this Act be construed to apply to any nonprofit or charitable corporation or association which engages in debt adjusting even though the nonprofit corporation or association may charge and collect nominal sums as reimbursement for expenses in connection with such services.

SEC. 4. (a) Whoever violates section 2 of this Act shall be subject to a fine of not more than $1,000 and to imprisonment for not more than six months, or to both.

(b) Prosecutions for violations of this Act shall be conducted in the name of the District of Columbia by the Corporation Counsel or any of his assistants.

Mr. MANSFIED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–288), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of S. 1458 is to prohibit the business of "debt adjusting" in the District of Columbia.

The business of debt adjusting, also known by several other names, involves an agreement by a debtor to pay money periodically to the adjuster who agrees in return for a fee paid by the debtor to apportion the money among the creditors of his client. The adjuster does not advance or lend money to the debtor.

This bill is identical to S. 1739, passed by the Senate July 19, 1968.

HEARINGS

Public hearings on this legislation were held by the Subcommittee on Business and Commerce on August 25, 1967, and February 1, 1969.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

A series of articles appearing in the Washington Star in 1967 called attention to the deceptive commercial practices of many so-called debt consolidators in the Washington area.

Debt adjusters persuade debtors to refrain from making direct payments to their creditors and instead to make payments to the adjuster. They, in turn, pay the creditors but only after taking a substantial premium from the debtor's payments. The debtor receives no real benefit from this arrangement. Instead he adds a new creditor—the adjuster—to an overwhelming list of his creditors.

Debt consolidation has nothing in common with moneylending institutions or credit-counseling services. A debt adjuster lends no money; he only takes it. In the process, he may mislead the harried debtor into believing that his creditors will all be repaid at once.

As a result of its hearings on S. 1458, the committee has concluded that the business of debt adjusting should be prohibited in the District of Columbia. Several facts have influenced the committee to reach this result:

1. The fee charged by the adjuster for his services, which may be 10 or 12 percent of each payment in addition to an initial conference fee, adds to the financial burden of the debtor and thereby postpones the day when the client will be debt-free.

2. The benefits to the debtor from using a debt adjuster are questionable. Debt adjusters do not lend money, nor do they stop the imposition of finance charges by paying off the creditors immediately. Most debt consolidators do not make any attempt to counsel their clients or set up budgets for them. It is sometimes the case that the adjusters do not assure that the debt payment plan they devise will meet the demands of the creditors or leave the debtors enough money on which to live.

3. By promising quick results that cannot be attained, debt adjusters deter debtors from seeking the financial counseling they need. The committee was informed that in many situations debtors need counseling and assistance in setting up a budget more than they need prorating of outstanding debts. The adjuster charges a fee based on his prorating activity, so it follows that many adjusters concern themselves only with this aspect of the task of helping the clients climb out of debt.

4. Deceptive advertising is often used to obtain clients. Copies of newspaper advertisements presented to the committee imply incorrectly that the consolidator would pay off the debtor's bills immediately and collect from the debtor in small installments. Significantly, these advertisements often fail to specify the total number of installments, the amount of the service charge, or the portion of each installment that would be applied to the outstanding debts. The potential client sees only a quick and easy way out of debt through payment of one weekly installment.

Witnesses representing the debt adjusting business testified that they favored regulation of the industry to eliminate some objectionable features and to control other practices. They testified that in the 10 States where the debt adjusting business is regulated, adjusters perfom a useful public service free from sharp dealing and corrupt practices.

The committee believes that simple regulation of debt adjusting cannot adequately protect the public. To be effective, regulation would require detailed and constant auditing of accounts of the numerous small debtors doing business with the adjusters. Moreover, the committee does not believe that debt consolidators offer any useful service that should be fostered by the official approval implied by regulation.

The practices of the debt-adjusting business have proved to be of sufficient concern in other parts of the country that it has been prohibited in 25 States, including Maryland and Virginia, and the city of Baltimore, and regulated in 10 other States.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

The first section of S. 1458 defines the term "debt adjusting" and other terms sometimes used for this activity. This section excludes attorneys and law partnerships from the definition in accordance with the provisions of section 3.

Section 2 prohibits the business of debt adjusting in the District of Columbia, except as provided in section 3.

Section 3 excludes from the prohibition those situations involving debt adjusting incurred incidentally in the lawful practice of law in the District.

The committee believes that debtors finding themselves in situations approaching insolvency often need legal assistance to marshal assets and to advise them on the legality of various claims, legal remedies governing the debtor-creditor relationship, and the applicability of the Bankruptcy Act.

Section 3 also provides that the act shall not apply to debt adjusting services performed by nonprofit or charitable organizations, even though the organization may charge nominal amounts as reimbursement for expenses.

In many States where the debt adjusting business is prohibited, private or public nonprofit agencies provide needed counseling to debtors who encounter difficulty in meeting their obligations. The committee was impressed by testimony concerning the successful operation of the Consumer Credit Counseling Service of Greater Baltimore, Inc., which is a nonprofit counseling service in that city. The Baltimore service is supported by contributions from finance companies, banks, credit unions, merchants, savings and loan companies, and other community-minded companies and individuals. Its policies are established and directed by a board of trustees representing broad community interests and diversified business and professional backgrounds.

The committee believes that counseling, as performed by the Baltimore organization, and to some extent in Washington by the Community Services Committee of the Central Labor Council and other nonprofit groups, can be a valuable service that could aid consumers who have gotten into trouble. The committee believes that such nonprofit service is useful to debtors seeking advice on how to manage their debts, without increasing them further.

Section 4 makes a violation of the act a misdemeanor punishable by a fine of not more than $1,000, imprisonment for not more than 6 months, or both.

CONSTITUTIONALITY

The Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of *Ferguson* v. *Skrupa*, 372 U.S. 726 (1963) upheld the constitutionality of a similar statute enacted in Kansas. The Court decision upheld specifically the prohibition and the exception for lawyers contained in this bill.

CONCLUSION

The committee believes that the business of debt adjusting is of such a nature as to lend itself to grave abuses against distressed debtors. The committee did not find economic justification for the so-called service provided by professional debt adjusters.

Accordingly, the committee urges that S. 1458 be enacted.

THE NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1969

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill S. 2185 to authorize a Federal contribution for the effectuation of a transit development program for the National Capital region, and to further the objectives of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 663) and Public Law 89–774 (80 Stat. 1324), which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments, on page 2, line 23, after the word "contributions" strike out "shall not exceed the lower amount of $1,047,044,000, or two-thirds of the net project cost of the adopted regional system less the $100,000,000 authorized to be appropriated in section 5(a)(1) of the Act of September 8, 1965 (Public Law 89–173; 79 Stat. 663)." and insert, "including the $100,000,000 authorized to be appropriated in section 5(a)(1) of the Act of September 8, 1965 (Public Law 89–173; 79 Stat. 663), shall not exceed the lower amount of $1,147,044,000, or two-thirds of the net project cost of the adopted regional system."; on page 5, line 23, after the word "Columbia" strike out "such amounts necessary" and insert "$166,500,000"; and on page 7, after line 8, insert a new section, as follows:

STUDY OF DULLES AIRPORT EXTENSION

SEC. 9. (a) The Secretary of the Department of Transportation is hereby authorized to contract with the Transit Authority for a comprehensive study of the feasibility, including preliminary engineering, of extending a transit line in the median of the Dulles Airport Road from the vicinity of Route 7 on the I–66 Route of the adopted regional system to the Dulles International Airport.

(b) The study to be undertaken pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall be completed within six months after execution of the contract authorized therein at a cost not in excess of $150,000, and there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $150,000 to carry out the purposes of this section.

So as to make the bill read:

S. 2185

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. That this Act may be cited as the "National Capital Transportation Act of 1969".

DEFINITION

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act—

(a) "Transit Authority" means the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority established by title III of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Regulation Compact (80 Stat. 1324).

(b) "Adopted Regional System" means that system described in the Transit Authority's report entitled "Adopted Regional Rapid Rail Transit Plan and Program, March 1, 1968 (Revised February 7, 1969)", as the same may hereafter be altered, revised, or amended in accordance with Public Law 89–774 (80 Stat. 1324).

AUTHORIZATION FOR FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

SEC. 3. (a) In order to provide for the Federal share of the cost of the adopted regional system, which system supersedes that heretofore authorized by the Congress in the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965, as amended, the Secretary of the Department of Transportation is authorized to make annual contributions to the Transit Authority under this section in amounts sufficient to finance in part the construction of the adopted regional system by the Transit Authority: *Provided,* That the aggregate amount of such Federal contributions, including the $100,000,000 authorized to be appropriated in section 5(a)(1) of the Act of September 8, 1965 (Public Law 89–173; 79 Stat. 663), shall not exceed the lower amount of $1,147,044,000, or two-thirds of the net project cost of the adopted regional system.

(b) Such Federal contributions shall be subject to the following limitations and conditions:

(1) The work for which appropriations are authorized herein shall be subject to the provisions of Public Law 89–774 and shall be carried out substantially in accordance with the plans and schedules for the adopted regional system.

(2) The aggregate amount of such Federal contributions on or prior to the last day of any given fiscal year shall be matched by the local participating governments by payment of the local share of capital contributions required for the period ending with the last day of such year in a total amount not less than 50 per centum of the amount of such Federal contributions.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Transportation, without fiscal year limitation, not to exceed $1,047,044,000 to carry out the purposes of this Act: *Provided*, That the appropriations authorized herein shall be in addition to the appropriations authorized in section 5(a)(1) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 665).

CONSTRUCTION APPROVALS

SEC. 5. (a) No portion of any rail rapid transit line or related facility authorized hereunder shall be constructed within the United States Capitol Grounds except upon approval of the Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol.

(b) All construction pursuant to this Act in, on, under, or over public space in the District of Columbia under the jurisdiction of the Commissioner of the District of Columbia shall, in the interest of public convenience and safety, be performed in accordance with schedules agreed upon between the Transit Authority and the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, to the end that such construction work will be coordinated with other construction work in such public space, and the Commissioner shall so exercise his jurisdiction and control over such public space as to facilitate the Transit Authority's use and occupation thereof for the purposes of this Act.

REPAYMENT FROM EXCESS REVENUES

SEC. 6. To the extent that revenues or other receipts derived from or in connection with the ownership or operation of the adopted regional system (other than service payments under transit service agreements executed between the Transit Authority and local political subdivisions, the proceeds of bonds or other evidences of indebtedness; and capital contributions received by the Transit Authority), are excess to the amounts necessary to make all payments and deposits, including debt service, operating and maintenance expenses, and deposits in reserves, required or permitted by the terms of any contract of the Transit Authority with or for the benefit of holders of its bonds, notes, or other evidences of indebtedness issued for any purpose relating to the transit system, other than extensions thereof, two-thirds of such excess revenues shall, at the end of each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year in which the adopted regional system (exclusive of extensions) is first put into substantially full revenue service, be paid into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 7. (a) To finance the District of Columbia share of the cost of the adopted regional system, the Commissioner of the District of Columbia is authorized to contract with the Transit Authority to make annual capital contributions under this section aggregating not to exceed $216,500,000, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of the general fund of the District of Columbia $166,500,000 to carry out the purposes of this section, and to remain available until expended.

(b) Section 9–220(b)(3) of the District of Columbia Code is amended by striking the first clause of the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "$216,500,000 of the principal amount of the loans authorized to be made to the Commissioner under this subsection shall be utilized to carry out the purposes of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1969: *Provided*, That the District of Columbia may exceed by an amount of not more than $166,500,000, the limitation on the aggregate indebtedness established pursuant to this Act;".

(c) The appropriations authorized in subsection (a) of this section shall be in addition to the appropriations authorized on behalf of the District of Columbia in section 5(a)(2) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965.

(d) The Commissioner of the District of Columbia is further authorized to contract with the Transit Authority for the service to be provided by the adopted regional system and to pay in accordance with the terms thereof the District of Columbia's share of any operating deficiency of the adopted regional system.

REPEAL AND AMENDMENT OF EXISTING LAWS

SEC. 8. (a) The following laws are repealed:

(1) The Act of December 20, 1967 (Public Law 90–220; 81 Stat. 670).

(2) Sections 3, 4, and 5(b) of the Act of September 8, 1965 (Public Law 89–173; 79 Stat. 664–666).

(3) The Act of July 14, 1960 (Public Law 86–669; 74 Stat. 537).

(b) Section 5(a) of the Act of September 8, 1965 (Public Law 89–173; 76 Stat. 665), is amended by striking the phrase "authorized in section 3 hereof" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "of the adopted regional system".

STUDY OF DULLES AIRPORT EXTENSION

SEC. 9. (a) The Secretary of the Department of Transportation is hereby authorized to contract with the Transit Authority for a comprehensive study of the feasibility, including preliminary engineering, of extending a transit line in the median of the Dulles Airport Road from the vicinity of Route 7 on the I–66 Route of the adopted regional system to the Dulles International Airport.

(b) The study to be undertaken pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall be completed within six months after execution of the contract authorized therein at a cost not in excess of $150,000, and there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $150,000 to carry out the purposes of this section.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 289), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

SUMMARY AND PURPOSE OF BILL

The purpose of this bill, unanimously approved by your committee, is to authorize a Federal contribution for the effectuation of a Transit Development Program for the National Capital region, and to further the objectives of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 663) and Public Law 89–774 (80 Stat. 1324).

The bill would authorize the Secretary of the Department of Transportation to make annual contributions to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority to provide for the Federal share of the cost of the "Adopted Regional Rapid Rail Transit Plan and Program, March 1, 1968 (revised February 7, 1969)." The aggregate amount of the Federal contributions under the bill would be limited to the lower amount of $1,147,044,000 including $100 million authorized to be appropriated in the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965, or two-thirds of the net project cost of the adopted regional system.

BACKGROUND OF THE LEGISLATION

This legislation is the product of nearly two decades of congressional concern over oppressive traffic congestion and its negative effects on the physical character, economic growth, and social well-being of the Nation's Capital.

This concern has been in constant evidence since 1952 when the Congress approved the National Capital Planning Act authorizing studies of the transportation need of the National Capital region. Three years later, Congress approved and funded a half-million-dollar survey, the results of which recommended rapid rail transit facilities as an integral part of a balanced transportation system.

In 1960, with the results of that survey before it, the Congress enacted the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960 creating the National Capital Transportation Agency. In taking this action, however, the Congress indicated that the ultimate responsible body should be an interstate authority. Pending creation of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, the National Capital Transportation Agency went ahead with plans for a rapid rail transit system. In 1962, the NCTA submitted a transit development program to President Kennedy. This program underwent substantial revision during the ensuing years and ultimately a 25 mile basic system was approved by Congress in 1965 along with authorization of $150 million of Federal and District of Columbia funds to initiate work on the system.

As NCTA pursued its responsibility for development of the rapid rail transit system authorized by Congress, representatives of Maryland, Virginia, the District of Columbia, and the Federal Government continued their efforts to create an interstate compact to establish a successor regional agency in accordance with the desire expressed by Congress in the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960. These efforts resulted, in 1966, in the creation of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority WMATA by interstate compact among Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia with the consent of Congress. The newly created WMATA assumed the functions and duties—and most of the staff—of NCTA on October 1, 1967. By March 1, 1968, the WMATA had adopted a regional rapid rail transit plan and program with the concurrence of all of the local political subdivisions. The WMATA then embarked on a net income analysis and a preliminary engineering study of the plan adopted on March 1. On February 7, 1969, the WMATA adopted a slightly revised physical plan and a financial plan as a proposal to all of the interested governmental entities.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND PUBLIC REACTION TO THE PROGRAM

S. 2185 was introduced in the Senate on May 16, 1969, by Senator Joseph D. Tydings, for himself, Senators Bible, Eagleton, Goodell, Mathias, Prouty, and Spong, the entire membership of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia. A companion bill, H.R. 11193, was introduced in the House of Representatives on May 13, 1969, by Congressman Fuqua for himself and nine other members of the House Committee on the District of Columbia. Joint hearings were held before both committees on June 10 and 11, 1969. Testimony was heard from the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Undersecretary, Department of Transporta-

tion, the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, representatives of the suburban transit commissions and of the Washington business community.

Supporting statements were filed by labor organizations, citizens groups, and representatives of local governments.

At an executive session of your committee on July 1, 1969, the bill won unanimous approval of all members of the committee, when it was ordered reported with amendments to the Senate.

It is your committee's belief that the joint hearings held by the Senate and House Committees on the District of Columbia, as well as the entire legislative history behind this project, demonstrate beyond doubt that the regional rapid rail transit plan and program has the overwhelming support of the Federal and District of Columbia governments. The local governments of the National Capital region have expressed their support of the program by committing themselves to millions of dollars both for the planning and the construction of the transit system. The people of the Washington metropolitan area have demonstrated their support of the program by voting overwhelmingly to tax themselves to bring rapid rail to the region.

URGENCY OF THE SITUATION

The streets and highways of the Nation's Capital and of the suburbs are beset by massive traffic congestion during the rush hours. The delays encountered in moving from home to work and back are becoming enormous. The statistics emphasize the magnitude of the problem. In 1960 this region had a population of some 2 million. By 1980 there will be 3.5 million, and by the year 2000, a population of some 5 million people is projected. There are more than 800,000 automobiles in the region today. It is estimated that by 1980, there will be an additional 1 million vehicles traversing the streets and highways of the region.

Traffic congestion is extremely serious today. It will become appalling in the years ahead, unless we move forward promptly with the development of an areawide system of exclusive right-of-way, high-speed, high-capacity rapid rail transit.

THE ADOPTED REGIONAL TRANSIT PLAN

The routes and related facilities of the regional rapid rail transit system authorized by this bill are described in some detail elsewhere in this report and even more fully in the report of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority entitled "Adopted Regional Rapid Rail Transit Plan and Program, March 1, 1968 (revised Feb. 7, 1969)." This report, together with documents entitled "Preliminary Design and Capital Costs, Adopted Regional System, 1968, Revised February 1969," and "Traffic Revenues and Operating Costs, Adopted Regional System, 1968, Revised February 1969" have been submitted by the Authority for the files of the committee.

Briefly, the transit system which would be authorized by this bill is a 97.7-mile network of rapid rail transit facilities serving the Nation's Capital and the nearby areas of Maryland and Virginia. It includes 37.7 miles of service within the District of Columbia, 29.9 miles in Maryland, and 30.1 miles in Virginia.

The system has 86 stations. Forty-four stations are in the District of Columbia. Twenty-two are in Maryland and the remaining 20 are in Virginia. Fifty-three stations will be in subway. The remaining 33 will be at surface or on aerial structures.

Metro will operate entirely on exclusive rights-of-way uninterrupted by other rail vehicles or at-grade traffic crossings.

Forty-seven miles of the system, mostly in the highly developed central portion, will be constructed below surface. Forty-two miles will be on surface utilizing, wherever feasible, existing rights-of-way along established rail lines or in the medians of highways. The remaining 8 miles will be on aerial structure, mostly for the purpose of grade separation.

Metro contains three principal through routes. All three traverse the District of Columbia. In certain instances, the routes branch as they reach into suburban areas to permit broader coverage of the region.

Convenient transfer points linking the three independent lines are provided at four double-level stations: Metro Center at 12th and G Streets NW.; Gallery Place at Seventh and G Streets NW.; L'Enfant Plaza at Seventh and D Streets SW.; and Fort Totten at Riggs Road and B. & O. Railroad. Transfer will also be possible by means of a walkway connecting the two stations at Farragut Square.

Facilties for parking 30,000 automobiles will be provided at 37 Metro stations. Spaces will be available for 5,000 vehicles in the District of Columbia, 11,000 in Virginia, and 14,000 in Maryland.

The equipment to be used in the Metro system will be the most modern. The Metro passenger car will be a comfortable, air conditioned, reliable, high-performance vehicle incorporating the latest proven engineering advances. A total of 658 vehicles will be required for full operation of the 97.7-mile system.

The train control and communications system will reflect the ultimate proven technique of the state of the art. Automatic train control will permit the trains to operate with high precision and efficiency. Each train will be attended by an operator who can override the electronics when necessary. The capability for automatic operation will permit the operator to answer questions and supervise passenger activity. The operator will also be able to communicate by radio with the train control supervisor. The automatic train control and communications systems will have three subsystems: (1) automatic train protection which guarantees the safety of passengers and equipment by regulating train speed and spacing; (2) automatic train operation which starts and stops trains and opens doors; and (3) automatic train supervision which monitors train performance throughout the system.

The automatic fare collection system will have fare vending equipment, money changers, fare gates, and coders as basic equipment.

Metro will be a visual asset to the National Capital region. All elements of the system will be designed to enhance the appearance of the area. The architectural concept has received the endorsement of the Commission of Fine Arts. It calls for station design in the District of Columbia to be in keeping with the classic public architecture of the Federal City. The stations will be air conditioned and extensive acoustical treatment will dampen the sounds of trains. Escalators will transport passengers from surface to mezzanine and then to platforms for boarding.

Service will be fast, frequent, and comfortable. Trains will run every 2 minutes on the main lines during peak hours. The system is expected to carry 293 million riders annually by 1990. Service will be provided over a 20-hour period from 5 a.m. to 1 a.m. Train schedules during typical weekday peak periods will consist of 2- to 4-minute service. During the base day, trains will run every 6 minutes and, during early morning and late evening hours, every 10 minutes.

OPERATION TIMETABLE

Your committee was advised that within 75 days after receipt of construction funds, the Authority will commence construction of the regional transit system. Its 10-year timetable for construction of the entire system establishes 1972 as the target date for initial operation of the regional system. That schedule anticipates that the entire 97.7-mile system will be in full operation by the end of 1979. Operations will commence in six phases. The phased operation technique will allow people to use the system as early as possible, thus maximizing revenues. The Authority's schedule contemplates six construction and operational phases of the 97.7-mile system for which all preliminary engineering is complete. By December 1972, phase I will be operational from north of Rhode Island Station to Union Station and across to Connecticut Avenue and north to Dupont Circle. In December 1973, service will be extended from north of Rhode Island Station to north of Silver Spring Station; and from south of 12th and Independence Station to the Pentagon City Station—1 year later, December 1974, the Huntington route south of Pentagon City the I–66 route from Rosslyn to the Courthouse Station; the Rockville route between Dupont Circle and Parkside and the entire Ardmore route will be operational—phase 4 will be complete by December 1976, from Courthouse Station to Route 7; Chillum Station to Pentagon Station (including the second river crossing) and from L'Enfant Plaza to Waterfront Station—phase 5, to be operational by December 1978, extends the system from Waterfront station to Branch Avenue; from Parkside Station to Rockville; and from Route 7 Station to Nutley Road Station. The final segments will be complete and operational by December 1979, from Chillum to Greenbelt Station; from north of Silver Spring to Glenmont; from Kenilworth to Addison Road; from Telegraph Road Yard to Backlick Road and the Franconia route.

FINANCING THE SYSTEM

The plan adopted by the WMATA for financing construction of the regional rapid rail transit plan calls for capital costs to be financed, to the extent possible, through revenues from the operation of the system. The remaining costs are to be shared among the Federal Government and the local jurisdictions within the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Zone.

The cost of the system is estimated at $2,494.6 million. Net interest during construction will amount to $60.9 million, increasing the total project cost to $2,555.5 million. Approximately one-third of the total project cost will be financed through sysem revenues. The Authority anticipates that net revenues of Metro will support issuance of revenue bonds during the construction period amounting to $835 million. Revenue bonds issued by the Authority would have a maturity of not more than 50 years and will be secured by a pledge of the gross revenue of the system. These bonds will have a coverage factor of 1.2 times net revenue before depreciation.

Because the revenue bonds are secured by a pledge of the gross revenues of the transit operation, provisions are made for meeting operating expenses in the event of a deficiency of revenues to pay both debt service and operating costs. To provide for such contingency, long-term service contracts will be entered into with suburban transit commissions or local units of government under which each entity will contract with the Authority for transit services in and for its area. In return for such services, the compact members will pay an allocated share of any deficiency occurring in revenue available for operating expenses after paying debt service and sinking fund obligations on the bonds. However, the Authority's revenue and operating expense estimates indicate that these service contracts will not require any local funding.

The remaining net project cost—that amount not covered by revenue bonds—is to be shared by governments. It amounts to $1,720.5 million. Under the congressionally authorized Federal-local matching formula for grants to construct the 25-mile basic sys-

tem, the Federal share is two-thirds of the net project cost. Extension of this formula to the Metro system will result in a total Federal contribution of $1,147 million or about 45 percent of the total project cost.

The matching formula for Federal and local grants charges local governments with responsibility for $573.5 million. The Authority has adopted a cost allocation formula for sharing this local net project cost among the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia. Suballocation formulas were adopted by the suburban transit commissions for distributing the Maryland and Virginia shares among the local jurisdictions within each transit district. On November 5, 1968, in all area jurisdictions where referendums were required to authorize issuance of bonds to cover each jurisdiction's allocated share of Metro's capital costs, the voters overwhelmingly expressed their willingness to tax themselves to bring rapid rail to the region. These referendums were approved in all five jurisdictions by nearly a 3 to 1 margin.

Your committee considers that the Authority's adopted financial plan adheres to the congressional mandate as well as the expressed provisions of the compact that, as far as possible, the cost of the transit facilities be borne by the persons using and benefiting from them. Your committee has carefully reviewed the Authority's estimates of construction costs, passenger traffic, revenues, and operating expenses. In your committee's judgment, the Authority's estimates have been prepared in a realistic manner and warrant the confidence of the Congress. The proposed contribution of two-thirds, or $1.147 million by the Federal Government and one-third, or $573.5 million by the local jurisdictions follows the pattern for Federal assistance to urban mass transportation improvement programs established in the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964. Financing of the Federal share of the regional rapid rail transit plan through congressional authorization, rather than under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, reflects four very important basic considerations.

(1) It carries forward the historical intent and precedent of the Congress established in the legislative history of this project previously mentioned in this report;

(2) It recognizes the special interest of the Congress in the unique characteristics of the Federal City and its long-range development;

(3) It accords with the desire of the President for early enactment of legislative authority for the construction of a regional transit system as an essential element of his program for the enhancement of the National Capital region; and

(4) It assures congressional oversight of the project by the committee of the Congress having the continuing interest, broad responsibility, and special expertise in the affairs of the Nation's Capital.

Finally, the provision in the Authority's financial plan and expressed in the legislation before the committee, for overpayment from excess revenues generated by operation of the system, is in accord with the intent expressed by this committee in its report on the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965. (S. Rept. 635, 89th Cong., first sess.) Under that provision, to the extent that the transit system once in substantially full operation, produces revenues in excess to amounts necessary to provide for its operating and maintenance expenses, debt service on the Authority's revenue bonds, and deposits in reserves, two-thirds of such excess revenues will be paid to miscellaneous receipts of the United States. The remaining one-third will be returned to the local jurisdictions in proportion to their capital contributions.

The Authority's traffic, revenue, and operating cost projections and its construction estimates have been prepared by nationally recognized consulting firms experienced in the transit field. The reports of these firms have been made available to your committee and are preserved in the committee files.

ESTIMATED RIDERSHIP

Briefly, as indicated in the aforesaid reports, an extensive analysis of ridership was undertaken utilizing the latest available regional data regarding population, employment growth, and levels of income and the most up-to-date proven computer techniques. This analysis resulted in an estimate that the percentage of persons using public transportation to downtown Washington in peak hours would be raised from an estimated 40 percent in 1965 to 60 percent of a larger population once the transit system is introduced. This estimate is comparable to the percentages that prevail in other cities with rail transit systems.

During the peak period, 86 percent of all 1990 transit trips would use rail services for at least part of the trip and 90–97 percent of all trips originating in individual Maryland and Virginia suburbs would use the rail service.

The analysis of total traffic demands in 1990 included data on passenger volumes for peak hours and for the average weekday as well as annual volumes. Total Metro ridership for the year 1990 is estimated at 292,610,000. Average weekday patronage amounts to 959,000, and the average for a peak 2-hour morning period is 252,500. A clear majority of these patrons will use the combined bus-rail system.

REVENUES

Total fare box revenue for the year 1990 is estimated at $124.2 million. Anticipated allocation to the private bus companies for their share of bus-rail joint fares is $37.9 million, resulting in net fare box revenue of $86.3 million. It is estimated that revenue accruing from parking, concession leases, and similar activities will amount to $3.1 million for an adjusted gross revenue of $89.4 million. Operating and maintenance expenses of $32 million reduces the net revenue before depreciation to $57.4 million. Net revenue after allowance for depreciation of $6.7 million is $50.7 million. Comparable figures have been computed for each year of the anticipated 50-year maturities of the Authority's revenue bonds. Based on these net revenue figures the Authority's financial consultants advise that Metro operations will support issuance of revenue bonds during the construction period amounting to $835 million. The Authority's revenue forecasts assume a fair structure approximating that which presently exists with respect to bus transit in the region. The forecasts also assume free transfers between bus and rail facilities and an even division of fares between bus and rail.

OPERATING EXPENSES

Estimated operating costs are based on the fiscal characteristics of the system, the plan of operation, the standards of the Authority, and practices of other systems. Again, a detailed analysis of these estimates appears in the Authority's previously mentioned report entitled "Traffic, Revenue, and Operating Costs." Both operating costs and fares were based upon comparable prices with the assumption that escalation would thus be neutralized. Given all cost-of-operation factors, total annual operating expenses by 1990 are projected at $32 million. Including depreciation, total operating expenses for 1990 will approximate $38.7 million. Operating cost estimates were also prepared for each year throughout the life of the Authority's revenue bonds.

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENTS

First, section 3(a) is amended to make it clear that the Federal contribution to the Authority may not exceed $1,147,044,000, including the $100 million authorized to be appropriated in the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965, and in no event shall the Federal contribution exceed two-thirds of the net project cost of the adopted regional system should the net project of the system turn out to be less than that which is presently estimated.

Second, section 7(a) of the bill has been amended to make it clear that the appropriations authorized under that section on behalf of the District of Columbia are limited to $166,500,000. This amendment was considered necessary because of the preservation of the $50 million appropriation authorization preserved in subsection (c) of section 7 contained in the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965. Together, the two appropriation authorizations equal the $216,500,000 District of Columbia allocated share of local net project cost.

Third, section 9(a) of the bill was added by the committee to provide $150,000 for studying the feasibility of a rapid rail line between Dulles Airport and the main metro system utilizing the median of the Dulles access highway. The amendment was introduced by Senator Spong and had the support of the Department of Transportation, the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, the National Capital Airports Bureau, and the Air Transport Association. All these agencies agreed that a rapid rail line is needed to improve utilization of Dulles which has operated at an average annual loss to the Federal Government of $7 million. The line would be constructed on right-of-way owned by the Federal Government and would be designed to mate with the main metro system.

CONCLUSION

Your committee believes that this proposed legislation represents the culmination of many years of cooperative effort by the Federal Government, Maryland, Virginia, the District of Columbia and the local governments in the Washington metropolitan area to effect a solution of the transportation problem in the National Capital region by means of a regional rapid rail transit system. President Nixon supports the program which would be made possible by this legislation as being vital and essential to the welfare of our National Capital. His immediate three predecessors in office have similarly supported a program of the same kind.

That a rail rapid transit system for the Washington metropolitan area is absolutely essential, there can be no doubt. Years of exhaustive studies by various agencies and extensive congressional hearings have confirmed this conclusion.

Washington's rapid growth demands early implementation of a balanced transportation system involving rapid rail transit, bus service, and an efficient freeway network. The metro rapid transit system is a vital element of such a balanced system.

It is the considered judgment of your committee that there is a manifest and urgent public need for this legislation. The time for action is now. The soundness of the investment is clear. A regional rapid rail transit plan and program is essential for the continued and effective performance of the functions of the Government of the United States, for the welfare of the District of Columbia, for the orderly growth and development of the National Capital region, and for the preservation of the beauty and dignity of the Nation's Capital. Accordingly, your committee recommends the prompt enactment of the bill with the reported amendments.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2546) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1970 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval

vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to authorize the construction of test facilities at Kwajalein Missile Range, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1969

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1072) to authorize funds to carry out the purposes of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended, and title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works, with an amendment, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

TITLE I—APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1969

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the "Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 1969".

SEC. 102. Subsection (b) of section 105 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (hereinafter referred to as "the Act") is amended to read as follows:

"(b) To carry out this section there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commission, to be available until expended, not to exceed $1,900,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1971. Not to exceed $475,000 of such authorization shall be available for the expenses of the Federal cochairman, his alternate, and his staff."

SEC. 103. Subsection (g) of section 201 of the Act as amended is amended to read as follows:

"(g)(1) To carry out this section there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, to be available until expended, $175,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; $175,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; $175,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; and $170,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973. Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (c), not to exceed $150,000,000 of such funds may be used for engineering work and advance right-of-way acquisition on sections of the development highway system whose actual construction is not expected to be accomplished under the authorization herein.

"(2) Funds authorized in this section shall be available for obligation on the first day of the fiscal year for which authorized, and shall remain available until expended. Funds appropriated under this section shall be available for payment of such obligations."

SEC. 104. (a) The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 202 of the Act is amended to read as follows: "(a) In order to demonstrate the value of adequate health facilities and services to the economic development of the region, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make grants for the planning, construction, equipment, and operation of multi-county demonstration health, nutrition, and child care projects, including hospitals, regional health diagnostic and treatment centers and other facilities and services necessary for the purposes of this section."

(b) The second sentence of subsection (c) of such section is amended by striking out "50 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "75 per centum".

(c) Subsection (e) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(e) In order to provide for the further development of the Appalachian region's human resources, grants under this section shall give special emphasis to:

"(1) Project components demonstrating the value of coordinated investments in early childhood health, nutrition, and education in the region. From funds appropriated pursuant to this Act and under such conditions as the Commission may establish, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to pay to a State which has a plan approved under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (in addition to amounts prescribed to be paid to such State under section 403(a)(3)(A) of the Social Security Act) not more than 60 per centum of the non-Federal share (as determined under section 403(a)(3)(A) of the Social Security Act) of expenditures for the furnishing of the services described in clauses (14) and (15) of section 402(a) of the Social Security Act which the Commission determines will assist in carrying out the demonstration projects authorized by this section and with respect to which the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, pursuant to section 1115 of the Social Security Act, has waived compliance with section 402(a)(1) of the Social Security Act; and

"(2) Programs and research for the early detection, diagnosis, and treatment of occupational diseases arising from coal mining, such as black lung."

SEC. 105. (a) Clause (2) of section 205(a) of this Act is amended by striking out the phrase "in accordance with the" and inserting in lieu thereof "or to make grants to the States for carrying out such projects, in accordance with the applicable".

(b) Subsection (b) of such section is amended by striking out "and 1969" and inserting in lieu thereof "1969, 1970, and 1971".

SEC. 106. Subsection (e) of section 207 of a new section as follows:

"(e) The Secretary is further authorized to provide, or contract with public or private organizations to provide, information, advice, and technical assistance with respect to the construction, rehabilitation, and operation by nonprofit organizations of housing for low or moderate income families in such areas of the region."

SEC. 107. Part A of title II of the Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"COMPREHENSIVE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

"SEC. 208. In order to facilitate the effective use of the Region's manpower and to contribute to full employment of its labor force, the Secretary of Labor is authorized to make grants not to exceed 80 per centum of the costs of manpower survey, recruitment, basic education, training, counseling, and mobility demonstration projects, including projects for training, rehabilitation and retraining of coal miners. Grants shall be made in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act (42 U.S.C. 2571 et seq.) and other laws authorizing grants for manpower development projects without regard to any provision therein relating to appropriation authorization ceilings or to allotments among the States. Grants under this section shall be made solely out of funds specifically appropriated for the purpose of carrying out this Act and shall not be taken into account in the computation of the allotments among the States pursuant to any other provision of law."

SEC. 108. Subsection (c) of section 214 of the Act is amended as follows:

(a) By striking "December 31, 1967" from the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1970";

(b) By adding at the end "For the purpose of this section, any sewage treatment works constructed pursuant to section 8(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act without Federal grant-in-aid assistance under such section shall be regarded as if constructed with such assistance."

SEC. 109. Part B of title II of the Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new section:

"CULTURAL PROGRAMS

"SEC. 215. (a) In order to encourage the development of the cultural resources of the region, the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts and the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities are authorized to make grants to assist the member States of the Commission (1) in supporting existing programs and projects (including productions) in the region which meet the standards enumerated in sections 5 and 7 of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 846; 20 U.S.C. 954); and (2) in developing programs and projects in the arts and humanities in such a manner as will serve all the people of the region. Such grants shall be made in accordance with the applicable provisions of sections 5 and 7 of that Act, for programs and projects which are compatible with State plans approved pursuant to subsection (h) thereof, without regard to any provisions therein relating to appropriation authorization ceilings or to allotments among the States. Grants under this section shall be made solely out of funds specifically appropriated for the purpose of carrying out this Act, and shall not be taken into account in the computation of the allotments among the States made pursuant to any other provision of law.

"(b) No grant shall be made to a State for a workshop production (other than a workshop conducted by a school, college, or university) for which a direct or indirect admission charge is asked if the proceeds, after deducting reasonable costs, are used for purposes other than assisting the grantee to develop high standards of artistic excellence or encourage greater appreciation of the arts and humanities by the people of the region."

SEC. 110. Section 302(a)(1)(B) of the Act is amended by inserting before "a local" the following: "a State agency certified as".

SEC. 111. Section 401 of the Act is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and not to exceed $294,000,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1971, to carry out this Act as follows:

[In millions]

"Section 202. Demonstration Health Projects	$95
"Section 203. Land Stabilization, Conservation, and Erosion Control	15
"Section 205. Mining Area Restoration	15
"Section 207. Housing Assistance	3
"Section 208. Manpower Development	10
"Section 211. Vocational Education	50
"Section 214. Supplemental Grants	90
"Section 215. Cultural Programs	1
"Section 302. Administrative Expenses of Local Development Districts and Research	15"

SEC. 112. Section 405 of the Act is amended by inserting after "Act" the following: ", excepting section 201,".

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE V OF THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the "Regional Action Planning Commission Amendments of 1969".

SEC. 202. Section 501 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3181) is amended by redesignating section 501 as section 501(a) and adding the following new subsection (b):

"(b) Upon resolution of the Committee on Public Works of the Senate or the House of Representatives, the Secretary is directed to study the advisability of altering the geographical area of any region designated under this section, in order to further the purpose of this Act."

SEC. 203. (a) Subsection (a) of section 505 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3185(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"REGIONAL ECONOMIC PLANNING, DEMONSTRATION, AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

"SEC. 505. (a) From the amounts appropriated to the Secretary for each of the regional commissions pursuant to the provisions of section 511 of this title, the Secretary shall provide funds to each commission to enable it to carry out its functions under this Act and to develop recommendations and programs. Such funds shall be available for studies and plans evaluating the needs of, and developing potentialities for, economic growth of such region, and research on improving the conservation and utilization of the human and natural resources of the region, and planning, investigations, studies, demonstration projects and training programs which will further the purposes of this Act. Such activities may be carried out by the commission, through the payment of funds to departments or agencies of the Federal Government, or through the employment of private individuals, partnerships, firms, corporations, or suitable institutions, under contracts entered into for such purposes, or through grants-in-aid to agencies of State or local government. With respect to demonstration projects and training programs, to the maximum extent possible, such activities shall be carried out through departments or agencies of the Federal Government or agencies of State or local government."

(b) The second sentence of subsection (b) of section 505 of such Act is amended to read as follows: "Thereafter, such expenses shall be paid 50 per centum by the Federal Government and 50 per centum by the States in the region, except that the expenses of the Federal Co-Chairman, his alternate, and his staff, shall be paid solely by the Federal Government. The share to be paid by each State shall be determined by the Commission. The Federal Co-Chairman shall not participate or vote in such determination.".

(c) Subsection (c) of section 505 of such Act is repealed.

SEC. 204. Section 506 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3186) is amended by designating it as section 506(a) and by adding the following new subsection (b):

"(b) The Federal Co-Chairman shall establish and at all times maintain his headquarters office in the District of Columbia. He may establish a field office or field offices at such other places within the region as the Commission and the Secretary deem essential to carrying out the functions of the Federal Co-Chairman under this Act."

SEC. 205. (a) Subsection (a) of section 509 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3188a) is amended to read as follows:

"SUPPLEMENTS TO FEDERAL GRANT-IN-AID PROGRAMS

"SEC. 509. (a)(1) In order to enable the States and other entities within economic development regions established under this Act to take maximum advantage of Federal grant-in-aid programs (as hereinafter defined) for which they are eligible but for which, because of their economic situation, they cannot supply the required matching share or for which there are insufficient funds available under the Acts authorizing such programs to meet pressing needs of the region, the Secretary shall, once a comprehensive long-range economic plan established pursuant to clause (2) of section 503(a) is in effect, provide funds to each of the Federal Cochairmen of the regional commissions heretofore or hereafter established under this title, to be used for all or any portion of the basic Federal contribution to projects under such programs authorized by the applicable Federal grant-in-aid law, or for the purpose of increasing the Federal contribution (subject to the limitations of subsection (b) of this section) to projects under such programs above the fixed maximum portion of the cost of such projects otherwise authorized by the applicable law. No program or project authorized under this section shall be implemented until (1) applications and plans relating to the program or project have been determined by the responsible Federal official to be compatible with the provisions and objectives of Federal laws which he administers that are not inconsistent with this Act, and (2) the Regional Commission involved has approved such program or project and has determined that it meets the applicable criteria under section 504 and will contribute to the development of the region, which determination shall be controlling.

"(2) In the case of any program or project for which all or any portion of the basic Federal contribution to the project under a Federal grant-in-aid program is proposed to be made under this section, no such Federal contribution shall be made until the responsible Federal official administering the Federal grant-in-aid Act authorizing such contribution certifies that such program or project meets the applicable requirements of such Federal grant-in-aid Act and could be approved for Federal contribution under such Act if funds were available under such Act for such program or project. Funds may be provided for programs and projects in a State under this subsection only if the Commission determines that the level of Federal and State financial assistance for the same type of programs or projects in that State will not be diminished in order to substitute funds authorized by this subsection. Funds provided pursuant to this Act shall be available without regard to any limitations on authorizations for appropriation in any other Act."

(b) Subsection (c) of such section is amended by striking out in the first sentence thereof "December 31, 1967" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1970".

(c) Subsection (d) of such section is repealed, and subsection (e) thereof is renumbered (d) accordingly.

SEC. 206. Title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended by redesignating section 510 as 513, and inserting immediately after section 509 the following new sections:

"ALASKA

"SEC. 510. Funds appropriated under this title shall be available to assist programs and projects in Alaska in the manner provided for programs and projects in economic development regions established under this title. For the purposes of this title, the Federal Field Committee for Development Planning in Alaska, or any organization hereafter established by the President as a successor thereto, shall be treated as if established as a regional commission, except that the administrative expenses of such Committee or successor organization shall be paid solely by the Federal Government. Nothing contained in this section shall be construed as precluding the establishment of a regional commission for Alaska. At such time as Alaska is designated as a regional commission under this title, it shall be eligible for funds under the provisions of section 512 of this Act.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 511. To carry out this title, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1971, to be available until expended, to the Secretary, not to exceed $50,000,000 for the Ozarks Regional Commission; $75,000,000 for the New England Regional Commission; $45,000,000 for the Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission; $45,000,000 for the Four Corners Regional Commission, $60,000,000 for the Coastal Plains Regional Commission; and $10,000,000 for the Federal Field Committee for Alaska.

"REGIONAL DEVELOPMENTAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS

"SEC. 512. (a) The Secretary of Transportation (hereafter in this section referred to as 'the Secretary') is authorized to assist in the planning and development of regional transportation systems including the construction of development highways, and local access roads, airports, and urban mass transit facilities serving economic development regions established under this title which will further the purposes of this Act. Provisions of Federal law relating to highway and airport construction and mass transportation programs shall apply to such regional development transportation systems to the extent the Secretary determines that such provisions are not inconsistent with this Act. No part of the funds provided to carry out the purposes of this section shall be used for the costs of operation or maintenance of any regional transportation system including development highways, local access roads, airports, railroad commuter service, and other mass transit facilities, except for demonstration projects.

"(b) The Commissions shall transmit to the Secretary designations of (1) the general corridor location and termini of the development highways; (2) local access roads to be constructed; (3) airports to be constructed; and (4) railroad and mass transportation programs to be funded, and shall establish priorities for the development of such transportation systems and other criteria for the program authorized by this section. Before any State member participates in or votes on any highway designations, he shall have obtained the recommendations of the State highway department of the State which he represents.

"(c) No project authorized under this section shall be implemented until (1) applications and plans relating to the project have been determined by the Secretary to be compatible with the provisions and objectives of the applicable Federal law, that are not inconsistent with this Act; and (2) the regional commission involved has approved such project and has determined that it will contribute to the development of the region, which determination shall be controlling.

"(d) On its completion, each development highway not already on the Federal-aid primary system shall be added to such system and each development highway and local access road shall be required to be maintained by the State as provided for Federal-aid highways in title 23, United States Code. Any airports constructed under this section shall be maintained in accordance with the provisions of section 11 of the Federal Airport Act, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1110 (2)).

"(e) Federal assistance to any construction project under this section shall not exceed 50 per centum of the cost of such project, unless the Commission determines that assistance in excess of such percentage is required in furtherance of the purposes of this Act, but in no event shall such Federal assistance exceed 70 per centum of such costs.

"(f) Not more than $20,000,000 from the funds authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for each Commission under section

511 of this Act may be used by such Commission for the purposes of this section."

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

SEC. 301. Title I of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, is further amended as follows:

(a) The first sentence of section 101(c) of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3131(c)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "except that in the case of a grant to an Indian tribe, the Secretary may reduce the non-Federal share below such per centum or may waive the non-Federal share".

(b) Section 105 is amended by striking "June 30, 1969" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1970".

SEC. 302. Section 301 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3151) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) The Secretary is authorized to make grants, enter into contracts or otherwise provide funds for any demonstration project which he determines is designed to foster regional productivity and growth, prevent out-migration, and otherwise carry out the purposes of this Act."

SEC. 303. Section 302 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3152) is amended by striking out "1970." and inserting in lieu thereof "1969, and $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970."

SEC. 304. (a) Subsection (a) of section 401 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3161) is amended by striking out the period at the end of such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following:

"(6) those areas selected for assistance under part D of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964."

(b) Subsection (b)(3) of such section 401 is amended by inserting after "(a)(3)" the following: "or (a)(6)".

(c) Subsection (b)(4) of such section 401 is amended by striking out "and (a)(4)" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(a)(4) and (a)(6)".

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on Thursday, June 26, the Committee on Public Works unanimously ordered reported S. 1072, to extend and revise the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended, and titles I, III, IV, and V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended.

This action of the committee followed 4 months of intensive review and examination of these programs by our Subcommittee on Economic Development under the able chairmanship of the junior Senator from New Mexico, JOSEPH MONTOYA, I congratulate and thank Senator MONTOYA and the members of his subcommittee for their thorough and comprehensive survey of the economic development regions of Appalachia, New England, the Ozarks, the Four Corners, the Upper Great Lakes, and the Coastal Plains. The hearing record, now printed in nearly 1,300 pages in two volumes, is a valuable source of information for all citizens concerned with the progress and the problems of regional economic development.

I shall not, Mr. President, describe the many provisions of S. 1072 as reported to the Senate.

I do, however, mention its salient features and invite the attention of Members to the text of the revised bill and to the committee report.

First, Mr. President, the legislation extends the Appalachian and title V regional development programs for 2 years, until June 30, 1971.

Second, it authorizes $294 million for the operative programs of the Appalachian Regional Commission, except highways, for the 2-fiscal-year period. The reported measure adds several important new programs, including funds for health demonstration projects to detect, diagnose, and treat black lung and other occupational diseases affecting coal miners.

Third, the bill extends the Appalachian development highway program to June 30, 1973, and adds $150 million in new authorizations over the next 4 years.

Fourth, S. 1072 authorizes $285 million for the five regional Commissions established pursuant to title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act. The bill also refines the method by which the regional Commissions are financed so as to give them greater autonomy and greater control over their own programs.

Fifth, we would extend for 1 year title I of the Public Works and Economic Development Act, under which the Economic Development Administration makes grants to assist local communities to improve their economic conditions.

These provisions, Mr. President, constitute the main thrust of the legislation. Further details are contained in the report accompanying S. 1072.

This landmark legislation comes to the floor with the unanimous support of the members of the Committee on Public Works. It not only has the active support of all the members; it incorporates the suggestions of many of them: the extension of title I of the Public Works and Economic Development Act proposed by our helpful friend, the ranking minority member of the committee, JOHN SHERMAN COOPER; the new language relating to demonstration projects and training programs and to the use of supplemental grants as "first dollar" money recommended by our capable colleague from Maine, EDMUND MUSKIE; the new section on regional transportation systems suggested by the subcommittee chairman, Senator MONTOYA; the inclusion of Alaska as a development region urged by the diligent Senator from that State, MIKE GRAVEL, and the new funding provisions for demonstration health programs in Appalachia proposed by the astute ranking minority member of the subcommittee, Senator HOWARD BAKER, of Tennessee.

This is a bipartisan, a nonpartisan effort, Mr. President, that has embraced the views of all the members of the committee. And, I add, the bill contains the imprint of the contributions made by every one of them in the hearings, in consultations and in executive sessions.

I thank all of the committee members for their cooperation and assistance in bringing to the Senate highly significant legislation. Senator STEPHEN YOUNG, the ranking member of the Committee on Public Works, Senator MUSKIE, Senator B. EVERETT JORDAN, Senator BAYH, Senator MONTOYA, Senator SPONG, Senator EAGLETON, Senator GRAVEL, Senator COOPER, ranking minority member on the Committee on Public Works, Senator BOGGS, Senator BAKER, Senator DOLE, Senator GURNEY, Senator PACKWOOD all aided our effort.

This measure will directly benefit the lives of the 40 million Americans who live in the 30 States that participate in these regional development programs, and indirectly benefit the entire Nation by helping lagging regions attain the high level of prosperity shared by their neighbors.

I asked unanimous consent that a summary of the bill be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

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

BRIEF SUMMARY OF S. 1072 AS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

TITLE I

Appalachia

The Act is extended for two years, to June 30, 1971, and $294 million are authorized for the Commission's activities, exclusive of highways for the two-year fiscal period.

Section 102 provides an increase of $275,000 for administrative expenses of the Commission and the Federal Cochairman to take care of pay raises.

Section 103 extends the authorization for the Appalachian developmental highway program for two years beyond the present expiration date of June 30, 1971. The funds authorized would be $175 million for each of FY 1970, 1971 and 1972, plus $170 million for FY 1973. This includes an additional $150 million above current authorizations.

Section 104 adds new emphasis under Demonstration Health Projects to early childhood health, nutrition and education and to programs and research to eliminate black lung and other occupational hazards to miners' health.

Section 105 authorizes grants to the States for control of coal mine fires.

Section 106 provides funds for technical assistance to stimulate non-profit organizations to undertake housing construction, rehabilitation and operation of low and middle income housing.

Section 107 adds a new section 208 providing for Comprehensive Manpower Development Demonstration Projects through 80–20 matching grants by the Secretary of Labor for manpower survey, recruitment, training, counseling and mobility including rehabilitation and retraining of coal miners.

Section 108 extends until December 31, 1970 authority for the Commission to use supplemental grant funds in connection with any Federal grant-in-aid programs enacted up to that date.

Section 109 authorizes the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities to make a modest contribution to the cultural development of the region.

Secion 110 authorizes continued financial support for local development districts under the Appalachian Act and also authorizes grants for research and demonstration projects to develop ways of reducing health and safety hazards in coal mining.

Section 111 contains the authorizations for each of the operative programs, except highways, for the next two-year fiscal period:

[In millions]

Section 202. Demonstration Health Projects	$95
Section 203. Land Stabilization, Conservation, and Erosion Control	15
Section 205. Mining Area Restoration	15
Section 207. Housing Assistance	3
Section 208. Manpower Development	10
Section 211. Vocational Education	50
Section 214. Supplemental Grants	90
Section 215. Cultural Programs	1
Section 302. Administrative Expenses of Local Development Districts and Research	15

Section 112 terminates the Appalachian Program, except highways, on July 1, 1971.

TITLE II

Title V regions

The bill extends the authority of the five regional commissions for two years, until June 30, 1971, and authorizes for all the regions, plus Alaska Federal Field Committee, the sum of $285 million for the next two-fiscal-year period.

Section 202 provides that the Committees on Public Works of the House or the Senate could direct the Secretary to study the advisability of altering the geographical area of any region.

Section 203, by amendment of Section 505 of the Act, gives the Commissions direct control over their own program development and broadens the present authority for technical assistance to include innovative demonstration projects and training programs. This section further provides that the Federal Government henceforth will pay only 50% of the Commission's administrative expenses and 100% of Federal staff costs.

Section 204 requires that the headquarters of the Federal Cochairman shall be located in the District of Columbia.

Section 205 amends Section 509 to authorize supplemental grants as "first dollar" money when there are insufficient funds for the Federal share under ongoing Federal grant programs.

Section 206 adds three new sections to the Act:

Section 510 of the Act would extend the regional development program to Alaska through the instrumentality of the existing Federal Field Committee of Alaska.

Section 511 authorizes two-fiscal-year sums for each of the Commissions:

[In millions]

Ozarks	$50
New England	75
Upper Great Lakes	45
Four Corners	45
Coastal Plains	60
Alaska	10
Total	285

Section 512 provides for planning and development of transportation systems, including construction of highways, local access roads and airports. No part of the funds authorized shall be used for the costs of operation or maintenance of any regional transportation system except for demonstration projects.

TITLE III

Section 301 extends for one year Title I of the Act, the public works program administered by EDA, with an authorization of $500 million as in past years. It also changes the matching ratio for grants to Indian tribes to give the Secretary of Commerce the power to adjust the amount required to match Federal funds.

Section 302 authorizes demonstration grants under Title III of the Act.

Section 303 increases authorizations under Title III from $25 million to $50 million.

Section 304. Extends grants under Title I to special impact areas under the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, the bill now before the Senate, S. 1072, was reported unanimously by the Committee on Public Works. As the chairman of the committee, the Honorable JENNINGS RANDOLPH has said, this bill represents the combined efforts of the members of the committee.

It was my privilege to chair the hearings on this legislation held by the Subcommittee on Economic Development. The subcommittee held 10 days of public hearings on bills extending and amending the Appalachian Regional Development Act and title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. Five of these hearings were in Washington and five in the field: 3 days in the Four Corners region—two in New Mexico and one in Utah; one in the New England region—Boston; and one in the Ozarks region—Missouri.

Testimony was received from the administration, from the Federal cochairmen of all six regional commissions, and from all the Governors of the 30 States belonging to these regions, as well as from other State and local officials, representatives of business, labor, health, education, and other organizations. A total of 151 witnesses appeared in public hearings, and a large number of written communications have been included in the hearing record.

During the hearings the subcommittee received numerous suggestions for improving the laws and for amending the pending bills. Many of these proposals have been incorporated in S. 1072, as reported.

Among the changes in law proposed by the committee that developed out of the testimony on S. 1072 is a significant new direction in the manner of funding of the regional development commissions established under title V of the Public Works and Economic Dtvelopment Act of 1965.

Section 505 of the act authorizes technical and planning assistance to the Commissions. S. 1072 would expand this authority to permit broader use of these funds for studies, technical assistance and demonstration projects, and training programs. This amendment would give the regional Commissions direct control over their own program development. It is intended that demonstration projects and training programs carried out by a regional Commission under this section will not only contribute significantly to the economic development of the region but will also serve as models for similar projects in other parts of the country. Demonstration projects and training programs should be undertaken only in those instances where existing Federal programs do not offer sufficient flexibility to permit the Commission to meet pressing development needs of the region or where no Federal program exists which could respond to problems the Commission seeks to solve.

It is the intent of the committee that once the Secretary of Commerce and the Federal agencies have participated in the policy decisions relating to Commission programs and projects that the Secretary would provide the Commissions with the funds which the Congress has appropriated for carrying out the purposes of title V. The Commissions must meet all of the conditions and requirements of title V in program planning before project funds are made available to them. The committee reiterates its strong belief that in carrying out demonstration projects and training programs that existing Federal and State agencies be employed to the maximum extent possible. The regional development Commissions are not to become operating agencies in their own right.

The committee is of the opinion that, since the research and planning phase of the title V programs should have been completed by this time, by far the greatest amount of funds spent under the authorizations in the present bill should be for action programs. The committee strongly recommends that the Commissions limit expenditures for any further research and studies to not more than 10 percent of the funds appropriated to them. Special circumstances involving demonstration projects and training programs may warrant an exception from this limitation.

To permit flexibility in administration, the authorization which is now carried in section 505(c) would be eliminated in favor of a single authorization of funds for the title V program which is carried in section 511. The expansion of the authority for Commission support for demonstration programs and technical assistance would facilitate implementation of several of the innovative proposals submitted to the committee.

I also proposed and the committee recommended that headquarters offices of the Federal Cochairman must be in Washington, D.C., and any regional offices they may establish for Federal employees must be located within the region.

Another new section in the bill as reported by the committee is an amendment I proposed and which authorizes regional development transportation systems. Adequate road, rail, and air transport is the key to the economic development of such regions as my own Four Corners, which encompasses large parts of New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, and Utah. Section 512 would provide that not more than $20 million of the amount authorized for each of the regional commissions could be used for the construction of highways, local access roads, airports, and mass transit facilities under this section. Under this section funds could be made available as part of a demonstration project under section 505 of the act. This section is patterned after the Appalachian developmental highway program. It further provides that Federal law relating to highway and airport construction and to mass transportation where applicable should govern the construction and maintenance of the regional transportation systems. The Federal share of any construction project under this section would not exceed 50 percent except by action of the regional commission but in no case should it exceed 70 percent.

Under the supplemental grant program the committee has approved another significant change. This amendment would provide that section 509 funds can be expended for all or any portion of the Federal contribution to projects authorized by existing Federal grant programs—in effect, this is "first dollar" money.

The language of this subsection would be broadened to specify that such "first dollar" grants may be provided under this section only for projects which meet the requirements of basic grant-in-aid programs, and would be approved for basic funds except for the lack of funds in such programs.

The language contained in the amendment relating to certification by agen-

cies with regard to the compatibility of the project to be supplemented with the provisions and objectives of the basic grant program does not give the certifying Federal official any additional discretion other than that contained in categorical grant programs. Administrative restrictions on agency operations based on budgetary considerations shall not be applied to any project proposed for supplemental assistance.

The amendment would also change the limitations on the use of section 509 funds so they can be provided only if the Commission is satisfied that section 509 funds are not used as substitutes for Federal and State contributions that would otherwise be available for projects in the regions; that is, the Commissions must see that section 509 funds indeed provide additional benefits to areas within economic development regions.

Subsection (c) would be amended to make such assistance available for programs enacted prior to December 31, 1970—presently limited to December 31, 1967.

Another provision of the bill affects economically lagging areas in all parts of the country. S. 1072 extends for 1 year title I of the Public Works and Economic Development Act which authorizes grants for the construction of public facilities. The annual authorization is continued at $500 million.

Because many of our Indian tribes lack sufficient funds of their own, they frequently cannot meet the matching requirements under Federal grant-in-aid programs. I have proposed, the committee has concurred, and, therefore, S. 1072, as amended by the committee, would provide authority to the Secretary of Commerce to adjust the amount required to match Federal funds in grants to an Indian tribe. EDA grants for public facilities could be up to 100 percent Federal funds if the tribe were otherwise unable to provide any matching funds.

The distinguished chairman of the committee has placed in the RECORD a summary of the specific provisions of the bill. I wish to add some comments of a more general nature concerning the role of the regional Commissions and the Federal Cochairmen.

When the Appalachian Regional Development Act was considered by this committee in 1965, questions were raised regarding the relationship and the relative authority of the participating States and the Federal Government in administration of the act. There was concern that the Federal Cochairman, because his affirmative vote is required for Commission action, would become a "czar" dominating and smothering State initiative. On the other hand, questions were raised regarding the requirement that projects be initiated by the State governments which would impede local initiative and thwart the application of Federal expertise. These extremes have been avoided in the administration of the Appalachian Regional Development Act. The experience of the Appalachian Commission should be instructive for the regional commissions organized under title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act.

It is the intent of the committee that the regional commissions shall not become operating bureaucracies but rather serve as catalysts for the development of plans, programs and projects, should serve as mechanisms for concentrating the best efforts of both the Federal and State Governments and focusing the talents and attention of these governments on the problems at hand.

The extent to which this is accomplished is directly dependent upon the initative and competence of each of the Federal Cochairmen of these Commissions. The Federal Cochairman must be attuned to the problems and potentials of his region as well as the governmental agencies and procedures which can serve the needs of his region.

The cooperation between Federal and State agencies which has marked the work of the Appalachian Regional Commission can be attributed in large measure to the competent leadership of the Commission. The Federal Cochairmen of the title V Commissions should note the success of the Appalachian Commission in involving a variety of Federal agencies and departments in its work through the Office of the Federal Cochairman. The success of a regional Commission's relationship with Federal agencies is the main concern of the Federal Cochairman, and pursuit of this objective requires that the Federal Cochairman maintain his permanent headquarters in Washington, D.C., where the major Federal policy decisions affecting his Commission will be made.

The role of the Secretary of Commerce in coordinating the activities of the Federal Cochairmen is left untouched by the bill. The Secretary must provide the policy direction for their activities in order to insure the proper Federal representation on the Commission. The committee expects that this direction will permit sufficiently broad latitude for action to enable the Federal Cochairman to respond to the particular needs of the Commission on which he serves.

Title II of S. 1072 would not alter the basic structure of the five regional commissions, or the role of the Federal and State parties to the Commissions. Creative federalism means partnership in policy determination between the State members of the Commission and the Federal Cochairman as the representative of the Federal Government. The bill would expand the program authority of the Commissions through the implementation of a broader range of programs and projects. The committee anticipates that each Commission will become a forum for enlisting the aid and involvement of all related agencies at the State and Federal levels in the accomplishment of its mission.

To insure that projects funded under section 509 of the act, as it would be amended, receive full evaluation by the Federal agencies involved, the bill would provide that no grant shall be made until the responsible Federal officials have certified that the supplemental program or project meets the applicable requirements of the basic grant-in-aid statute. The committee anticipates that such response should be obtained by the Federal Cochairman of the commission involved prior to commission action.

In title II of the Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 1967, funds were authorized to initiate development programs in the areas covered by the Commissions. Funds were authorized for supplemental grants and technical assistance. This action was premised largely on the success of the supplemental grant program in the Appalachian region and the need for technical assistance funds to support the planning and comprehensive development programs.

While the supplemental grant program has been useful, real progress in the implementation of the plans which the Commissions have developed requires expanded authority and substantial funding. Isolating problems and developing programs to attack them are merely intellectual exercises, if sufficient funds are not available to pay the costs of what has been developed, and the Congress cannot reasonably expect the Commissions to carry out the tasks assigned them in this legislation if sufficient amounts of money are not provided.

In closing, Mr. President, I want to express my deep appreciation for the courtesy and cooperation I have received as chairman of the Subcommittee on Economic Development from the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the Honorable JENNINGS RANDOLPH, who has paid me the honor of serving at my side on the subcommittee; to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, the Honorable JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, ranking minority member of the full committee, who likewise has honored me by ably serving on the subcommittee; to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, the Honorable HOWARD BAKER, who is a strong supporter of our common efforts in his capacity as ranking minority member of the subcommittee; and to all the other members of the subcommittee and the committee who have contributed so much to the bill reported to the Senate.

I regard this as landmark legislation and I urge its favorable consideration and early enactment by Congress.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, it is always a pleasure to join with my colleague from West Virginia, the chairman of the Public Works Committee, when the Senate is considering a bill from our committee. It is a singular moment as S. 1072 is considered, for Senator RANDOLPH and I have been cosponsors of the enabling legislation in 1965 and the amendments of 1967—and the Appalachian Regional Development Act and the Public Works and Economic Development Act have proved, I think it safe to say, successful endeavors of our committee.

The bill S. 1072 will advance the work already begun in Appalachia and in the regional action planning commissions of title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act. This legislation and that which has preceded it have particular significance for us and I believe I may say for the ranking Republican member of the Subcommittee on Economic Development of the Public Works Committee, Senator BAKER, for the law

has roots deep in our part of the country and is born of the Appalachian experience.

In Appalachia something has been achieved that we have talked a lot about in the Congress—State and Federal cooperation. In the creation and programs of the Appalachian Regional Development Commission we have seen that principle given more than lipservice. The Appalachian Governors have worked together, cooperatively, for the benefit of the whole region. The State governments have looked to their organization, planning, and priority establishment procedures as a result of the approaches they have learned through their participation in the Commission. The bill which the Senate considers today would enable the Commission to continue its work in the areas of highway and public facility construction, vocational education and demonstration health by stretching out the highway program through 1973 with an increase of $150 million over existing authorizations, and by authorizing $294 million for the nonhighway programs of the Commission.

With a new and vital thrust the bill will also move the Commission into new areas of activity. Perhaps the most important of these in my view, is the comprehensive child nutrition and development programs authorized under the demonstration health program of the Commission. The Commission is anxious to serve as a national demonstration area for the development and implementation of programs to help bring thousands of children to a decent and deserved place in society and to prevent the scourges of disease and malnutrition and the ravages of ignorance and deprivation. In addition, the Commission will be authorized by S. 1072 to develop programs to deal with occupational illness, such as black lung, and also to undertake concentrated efforts for manpower development and training.

The amendments to title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act are designed to give the regional Commissions created in other parts of the Nation, authority to act to solve regional problems with methods comparable to those employed in Appalachia. To date, these Commissions have functioned primarily as planning units. The time has come to accord them the authority and resources consonant with the intention of Congress at the time of passage of the act in 1965. The bill reported from the commitee would establish demonstration and training program authority, transportation planning and demonstration programs, and supplemental funding authority.

The Committee on Public Works has devoted great effort to this bill in hearings, in Washington and in the field, and in executive session. S. 1072 is innovative, as is the whole regional Commission concept. It represents, I believe, the committee's commitment to the solution of problems of deprivation in these areas which represent 20 percent of the population of the United States. I know the Senate will recognize its merits, and consider it with care.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I would like to associate myself with the remarks already made in support of S. 1072. As a native of Appalachia, as a Senator from a State which is a member of the Appalachian Regional Commission, and as a member of the Senate Subcommittee on Economic Development which first considered the pending legislation, have a great personal and public interest in it.

The distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Public Works, the Senator from West Virginia, has presented to the Senate an eloquent and adequate summation of the various purposes of this legislation, and what I might have to say about it will serve only as supplementary to his remarks.

The success of the programs of the Appalachian Regional Commission has been, I think, almost universally recognized. While much remains to be done in this region which still lags significantly behind the rest of the Nation in its standard of living, economic progress has been statistically measurable and there is a readily detectable sense of hope and optimism throughout the area.

In terms of long-range implications, the unique mechanism established by the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 may prove to be as important as the assistance rendered. The act itself was the result and culmination of coordinated study and activity that had been going on for some years in the region and in agencies of the Federal Government. In May of 1960 a group of Appalachian Governors met in Annapolis to discuss the many serious economic and social problems that were common to the entire region. It became increasingly clear to this Conference of Appalachian Governors that solutions to the interrelated problems facing the region—which were virtually all attributable in one degree or another to geographical isolation and sharp declines in mining and agricultural employment—would not yield to the kind of piecemeal programs that were then underway. Two major new elements were badly needed—an unprecedented coordination of Federal, State, and local efforts, and a large infusion of public funds. The Governors met with President Kennedy, who directed appropriate Federal agencies to cooperate in studies of the region, and in 1963 he appointed the President's Appalachian Regional Commission. This Commission, made up of the Governors and representatives of 10 Federal departments and agencies, conducted an intensive study of the problems of the region and made a series of recommendations for action to President Johnson in April of 1964. Out of these recommendations grew the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

This act contained three significant types of program financing designed to promote the economic development of the Appalachian region. The first was the authorization of a major network of developmental highways and access roads to be funded, not out of the highway trust fund, but out of general funds; this program was and continues to be viewed as being of prime importance in overcoming the geographical isolation of the region. The second part of the financing package was the formulation of a series of special programs such as those providing aid for demonstration health facilities, land stabilization, conservation, and erosion control, timber development, mining area restoration, and so on; these programs were clearly required by problems peculiar to the region as a whole. Third, the act authorized the Commission to utilize funds appropriated to it to supplement existing Federal grant-in-aid programs by paying a part of the non-Federal or local share; this supplementary authority was provided in response to the demonstrated inability of many Appalachian communities to take normal advantage of existing Federal programs due to a lack of local tax revenues needed to provide the non-Federal share.

The Commission itself was structured in such a way as to reinforce the need for close cooperation. The Commission is comprised of one representative of each member State and one member appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. Although not specified in the statute, at the first meeting of the Commission it was agreed that the Governor of each State would serve as the State member, rotating the cochairmanship among themselves. This direct participation by the Governors was a clear indication of the importance that was to be attached to the program from its outset. Action by the Commission requires the votes of two-thirds of the State members and the vote of the Federal Cochairman. Thus a close working relationship between the State interest and the Federal interest is assured.

The Federal Cochairman and his staff and the Commission staff maintain joint offices in Washington. In many ways, the Federal Cochairman and the States regional representative serve as "ambassadors" from the States and their constituent localities to the Federal Establishment. The highway program, the special Appalachian programs, and the supplemental functions of the Commission obviously require the closest possible liaison and coordination with line agencies of the Government. In each project wholly or partially funded under the program the expertise of Federal, State, and local government officials is drawn upon and utilized. One of the most extraordinary achievements of this coodinated approach to a regional development program is that a professional staff of roughly 70 people have administered the expenditure of more than three-quarters of a billion dollars in slightly more than 4 years. This represents a greater "return per bureaucrat" than any other program with which this Government has ever had experience.

It would be difficult to overemphasize the importance of this coordinated effort. So many of our Federal and State programs are authorized and administered in a piecemeal fashion and much of their potential effectiveness is lost. The great economic and social problems facing our industrial society are all part of a closely interrelated syndrome. Planning and coordination—really a kind of systems approach—need not and should not mean drab and unimaginative uniformity. But it is clear that much waste

and inefficiency can be eliminated by employing the kind of approach applied so successfully by the Appalachian Regional Commission.

The amendments to the Appalachian Regional Development Act included in the pending bill would extend the highway program for 2 years beyond its original expiration date, and provide obligational authority within the limits of funds authorized for the highway program, authorize a new program of comprehensive manpower development demonstration projects, and provide for limited Federal assistance in developing cultural programs within the region.

The amendments would also add a significant new emphasis to section 202 of the act, that section providing for demonstration health projects. The amendments to section 202 would underscore the commitment of Congress to coordinated investments in early child health, nutrition, and education. The Appalachian Regional Commission is ideally suited, because of its unique ability to coordinate the activities of Federal, State, and local agencies, to conduct on a demonstration basis, pilot programs in the field of early child development. There are already in operation nearly 20 Federal programs that bear in one degree or another on the health and welfare of the preschool child. Among the most significant of these is the provision of services in accordance with State plans authorized by title IV–A of the Social Security Act. The proposed amendments of section 202 of the Appalachian Act would authorize Federal payment of a part of the non-Federal share of services provided under the Social Security Act, if approved by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, on a demonstration or pilot basis. I believe deeply that coordination of existing Federal and State programs in this vital area of child development on a demonstration scale in selected parts of the Appalachian region will provide invaluable information to the national administration and to the Congress as we proceed to develop the most efficient ways of dealing with the complex and interrelated problems of malnutrition, inadequate child health care, and the educational handicaps that result from little or no intellectual and cultural stimulation. It is necessary that the Commission will work closely in administering these pilot programs with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Agriculture, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and other appropriate agencies. No additional authorization is provided for these activities. It is felt that their success will depend on effective coordination of existing programs and not immediately from any major new commitment of funds.

The pending bill also includes significant amendments to title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, under which the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to designate other regional commissions throughout the country. It is unfortunate that the five existing title V commissions have not been able to make contributions comparable in scale to those of the Appalachian Regional Commission. But there are a number of readily apparent reasons why this discrepancy in performance exists. The title V Commissions are younger than the ARC, they have not had the advantage of the substantial groundwork that had already been laid prior to the creation of the ARC, and most important of all, there has been virtually no action money appropriated for their activities and use.

The new administration is currently conducting an extensive review of the Commission concept and expects to make major recommendations as to their future course early next year. At that time I would hope and expect that those recommendations would be given prompt and careful consideration by Congress and that appropriate legislative action will be taken, in spite of the fact that the pending amendments would otherwise be in effect through the end of the 1971 fiscal year.

Nonetheless, the title V Commissions, some clearly more than others, are prepared to move ahead with significant projects and programs in their respective regions. The amendments to title V contained in the pending bill would provide broad authority to conduct such activities, as approved by the Secretary of Commerce, that are best suited to the immediate needs of each region. The experience gained during the initial implementation of these programs and projects will be of significant use to the Congress when it evaluates the recommendations of the administration next year.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I am very pleased to give my voice to those of support for S. 1072, a bill to extend the authorizations of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended, and certain sections of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended. It has been a privilege as a junior member of the Committee on Public Works to work with the distinguished members of this committee on S. 1072.

This legislation advances the work of the Appalachian Regional Commission by extending existing provisions and making possible increased participation in reaching solutions to the problems engendered by dying or dead economies. Of particular significance to me are the new provisions which place emphasis on programs directed at human resources—child nutrition, health development, and manpower development and training. I am sure that the Commission will continue to demonstrate in these areas of endeavors the viability of the regional concept as a method of attacking problems and the reality of State-Federal partnership.

Title II of S. 1072 is of particular interest to me because of the involvement of a part of my own State in the Ozarks Regional Commission created pursuant to title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. The effect of the amendments to that act contained in S. 1072 is to place the title V commissions on equal footing with the Appalachian Regional Development Commission in terms of methods at their disposal with which to attack the problems of their regions. So far they have functioned primarily as planning and research units, seeking answers to questions about the nature and extent of their economic problems and possible solutions. S. 1072 extends to them broad authority for carrying out programs tailored to those needs and in accordance with priority and time schedules of their own design. It would make possible the actual cooperation of the Governors and State officials with Federal officials in a manner in conformance with the intention of the Congress in the passage of the enabling legislation in 1965. Although I have reservations about the concept of regional planning, it is my hope the coming year will demonstrate that the regional commission can operate on a truly regional basis.

The provisions of S. 1072 taken as a whole do represent a strong and innovative approach to the problems of these areas of the country which have been left behind as the Nation has moved forward in continually growing prosperity. The Appalachian region and those of the Ozarks, the upper Great Lakes, the Four Corners, the Coastal Plains, and New England contain 20 percent of the total population of the United States. Congress has made a commitment to the welfare of these Americans in many ways, through many pieces of legislation. The regional commissions are making possible the focusing of resources with the intensity necessary to make an impact in breaking the cycle of deprivation prevalent in these areas. I hope the Senate will act on its commitment and pass this bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–291), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

INTRODUCTION

The Congress set in motion a new experiment in federalism when it inaugurated the Appalachian regional development program and similar programs in other regions of the country in 1965. It created a new dimension in governmental relations, established a new instrumentality for coping with persistent old problems, and, most of all, in practical financial terms, opened the way for innovative and imaginative approaches to the use of the Federal taxing power for attacks on basic and hithereto insurmountable barriers to economic advance in some of the less prosperous parts of the country.

The Appalachian experiment, in operation only 4 years, has proved a success: employment has increased; unemployment has declined; and outmigration is subsiding. Roads are connecting once-isolated communities; children can travel to better consolidated schools; medical care is becoming available to people formerly without hope of diagnosis or treatment. The Appalachian experiment is working. It is the example, the model of intergovernmental cooperation, for other parts of the country to emulate. Once there is a substantial investment in basic transportation facilities, vocational training, and health care in a deprived area, the entire picture begins to change. Once a system of coordinating available Federal grant-in-aid programs is established. State and local agencies can begin to make use of the funds authorized in

those programs in order to compensate for lesser local financial capacities. The supplemental grant program, first envisaged for Appalachia, has been adapted to the needs of the other developmental regions. A most persuasive proof that the program is working is the significant increase in private investment in the region.

The lessons learned in administering the Appalachian program have been carefully studied and applied in the five regions established by the Secretary of Commerce in cooperation with the Governors of the States involved under title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. These regions are:

Commission	Date designated	States involved
Ozarks	Mar. 1, 1966	Arkansas, Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma.
New England	Mar. 2, 1966	Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont.
Upper Great Lakes	Mar. 3, 1966	Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.
Four Corners	Dec. 19, 1966	Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah.
Coastal Plains	Dec. 21, 1966	Georgia, North Carolina, and South Carolina.

MAJOR PURPOSES OF THE BILL

Three major economic development programs of vital importance to the Nation are due to expire on June 30, 1969. These are the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended, which involves 13 States; title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, which directly affects 20 States; and title I of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, which, through the Economic Development Administration, affects every State in the Union.

The Committee on Public Works believes these three programs should be extended, and in reporting S. 1072 to the committee has so expressed itself.

The committee has further concluded that: (1) the authority of the Appalachian and of the title V regional development commissions should be expanded and their funds increased to enable them to undertake additional functions, and (2) the title V commissions should receive substantially larger Federal appropriations in order to carry out the responsibilities, both old and new, which the Congress has laid upon them.

Also, the committee agrees with the recommendation of the Administration that authority of the Economic Development Administration should be extended for 1 year at the current rate of authorization for funds.

S. 1072, as reported with amendments, is designed to achieve these three objectives as follows:

(a) The bill extends the Applachian Regional Development Act for 2 years, until June 30, 1971, and authorizes for the 2-fiscal-year period, exclusive of highway construction funds, the sum of $294 million. New emphasis in the demonstration health program is placed on intensive early childhood care, nutrition, and the early detection, diagnosis and treatment of black lung and other coal miners' occupational diseases. Likewise, stress is laid on comprehensive manpower training programs including rehabilitation, training and retaining of coal miners.

In addition, in order to facilitate completion of the Appalachian Development Highway System, key to economic growth in the region, the bill extends the highway portion of the program 2 years beyond its present terminal date, until June 30, 1973, and authorizes appropriations for the 4-fiscal-year period as follows:

Fiscal year:	
1970	$175,000,000
1971	175,000,000
1972	175,000,000
1973	170,000,000

These authorizations would also provide that up to $150 million may be used for engineering and advance right-of-way acquisition, if the States so desire.

These are the main provisions of the bill. Other changes and additions are discussed later in this report.

(b) The bill also extends title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 for 2 years and authorizes for the 2-fiscal-year period the sum of $285 million, including not to exceed $20 million to each of the five regions for developmental transportation systems. Authorizations for the five regional commissions, including transportation, are as follows:

Ozarks	$50,000,000
New England	75,000,000
Upper Great Lakes	45,000,000
Four Corners	45,000,000
Coastal Plains	60,000,000
Alsaka [1]	10,000,000

[1] Special provision is made to treat Alaska as a development region within the meaning of the act.

(c) The bill extends title I of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 for one year in order to authorize the Economic Development Administration to continue to make grants for public facilities.

HEARINGS

The Subcommittee on Economic Development of the Committee on Public Works held 10 days of public hearings on bills extending and amending the Appalachian Regional Development Act and title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. Five of these hearings were in Washington and five in the field: 3 days in the Four Corners region (two in New Mexico and one in Utah); one in the New England region (Boston); and one in the Ozarks region (Missouri).

Testimony was received from the administration, from the Federal Cochairman of all six regional commissions, and from all the Governors of the 30 States belonging to these regions, as well as from other State and local officials, representatives of business, labor, health, education, and other organizations. A total of 151 witnesses appeared in public hearings, and a large number of written communications have been included in the hearing record.

During the hearings the subcommittee received numerous suggestions for improving the laws and for amending the pending bills. Many of these proposals have been incorporated in S. 1072, as reported.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to authorize funds to carry out the purposes of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended, and title I, III, IV, and V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, today the Senate took an important step forward in regional economic development by passing the Appalachia and Regional Development Act of 1969. Under the able leadership of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), the chairman of the Public Works Committee, and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Economic Development, the Senate has strengthened the Appalachia Commission's ability to deal with the critical problems of economic underdevelopment which persist in that area, and has increased the powers of the other title V Commissions to deal with similar problems in their regions.

Although public attention has not been as concentrated; the poverty, unemployment, and underdevelopment of the New England, Ozarks, Upper Great Lakes, Coastal Plains, and Four Corners regions have created hopelessness and despair for too many of the people of those regions. Congress recognized these conditions in the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, and the five title V Commissions were created in 1966 and 1967.

On the basis of the experience of the Appalachia experiment, Congress felt that the same principles could be applied to other regions of the Nation which suffered from economic underdevelopment.

In amendments to title V enacted in October of 1967, the Congress provided the commissions with authority to initiate supplemental grant programs to enable them to begin on a modest scale the important task of spurring their regional economies. In addition, the Congress directed the commissions to develop comprehensive long-range economic plans which would define regional needs and priorities and serve as the basis for the development of programs addressed to those needs. During the past 2 years the commissions have made substantial progress in complying with that congressional directive, and have developed specific programs and projects to carry out their development plans.

Mr. President, in the title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act the Congress laid the foundation for a new form of cooperation between the Federal Government and the States through which their combined resources could be brought to bear on problems which are regional in nature, but relate directly to national goals and objectives. The regional commissions—consisting in each instance of the Governors of the States involved and a Federal cochairman—have the responsibility for administering and implementing this cooperative venture.

The long-range plans developed by the regional commissions, when approved by the Secretary of Commerce, represent agreement by both Federal and State governments on what needs to be done and the apportionment of responsibilities for doing it. Now the regional commissions need authorization to carry out their plans in accordance with the objectives of the Congress in the enactment of title V of the Public Works Act, and the bill passed this morning provides that authority.

Earlier in the session I introduced alternative legislation to S. 1072. This bill (S. 1090), cosponsored by more than 30

of my colleagues, recommended several important changes in the authority of the regional commissions. Although all of these changes were not accepted by the committee, several of them are among the significant provisions in the legislation passed by the Senate today.

The discretion of the Secretary of Commerce in providing funds to the regional commissions has been limited. The committee felt that the preservation of the independence of the commissions was important, and I hope that this will encourage the commission to function as responsible regional organizations.

The addition of "demonstration projects and training programs" to the activities which may be funded under section 505 of the act—technical assistance—will give the commissions the latitude in program development necessary to the innovative development of the regions.

The supplemental grant authority of section 509 has been broadened to allow the commissions to make supplemental grants where there are not sufficient funds under existing categorical aid programs for the Federal share. This "first dollar" money will increase the commissions' ability to deal with regional problems by eliminating the middleman when funds are in otherwise short supply.

The committee also recognized that some of the title V commissions are progressing at a faster rate than others in developing the plans and capabilities to administer the large amounts of funds which the act envisions. Therefore, the committee recommended separate authorizations for each of the commissions. I hope that one of the important effects of this decision will be an increased independence of the commissions from the Department of Commerce.

I congratulate the Senate for its recognition of the pressing economic problems faced by these five regions. The increased assistance provided in the legislation passed today will pay its own way by developing in these five regions the self-sufficiency and imagination which can eliminate hopelessness and despair.

DISASTER RELIEF ACT OF 1969

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 271, S. 1685.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1685) to provide additional assistance for areas suffering a major disaster.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Disaster Relief Act of 1969".

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this Act, the term "major disaster" means a major disaster as determined by the President pursuant to the Act entitled "An Act to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, and for other purposes", approved September 30, 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1855–1855g).

FEDERAL LOAN ADJUSTMENTS

SEC. 3. In the administration of the disaster loan program under section 7(b) of the Small Business Act, any application *for a* loan thereunder in an amount of $30,000 or less in the case of a homeowner, or $100,000 or less in the case of a business concern, may be granted, if such loan is for the repair, rehabilitation, or replacement of property damaged or destroyed as the result of a major disaster, without regard to whether the required financial assistance is otherwise available from private sources.

GRANTS TO STATES FOR DISASTER PLANNING

SEC. 4. (a) The President is authorized to provide assistance to the States in developing comprehensive plans and practicable programs for assisting individuals suffering losses as the result of a major disaster. For the purposes of this section, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, the territory of Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territories.

(b) From the sums available for the purposes of this section, the President is authorized to make grants not to exceed $250,000 to any State, upon application therefor, in an amount not to exceed 50 per centum of the cost of developing the plans and programs referred to in subsection (a).

(c) Any State desiring to participate in this program shall designate or create an agency which is specially qualified to plan and administer such a disaster relief program, and shall, through such agency, submit a State plan to the President not later than December 31, 1970, which shall set forth a comprehensive and detailed State program for assistance to individuals suffering losses as a result of a major disaster.

(d) The President shall prescribe such rules and regulations as he deems necessary for the effective administration of this section.

(e) Upon the submission of such plans the President shall, not later than June 30, 1971, report and recommend to the Congress a program for implementation and funding of the State comprehensive disaster relief plans, and such other recommendations relating to the Federal role in disaster relief activities as he deems warranted.

SHELTER FOR DISASTER VICTIMS

SEC. 5. (a) The President is authorized to provide dwelling accommodations for any individual or family whenever he determines—

(1) that such individual or family occupied a house (as an owner or tenant) which was destroyed, or damaged to such an extent that it is uninhabitable, as the result of a major disaster; and

(2) that such action is necessary to avoid severe hardship on the part of such individual or family; and

(3) that such owner or tenant cannot otherwise provide suitable dwelling accommodations for himself and/or his family.

(b) Such dwelling accommodations, including mobile homes, as may be necessary to meet the need, shall be provided through acquisition, acquisition and rehabilitation, or lease. Dwelling accommodations in such housing shall be made available to any such individual or family for such period as may be necessary to enable the individual or family to find other decent, safe, and sanitary housing which is within his or its ability to finance. Rentals shall be established for such accommodations, under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe and shall take into consideration the financial ability of the occupant. In cases of financial hardship, rentals may be compromised or adjusted for a period not to exceed twelve months, but in no case shall any such individual or family be required to incur a monthly housing expense (including any fixed expense relating to the amortization of debt owing on a house destroyed or damaged in a disaster) which is in excess of 25 per centum of the individual's or family's monthly income.

(c) In the performance of, and with respect to, the powers and duties conferred upon him by this section, the President may—

(1) prescribe such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this section;

(2) exercise such powers and duties either directly or through such Federal agency or agencies as he may designate;

(3) sell or exchange at public or private sale, or lease, any real property acquired or constructed under this section;

(4) obtain insurance against loss in connection with any such real property;

(5) enter into agreements to pay annual sums in lieu of taxes to any State or local taxing authority with respect to any such real property; and

(6) include in any contract or instrument made pursuant to this section, such conditions and provisions as he deems necessary to assure that the purposes of this section will be achieved.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

SEC. 6. (a) Whenever, as the result of a major disaster, the President determines that low-income households are unable to purchase adequate amounts of nutritious food, he is authorized, under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, to distribute through the Secretary of Agriculture coupon allotments to such households pursuant to provisions of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 or as said Act may be amended and to make surplus commodities available pursuant to the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 875 of the Eighty-first Congress.

(b) The President is authorized to continue through the Secretary of Agriculture to make such coupon allotments and surplus commodities available to such households so long as he determines necessary, taking into consideration such factors as he deems appropriate, including the consequences of the major disaster on the earning power of the households to which assistance is made available under this section.

(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed as amending or otherwise changing the provisions of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 except as it relates to a Presidential determination regarding availability of food stamps in major disaster situations.

ASSISTANCE TO INDIVIDUALS

SEC. 7. The President is authorized to provide to individuals unemployed as a result of a major disaster, such assistance as he deems appropriate while they are unemployed. No individual who is receiving unemployment compensation or the proceeds of private income protection insurance shall be eligible for such assistance. Such assistance as the President shall provide shall not exceed the amount and the duration of payments under the unemployment compensation program of the State in which the disaster occurred.

CLEARANCE OF LAKE CONTAMINATION

SEC. 8. The President is authorized to make grants to any State or political subdivisions thereof for the purpose of lake clearance in cases where a major disaster has resulted in contamination of any lake by debris which has created conditions hazardous to health and safety.

FIRE CONTROL

SEC. 9. The President is authorized to make grants and loans to any State to assist such

State in the suppression of a fire or fires on State or privately owned forest or grass lands which threatens destruction of such proportions as to constitute a major disaster.

DEBRIS REMOVAL

SEC. 10. The President is authorized to make grants to any State or political subdivision thereof for the purpose of removing debris deposited on privately owned lands as the result of a major disaster which has created conditions hazardous to health and safety.

TIMBER SALE CONTRACTS

SEC. 11. (a) Notwithstanding provisions of contracts entered into prior to July 1, 1965, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall, as part of the regular road and trail construction program administered by each such Secretary, reimburse timber sale contractors or otherwise arrange to bear road and trail construction and restoration costs either directly or in cooperation with timber purchasers to the extent of costs determined by each such Secretary as incurred or to be incurred for restoring roads in any stage of construction, authorized by a contract for the purchase of timber from lands under such Secretary's jurisdiction, to substantially the same condition as existed prior to a major disaster, and to the extent costs determined by such Secretary as incurred or to be incurred for completing road construction not performed under any such contract prior to a major disaster but which, because of changed conditions resulting from such disaster, exceed road construction costs as originally determined by such Secretary. The costs for such road restoration, reconstruction, and construction under any single timber purchase contract on roads not accepted prior to a major disaster, whether construction was complete, partial, or not yet begun, shall be borne as follows: 15 per centum of all amounts shall be borne by the timber purchaser, except that such purchaser shall not be required to bear costs of more than $4,500, and the Secretary shall bear the remaining portion of such costs. This subsection shall not apply (A) in the case of any road restoration or reconstruction if the cost of such restoration or reconstruction is less than $500, and (B) in the case of any road construction if the increase in the cost of such construction as the result of a major disaster is less than $500 more than the construction costs as originally determined by such Secretary.

(b) Where either such Secretary determines that damages resulting from a major disaster are so great that restoration, reconstruction, or construction is not practical under the cost-sharing arrangement authorized by this subsection, he may allow the cancellation of any such contract notwithstanding provisions therein.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 12. This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to any major disaster occurring after December 31, 1968.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate is about to consider S. 1685, my bill to provide additional assistance for areas suffering a major disaster. This bill is the culmination of several years work by a large group of Senators who in 1965 began working toward major revisions in national disaster relief legislation.

As a result of previous efforts, Congress enacted Public Law 89–769 in 1966. The present measure proposes to extend help to disaster victims in a number of other areas. Anyone who has witnessed the terrible consequence wrought by tornadoes, floods, hurricanes, earthquakes, and forest fires knows the devastating effects they often have on the homes, businesses and lives of our people.

Even though man cannot avoid or control such unpredictable acts of nature, much can be done to help in the reconstruction and adjustments made necessary by major disasters. Most individuals are not able to cope adequately with the heavy losses often incurred during such catastrophes. It seems to me and the other 27 Senators who have joined in sponsoring this bill, as well as the Public Works Committee, that the Federal Government should assume a larger role in helping those who have, through no fault of their own, become victims of a major disaster.

The bill would authorize Small Business Administration loans of limited amounts to be made without regard to the availability of financial assistance from private sources. It would also authorize increased shelter, free food stamps, and aid to unemployed who have suffered losses in major disasters. Aid could be extended by the President to the States for assistance in clearing debris left by major disasters in lakes or on private property which might be hazardous to health and safety. Also, the President could make grants to States for the purpose of assisting in the suppression of fires on either public or private lands which threaten to become major disasters. Finally, States would be encouraged to formulate comprehensive plans and programs to assist individuals suffering losses as a result of a major disaster. States would be expected to submit a disaster relief plan to the President no later than December 31, 1970, and within 6 months from that date the President would in turn make recommendations to Congress for implementing and funding the State plans.

Mr. President, the Disaster Relief Act of 1969 is designed to help Americans who have experienced the holocaust of a major disaster to reestablish their homes and businesses and to restore their normal lives insofar as it is possible to do so. I urge the Senate to act favorably on this measure.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–280), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of S. 1685, as reported by the Committee on Public Works, is to provide emergency relief and temporary assistance to private citizens who suffer losses and privation as a result of a major disaster. This broadening and enlargement of existing statutory provisions is a necessary and logical sequence to the great emphasis which has heretofore been placed on assistance to local and State governments for the replacement of public facilities. Major disasters, when they occur, also wreak serious harm to private individuals and deprive them of the ability to provide themselves with the basic necessities of life—food, clothing, and shelter. Without emergency assistance to enable people so stripped of the means for survival to reestablish their place in the community within a reasonable time and under satisfactory conditions, the entire community will be seriously impeded in its recovery from the impact of a major disaster.

The Committee on Public Works recognizes the need for effective State advance planning and direct involvement in meeting major disasters and in preparing to coordinate and organize assistance for individuals and communities. In addition, Federal assistance to States in protecting public health and safety must also be provided through help in clearance of debris from lakes contaminated as a result of major disaster and private property on which debris has been deposited by such disasters.

During the hearings on S. 993, the committee was made aware of the need for relief to certain timber sale contractors in California whose ability to meet the terms of their contract with the Federal Government was seriously impaired as a result of the flooding which took place in December 1968 and January and February 1969. The committee is further aware that similar situations could occur elsewhere in the country.

THE NEED FOR ADDITIONAL DISASTER RELIEF LEGISLATION

In 1964 and 1965, the Nation experienced a series of devastating and widespread major disasters—hurricanes, floods, tornadoes, earthquakes, and so forth. The customary practice of enacting special measures granting relief for specific stricken areas proved totally inadequate. Evidence presented to the Congress indicated that Federal law did not provide sufficient authority to cope with catastrophes as they occur. The specific disaster-by-disaster legislation approach was uncertain and characterized by great delay and much variation in treatment of the different stricken areas.

Investigation disclosed further that, while fairly adequate help for damages incurred by governmental agencies and operations had been authorized by national disaster legislation, comparatively little basic assistance had been made available to private individuals. Although acts providing special relief for citizens had been adopted from time to time, such as those following the Alaskan earthquake or the Northwest floods, there was no permanent legislation authorizing immediate and comprehensive Federal assistance to help restore to normal life private victims who had suffered extensive losses to their homes and livelihoods. Moreover, it seemed wasteful, unsystematic, and inexpedient for Congress to consider separate new relief bills each time a major disaster took place.

LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

In an attempt to rectify this deficiency, more than 40 Senators joined on April 30, 1965, in introducing S. 1861, a bill proposing several major revisions in the basic disaster relief law. After hearings were held and certain modifications made, this committee on July 15 without dissent reported S. 1861 favorably, and it was adopted unanimously by the Senate one week later. Hearings were held during the following year by the House Public Works Committee and an amended version of the bill, which deleted several important sections, was passed by the House of Representatives on October 17, 1966. Because of the impending congressional adjournment, the Senate concurred in these amendments the next day, and the bill was signed by the President on November 6, 1966.

The new act (Public Law 89–769) retained, with some minor changes in language, most of the provisions of S. 1861 which dealt with the problems of loan adjustments, disaster warnings, assistance to unincorporated communities, restoration of public facilities, and non-duplication of benefits. An excellent new section was added by the House of Representatives which provided aid for higher educational facilities damaged in major disaster areas. Other new sections authorized an extension in time for fulfilling requirements in certain public land matters

and directed the President to plan and coordinate, through the Office of Emergency Planning, all major disaster assistance. The act also ordered a study to be made of additional or improved air operational facilities needed to prevent or minimize losses from grass or forest fires.

Several significant provisions of the original bill, however, were not included in Public Law 89–769. Provisions for disaster loans to both homeowners and business concerns, without regard to whether or not the required financial assistance might be provided by private sources, were eliminated. A proposed new cost-sharing program, which invited States to develop comprehensive disaster relief plans eligible for Federal grants up to 50 percent of the losses sustained in major disasters, with the State governments and individual owners each assuming 25 percent of the cost, was deleted. Similarly, a section providing for shelters for victims whose homes have been made uninhabitable by a major disaster was not enacted.

The need for the provisions deleted from the original bill were of sufficient significance to warrant further consideration. Accordingly, on January 17, 1967, S. 438 was introduced.

Hearings on S. 438 were held in Dunlap, Ind., the site of great destruction during the 1965 Palm Sunday tornadoes, and in Washington, D.C. The field hearings brought forth testimony from officials and residents of disaster affected areas of Indiana, Illinois, and Michigan. These accounts emphasized the need for Federal legislation which would bring meaningful aid to affected individuals so that they could resume normal, productive lives as soon as possible.

S. 438 was reported by the Committee on Public Works on April 2, 1968, but no action on it as such was taken by the Senate.

CALIFORNIA FLOODS

In December 1968 and January and February 1969, the people of the State of California experienced extensive property loss and damage as a result of storms, floods, landslides, and high water. Hearings were held on April 1 and 3, 1969, on S. 993, a bill to provide assistance to the State of California. Most of the relief sought in that legislation is presently available under existing Federal law, as a result of the enactment of Public Law 89–769. The Committee on Public Works, however, was once again impressed with the need for generally available Federal emergency assistance for individuals who have lost the ability to provide food, clothing, and shelter for themselves as a result of disaster and who, as a result of the severe flooding of croplands and orchards, are unable to find employment.

On March 26, 1969, 27 Senators cosponsored S. 1685 which provides the vehicle for achieving a proper level of temporary emergency assistance to such individuals and calls on the States to establish coordinated and comprehensive plans and programs for assisting individuals who suffer loss as a result of major disasters.

EXPLANATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF S. 1685

S. 1685 contains nine operative sections which provide: Federal loan adjustments, grants to States for disaster planning, shelter for disaster victims, food stamp program, assistance to unemployed individuals, clearance of lake contamination, fire control, debris removal, and timber sale contracts.

Federal loan adjustments

Section 3 authorizes the Small Business Administration to make loans to homeowners in an amount not to exceed $30,000 and to business concerns not to exceed $100,000, without regard to availability of financial assistance from private sources.

The comparable provision relating to the consolidated farmer's home loan program is statutorily designed as a loan program of the "last resort." As presently set up, the farmers home program has only limited funding authority.

The language relating to the change in the interest rate contained in an amendment to S. 993 and considered by the committee has not been reported since legislation of this type is pending before the Committee on Banking and Currency which has basic jurisdiction with respect to the Small Business Administration. An adjustment in interest rates, and a similar one in the consolidated farmers home loan program, are desirable. The committees with legislative jurisdiction may well wish to consider such changes in the law.

The language of section 3 obviates the need to take into consideration the availability of financial assistance to homeowners and businesses which might otherwise be available from private sources; it confirms the more liberal attitude to disaster loans which current regulations of the Small Business Administration appear to have adopted.

State disaster planning

Section 4 of the bill is a redraft of the language originally contained in S. 1681 of the 89th Congress, relating to a Federal-State grant program for assistance to homeowners and businesses. The new language would authorize assistance to States for disaster planning; it would limit Federal financial participation in such planning to not more than $250,000 for any State; it would require the designation or creation of a State agency to carry out the planning; and it requires that plans be submitted to the President no later than December 31, 1970.

Section 4 requires the President to report, not later than June 30, 1971, to the Congress recommendations resulting from the State submissions in order to carry out a Federal-State disaster operation. In addition, the President could also make recommendations relative to the overall Federal role.

It is hoped, as a result of such comprehensive plans and practicable programs, that an effective State disaster relief program could be developed which would eliminate the need for further Federal legislation in cases of disaster emergencies.

Shelter for disaster victims

Section 5 is one of three amendments to the existing Federal disaster emergency framework which will insure that families and individuals who lose their dwellings as a result of rampages of nature will be able to secure suitable accommodations without draining all of their economic resources. This section, together with sections 6 and 7, is designed to enable families and individuals to regain their place in the community. These sections are not intended to provide unlimited Federal support but would enable those who suffer the impact of natural disasters to recover as rapidly as possible.

Food stamp program

Section 6. Often in the aftermath of floods, hurricanes, and tornadoes, low-income households are unable to supply themselves with food. The Congress recognized this in the basic Disaster Relief Act of 1950, Public Law 875, when it provided authorization to make surplus commodities available. The provisions of section 6 or S. 1685 are designed to pull together all aspects of Federal law which bear on emergency food assistance to individuals. A food stamp program is a necessary element in this emergency relief program, and, while the Committee on Public Works has no intention of amending or otherwise changing the basic provisions of that legislation, it believes that, where applicable, the President should have the authority through the Department of Agriculture to make such relief available on an emergency basis.

Assistance to unemployed individuals

Section 7 recognizes that while public unemployment compensation programs and private income protection programs are available to a large number of workers and businessmen, there is a significant number of migratory workers who, when disaster strikes, lose everything, including the opportunity to work. Senator Alan Cranston of California, in an appearance before the Committee on Public Works, stressed the difficult situation of migratory farm labor in California following the winter rains and floods. This provision attempts to fill the gap in Federal authority by bringing aid to those who are unemployed, as a result of a major disaster. Such assistance would be in the form of unemployment compensation in the nature both of a temporary income supplement and, especially, of employment services designed to provide gainful and productive employment as rapidly as possible. This provision is made necessary by the fact that public assistance funds in an area overwhelmed by a major disaster are almost immediately depleted, and neither the local nor the State government is capable of meeting the problem.

Public health and safety

Section 8, clearance of lake contamination; section 9, fire control; and section 10, debris removal. These sections, in providing greater assistance to States to cope with these problems, recognize the need for State efforts to remove threats to the public health and safety.

Clearance of lake contamination

The need for the language in section 8 became apparent to the committee during the hearings in Dunlap, Ind. in 1967 when testimony revealed that food and other contaminating materials had been deposited in a number of small lakes making them unusable by the people of the area and presenting a threat to public health.

Fire control

Section 9 relating to fire control is a result of the study conducted by the Office of Emergency Preparedness pursuant to the requirements of section 13, Public Law 89–769, the Disaster Relief Act of 1966, which demonstrated the need for grants to States to assist in the suppression of forest or grassland fires which threaten to become a major conflagration, especially in the Western States.

Timber sale contracts

Section 11. Testimony received by the committee during its hearings on S. 993, the California Disaster Relief Act, brought to light that some timber sale contractors are seriously affected by the provisions of their contracts relating to the reconstruction of timber sale and timber roads. Following the Northwest floods of 1964, the Department of Agriculture adopted a new contract form which provides for relief to timber sale contractors whose operations are seriously affected by a major disaster. The language of section 11 would provide similar relief to those who entered into contracts prior to July 1, 1965.

Pending the development of the comprehensive State plan and the recommendations of the President with respect to such State plans and his review of existing Federal disaster relief, the provisions of S. 1685, if enacted, should result in a broad gauged and inclusive Federal program of action in emergency situations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The bill clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of State.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the Department of State be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

AMBASSADORS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of Ambassadors.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of Ambassadors be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

The bill clerk read the nomination of Joseph J. Jova, of Florida, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Council of the Organization of American States, with the rank of Ambassador.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

The bill clerk read the nomination of William F. Buckley, Jr., of Connecticut, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information for the term of 3 years expiring January 27, 1972.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

The bill clerk read the nomination of W. Byron Sorrell, of Maryland, to be an associate judge of the District of Columbia court of general sessions for the term of 10 years.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RELEASE OF CERTAIN LEAD FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE AND SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1647) an act to authorize the release of 100,000 short tons of lead from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on May 8, 1969, the Senate passed the bill S. 1647 which would authorize the disposal of 100,000 short tons of lead from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile.

This bill, as reported by the Senate Armed Services Committee, contained the traditional language of similar legislation in the past, authorizing the General Services Administration to dispose of surplus commodities by "negotiation or otherwise," thus allowing them some flexibility in adjusting their selling methods.

While the General Services Administration normally views competitive selling methods, including sealed bid sales, as the most effective means of carrying out the intent of the Stockpile Act—the said act requires that disposals be made without disruption of the market of producers, processors, and consumers—situations do arise when other sales procedures must be followed if GSA is to follow its legal mandate to avoid disruption of the market.

The proposed plan for disposal of the lead covered by this bill, developed by GSA after consultation and conferences with various segments of the industry and other Government agencies, provides that the quantity of lead covered by the legislation will be available for off-the-shelf sales to primary and secondary producers, importers of record, recognized distributors and dealers, and domestic consumers; and this at the producers' price, minus an allowance of up to one-half of 1 cent per pound in order to compensate for freight charges actually paid.

Transactions under this selling method for lead provide no profits to the producer, importer, distributor, or dealer. The lead will be sold for domestic consumption only. Consumers who purchase the lead will be required to certify that they will consume the lead in their own facilities within the United States. Producers, importers, distributors, and dealers will be required to certify that they will resell the lead for domestic consumption.

An example as to why the GSA needs the flexibility provided by the clause "negotiation or otherwise"—sometime ago a procedure was worked out with the aluminum industry to absorb into normal market channels over a period of years some million tons of aluminum. This, of course, was a negotiated matter. The alternative would have been for GSA to dump this commodity on the market, thus completely disrupting the market, or to dispose of it in small amounts as the consumer market permitted. The latter, of course, would have involved a tremendous administrative expense over a much longer period of years.

Now, Mr. President, when this measure was taken up for consideration by the Senate on May 8, 1969, an amendment proposed by the senior Senator from Delaware requiring the disposal of this lead to the highest responsible bidder was adopted without a dissenting vote. The House of Representatives, however, objected to this procedure, as they have in the past, and returned the bill to the Senate with an amendment which, in effect, deletes the Senate amendment.

It is my understanding that the House is adamant in their position. When appearing before the House committee, representatives of Government and industry testified they favored enactment of the original Senate bill which required disposal by negotiation or otherwise; they opposed the language contained in S. 1647 as referred to the House which requires disposal to the highest responsible bidder. These representatives indicated that disposal of lead to the highest responsible bidder would be disruptive to the ordinary marketing of this material, because it may upset the stable price structure of the material in the market and cause a decline in price; the highest bid might be less than the market price; it might upset the distribution pattern in the market and cause distribution and price changes; and it eliminates the flexibility General Services Administration would have in its method of sale.

Today, Mr. President, there is a shortage of lead. Lead is primarily used for such basic items as automobile batteries, antiknock components in gasoline, ammunition, paint pigments, insulation, and other products such as cable, solder, and pipe.

There is presently in the stockpile 1,171,000 short tons of lead, all of which is surplus to modern stockpile requirements. The stockpile objective is zero at present. Work interruption in the industry and at east and gulf ports affected both domestic and imported sources in 1968 and early 1969. The resulting tight supply generated two price increases in January 1969. The dock strike ended in mid-February but supply continued tight. Imports showed their first strong improvement in April. Producer inventories were still quite low in April and demand exceeded availability. The result was another price increase. Demand continued quite strong through June 1969, evidenced by a price increase on June 9, 1969, and still another within the past few days, bringing the price of lead currently to 15½ cents per pound.

There is currently a strong demand and thus an excellent time for the Government to dispose of some of its tremendous excess lead at a small gain. If this material is not made available for immediate offering, this opportunity might be, and I believe would be, missed since it is anticipated that the supply situation will improve over the next 6 months, in which case producers will be opposing disposal of any of this surplus lead that is owned by the taxpayers.

The average acquisition cost of lead in the stockpile was 14.4 cents per pound and with the current market price being 15½ cents per pound, the value of the lead to be disposed of is $31 million.

The sale of lead by advertising for sale to the highest responsible bidder is not likely to improve the return to the Government over the method proposed by the General Services Administration. While the demand for lead is great at this time, consumers are unlikely to offer the Government more than the published

domestic price for excess lead. This material has been in outside storage for many years and at a minimum requires some cleaning and handling before it can be used in contrast to fresh, newly produced material which is delivered to them ready for immediate use.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I should like to state that I am not opposed to competitive bidding nor are the other members of the Armed Service Committee, but we do feel we should consider the existing circumstances and dispose of this lead at the time propitious to the Government and in a manner that will not cause a disruption to the market.

Mr. President, it is with those premises that I move that Senate concur in the House amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Who yields time?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Missouri to the extent that the Government should dispose of some of these materials, including lead as well as other commodities, that are surplus in the stockpiling program. However, I do not see why there is such an objection to selling the lead at a competitive bid so that the Government could realize the highest possible dollar in getting rid of it.

The Senator pointed out that we have 1,170,000 tons of lead which are surplus and should be disposed of. This measure provides for getting rid of around 100,000 tons. We should sell the lead.

I think it is well to review the manner in which this lead was first accumulated. It was accumulated under the premise that we should stockpile strategic materials that would be necessary in case of an emergency. The Government soon had whatever supply it needed under that category. Then this stockpiling program was turned into a support program, and the Government continued to buy and stockpile those materials which were in excess supply and which were not bringing a good price on the free market. In buying these materials the Government did not buy them at the lowest prices available on the date of purchase. It bought them at the quoted prices on the market. They were bought in a weak market with the result that the minerals, in many instances, were actually selling considerably below the quoted prices, and the Government did not get the benefit of this "below the quoted price."

Mr. President, a striking example was the manner in which they stockpiled magnesium. In that case the mineral was bought at a price which was 200 or 300 percent above the prevailing price at which it could have been bought at the same time if the Government had made its purchases from this industry at the lowest available price.

I repeat, we bought these materials at the quoted price, and in most instances the quoted price was above the market price prevailing on the date it was purchased. Now, we are planning to sell this lead. Today we have a tight market. There is a strong demand, and instead of suppliers being able to buy these minerals at the quoted prices, the minerals are bringing premiums, not discounts; and they have to pay a premium above the quoted price in many instances in order to get the necessary materials, whether it be lead or another mineral in short supply.

The difference in selling this mineral by competitive bids is that the bidders would pay the market price, which may or may not be the quoted price. The Government could very well receive bids, and more than likely would receive bids, in excess of the quoted price, which would mean it could realize more money than selling at quoted prices minus the usual discounts they give under customary procedures.

This was a case where the Government was taken for a ride when we bought it, and now they want to take the Government for another ride when we are selling it. I do not understand this line of reasoning. The argument is made that if we do not sell it today while the market is strong the producers may object to selling it later.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If the producers object to selling it later, it is because they want production after the supply meets demand. It seems to me most unfortunate that due to the technicalities involved, when we have an opportunity to sell it above what was paid for it, we are not giving the taxpayers the benefit of making the sale because this lead will ultimately deteriorate to the point that it will not be worth as much as new lead.

For that reason, as the Senator from Delaware—for whom I have the greatest respect, especially in the field of taxation—knows under competitive bidding it is possible that we would not get the market price today. Therefore, I would hope, inasmuch as we have this gigantic surplus which the taxpayers paid for, and which we could partially reclaim, as we did in the very wise and constructive handling of the aluminum picture, where we ran into the same situation, that the able Senator from Delaware would not tie the hands of the General Services Administration by a theoretical presentation of the competitive situation. That is the thrust of my statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Seldom do I find myself in disagreement with the distinguished Senator from Missouri. It is true that the highest bid may be below the market price, but the Government can reject a bid under that circumstance. In the end they would get bids at least at the market price. I concur completely in the need for getting rid of lead, and I would be willing to support selling double the amount in the amendment; but the point I am making is that we should have an orderly liquidation of the stockpiling inventories for which we have no use. By all means, we should start getting rid of them today when there is a market for them, but at the same time, the mere fact that the Government, as a result of inflation and war, will be getting more money than it paid for it, is in itself not the whole answer. If the Government can get even more money, why not get it? The mere fact is that they are making a profit but can make more—let them do it. They have a place to use it.

I am not unmindful of the fact that the argument last year was made along those lines in the proposed sale of platinum.

The Senator remembers the platinum proposal, which we stopped at that time. That plan was to sell at the quoted market price, which was around $100 an ounce lower than the prevailing market price. It represented millions of dollars that the Government would have been losing had that particular sale of platinum been made at the negotiated price as it wished.

I was talking to a GSA representative a couple of weeks ago, and he said it was most fortunate we stopped that sale because they now realize that instead of having a surplus of platinum we are actually in short supply, and I assume that had we sold that platinum then at the price of about $100 below the prevailing price we would be buying it today at the higher price. How ridiculous can we get?

After all, the Senate, as the board of directors of our Government, should help protect the Government's interest and see that the Government buys as cheaply as possible, and when selling that it does so at a higher price, just as the Senator and I would do as businessmen. I do not see why we are asked to pass a bill to hand out bargains, ofttimes to the very same people that sold us those products at prices above market prices in the first place.

I know that the Senator had supported my amendment to make this a competitive bid, and I appreciate that. As businessmen I know that we agree on that principle of business operation. Let us insist on the Senate amendment and reject the House proposal that these sales be made on a negotiated basis.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The question of platinum and the question of lead are two distinctly different questions. My State is the largest producer of lead. Over the years, I have received a great many protests for release of any lead from the stockpile, because it would interfere with the fact that the production of lead is a heavy market and because there has been more of supply than of demand. But in just this short period, GSA—and things went well during both administrations—has got the producers to the point now that they are willing to say, "We will pay you to dispose of the lead."

In the case of platinum, the situation is exactly opposite. Much platinum came from the Soviet Union. We estimated what was needed in the national stockpile and found the demand for platinum has increased, whereas the demand for lead in the stockpile has been reduced to nothing. In the theory of it, I say to my good friend from Delaware, we all agree it is complicated, but in this particular case the administration itself, and unanimously all members of the Subcommittee on Stockpiling believe that this is the best way to handle it, if the taxpayer is going to get rid of $31 million worth of unnecessary lead.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I repeat, I am perfectly willing to

sell this lead. I also recognize the concern of the producers of lead in the Senator's State and elsewhere as the Government initiates an orderly liquidation of this stockpile of 1,170,000 tons. I recognize also that as we liquidate this unnecessary and unneeded inventory it will have an adverse effect on the market and, therefore, an adverse effect upon the earnings of these producers. We cannot escape that. I mentioned this danger at the time they were accumulating these surplus supplies. I warned that when the time came to get rid of the inventories we would hear complaints in reverse.

I remind the Senator that the same argument is used concerning disposals of agricultural commodities. It is true in any of the areas where the Government operates. As we increase Government inventories of corn, wheat, and any other agricultural commodity as a result of our support programs those commodities in the Government inventories are hanging over the market and have a weakening and dampening effect on prices, both as to the result of their hanging over the market and as a threat to their being liquidated. Then when they are liquidated they do adversely affect the market. We cannot escape that.

The only way to escape this result is to stop accumulating excess inventories when the Government does not need them. This stockpile program was nothing more nor less than a support program for the mining industry at a time when there was not much demand for the product. The Government accumulated its inventories as it supported the mineral producers. Now the Government does not need the inventories, and it wants to liquidate them.

All I am saying is, let us get all we can when they are sold. We do not have enough money in the Treasury to be passing out windfalls.

I certainly hope that the Senate will stand pat and insist on requiring competitive bids when liquidating this stockpile of lead. Let us begin an orderly liquidation of all the minerals we do not need, but let us do it in a businesslike manner.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall not delay the Senate longer. I hope that the Senate will reject the amendment of the House and insist that we keep the Senate text of the bill, which would merely provide for competitive bids in the liquidation of this stockpile of lead.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield such time as I have remaining to the Senator from Louisiana.

TAX LEGISLATION

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, with regard to the proposed extension of the surtax and the issue of tax reform, I ask unanimous consent that the statement which I made at the opening session of the Committee on Finance be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TAX REFORM AND THE SURTAX

This is the first of a two-part hearing with respect to H.R. 12290, a bill passed by the House of Representatives to extend the income tax surcharge and to repeal the 7 percent investment tax credit. The bill also continues for another one-year period the present 10 percent excise tax on telephone service and the 7 percent tax on passenger automobiles. In addition, it provides a special low income allowance which relieves millions of poverty-level wage-earners from the tax rolls. Finally, it allows air and water pollution control devices to be amortized over a 5-year period.

During this first portion, the Committee will receive testimony from the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget with respect to the need for the legislation. We will also hear public witnesses with respect to the provisions in the House bill. If the Secretary concludes his testimony today, we will begin hearing public witnesses tomorrow.

In the second phase of the hearing, the Committee will take testimony with respect to tax reform.

There will be no tax hearing on Thursday, July 10, because of a prior commitment to the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs which will be inquiring into several matters relating to the Veterans' statutes.

Before recognizing the Secretary of the Treasury, let me make an announcement with respect to the Committee's schedule for considering tax reform.

TAX REFORM HEARINGS

In our Committee on Finance it has been the practice to hold hearings on specific bills and amendments that Senators are interested in. This procedure differs from that followed by the Committee on Ways and Means where hearings often precede the introduction of a bill.

In keeping with this practice of the Committee, I plan to announce to the Senate that our tax reform hearings are going to be just as broad and comprehensive as the Senators want them to be. All we ask is that the Senators draft and indicate to us all of the tax reform proposals they desire to offer to H.R. 12290 so that we can conduct hearings on them before we take the bill up in executive session.

I know most Senators will agree with me that we should not take taxpayers by surprise and take up amendments which may affect them without giving them an opportunity to state their side of the question. That's what the hearing process is all about.

Similarly, a Senator should be entitled to state to the Senate that his tax reform suggestions have been through the hearing process in the Committee on Finance and thus prevent that procedural argument from being used as a device to build up opposition to his amendment. He should be entitled to get a vote on the merits of his tax reform suggestions.

IDENTIFICATION OF TAX REFORM PROPOSALS

So to be fair to them and to the Senators who want to propose tax reform amendments to the surtax bill, I urge that Senators who have introduced bills in the Senate identify to the Committee on Finance those which they intend to call up as amendments during Senate consideration of H.R. 12290.

If Senators have tax reform suggestions in mind that they intend to propose but which have not yet been introduced, I urge that they introduce them and identify them as matters they would like to have considered during discussion of H.R. 12290.

If Senators will cooperate with the Committee on Finance in this way, we can publish all these tax reform suggestions in a Committee print and make them the basis for the tax reform phase of our hearings.

No Senator will be deprived of the right to a hearing on his tax reform ideas. But in order to advance these hearings in an orderly manner, it is necessary that we know within a specified time exactly what the Senators want to propose in the way of tax reform.

Therefore, I urge Senators to let us know by Friday of next week—July 18, 1969—what they plan to offer in the way of tax reform. Then we can schedule our tax reform hearings to begin promptly the following week—the week of the 21st.

I believe this procedure recognizes the right of every Senator to offer whatever tax reform amendment his conscience dictates, and at the same time, enables the Committee on Finance to carry out its responsibility to the Senate.

SENATE DEMOCRATIC POLICY COMMITTEE POSITION

I might add that in my opinion this procedure also fully conforms to the announcement made on June 25 by the distinguished Majority Leader that the Democratic Policy Committee had voted unanimously:

"That any proposal to extend the income tax surcharge be considered simultaneously with recommendations on meaningful tax reform." and

"That the present income tax withholding rates be continued after June 30, 1969 for a period of one quarter to permit full consideration and disposition of the reform and extension of the surtax."

The Majority Leader elaborated on the Policy Committee resolution in a letter to me dated July 1. In his letter he emphasized that the debate on the Floor prior to passage of the 31-day extension of the surtax withholding rates "clearly specifies that additional extensions will be forthcoming if necessary to afford the ordinary processing of intended tax reform through the Senate Finance Committee."

It is my purpose today to implement the Majority Leader's announcements by again urging that Senators identify their tax reform proposals to us by July 18 so that the Committee on Finance can proceed with the ordinary processing of intended tax reform.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the letter of the majority leader addressed to the chairman of the committee, dated July 1, 1969, be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

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

U.S. SENATE, OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, D.C., July 1, 1969.

Hon. RUSSELL B. LONG,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR RUSSELL: At the meeting of the Democratic Policy Committee on Tuesday, June 24, 1969, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas, the Senate Majority Policy Committee, having met and considered the matter of the extension of the income tax surcharge, hereby resolves:

"That meaningful tax reforms should be adopted as a means of achieving an equitable national income tax policy, and further resolves,

"That any proposal to extend the income tax surcharge be considered simultaneously with recommendations on meaningful tax reform and further resolves,

"That the present income tax withholding rates be continued after June 30, 1969 for a period of one quarter to permit full consideration and disposition of the reform and extension of the surtax."

It was my intention of course to inform the full Democratic membership of the Policy Committee's recommendation before incorporating that action into any deliberations on the Senate floor. You will recall, however, that during the Senate's consideration of the temporary extension of the tax withholding rates last Wednesday. I publicly announced the Policy Committee's unanimous position that meaningful tax reform should be considered simultaneously with any fixed extension of the surcharge.

The announcement was required at that time simply because Senate action was needed. The House had planned originally to consider the surcharge question on Wednesday. It was unable to do so, in fact the House leadership announced a postponement of two weeks. That event required the Senate's Finance Committee to proceed immediately with an interim 31-day withholding rate extension to preserve the status quo until House disposition of the surcharge. The short extension of the tax withholding rates was necessary to permit House action; it was undertaken at the request of the House leadership. So it was because of this impending action that I felt it was imperative to publicize the Policy Committee's position. In going on record at that time, I was hoping to assure against any misinterpretations of any subsequent extensions of the withholding tax rates to permit additional time for Senate action. The debate on the floor prior to passage of the 31-day extension of *withholding rates* clearly specifies that additional extensions will be forthcoming if necessary to afford the orderly processing of intended tax reform through the Senate Finance Committee.

I should mention that during its deliberations on this question, the Policy Committee was well apprised of the inequities of the tax structure and the growing public awareness of this fact. To vote simply to extend the surtax would have compounded these inequities. Coupling the reform of the tax structure with any extension of the surtax thus appeared eminently fair. Indeed, for the taxpayer, it should come as a welcomed message.

So it was for these reasons that the Committee felt that no permanent extension of the surcharge should be voted, unless and until tax reform is passed. And it should be added that Senator Russell Long, Chairman of the Finance Committee, participated fully in these deliberations and in the unanimous vote of the Policy Committee.

I hope you will be understanding of these events that prohibited a more orderly communication of this action. I hope also you will consider favorably the position adopted on this proposal.

Sincerely,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, it is the intention of the Committee on Finance to move as rapidly as we can, in good legislative procedure, with the surtax extension and the other amendments voted by the House.

It is also our intention to consider amendments proposed by Senators in the nature of tax reform, be they those to reduce someone's tax or those which raise someone's tax. Many Senators have ideas on this subject which they would like to have considered.

It is our hope that Senators who have amendments to be considered will have them drafted by July 18 and that they and other witnesses will be prepared to testify starting on July 21 with regard to them.

The Secretary of the Treasury testified on the bill this morning. He will be back before the committee this afternoon. It is expected that he and the Director of the Budget will conclude their testimony today. It is our hope to consider the testimony of public witnesses starting tomorrow.

I hope Senators will realize that it is important that amendments to this important legislation be considered by the committee, so it can vote those suggestions up or down, improve them if we can, before they are offered on the floor. I think most Senators will agree that it is appropriate that the committee have an opportunity to study their suggestions before they are offered on the floor to a big revenue bill.

Therefore, we hope to commence hearing those matters the week beginning Monday, July 21, and perhaps concluding on Friday; proceed immediately into executive session; and report the bill the first week of August. If that can be done, perhaps the bill will be voted on before the Senate takes its recess in August. If we cannot do it, we will have to ask for another extension of the surtax withholding rate.

When we asked that the bill be voted extending for 31 days the withholding tax rates, we did so at the request of the House. That was not a proposal initiated in the Senate. It was because of a problem confronting the House Members that we asked for the 31-day extension of the withholding tax rates. We will perhaps find it necessary to ask for an extension in our own right, and we think the House will be considerate of us, just as we were considerate of the House when they asked us for a 31-day extension. We hope we will not have to do it, but it may be necessary.

If the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DIRKSEN) wishes me to clarify the record further, I will be glad to try to do so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I explored this matter with the Secretary of the Treasury and the distinguished chairman of the Senate Finance Committee in open committee session this morning. I tried to point out that if we waited until the 18th of July to get in all the tax reform proposals, we would then have to set hearings, hear Senators first, and then Government witnesses, and then outside witnesses. Then, after a time, we get around to the marking up of the bill. After the markup the staff has to prepare the report. Then the bill goes to the Senate Calendar. Always, right ahead of us, is the 13th of August date, because that is when the late recess begins. That is immutable and cannot be changed. So if no bill is passed, then nothing more can be done until after Labor Day. Meanwhile, we have to go to conference. We cannot go to conference unless a bill has been passed in some form or other. So it goes to the third house. The custom is for the third house to wrestle with it for a long, long time.

So one can well apprehend that, unless these delays are not met, we are not going to get a tax bill until late in the year. Obviously, the inflationary fever is going to be eating away at the economy. I would not like to undertake that kind of responsibility if there is a way to somehow accelerate this matter and get quicker action on it.

Obviously, if possible, we could bring in a bill relating to low-income people, the so-called top credit, and the surtax bill—those three items—put them in a package and let the other reform items come in a later package. I know there is an indisposition to go along with that idea. On the other hand, haste is essential, because it is vital that we find a cure and a solution for inflation.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I think I should state that it was the view of the Democratic Policy Committee that tax reform should accompany this tax bill. I certainly agreed with that procedure. I did not feel that I was according anyone any right that was not his anyway, because we have no closed rule in the Senate. Any Senator can offer any amendment he wants to on a revenue bill. He can offer any amendment he wants to on a revenue bill, except a constitutional amendment, and remain entirely within the rules.

Senators who have their favorite amendments will offer them in any event. We cannot deny them that right. That being the case, it seemed to me we might as well go ahead and agree that we would be willing to hold a hearing on amendments Senators might offer.

Perhaps we can work out some way to expedite this matter. As far as I am concerned, I am willing to help. At the moment, I would like to continue doing what we are doing. But I must say the House somehow resents the Senate's undertaking to initiate big revenue measures.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the previous agreement, all time having expired, the question is on the motion to concur in the House amendment.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, as I said, at the moment I am satisfied we are doing what we should be doing. We are moving as rapidly as we can. We have heard the Secretary of the Treasury. We hope to conclude his testimony and that of the Director of the Budget. Tomorrow we expect to hear public witnesses. Starting on July 21, we expect to hear Senators and other witnesses testify on their pet propoals or such amendments as they may want to propose, which they feel will make for equitable tax reform, whether on the up side or on the down side, as may suit Members of this body.

Perhaps we might be able to prevail on the Senate to follow the approach suggested by the Senator from Illinois, but that is not before us at this time. In the meantime, we will go ahead as we are.

RELEASE OF CERTAIN LEAD FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE AND SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1647) an act to authorize the release of 100,000 short tons of lead from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile.

The VICE PRESIDENT. All time has expired under the unanimous-consent agreement. The question is on concur-

ring in the House amendment to the bill (S. 1647). On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, for clarification, am I correct that a "yea" vote would be a vote to sustain the position of the House requiring negotiated sales, and a "nay" vote would sustain the position of the Senate providing for competitive bidding?

The VICE PRESIDENT. A "yea" vote would be to concur in the House amendment.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, am I correct in assuming that a "yea" vote means that we are willing to carry on in the lead picture the extremely successful results that we obtained through negotiation in the aluminum picture, to the benefit of the taxpayers of a great many millions of dollars?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that it is not within the province of the Chair to interpret the law.

The question recurs on concurring in the House amendment to Senate bill 1647. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE), and the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON) are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. SPONG) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. SPONG) would each vote "yea."

Mr. SCOTT. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE), and the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 32, as follows:

[No. 56 Leg.]

YEAS—58

Anderson	Hatfield	Pastore
Baker	Holland	Pearson
Bayh	Hollings	Percy
Burdick	Hughes	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Jackson	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Russell
Cannon	Kennedy	Saxbe
Church	Long	Schweiker
Cranston	Mansfield	Scott
Dodd	Mathias	Sparkman
Dole	McCarthy	Stennis
Eagleton	McClellan	Symington
Eastland	McGee	Talmadge
Ellender	McGovern	Tower
Ervin	McIntyre	Tydings
Fulbright	Metcalf	Williams, N.J.
Goodell	Montoya	Yarborough
Harris	Moss	Young, Ohio
Hart	Muskie	
Hartke	Nelson	

NAYS—32

Aiken	Bennett	Cooper
Allen	Boggs	Cotton
Allott	Brooke	Curtis
Bellmon	Cook	Dirksen
Dominick	Hansen	Prouty
Fannin	Hruska	Smith
Fong	Jordan, Idaho	Stevens
Goldwater	Miller	Thurmond
Gore	Mundt	Williams, Del.
Griffin	Murphy	Young, N. Dak.
Gurney	Packwood	

NOT VOTING—10

Bible	Javits	Ribicoff
Case	Magnuson	Spong
Gravel	Mondale	
Inouye	Pell	

So the motion to concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives was agreed to.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRANSTON in the chair). Under the order of yesterday, the Senate will proceed to the transaction of routine morning business under a 3-minute limitation on statements.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I have a speech of approximately 15 minutes' duration. I should be pleased to yield to any Senator whose remarks would be of shorter duration.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. EAGLETON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

WE SHOULD ESTABLISH DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH THE MONGOLIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the failure of President Nixon to act on the reported recommendation by Secretary of State Rogers to recognize the Mongolian People's Republic demonstrates once again the serious penalty that our Nation continues to pay for our failure to establish a realistic policy in the Far East.

The fact is that I first advocated in this Senate Chamber that the United States establish diplomatic relations with the Mongolian People's Republic on May 16, 1966. Since then I have spoken and written on numerous occasions calling for a diplomatic exchange and establishment of formal channels of communication with Mongolia. It could hardly be claimed that the United States acted in haste in recognizing a sovereign nation functioning and viable for more than half a century.

Now, once again, it appears that objection from Chiang Kai-shek, that corrupt warlord in Taiwan, has again forced inaction on the part of the United States on this proposal. Senators will recall that once before, in 1961 at the time the Mongolian People's Republic was admitted to the United Nations, the United States was on the verge of recognizing that nation but backed off because of Chiang Kai-shek's objections. It is also noteworthy that the nationalist Chinese dictator of Formosa, or Taiwan, again recently voiced objection to officials in the executive branch of our Government particularly to President Nixon shortly after his meeting with President Thieu of the Saigon militarist regime preceding the Midway Conference between Thieu and President Nixon. Here is a blatant case of the tail wagging the dog. It is none of the business of either Saigon dictator Thieu or that warlord Chiang Kai-shek as to what nations our Government chooses to recognize and with whom we choose to maintain diplomatic relations. It is a further example of the harmful effects of our continuing the absurd fiction that the nationalist government of Taiwan is the government of all China. It is not. Nor was it at any time since the defeated Chiang Kai-shek fled from mainland China hanging on in Taiwan due solely to the protection of our warships and airpower.

It is a matter for astonishment that President Nixon would knuckle down to the demands of Chiang Kai-shek who is of no use whatever to our Nation and who could not remain in power in Formosa, now called Taiwan, except for the supporting umbrella of our airpower and 7th Fleet. Talk about unleashing Chiang Kai-shek, he and his armed forces are utterly useless to the free world. I am sorry to say he and the government of which he is dictator has received more than $7 billion of our taxpayers' money since 1948. Furthermore, mirabile dictu, it is astonishing to narrate that President Nixon seems to be yielding not only deference and devotion to this old warlord but has yielded subservience and has because of Chiang's objections again postponed holding diplomatic relations with Mongolia. Let us hope that this is but a temporary submission on his part. As stated, this dictator, who recently decreed that his oldest son would succeed him as President of Taiwan, and Madame Chiang have been enriched with more than $7 billion of our taxpayers' money.

Since World War II our Government has handed over more than $7 billion of taxpayers' money to Chiang Kai-shek to maintain his regime and his army of 600,000 aging men in Taiwan. They parade on holidays in perfect cadence and as beautifully as Shriners. They might fight about as well, though that is a debatable matter. Our Government has never sought even one platoon of the 600,000 so-called soldiers of Chiang Kai-shek to aid us in Vietnam. Fighting qualities of Chiang's troops are questioned by our military leaders. Not one soldier of his aging army ever fought beside Americans in Korea or in South Vietnam. In the Korean conflict fought under the flag of the United Nations soldiers of Turkey, Ethiopia, and other nations sent combat troops into South Korea to join our forces. A high ranking officer of our Armed Forces in South Vietnam recently stated it would probably be dangerous and disruptive to our GI's if in combat there were some hundreds of Chiang Kai-shek's forces to be in the same battle and perchance be ahead of some of our troops. The moment real combat commenced, he said,

Chiang's soldiers would probably run so fast toward the rear our own forces might be thrown off balance.

Chiang is a ruthless, unscrupulous warlord. The fact is that in February 1947, the Taiwanese people revolted against the tyranny of their nationalist Chinese overlords. In quelling this undisciplined civilian revolt Chiang's armed forces and policemen slaughtered more than 13,000 unarmed civilians, many of them women and children who had been uprooted from their homes and villages.

The Soviet Union and Communist China are dangerously close to war. There are border incidents, shooting and killing with small arms and artillery between the two nations almost daily along their 6,500 mile common border. The Soviet Union has stationed its best troops along the Manchurian border with Communist China. The Peking "People's Daily" terms the rulers of the Kremlin "the mad new czars" and "Fascist renegades." Meanwhile, the United States continues to bury its head in the sand and to officially ignore the existence of the Mongolian People's Republic strategically situated between two giant adversaries with a 2,485-mile border with China and a 2,134-mile border with the Soviet Union.

The Mongolian People's Republic is a vast area of 625,950 square miles—more than 50 times the size of Belgium, more than 78 times the size of Massachusetts, and more than 125 times the size of the sovereign State of Connecticut. It has diplomatic relations with 44 nations, including our allies, Canada, Great Britain, Australia, and France. This country with a population of approximately 1,200,000 people is landlocked between the two greatest powers in the Communist world—Soviet Russia and Red China.

Recent events in the struggle for power in the Communist world have made it clear that Mongolia is within the Soviet sphere of influence. Its nationalist Communist rulers have allied themselves with the Soviet Communist leaders in the power struggle going on between the Communist Russians and Communist Chinese. However, Mongolia has developed a spirit of intense nationalism and pride. This nation has history and noble tradition stretching back over centuries even before the time Genghis Khan and the Mongol conquerors of that era. At one time Mongolian armies under Genghis Khan controlled a vast empire reaching from northern Siberia to Tibet and from the Pacific Ocean to the Caspian Sea. In the centuries following Genghis Khan's death, Mongolian sovereignty and power gradually declined. In recent years the country was split into the two Mongolias of today—the Mongolian People's Republic established in 1921, and Inner Mongolia—a huge area which is now a Chinese province.

Mongolia's economy is primarily agrarian. Indeed, this nation enjoys the distinction of holding first place in the entire world in the number of domestic animals per capita. Moreover, it is a land rich in natural resources such as gold, copper, and other precious metals. Also, it is said that this land is rich in oil deposits. Leaders of the Mongolian People's Republic are eager to establish an industrial base for their country so that their nation may leap into the 20th century, on their own, buttressed by their national wealth and resources and end any economic reliance on the Soviet Union.

The presence of a U.S. embassy in Ulan Bator, the Mongolian capital, would provide valuable contacts and information on the sensitive Soviet-Chinese border area. Since the end of World War II the United States has been handicapped in that we have no diplomatic relations with Communist China. The American Consulate General in Hong Kong is our only listening post and open window to what is going on in the vast expanse of Mao Tse-tung's China.

An embassy in Ulan Bator would be of immense assistance as an additional listening post in the heart of Communist Asia in that strategic—yet relatively little known—area of the world.

The fact is that the United States has no legal or historical grievances with Mongolia. Furthermore, the leaders of that nation cannot be accused of aggression or hostile intent. Unlike the Communist rulers in Peking, the nationalist Communist rulers of Mongolia have welcomed tentative gestures which the United States has made in recent years toward a diplomatic exchange. Premier Yumjagiyn Tsedenbal has often said that he would welcome diplomatic relations with the United States.

We Americans have nothing whatever to lose and we would have much to gain were we to establish diplomatic and trade relations with the Mongolian People's Republic. In addition to the obvious strategic benefits of having an embassy there, this would also help prevent the complete submergence of Mongolia into the Communist bloc, and would contribute toward a relaxation of tensions between our Nation and the Soviet Union and also Communist China.

Nations of the free world have been engaged in trade with the Mongolian People's Republic. They have profited by selling their products and buying furs and other products from Mongolia. India recognized the Mongolian People's Republic in 1955 and Indonesia and Burma in 1956. Cambodia, Australia, Afghanistan, Malaysia, Pakistan, and other Asiatic nations exchanged embassies and have had diplomatic and commercial relations from the early 1960's. France, Denmark, Austria, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom have all recognized the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic and have had continuing diplomatic and commercial relations throughout recent years. The United Kingdom recognized Mongolia and has had continuing diplomatic relations throughout the past 6 years and has had steadily increasing commercial relations. In all, more than 30 nations of the free world maintain diplomatic relations with Mongolia and also commercial relations.

Very definitely, our Government should no longer delay in recognizing that government in establishing an embassy in Ulan Bator. By maintaining commercial relations we would have a new outlet for the products of American farms and factories, and we in America would benefit by importing the products and handicraft of the Mongolian people. It is evident that officials of our State Department have laid themselves open to severe criticism for their failure some years back to join with Switzerland, the United Kingdom, Sweden, India, Australia, Canada, and other nations of the free world in having complete diplomatic relations with Mongolia and in encouraging commerce and trade between our country and that country.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the previous order as to the limitation of time be suspended and that I be allocated a period of time not to exceed 15 minutes.

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

OPEN AND EQUITABLE TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, last March I was joined by 10 Senators in urging President Nixon not to relegate the critically important function of negotiating foreign trade agreements to the Department of Commerce, but rather to keep the Office of Special Trade Representative in the White House. Our concern was that all sectors of the American economy—manufacturers, farmers, and consumers, workers, and businessmen—be fully and objectively represented in any trade negotiations.

The Office of Special Trade Representative has in fact been preserved as an independent entity, and the name of a Special Trade Representative-Designate, Carl J. Gilbert, is now before the Senate. Nevertheless, I feel compelled once again to speak out in favor of fair, open and equitable trade negotiations.

I do so as a concerned citizen, as a representative of a State whose commerce and agriculture has a great deal to lose from unwise, unnecessary, or unfair restraint of trade with other nations, and as a Senator who takes seriously his constitutional obligation "to regulate commerce with foreign nations."

During the month of April, Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans, the special trade representative-designate, Carl Gilbert, and various other executive branch officials with responsibility for trade affairs held a series of discussions with their counterparts in Western Europe. During the month of May, Secretary Stans led a similar expedition to the Far East for discussions with our major trading partners in that area.

As Secretary Stans' various public statements confirm, one of the primary purposes of these trips has been to convince major textile-producing nations that they should agree to a new international arrangement which would place voluntary quotas on the flow of woolen and synthetic fabrics and products to the United States.

In these discussions, the threat of con-

gressional action to establish mandatory import quotas has evidently been used—as it has often been used in the past—to press our trading partners to sign "voluntary" quota agreements.

This effort to negotiate a multilateral agreement raises a number of troubling questions which Members of this Congress must clearly consider, particularly if their presumed intentions regarding foreign trade are to be used as a negotiating pawn.

First, to what extent is a new international arrangement actually needed to protect this country's textile and apparel manufacturers and workers? Granted, there has been a rapid growth of textile imports in recent years—from 334 million pounds in 1961 to 784 million pounds in 1968—an increase of 135 percent. Nevertheless, imports of all fiber constitute less than 8 percent of domestic consumption.

During the last 8 years when textile imports were growing at a rapid pace, the textile industry more than doubled its profits and increased its own production from approximately 6,550 million pounds to approximately 9,650 million pounds. Employment in the textile industry is up 300,000 since 1961.

On their face, these statistics do not constitute an indisputable case of injury to the domestic industries.

In view of these figures—and in view of the concessions American workers, manufacturers, exporters, retailers, and consumers would have to pay under our international obligations in exchange for any new arrangement—it would seem appropriate that those in favor of a new voluntary arrangement, and those opposed to it, present their positions to the public in open hearings.

It is quite possible that some parts of the textile industry and some of its workers are suffering acute disruption and have a legitimate case for more protection, even at a possible cost to other parts of the economy. It may even be possible to demonstrate a threat of substantial disruption in the future. If this is the case, I believe these industries and workers should have reasonable protection. If our trading partners are not prepared to offer such protection, it is up to Congress to provide it.

But let us put all the facts on the table before we commit ourselves to any more building blocks in what could become an economic fortress America.

Second, if it is determined that some areas of the domestic textile industry are suffering such substantial injury that a new international arrangement is needed, it then becomes relevant to determine which products of man-made and woolen fabrics should be included in this arrangement. It is probable that the need for restrictions varies according to the type of article at issue. Some articles of woolen or synthetic fabrics may not be produced domestically in substantial quantities. If that is the case, then perhaps these articles should be excluded from the arrangement since their inclusion will not aid the U.S. textile or apparel industries, but will harm American consumers by raising prices and limiting selection.

Third, if there is injury, is a quota arrangement the best and most equitable means, in terms of America's long-term economic and security interests, for remedying the situation?

Fourth, if we persuade our major trading partners to enter into a new voluntary textile arrangement, what concessions will we be asked to pay in return? Will the price for a textile arrangement be the adoption of a new internal tax in Western Europe on Missouri soybeans, for example? Will it be the cessation of Japanese action to eliminate their present quotas on certain American products or tightened restrictions on foreign investments.

All of us should know what price is to be paid for a new international textile arrangement and who among us will be paying it.

Fifth, will a new textile agreement—following so quickly on the heels of the voluntary arrangement for steel products—create a precedent for other domestic industries which feel threatened by the flow of imports? Will we suddenly discover that protectionist forces have shifted their emphasis from pressure on Congress for legislative quotas to pressure on the Administration for quiet international arrangements on behalf of their products?

And if such pressure is placed on the administration and some concessions are given, will this country not find that it has suddenly become one of the world's leading protectionist nations and the originator of an international trend away from the free movement of goods and capital?

Finally is Congress content to find itself in the position of being used as a tool by the administration in its efforts to persuade foreign countries that public opinion in this country favors various protectionist measures?

In my judgment, all of these questions and others should be raised publicly. I feel very strongly that the President should order the Office of the Special Trade Representative to undertake public hearings at which information can be freely exchanged on the scope and ramifications of any new textile arrangement, prior to the time that arrangements are made for any negotiations.

Basic considerations of fairness and equity, as well as the need for information, dictate that public hearings on the proposed arrangement should be held. Those who may experience either substantial economic benefits or harm from such an arrangement—be they textile and apparel manufacturers, textile importers, retailers, consumers or domestic exporters of goods unrelated to textiles—should have an opportunity to be heard before the United States of America embarks on what is nothing less than a major new foreign policy.

It is my hope that this new administration—which has committed itself to the need for public awareness and public acceptance of governmental action—will adopt this suggestion and embark upon such open hearings in the very near future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article written by Marquis Childs, published in the Washington Post on June 30, 1969.

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

STANS TRADE PRONOUNCEMENTS SMACK OF HERBERT HOOVER ERA

(By Marquis Childs)

Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans is one of the most inconspicuous members of the Nixon Administration. He plays it in a low key, with a smooth exterior and every evidence of the stern interior of the banker and the fund raiser who for a year and a half gathered prodigious sums of money to elect Richard Nixon President.

Nevertheless, Stans' influence can be as decisive as that of any of the Nixon policymakers, not excepting Secretary of State William P. Rogers. This is true if only because he is setting the course on trade and tariffs. And while his pronouncements rarely make the headlines in this country, they were front-page news in Europe and Asia when he toured the world with a warning that restrictive quotas should be imposed voluntarily or Congress would respond to a rising tide of protectionism and legislate quotas.

For free traders Stans' tour and the resentments it generated are an ominous echo of the protectionist clamor of the Herbert Hoover era. Congress reponded to that clamor by enacting the Hawley-Smooth tariff act which helped to bring on the worldwide depression of the '30's.

Stans' immediate concern in his tour first of Europe then of Asia was to get voluntary quotas on artificial fibers and manufactured textiles. These would be like the quota on cotton textiles and the quota on steel designed to limit competition from Japan.

Everywhere he went the Secretary met stout resistance. He could point to protectionism in the countries he visited, Japan's tariff barriers against American textiles and American motorcars. But these same countries buy American products in large volume and, particularly, cotton and tobacco from the South, where the clamour for textile quotas is loudest. President Nixon's campaign promise to protect Southern textile mills was widely exploited by his Southern strategist Sen. Strom Thurmond of South Carolina.

Stan says today that the aim is not to keep out competing textiles and fibers but rather to limit the rate of increase. He cites Taiwan as an example. In recent years Taiwan's textile exports to the United States have grown by 20 to 30 per cent a year, with the prospect that the volume will total $100 million by 1970.

Korea is another case in point. With large infusions of American aid Korea is close to economic sufficiency. Out of exports to this country of $251 million, textile products amount to $81 million. The latter is one-fifth of one per cent of total American consumption, which is a whopping $41.5 billion.

On his return in a press conference statement Stans seemed to issue an ultimatum—apply voluntary quotas in 60 to 90 days or suffer the consequences. He noted an unfavorable textile trade balance of $800 million. It was not, he says now, an ultimatum but an appeal to be reasonable with a suggested timetable.

To Koreans, as to 20 other friendly countries dependent in one degree or another on textile exports, Americans insistence on quotas is baffling. They must build up their economy against the persistent Communist threat from the north. With 55,000 troops in Vietnam they find it hard to understand why their powerful friend and partner should propose cutting down on one of their few dollar earners while they continue to

import a half-billion dollars in American goods, more than two-thirds of it paid for in hard cash.

To rebut Stans' contention the free traders cite the great prosperity of the American textile industry. Profits in 1961 were $589 million, in 1968 $1.276 billion. Despite widespread automation in new plants employment grew during this same period by 300,000, with a jump of 50,000 in 1968 alone. These facts are widely known in the developing countries, even though they get little attention here at home.

Nothing like the Nixon grab bag has been seen in this capital for many a year. It is stuffed with something for everybody. As a counter to Stans the White House nominated Carl J. Gilbert, former chairman of the Committee for a National Trade Policy and long known as a free trader, to be principal foreign trade adviser and negotiator.

If any differences should develop between Stans and Gilbert, it is a safe bet Stans will win the debate. The President is deeply in his debt. Moreover, he is the missionary for the conservatives who feel he is their legate at the Nixon court.

The commencement address Stans delivered at Grove City College in Pennsylvania was almost pure vintage 1928. All is for the best under the free-enterprise system. The system is predicated on the most basic human urges—to compete and acquire—and so long as we permit the free, orderly exercise of those instincts nothing will ever surpass it, Stans told the graduating class. Grove City is endowed largely by the Pew oil family, which is also among the most generous benefactors of the Republican Party.

In Stans' handsomely paneled office in the Department of Commerce is a portrait of Herbert Hoover. It is a brooding presence that seems to hold both promise and threat.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

EMPLOYMENT SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1969

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend and improve the Federal-State unemployment compensation program (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on U.S. financial participation in the United Nations Children's Fund, Department of State (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH GRANTS

A letter from the Director of Management Operations, Department of the Interior, Office of the Secretary, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering grants made during the calendar year 1968 to nonprofit institutions and organizations for support of scientific research programs (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 45

"Relative to soil grants for recreation

"Whereas, Congress enacted P.L. 566, 83rd Congress, which provides technical information and financial grants for soil conservation and flood prevention purposes; and

"Whereas, This law does not include recreation as a major beneficial use in the programs that are funded under its provisions; and

"Whereas, The increasing population and shortening of the general workweek have placed increasing pressures on existing recreational facilities; and

"Whereas, To meet this increasing pressure for recreational facilities it is necessary that multiple use be made of all facilities available; and

"Whereas, Projects developed for soil conservation purposes might be adapted to other uses, such as recreation; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to change existing laws regulating grants for soil conservation purposes to include recreation as a major beneficial use; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 42

"Relative to the retention of judge advocates and law specialist officers for the armed forces

"Whereas, There was introduced on January 28, 1969, H.R. 4296 by Congressman Alexander Pirnie of New York, designed to amend Title 37, United States Code, to provide for the procurement and retention of judge advocates and law specialist officers for the armed forces and the measure is now pending before the House Committee on Armed Services; and

"Whereas, H.R. 4296 is designed to amend Title 37, United States Code, to provide for the procurement and retention of judge advocates and law specialist officers for the armed forces by making provision for special or incentive pay for judge advocates of the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps and for law scpecialists of the Coast Guard who extend their periods of service on active duty by the execution of written agreements to remain on active duty for a period of at least three (3) years; and

"Whereas, At the present time, similar incentive pay is paid by the armed forces to doctors, dentists, and veterinarians; and

"Whereas, The retention rate of legal officers by the armed services is now dangerously low and the trend to deterioration should be stopped by early action intended to make legal careers with the armed forces more financially acceptable; and

"Whereas, The Military Justice Act of 1968 has extended to service personnel the right-to-counsel safeguards which the United States Supreme Court in recent years has granted to criminal defendants in the civil courts, and the same law requires the services to provide qualified and experienced lawyers as military judges in trials by special and by general courts-martial and the four services estimate that they will need approximately 700 additional military lawyers in order to meet the requirements of the statute; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact early appropriate legislation approving the subject matter and the contents of H.R. 4296; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the Chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, to the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, to the author of H.R. 4296, to the Secretary of Defense, and to the Executive Secretary, Judge Advocates Association."

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 44

"Relative to the equalization of the compensation of retired members of the uniformed forces

"Whereas, Compensation for retirees of the uniformed services of the United States has normally been computed upon active duty rates in accordance with permanent statutory law set out in Title 10 of the United States Code; and

"Whereas, Persons now retired from the uniformed services, with very few exceptions, entered the service while that law was in effect and served their entire active career, or the greater portion of it, under that system; and

"Whereas, The Military Pay Act of 1958, P.L. 85-422, temporarily suspended the operation of that law, without removing it from the statutes, thus denying the earned pay raise to retirees then on the rolls; and

"Whereas, The Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1963, P.L. 88-132, permanently changed Title 10 of the United States Code so as to deny the benefits of that act and of future active duty pay raises to retirees and to substitute therefor a less advantageous system of raises based upon the cost-of-living index; and

"Whereas, This ex post facto abrogation of the system under which today's retirees served and which they had every valid right to expect to be continued during their retirement, constitutes a clear breach of faith with those retirees; and

"Whereas, As a result of this unjust and discriminatory action, there are now seven standards of pay for persons who served in the same rank and for the same period of time, with the older retirees drawing as much as 32.5 percent less than their younger colleagues; and

"Whereas, This discriminatory action has had a very adverse impact not only upon the morale of retirees but also upon those now serving in the active forces and consequently has contributed to a worsening of the problem of retaining professional military personnel in the active forces; and

"Whereas, The State of California is privileged to be the home of many military retirees who have served their country faithfully and well, only to become the subject of the aforementioned discrimination; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation which will remove the existing discrimination against older retirees by equalizing the compensation of all retired members of the uniformed services who have served in the same rank and for an equal period of time; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and

Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution adopted by the National League of Insured Savings Associations, Washington, D.C., commending the administration for making housing one of the major goals; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Trustees of the Reed Union School District, of Belvedere-Tiburon, Calif., remonstrating against any proposal which would deprive State and local government obligations of their immunity from Federal taxation; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Village Council of Minnetonka, Minn., praying for the retention of the tax exemption feature pertaining to municipal bond interest; to the Committee on Finance.

Resolutions adopted by the National Executive Committee of the Polish Legion of American Veterans, U.S.A., in support of those serving in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by Americans for Patriotism, Inc., Scarsdale, N.Y., praying for the enlargement of the American Revolution—Bicentennial Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. ERVIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 2173. A bill to amend an Act entitled "An Act to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes", approved April 11, 1968 (Rept. No. 91-294).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session, the following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

George H. Goodrich, of Maryland, to be an associate judge of the District of Columbia court of general sessions.

By Mr. LONG, from the Committee on Finance:

Carl J. Gilbert, of Massachusetts, to be Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CASE, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOLE, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. FONG, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GOODELL, Mr. GRAVEL, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. HART, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. SCHWEIKER, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 2561. A bill to incorporate Pop Warner Little Scholars, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The remarks of Mr. SCOTT when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself and Mr. HATFIELD):

S. 2562. A bill to assist physicians and other professionals in prescribing drugs covered under Federal-State programs, to provide for the preparation and distribution of State drug formularies, and to encourage economy in the prescribing and dispensing of prescription drugs; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(The remarks of Mr. SCOTT when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. HART:

S. 2563. A bill to amend section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the disposal of surplus urban real property to public housing agencies for use for public housing purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(The remarks of Mr. HART when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 2564. A bill to amend the act fixing the boundary of Everglades National Park, Fla., and authorizing the acquisition of land therein, in order to authorize an additional amount for the acquisition of certain lands for such park; and

S. 2565. A bill to amend the act fixing the boundary of Everglades National Park, Fla., and authorizing the acquisition of land therein, in order to increase the authorization for such acquisitions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(The remarks of Mr. HOLLAND when he introduced the above bills appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 2566. A bill for the relief of Jimmie R. Pope; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLINGS:

S. 2567. A bill for the relief of Li Chun Chung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 2568. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, so as to make it an unfair labor practice for an employer to employ any alien unlawfully present in the United States, or to employ aliens whose principal dwelling places are in a foreign country during a labor dispute; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(The remarks of Mr. MONDALE when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. BENNETT) (by request):

S. 2569. A bill to amend section 3(d) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(The remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

S. 2561—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO INCORPORATE POP WARNER LITTLE SCHOLARS, INC.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, legislation to grant a Federal charter for the purpose of incorporating the nationwide Pop Warner junior league football program under the name Pop Warner Little Scholars, Inc. in recognition of this organization's continuing contributions in youth development.

Never before in our history has the need for youth guidance and counseling been greater than it is today. We are spending increasing sums from our Federal, State, and local treasures to provide more adequate formal education for our children. These expenditures are, in reality, investments in our greatest assets—our children.

Along with our efforts to provide opportunities for the formal education of our youth, a great need exists to provide for their physical fitness and their character development. We are fortunate indeed that several voluntary organizations are dedicated to the task of providing programs for the development of good citizenship, programs that are so essential for the full development of tomorrow's leaders. I wish to express my deep appreciation and my respect to the Boy Scouts of America, the Girl Scouts, and Little League Baseball, Inc., for the splendid role they are playing in youth development.

There is another organization dedicated to youth development, the Pop Warner junior league football program, and I should like to discuss its program.

Glen Scobie Warner, better known as "Pop" Warner, played varsity football at Cornell University and went on to coach the famous Carlisle Indians, of Carlisle, Pa., until that school closed in 1914. He then went to Pittsburgh, to Stanford, and to Temple University as coach. Pop Warner not only developed winning teams, he also developed great citizens through his emphasis on physical fitness, team play, citizenship, and scholarship.

Using the precepts established by Pop Warner as his charter, Joseph J. Tomlin, an outstanding lineman at Swarthmore College and an alumnus of Harvard Law School, founded the Pop Warner Little Football League in Philadelphia in 1929. Tomlin sought to expose boys of the ages of 7 to 14 to safety-first football, insisting that satisfactory school work be a prerequisite to team participation. He established a system of obtaining proper coaching and officiating and encouraged the development of safety-first equipment. Through this organization, he has been able to obtain group accident insurance for all team members at an extremely low rate.

During each of the last 40 years, the number of organized teams has expanded and the number of participants has increased. In 1968 organized leagues, using Pop Warner's standards, were playing in 32 States and over 600,000 boys received guidance in Pop Warner's precepts. Teams are matched by weight and age, and scholarships remain a prerequisite to team participation. The All-American team, selected at yearend, had many honor students on its roster.

The board of trustees is composed of outstanding citizens dedicated to the ideals fostered by Pop Warner. Individual members of the board contribute generously of their own time and money and raise additional funds through soliciting support from others. Joe Tomlin, the founder of the organization, remains its president and, to a large extent, is responsible for its growth and its smooth operation.

Pop Warner Little Scholars, Inc., now operates under a nonprofit charter granted by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The activities of this organization have expanded to such an extent that a Federal charter is necessary to recognize the organization's broad scope and to protect the Pop Warner name and insignia, those participating in the program and those who give their dedi-

cated services. Its prime purpose, like that of the Boy Scouts of America, the Girl Scouts, and Little League Baseball, Inc., is the fostering of leadership and good citizenship. This organization has been in existence sufficiently long to insure its permanency. Its operations are scattered geographically as to assure its national character. Its purposes are lauditory and its achievements are to be highly commended.

Mr. President, it is a great honor for me to introduce this bill for myself and 37 cosponsors on behalf of Pop Warner Little Scholars, Inc. I hope that many more of my colleagues will join me in sponsoring this measure as a token of our appreciation of this splendid effort for youth development.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this legislation as well as a list of the Pennsylvania communities in which Pop Warner Football is played be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 2561) to incorporate Pop Warner Little Scholars, Inc., introduced by Mr. SCOTT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2561

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Herbert Barness, 1352 Easton Road, Warrington, Pennsylvania; Joseph J. Tomlin, 1004 Western Saving Fund Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvaina; G. Martin Brill Watts, 571 Sycamore Mills Road, Media, Pennsylvania; James T. Bryan, Jr., 67 Wall Street, New York, New York; Milton Clark, 5401 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; George M. Ewing, Jr., 611 Maplewood Road, Wayne, Pennsylvania; Donald C. Osgood, 1000 Miramar Place, Fullerton, California; Anthony F. Visco, Jr., 1418 Packard Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Maurie H. Orodenker, 6004 N. 13th Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Charles A. Barsuglia, 7246 Marsden Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Stanley M. Bednarek, 2607 East Allegheny Avenue, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Mitchell N. Daroff, Rittenhouse Plaza Apartments, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; John D. Scott, City Hall, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; David G. Tomlin, 3664 Richmond Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; and their successors, are hereby created and declared to be a body corporate by the name of Pop Warner Little Scholars, Incorporated (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "corporation"), and by such name shall be known and have perpetual succession. Such corporation shall have the powers and be subject to the limitations and restrictions contained in this Act.

COMPLETION OF ORGANIZATION

SEC. 2. A majority of the persons named in the first section of this Act are authorized to complete the organization of the corporation by the selection of officers and employees, the adoption of bylaws, and the doing of such other acts as may be necessary to complete the organization of the corporation.

OBJECTS AND PURPOSES OF CORPORATION

SEC. 3. The objects and purposes of the corporation shall be—

(1) to inspire youth, regardless of race, creed, or color, to practice the ideals of sportsmanship, scholarship, and physical fitness; and

(2) to bring youth closer together through the means of common interest in sportsmanship, scholarship, fellowship, and athletic competition.

CORPORATE POWERS

SEC. 4. (a) The corporation shall have power—

(1) to sue and be sued, complain, and defend in any court of competent jurisdiction;

(2) to adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal;

(3) to appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as its business may require and define their authority and duties;

(4) to adopt and amend bylaws, not inconsistent with this Act or any other law of the United States or any State in which it is to operate, for the management of its property and the regulation of its affairs;

(5) to make and carry out contracts;

(6) to charge and collect membership dues, subscription fees, and receive contributions or grants of money or property to be devoted to the carrying out of its purposes;

(7) to acquire by purchase, lease, or otherwise, such real or personal property, or any interest therein, wherever situated, necessary or appropriate for carrying out its objects and purposes and subject to the provisions of law of the State in which such property is situated (A) governing the amount or kind of real or personal property which similar corporations chartered and operated in such State may hold, or (B) otherwise limiting or controlling the ownership of real or personal property by such corporations;

(8) to transfer, lease, and convey real or personal property;

(9) to borrow money for its corporate purposes, issue bonds therefor, and secure the same by mortgage, deed of trust, pledge, or otherwise, subject to all applicable provisions of Federal or State law; and

(10) to do any other acts necessary and proper to carry out its objects and purposes.

(b) For the purpose of this section, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia.

PRINCIPAL OFFICE; SCOPE OF ACTIVITIES; DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AGENT

SEC. 5. (a) The principal office of the corporation shall be located in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, or in such other places as may later be determined by the board of directors, but the activities of the corporation shall not be confined to that place, but may be conducted throughout the United States.

(b) The corporation shall maintain at all times in the District of Columbia a designated agent authorized to accept service of process for the corporation. Service upon, or notice mailed to the business address of, such agent, shall be deemed notice to or service upon the corporation.

MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 6. Eligibility for membership in the corporation and the rights and privileges of members shall, except as provided in this Act, be as set forth in the bylaws of the corporation.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS; COMPOSITION; RESPONSIBILITIES

SEC. 7. (a) Upon enactment of this Act, the membership of the initial board of directors of the corporation shall consist of the persons named in the first section of this Act.

(b) The initial board of directors shall hold office until the first election of a board of directors. The number, manner of selection (including filling of vacancies), term of office, and powers and duties of the directors shall be set forth in the bylaws of the corporation. The bylaws shall also provide for the selection of a chairman and his term of office.

(c) The board of directors shall be the governing board of the corporation, and a quorum thereof shall be responsible for the general policies and programs of the corporation and for the control of all funds of the corporation. The board of directors may appoint committees to exercise such powers as may be prescribed in the bylaws or by resolution of the board of directors.

OFFICERS; ELECTION OF OFFICERS

SEC. 8. The officers of the corporation shall be those provided in the bylaws. Such officers shall be elected in such manner, for such terms, and with such duties, as may be prescribed in the bylaws of the corporation.

USE OF INCOME; LOANS TO OFFICERS, DIRECTORS, OR EMPLOYEES

SEC. 9. (a) No part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure to any member, officer, or director be distributable to any such person during the life of the corporation or upon its dissolution or final liquidation. Nothing in this subsection, however, shall be construed to prevent the payment of reasonable compensation to officers of the corporation or reimbursement for actual necessary expenses in amounts approved by the corporation's board of directors.

(b) The corporation shall not make loans to its members, officers, directors, or employees. Any director who votes for or assents to the making of such a loan, and any officer who participates in the making of such a loan, shall be jointly and severally liable to the corporation for the amount of such a loan until the repayment thereof.

NONPOLITICAL NATURE OF CORPORATION

SEC. 10. The corporation and its officers and directors as such shall not contribute to, support, or otherwise participate in any political activity or in any manner attempt to influence legislation.

LIABILITY FOR ACTS OF OFFICERS AND AGENTS

SEC. 11. The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

PROHIBITION AGAINST ISSUANCE OF STOCK OR PAYMENT OF DIVIDENDS

SEC. 12. The corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock nor to declare or pay any dividends.

BOOKS AND RECORDS; INSPECTION

SEC. 13. The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall keep minutes of the proceedings of its members, board of directors, and committees having authority under the board of directors, and it shall also keep at its principal office a record of the names and addresses of its members entitled to vote. All books and records of the corporation may be inspected by any member entitled to vote, or his agent or attorney, for any proper purpose, at any reasonable time.

AUDIT OF FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS

SEC. 14. The provisions of sections 2 and 3 of the Act of August 30, 1964 (36 U.S.C. 1102, 1103), entitled "An Act to provide for audit of accounts of private corporations established under Federal law" shall apply with respect to the corporation.

USE OF ASSETS ON DISSOLUTION OR LIQUIDATION

SEC. 15. Upon dissolution or final liquidation of the corporation, after discharge or satisfaction of all outstanding obligations and liabilities, the remaining assets of the corporation may be distributed in accordance with the determination of the board of directors of the corporation and in compliance with this Act, the bylaws of the corporation, and all other Federal and State laws applicable thereto.

EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO NAME, EMBLEMS, SEAL, AND BADGES

SEC. 16. The corporation shall have the sole and exclusive right to use the name "Pop Warner Little Scholars", and to have and

to use such emblems, seals, and badges as may be required in carrying out its program. Nothing in this section shall be construed to interfere or conflict with established or vested rights.

RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO AMEND OR REPEAL CHARTER

SEC. 17. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved.

The list, presented by Mr. SCOTT, is as follows:

Pop Warner Football is played in the following Pennsylvania communities:

Aliquippa, Aston Mills, Baden, Beaver, Beaver Falls, Berwyn, Bethlehem, Center Township, Center Valley, Chalfont, Chester, Clairton, Collegeville, Colmar, Colwyn, Conshohocken, Conway, and Coopersburg.

Darby, Donora, Downingtown, Easton, Elizabethtown, Elwood City, Ephrata, Feasterville, Glenside, Huntingdon, Industry, Koppel, Lancaster, Langhorne, Lansdale, Laverock, Levittown, and Malvern.

Media, Monaca, Mt. Joy, Nazareth, New Brighton, New Castle, N. Charleroi, Oakhurst, Oreland, Paoli, Parker Ford, Pen Argyl, Penndel, Perkasie, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Pottstown, and Pughton.

Quakertown, Reiglesville, Richboro, Roslyn, Souderton, Southampton, Springfield, Swarthmore, Trumbauersville, Upland, Warminster, Williamsport, Willow Grove, Wind Gap, Woxall, York, and Zionsville.

S. 2562—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL RELATING TO DRUG FORMULARY

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to require the establishment of drug formularies by States participating in federally assisted health programs. The purpose of this legislation is to encourage physicians to prescribe the most economical drugs which, in their professional judgment, best meet the needs of their patients who are beneficiaries of these Federal-State health programs.

My bill would require each State to establish and file with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare a drug formulary that lists the most frequently prescribed drugs paid for under Federal-State matching fund programs. It would direct each State participating in these programs to establish a drug formulary committee, a majority of whose members would be required to be practicing members of the professions authorized to render health services under these programs.

The drug formulary committee would recommend, for the approval of the State officer designated by the Governor, a list, by brand and generic name, of the drugs most frequently prescribed. This listing, or formulary, would also show the reimbursement allowed to vendors to each listed drug, or would indicate the cost of each drug to the community pharmacist. Costs would be shown in a manner to clearly reveal the comparative cost of all listed drugs which may be used for similar therapeutic purposes.

My bill would require each State to distribute its drug formulary to all practioners authorized to prescribe drugs under these programs. The drug formulary could be revised as often as is deemed desirable, but my bill would require revision at least once annually for each State. At the State's option, area formularies, covering different geographical portions of a State, or regional formularies serving the needs of several States, could be adopted.

Although this legislation seeks to promote economy in federally assisted welfare participation prescription drug programs, I want to emphasize, Mr. President, that it would in no way undermine the quality of medical care administered to their beneficiaries. It would not force physicians to alter their practices in prescribing drugs for their patients; nor, would it require physicians to prescribe by brand name or generic name. Finally, this bill does not specify the amount of payment that is to be made for prescription drugs of the method of pricing to be employed.

In short, my bill neither authorizes nor contemplates Federal interference with State prerogatives. While it would require, as a condition of Federal matching, that each State file a drug formulary with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, my proposal would reserve for each State the right to say which drugs would be covered, and what prices would be paid for these drugs.

My Commonwealth of Pennsylvania already has the type of drug formulary contemplated in the bill which I am introducing today. Practicing physicians, pharmacists, and administrators of the Commonwealth's welfare program have acclaimed the formulary as a very helpful instrument. The Pennsylvania drug formualry is not only helpful to those participating in these matching fund programs, but it is simple to operate and leads to economy in drug usage. Even though use of the formulary is voluntary, 98 percent of the drugs listed in the formulary are prescribed for welfare patients by physicians.

Practicing physicians and others concerned with Federal assisted Pennsylvania welfare programs have made themselves available to serve on the State's formulary committee. Since physicians comprise a majority of this committee, their practices and desires are given every consideration, thus resulting in a cooperative relationship between the physicians and the Department of Public Welfare. A systematic listing of drugs in the Pennsylvania formulary has substantially reduced the clerical efforts required to audit and prepare invoices for payment. Before the formulary was established, 5 to 6 months often elapsed between the time a pharmacist rendered service and the time payment was received. This timelag has now been reduced to approximately 40 days, and I understand even this period could be cut in half with the use of automatic data processing, a step to which the Pennsylvania system readily lends itself.

Pennsylvania's pioneer drug formulary has achieved substantial economies without sacrificing quality in medication. The Commonwealth's drug costs declined by $1 million during the first 9 months of the formulary's use. During Pennsylvania's fiscal year 1967–68, the average price of a prescription drug under the State's program was lower than the national average.

The State of Nebraska, which adopted the Pennsylvania drug formulary last year, reported a similar experience with the average cost of a prescription drug under the Nebraska welfare program dropping from $5.10 to $3.60.

Pennsylvania's Department of Public Welfare has advised me that there is no undue administrative burden in establishing and maintaining the formulary. A single pharmacist, spending about one-fifth of his time on the formulary, can do all that is currently required in order to keep it up to date. Moreover, the simplification of work may allow the assignment of a pharmacist already on the staff to complete this task, thus avoiding the need to hire any additional clerical help.

I commend to the attention of Senators and other interested parties this measure which I am introducing today. I am confident that with the knowledge derived from the drug formulary required by my bill, doctors will prescribe the most economical drugs which, in their professional opinion, best meet the needs of their patients.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill be printed at this point in the RECORD, and that letters to me from the administrator of Pennsylvania's drug formulary, and from the Nebraska Department of Public Welfare, be printed immediately thereafter.

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

The bill (S. 2562) to assist physicians and other professionals in prescribing drugs covered under Federal-State programs, to provide for the preparation and distribution of State drug formularies, and to encourage economy in the prescribing and dispensing of prescription drugs, introduced by Mr. SCOTT (for himself and Mr. HATFIELD), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2562

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, no Federal grant shall be made to defray any expenses incurred after December 31, 1970, by any State in providing prescription drugs to any person, under any Federal-State matching fund program which provides drugs to needy individuals, unless such State shall have prepared, published, and made available to the practitioners authorized to prescribe drugs under such programs in such State, a drug formulary, with respect to which a certification shall have been made by the State officer designated by the Governor, to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the Secretary) as provided in section 2(a).

SEC. 2. (a) The certification referred to in the preceding section means a certification by a State officer designated by the Governor certifying that—

(1) such formulary was prepared by, and the contents thereof were approved by, a competent formulary committee, the membership of which included individuals having expertise in the rendering of professional services under, or in the administration of, State-Federal financed health programs, and a majority of the members of which were

practicing members of the professions authorized to render professional services under such programs;

(2) such formulary contains a listing by generic and brand names of the drugs which are most frequently prescribed and approved by the formulary committee in the State for needy individuals receiving drugs under State programs in which Federal financial participation is authorized.

(3) such formulary indicates, with respect to each drug listed therein, (i) the maximum reimbursement which will be paid (under State programs in which there is Federal financial participation) to vendors for each listed product or (ii) the usual cost thereof when obtained by community pharmacists in usual quantities from the most frequently used source of supply for such drug, or (iii) a cost index or a ratio of drug costs (to community pharmacists) which clearly indicates the degree of cost variations existing between listed drugs used for comparable therapeutic purposes;

(4) adequate provision has been made by the State for the distribution of copies of such formulary and revisions thereto among physicians and other appropriate individuals in the State;

(5) such formulary will be revised from time to time (but not less than once each twelve months) so as to include therein new drugs approved for inclusion and to reflect current information as to drug costs; and

(6) the State has made adequate provision for appeal from the decision of the formulary committee by any party at interest as to the inclusion or exclusion of any generic or branded product in the formulary.

(b) If the State deems the same to be desirable, it may submit to the Secretary a separate formulary for any particular area of the State, which formulary shall be subject to the same certification requirements as those set forth in subsection (a).

SEC. 3. No certification with respect to a drug formulary of any State shall be effective until a copy of such formulary shall have been filed with the Secretary. Any certification with respect to a drug formulary shall cease to be in effect if, within a reasonable time after any revision or modification of, or addition to, such drug formulary, a copy of such drug formulary which contains such revision, modification, or addition is not filed with the Secretary.

SEC. 4. For purposes of this Act—

(a) the term "generic name", when used in connection with any drug, means the "established name" of such drug as that term is defined in section 502(e) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and

(b) the term "brand name", when used in connection with any drug or drug product, means any name or term or a combination of these (including a trademark or a proprietary name) which serves clearly to identify such drug or drug product as the product of a particular manufacturer, packager, or distributor.

The letters, presented by Mr. SCOTT, are as follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE,
Harrisburg, Pa., May 22, 1969.

HON. HUGH SCOTT,
U.S. Senate, Committee on the Judiciary, Old Senate Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SCOTT: This is in reply to your letter of May 5, 1969, regarding the Pennsylvania Formulary System. The remarks of Senators Javits, Scott and Hatfield as published in the Congressional Record are accurate and suitable descriptions of the Drug Formulary System.

On October 18, 1965, the Department of Public Welfare of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania launched a program to study drugs and systems being used in the Medical Assistance program. The results of this study indicated an antiquated system of administration with little or no controls on quality medications, utilization of the program or payment to vendors.

It was interesting to learn that the number of drugs being used on the Welfare program was relatively small, in fact, approximately 1,300 drugs represented the total program. The following recommendations were made and accepted.

(1) That a controlled list of drugs be compiled and presented as a formulary which would guarantee quality medication.

(2) Establish a sound effective administration in the Department's pharmaceutical program.

(3) Speed up payments to vendors by bypassing the County Office and forwarding invoices directly into State Office. This transition to a direct submission program was implemented on January 1, 1968, and it is unfortunate in that our manual audit section received, during the month of January 1968, the total submissions for the month of December 1967, the month of January 1968, plus a one to three month backlog from the County Office. It was because of this tremendous number of invoices that the Department got behind in payment. In fact, it took almost eight months to work out of the massive paper. However, as a general rule the delay was no greater than that which existed on the old system.

(4) Establish and update vendors' prices for drugs.

(5) To design a system to be adaptable to electronic data processing.

Shortly after this approach was accepted a Formulary Committee was formed which was chaired by the Welfare Department's pharmacists responsible for the administration of the Drug Formulary. The Committee was made up of a physician from each of the major specialties in the field of medicine, a dental consultant, retail pharmacists, hospital pharmacists, and a pharmacologist. The selection of this Committee was made with the geographical location of each member as a requisite to a program representing the entire Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The Medical Care Advisory Committee assigned certain professional members of the Medical Advisory Committee to serve on this Formulary Committee without pay. The remaining members, selected geographically, were asked to serve under a contract in which a stipend of $35.00 per day and expenses were paid. This Committee screened approximately 40,000 drugs including those drugs that were currently being used on the program. As a result, the present formulary is made up of drugs that were most frequently used in the Welfare program. The exceptions were drugs of questionable quality and unethical marketing in nature. The program was put into effect July 1, 1966, without coercion and it is known now that because this system did not contradict the distribution system in the community nor the physician's prerogative, and include the most commonly prescribed drugs, it was accepted without question.

It is interesting to note that even though the formulary is still on a guideline basis the physicians' use of drugs currently represents almost 98 per cent of those drugs in the formulary.

Our present system updates the formulary three times a year, and on the fourth quarter, a complete revision is compiled. The updating of the current formulary requires about two days' labor of a pharmacist and a clerical person. The revision requires approximately two weeks and by the same personnel. Currently, as we update or compile a revision, a master printer's copy is forwarded to each State which is using this program. We have found that the pricing, which is a medical approach between direct and wholesale purchasing, is a valid one in most States east of the Rockies. Therefore, the forwarding of such printer's copies represents a savings of updating and revisions to that State.

When we published the formulary we purchased a binder for approximately 60 cents. The 240 pages consisting of composition and printing plus the index tabs cost approximately 70 cents, so that the over-all cost of the formulary was approximately $1.30. We distributed this to approximately 12,000 professional people and institutions such as:

(1) Physicians
(2) Pharmacies
(3) Hospital Pharmacies
(4) Hospital Clinics

In addition to the above we sold the formulary to non-participants such as nursing homes, drug firms, etc., for $8.00 plus 6 per cent sales tax. Annual updating and the revision cost $3.00 on a renewal basis only.

At the date of the implementation of this program, we also implemented a utilization review and disposition program. This is a program whereby the hospital inpatient, physician, nursing home, pharmacy, outpatient clinic, and dentist were incorporated into a program of invoice review. We set up an administrative mechanism and source of complaint originating first in our Medical Audit Section in which they were to forward invoices to this review section based upon certain fiscal and professional norms such as dollar and professional utilization of the program as defined by over-, under-, and misutilization. In addition to this complaint source, we were able to establish a mechanism whereby drug salesmen, providers of service, and the County Office personnel, etc., would identify unusual procedures which occur in the field. It is the responsibility of these people to direct such complaints to the attention of the utilization review section. To this program we added field investigators which we refer to as Medical Program Representatives. It is their responsibility to document and dispose of such cases administratively by means of disbarment from the program, restitution and if necessary, prosecution in the Courts.

This program is exceptionally successful, as the amount recovered by the Department is many times greater than the cost of the entire operation.

In addition to the above function we have established a master professional vendor list of professional people. To each provider of service we have assigned a contract number for easy identification. It is through this master vendor file that we have been able to identify for the first time instances of billing for professional services by unlicensed professional vendors.

Incidentally, this vendor system is also on the computer which is also updated daily so that when we wish to distribute manual or drug formulary material by mail, the computer supplies us with the vendor's name reproduced on gummed labels.

The next major function is in the field of drug control. Currently there are three pharmacists on our staff that in addition to other responsibilities, are preparing drug specifications in cooperation with the Defense Department and other agencies of Federal and State Government.

This drug specification is a very sophisticated document unlike any available today. It attempts to spell out quality by the determination of the condition under which a product is made as well as the actual formulation and quality control of the drug. This specification will, in the near future, be the criteria for the acceptance of a drug to be listed in the formulary.

I am attaching to this letter a letter directed to Doctor Neer in Health, Education, and Welfare in Washington, D.C., by the Nebraska Department of Public Welfare. Prior to the date of implementing the Pennsylvania Formulary System, the average price of a prescription on the Welfare program in Nebraska was approximately $5.10. By adopt-

ing this system and its administrative controls, the average price of prescriptions fell to approximately $3.60.

In addition to the above the results of the first nine months of operation under the formulatory system in Pennsylvania showed a 15.9 per cent ($1,058,948.82) decrease in drug expenditures which was in contradiction to the national trend at that time. Admittedly, this downward trend came as a surprise to the Department as compared to the position of maintaining the current fiscal situation while identifying a quality medication. Nevertheless, the drug program is still somewhat misunderstood in that few seem to grasp that a complete system is involved and not just a catalogue of drugs.

The following table represents the number of prescriptions and total expenditures. It should be noted that the average price of a prescription remains far below national averages.

Fiscal year	Number of prescriptions per year	Dollar amount per year
1963–64	2,294,686	$6,682,363
1964–65	2,361,356	6,991,160
1965–66	2,664,605	8,711,411
1966–67	2,500,839	8,205,327
1967–68	2,934,164	9,313,061

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania early in 1966 recognized that the generic brand name controversy which had been on a merry-go-round since the Kefauver hearings, was but a myth. The Formulary Committee recognized that there were good brand name drugs and there were very poor quality brand name drugs. And conversely that there were good generic drugs as well as very poor generic drugs, and further that there was a definite cost factor existing between good and poor drugs which was more implicit than that which existed between brand and generic name drugs. The answer to the problem was resolved by the necessity to determine the difference between a good quality medication and one that did not come up to such specifications. It is upon this philosophy that the Pennsylvania Formulary System is based.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM G. SHOEMAKER,
Acting Director, Bureau of Medical Policies and Standards.

NEBRASKA DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE,
Lincoln, August 14, 1968.

Dr. BRADLEY P. NEER,
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. NEER: Reference is made to your telephone conversation of August 13, 1968, with Mr. Harold Strode of this Department regarding a report of what has happened in our drug program since your visit here.

Following are your recommendations and our comments concerning action taken:

Recommendation: The State Welfare Department should completely staff its medical unit. The pharmacist consultant should be put on a full time basis. While the pharmacist should be available for consultation to the medical processing and auditing unit, we suggest he report directly to the director of the Medical Services Division and have major responsibility for the continuing development, implementation, evaluation, and periodic revision of the pharmaceutical services plan. This includes maintaining a close liaison with State and local pharmaceutical associations and representation at conferences and committees dealing with various segments of pharmacy.

Action Taken: Action is being taken to staff completely our medical unit. A Psychiatrist has been employed on a part-time basis to provide three full days of consultation per month. An interview has just been completed with a qualified psychiatric social worker and we hope to add this person to the staff shortly. The part-time pharmacist was placed on a full-time status June 17, 1968, and is directly responsible to the Chief of the Medical Services Division. He has been most active since that time in explaining our drug program to local professional associations and representing this Department at conferences and committees dealing with various segments of pharmacy, in addition to compiling the necessary data for the publication of our Official Drug Pricing Guide.

Recommendation: The State Welfare Department should strive to streamline processing of provider's claims through by-passing unnecessary handling at the county level.

Action Taken: We believe legislation is necessary to eliminate the current approval of medical claims at the county level. Legislative revisions are under consideration for the next session of the legislature.

Recommendation: Develop an approved drug listing of those items determined necessary by appropriate medical advisory committees. This list may then be used as a guide for authorized providers in prescribing, dispensing, and pricing. The necessary built-in controls for refills, quantity or dollar limitations should be simultaneously developed and made known to all providers of medical services and care.

Action Taken: Enclosed is a copy of the Nebraska Department of Public Welfare Official Drug Pricing Guide which was placed in effect August 1, 1968. This publication was distributed to all Physicians and Pharmacists in the State who are providers of medical services and care as well as to other appropriate personnel such as hospital pharmacists, clinic pharmacists, and welfare personnel at the county level. We are reimbursing all vendors for public welfare patients for medicines in this manner. Legend or prescription medicines at the rate of acquisition cost plus $1.75 dispensing fee. Non-legend or over-the-counter items at the rate of cost plus 33⅓% mark-up.

Recommendation: The State should furnish printed instructions and necessary forms to the various providers with a minimum of "form filing" but adequate to provide all required data for evaluation, utilization, and certification of services and care provided.

Action Taken: Enclosed is a copy of the new Form DM–10F which will serve as the only form required from initiation by the Physician to payment to the vendors for services rendered. Instructions regarding the form are included in the Official Drug Pricing Guide.

Recommendation: The State should employ a field investigator to review and inspect those providers or recipients who exhibited abnormal patterns of utilization.

Action Taken: A full-time field investigator was employed May 6, 1968, to review and inspect those providers or recipients who exhibit abnormal patterns of utilization. He is eminently qualified because of his law enforcement background of twenty years' experience as a sheriff in the State of Nebraska. Mr. Tobiassen was given intensive training for a period of two weeks by the investigative staff of the State of Pennsylvania, Department of Public Welfare. We feel the work that Mr. Tobiassen has done in the short time he has been on our staff is probably the most significant factor in lowering our prescription prices to their present level. Several problems of over-utilization have come to our attention and the welfare patients guilty of these offenses are healthier by far than they have been in recent years. Nebraska's average prescription cost for welfare prescriptions prior to the implementation of our investigative processes was $5.10 and has since been reduced to $4.36. Specific cases in the investigators files are of a hospital's monthly billing being cut $4,500, because of improper charging and billing processes. Also, a privately owned retail pharmacy had their monthly statement cut from $1,700, to $1,250. These are but two examples of the many circumventions we have uncovered which fortunately are the exception rather than the rule.

Recommendation: The Medical and Processing Unit should develop programs in conjunction with the State's Data Processing Section to provide adequate data for evaluation. This would include vendor profiles, recipient profiles, etc.

Action Taken: Programs have been developed to provide adequate data for evaluation. Enclosed is one example (Drug Cost Index) of such a program. Others already developed are Drug Utilization Index, Vendor Cost Index, and Vendor Drug Utilization Profile. Others are in the development stage. Mr. Harold Strode's research and data have been compiled and the amazing accumulation of data has been made available to your office on a monthly basis. This data aids our office specifically in the study of pricing by the dispensing doctor and druggist and will also be the basis of the quarterly updating of our "Official Drug Pricing Guide."

Recommendation: The State should make better use of the Medical Advisory Committee as described in "The Role of the State Medical Advisory Committees in Medicaid (Title XIX)." Copies have been provided to the State Welfare Department.

Action Taken: Action is underway to revitalize our committee and to propose the establishment of several sub-committees with whom we could work on a day-to-day basis. Sub-committees were used in our new drug program.

Recommendation: All instructions should be properly disseminated to those concerned. Follow-up by the State should be made to counties in coordinated efforts with State and County personnel.

Action Taken: All necessary instructions are disseminated to appropriate personnel by means of memoranda and the Nebraska State Plan and Manual. Responsible personnel visit counties for discussion of problems and coordination.

Although there has not been time since our drug program was placed into effect to offer such of an evaluation, we believe it has been fairly well accepted by the great majority of the professional personnel. A few of the vendors were not exactly happy with the dispensing fee and a very few of our Physicians were displeased with the change, per se; however, the vast majority have accepted it without comment.

Our sincere and special thanks to your committee and the State of Pennsylvania for the invaluable aid given us in helping our staff develop these positive and forward steps in the proper and efficient administration of our Title XIX program.

Sincerely,

H. W. ROGERS,
Director, Department of Public Welfare.

S. 2563—INTRODUCTION OF BILL RELATING TO PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT WITH RESPECT TO DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS URBAN REAL PROPERTY

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on June 26, 1969, I advised my colleagues that I was drafting an amendment to section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to permit the disposal of surplus urban real property to public housing agencies for use for public housing purposes.

As I explained at that time, I have long been concerned about the surplus

property disposal program. I believe we need a fresh look at the act and an examination of the purposes for which surplus Federal land may be acquired by States and their political subdivisions at discounted prices.

First of all, we should analyze in the light of today's needs, the purposes for which such land may be acquired at reduced or no cost. Much as we may revere historic monuments, my view would be that a no less worthy purpose would be to permit cities to acquire surplus Federal real property for public housing.

Mayor Jerome P. Cavanagh, of Detroit, called my attention to the following situation: after the Detroit riots, the city was authorized to use certain of the old Fort Wayne military post for temporary housing. The Federal Surplus Property Division has now told the city that it must plan to vacate unless it wants to buy or lease the housing. Either purchase or lease would be at full market value, according to GSA.

The mayor suggested, and I agree, that if, in fact, the Federal Surplus Property Act does not include housing as one of the purposes for which a municipality would be eligible to purchase at less than market value, an amendment to the act should be sought which would include public housing.

Accordingly, I am today introducing such a proposed amendment. I note that the Senate Government Operations Committee's Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Surplus Property is meeting July 9 and 10 on a number of bills amending this act, and I would hope that this amendment could receive consideration, along with the other bills before the subcommittee.

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

The bill (S. 2563) to amend section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the disposal of surplus urban real property to public housing agencies for use for public housing purposes, introduced by Mr. HART, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 2564 AND S. 2565—INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AUTHORIZING THE ACQUISITION OF THE INHOLDINGS IN THE EVERGLADES NATIONAL PARK, FLA.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am today introducing two bills to authorize the acquisition of the inholdings in the Everglades National Park, Fla. Having spearheaded the establishment of the park when I was Governor, and negotiated with the Department of the Interior the agreement for the ultimate setting up of the park, and as Governor signed the first deed conveying State lands for ultimate inclusion in the park, I am very deeply interested in seeing that the private holdings within the park boundaries are acquired.

Since coming to the Senate I have introduced various bills relating to the park, and in 1957 I introduced a bill, cosponsored by Senator SMATHERS, to finalize the boundaries of the park by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the inholdings therein, and providing for further transfer of certain lands by the State and Federal Government, and providing for the acceptance of substantial other lands to add to the park in the vicinity of Everglades City and the Ten Thousand Islands. This legislation was enacted into Public Law 85–482 dated July 2, 1958, but due to committee action, the authorization was limited to $2 million for acquisition of the inholdings to match the $2 million which the State had already given, in addition to its gift of some 850,000 acres of land and water.

Up to 1965 efforts to obtain appropriations for the acquisition of the inholdings in the park were to no avail even though a budget request was submitted. In fiscal year 1965, however, $452,000 was included in the supplemental bill to purchase 4,420 acres. Subsequently, additional appropriations were made up to the legal authority of $2 million.

Mr. President, the limitation on authorization contained in Public Law 85–482 and the consistent refusal of Congress to fulfill the Government's responsibility to acquire the private inholdings results in the fact that there still remains some 74,638 acres yet to be acquired at an estimated cost of $20 million.

Mr. President, with all the emphasis being placed on the assurance of an adequate water supply to the park, and let me say I am in accord with the furnishing of such water supply, I believe it is incumbent upon the Government to live up to its agreement and to complete the acquisition of the inholdings in the park, which has been pending for a great number of years.

Mr. President, I introduce a bill authorizing the appropriation of $1 million for the acquisition of 6,640 acres of land, known as the Flagler tract, in the Hole in the Donut section of the park, and ask that it be received and immediately referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. President, I also introduce a bill authorizing an appropriation of $10 million for the acquisition of the remaining private inholdings in the park of some 67,998 acres of land and ask that it be received and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

For clarification, Mr. President, I have submitted two bills since there is an emergency need for the acquisition of the 6,640 acres of land contained in the first bill I have offered as the Department of the Interior currently has an option on the acreage that will expire prior to the end of the year. And while it is of great importance that all of the remaining acreage be acquired, and the sooner such acquisition is accomplished the less likely it is that the cost of acquisition will be increased, the emergency situation applicable to the Flagler tract does not apply with regard to other acquisitions, although the private owners have been waiting for years for the Government to fulfill its obligation.

Mr. President, I might also add that it is my understanding that the funds provided by Public Law 90–401, to amend title I of the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965, and for other purposes, could be used for the acquisition of the inholdings in the park provided that the authorization had been enacted. Although I understand informally that funds of the Land and Water Conservation Act for the next fiscal year have already been committed, I am hopeful that, by affirmative action on the bills I have just sent to the desk, the Department of the Interior will be able to rearrange priorities to expedite the long overdue acquisition of the inholdings in the park.

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

The bills (S. 2564) to amend the act fixing the boundary of Everglades National Park, Fla., and authorizing the acquisition of land therein, in order to authorize an additional amount for the acquisition of certain lands for such park; and (S. 2565) to amend the act fixing the boundary of Everglades National Park, Fla., and authorizing the acquisition of land therein, in order to increase the authorization for such acquisitions, introduced by Mr. HOLLAND, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2568—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL ALLEVIATING THE BORDER COMMUTER LABOR PROBLEM

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, so as to make it an unfair labor practice for an employer to employ any alien unlawfully present in the United States, or to employ aliens whose principal dwelling places are in a foreign country during a labor dispute.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, I am acutely aware of the adverse social and economic impact caused by commuters who cross the U.S.-Mexican border to work in Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California. Recent hearings by the Migratory Labor Subcommittee revealed the severity of this problem.

The commuters I refer to are workers, predominantly from Mexico, that gain entry into the United States for a day, or a week, or a month or more, by displaying either a form I–151—permanent alien registration card—commonly referred to as a green card—or a certificate showing a U.S. birthplace, or a temporary 3-day visa—white card—or a baptismal certificate. Large numbers of illegal entrants also come across the border to work in the United States.

The ready availability of workers along the border areas has contributed to the depression of living and working conditions in the United States and Mexico, and has created a situation resembling our 1930's depression economy. Illustrative of the commuter's adverse impact on our economy are the following data: 90 percent of commuters are in eight border areas from Texas, Arizona, and California; unemployment in Texas border cities

is almost 95 percent greater than in Texas interior cities; alien commuters work most often in the lowest skilled, most menial and lowest paid jobs; wages for seasonal farmwork in Texas border areas are over 30 percent less than in the rest of the State; firms that employ commuters tend to pay lower wages than firms that employ only U.S. residents and tend to pay lower wages than are paid U.S. residents for the same work; wage rates paid to commuters are often less than what unemployed U.S. residents say they are able to accept; California farm wage rates are lowest in the border areas where the bulk of the farm labor force is composed of commuters; commuters constitute about 85 percent of the farmwork force in California Imperial Valley, where unemployment in 1966 was 10 percent of the labor force, twice the average rate for the entire State. Furthermore, an adverse impact on the Mexican economy is created by the introduction of U.S. dollars.

Another major adverse effect is that community and union organization efforts are rendered difficult and often ineffective due to the ready availability of workers at such low wages and poor living conditions. By permitting commuters to work indiscriminately in our economy and then take their wages back to the low-cost, low-wage Mexican economy, living and wage standards of U.S. citizens are undermined, decent job opportunities are damaged, and there is an impact throughout our entire Nation. The economic depression no doubt causes U.S. citizens to migrate north, and to our cities, in a desperate search for work. Commuters too often have little or no stake in the resolution of domestic labor disputes or in a sustained effort to improve living conditions. They simply return to the Mexican economy with their earnings. It is widely recognized that commuters are used as strikebreakers during labor organizing efforts to obtain collective bargaining agreements in California and Texas. It has been reliably estimated that 40 percent of the workers at 24 struck grape ranches in the California area in 1968 were Mexican national green-card holders.

This situation has a particular impact on the migrant and seasonal farmworker who is powerless to affect his own unemployment and underemployment, powerless to fight job displacement, and powerless in union or community organization efforts to improve his living and working conditions.

A proposal that is designed to alleviate some aspects of the commuter problem is contained in a bill which I am introducing today. The proposal would add a new section 8(a)(6) to the National Labor Relations Act making it an unfair labor practice for an employer to hire any alien unlawfully present in the United States, or for an employer to hire during a labor dispute as replacements for a regular employee, any person lawfully admitted to the United States whose permanent residence is in a country contiguous to the United States. It is further proposed that the present section 10(l) of the NLRA be amended to provide mandatory and speedy injunctions for violations of the proposed new section 8(a)(6). The proposal contemplates coverage of the agriculture industry even if legislative proposals—such as S. 8—to remove the exclusion of agriculture employees are not enacted.

Other proposals relating to the border commuter labor problem are already under consideration. Today Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, of New Jersey, is introducing a bill similar to the bill I now am introducing, and hearings are scheduled on his bill for next week. Senator EDWARD KENNEDY has introduced another bill (S. 1694), which I am cosponsoring, that would amend our Immigration and Naturalization laws by refining the commuter labor system. I understand that the Judiciary Subcommittee, which has legislative jurisdiction, and on which Senator KENNEDY serves, will soon be holding hearings on that bill. There are companion bills to the KENNEDY bill on the House side. I do hope that hearings, in addition to the investigative hearings already conducted by the Migratory Labor Subcommittee, can be held soon on my proposal today.

The investigative hearings held by the Migratory Labor Subcommittee on May 28 and 29, 1969, confirmed the fact that the border commuter labor problem is quite complicated and difficult to define. It is not subject to easy solution. One matter is certain, however, and it is that the best way to cure the problems of poverty, low wages, and deplorable living conditions along our Southwestern border communities is to remove the barriers that stand in front of human beings who are trying to gain their fair share of the American dream that has been denied them for so long. A major hurdle to strong, effective, self-help union and community organization is the continuation of the commuter system as we know it today. My bill will hopefully eliminate at least one aspect of the problem by making it an unfair Labor practice under the NLRA for employers to hire illegal entrants and commuter strikebreakers. I am open to further suggestions to alleviating the problem from my colleagues and interested parties.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2568) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, so as to make it an unfair labor practice for an employer to employ any alien unlawfully present in the United States, or to employ aliens whose principal dwelling places are in a foreign country during a labor dispute, introduced by Mr. MONDALE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2568

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8(a) and section 10(1) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, are amended as follows:

SECTION 1. Add a new paragraph to section 8(a) to read as follows:

"(6) to employ any alien unlawfully present in the United States; or to hire during a labor dispute as replacements for a person or persons ordinarily employed by such employer any alien lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence whose principal, actual dwelling place is in a foreign country contiguous to the United States; Provided that this section 8(a)(6) shall apply to any employer, whether or not he employs 'employees' as defined in section 2(3)."

SEC. 2. Amend the first sentence of section 10(1) of the National Labor Relations Act by adding the words "or section 8(a)(6)," after "or section 8(b)(7),".

S. 2569—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE BANK HOLDING COMPANY ACT OF 1956

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the bill which the senior Senator from Utah and I introduce today, by request, deals with a banking matter in the District of Columbia which we feel needs consideration. We introduce this bill so that the issue may be given attention and the matter can be given a forum.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in full in the RECORD, and I also ask unanimous consent that a summary of the proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD following the bill.

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

The bill (S. 2569) to amend section 3(d) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. BENNETT), by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2569

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3(d) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1842(d)) is amended by deleting the period at the end of the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ": *Provided,* That the foregoing prohibition shall not be applicable in the case of any bank holding company if (1) the operations of such bank holding company's banking subsidiaries were principally conducted in the District of Columbia on the effective date of this proviso, or on the date on which such company became a bank holding company, whichever is later, and the additional bank the assets or shares of which, or other interest in which, is to be acquired is located in the National Capital region, as defined in section 103(a) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960 (40 U.S.C. 652(a)), or (2) the operations of such bank holding company's banking subsidiaries were principally conducted in a State contiguous to the District of Columbia on such effective date, or on the date on which such company became a bank holding company, whichever is later, and the additional bank the assets or shares of which, or other interest in which, is to be acquired is located in the District of Columbia."

The summary of the bill, presented by Mr. SPARKMAN, is as follows:

BANK HOLDING COMPANIES IN THE NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION: SUMMARY OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Under the existing provisions of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, a registered bank holding company must obtain the approval of the Federal Reserve Board before acquiring control of any bank, and the Board is prohibited from granting its approval where the acquisition would cross a State line—that is, where a holding company has subsidiary banks in one State and seeks to acquire a bank in another State. This State-line limitation is contained in section 3(d) of the 1956 Act.

Because this restriction has given rise to special difficulties in the metropolitan area of Washington, D.C., the attached bill would modify section 3(d) with respect to the Washington metropolitan area. The bill would add a proviso to section 3(d) permitting the Board to approve a bank acquisition across a State line only in the following two specific circumstances:

(1) Where the holding company is based in the District of Columbia (that is, where its banking subsidiaries are principally located in D.C.), the Board could approve the company's acquisition of a bank located in the immediate suburban areas of Maryland and Virginia.[1]

(2) Where the holding company is based anywhere in the States of Maryland or Virginia, the Board could approve the company's acquisition of a bank located in the District of Columbia.

This amendment is intended to make it possible for individual banks in Washington to become affiliated, through registered holding companies, with banks in Maryland and Virginia, in order to improve banking services and increase banking competition throughout the area. A D.C.-based bank holding company could acquire banks only in the immediate suburbs of Washington, although a holding company based anywhere in Maryland or Virginia could acquire a D.C. bank.

The bill would not alter Federal or State law in any other way. Thus, for example:

(a) The bill would not reduce or alter the existing authority of Maryland and Virginia over the establishment of State-chartered banks and branches within their jurisdictions. It would not permit any D.C. or other out-of-state bank to come into Maryland or Virginia and establish branches there. Just as at present, new banks or branches could be established only with the approval of the State banking authorities, in the case of State-chartered banks, or the Comptroller of the Currency, in the case of National banks.

(b) The bill would not reduce or alter the existing authority of Maryland and Virginia banking agencies to examine and supervise State-chartered banks within their jurisdictions. Thus, a State-chartered bank acquired by a holding company under this proposed legislation would retain its separate identity and continue to be subject to supervision and examination by State authorities. Similarly, the bill would not authorize the merger of Maryland or Virginia banks with District banks.

(c) The bill would not alter the legality of bank holding companies in Maryland or Virginia, since the formation of bank holding companies currently is permitted by the law of both States.

(d) The bill would not alter the standards or requirements for Federal Reserve Board approval of an acquisition, except for the specific modification of the State line restriction described above. Under the existing provisions of the Bank Holding Company Act, the Board would be required to seek the views of the appropriate State banking agency on any proposed acquisition of a State-chartered bank. If the State agency disapproved of the acquisition, the Board would have to hold a full hearing on the matter, and its decision would be subject to review in the courts. Moreover, the Board is required to give heavy weight to the competitive considerations involved in any proposed acquisition, and to notify the Attorney General of every application the Board receives, so that the Justice Department's Antitrust Division may present its views and have an opportunity to challenge the acquisition under the antitrust laws.

(e) The bill would not alter the supervisory powers of the Federal Reserve Board over registered bank holding companies. A holding company formed pursuant to this bill would be subject to the same strict regulation as now provided under the 1956 Act for all other registered bank holding companies.

(f) The bill would not affect the current controversy concerning "one-bank holding companies". This bill relates exclusively to registered bank holding companies, and its desirability will not be affected by the outcome of the one-bank holding company controversy, whatever that outcome may be.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, today I join in introducing S. 2569, a bill to establish within the National Capital region a commercial banking area. This bill is further recognition of the ever expanding Washington Metropolitan area and its needs for increased commercial credit.

The outlines of the problem become very clear when we look at the great need for banking services in the District—compared with that for the surrounding suburban areas—and then look at the services available in the two areas of this region. The total area to which I refer is composed of the District of Columbia; the Maryland counties of Montgomery and Prince Georges; the Virginia counties of Loudoun, Prince William, Arlington, and Fairfax; and the cities of Alexandria and Falls Church. The area of the District of Columbia is 61.4 square miles. Within the District are 14 banks. Right on the boundary of the District of Columbia the major Maryland and Virginia banking institutions have a total 15 banks. The eight major Maryland banking institutions which maintain offices on the District line are: First National Bank of Maryland, Maryland National Bank, Union Trust Co. of Maryland, Equitable Trust Co., Farmers and Mechanics National Bank, Suburban Trust Co., Citizens Bank & Trust Co., and American National Bank of Maryland. These eight banks show totals of over $3.2 billion in deposits. On the other side of the District line are seven large Virginia banking organizations. They include: United Virginia Bankshares, Virginia Commonwealth Bankshares, First Virginia Bankshares, Financial General Corp., Virginia National Bank, First and Merchants National Bank, and Dominion Bankshares. These seven banks show a total of more than $4 billion in deposits. All 15 of these suburban banks can and do operate on a statewide basis. In comparison with these banks with their over $7 billion in deposits, the total deposits of the 14 District banks of $2.6 billion looks rather insignificant.

The present distribution of bank deposits has not always been this way. From 1940 to 1966 the total population of the District increased from 663,091 to 806,000 for an increase of about 22 percent. In the same period the population of the Virginia and Maryland suburbs surrounding the District increased from 342,923 to 1,809,000 for an increase of over 400 percent. With this increase in population, the total personal income in the National Capital Area has increased from $3 billion to $18 billion. One of the major factors in this increase in population and total income is the Federal payroll. With the Federal payroll as the base for the District economy, the District still remains the major employment center in the region with a figure of 61 percent of the region's employment.

With this rise in population and income, total regional deposits have since 1947 increased from $1 billion, 127 million to $4 billion, 150 million in 1968. In 1947 deposits in the District banks totaled $944 million and in the suburbs totaled $183 million. Of the regional deposits therefore, the District banks represented over 83 percent of the total. But as stated before, with the large banking associations of Maryland and Virginia moving right up to the borders of the District, and using their proximity to the District line to acquire the bank deposits not only of Maryland and Virginia workers but also District employees, the Washington banks have been unable to compete. Historically, the District of Columbia banks have been the major financial institutions in the region—certainly much more so than the major metropolitan centers of Baltimore and Richmond. When the District banks met with a declining loan demand in the District and an ever increasing loan demand in the suburbs, the District banks rose to the occasion. Now, though, with the decline in deposits, the District banks are finding it harder and harder each day not only to meet the loan demands of the region, but also the District in which they are based.

If the District economy is to be revitalized—particularly in the slum areas and, of course, it must, then large commercial loans will be needed. The chief source of these loans must be the local banks and these banks need deposits to make the loans. The bill before us today is a recognition of this need and is an attempt to provide a workable solution to the problem. No State's rights are being infringed; no new precedent will be set. All that the bill proposes is that commercial banking institutions be allowed, with Federal Reserve Board ap-

[1] Specifically, the acquired bank would have to be located in "the National Capital region," which has been defined in several other Federal statutes as follows:

"National Capital region" means the District of Columbia, Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties in the State of Maryland, Arlington, Fairfax, Loudoun, and Prince William Counties and the cities of Alexandria and Falls Church in the Commonwealth of Virginia, and all other cities now or hereafter existing in Maryland or Virginia within the geographic area bounded by the outer boundaries of the combined area of said counties and cities.

United States Code, title 40, section 652(a).

The definition quoted is from section 103 of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960, although other statutes also define the National Capital Region as encompassing the same area.

proval, and under individual State regulation, to enter into competition with other commercial banking institutions in the overall metropolitan area for the much-needed bank deposits of a congressionally recognized geographic and economic unit.

I have joined in the introduction of this bill because I believe the problem is of sufficient importance to justify congressional attention and review. If its initial features need changing—that can be done. But I think that at least we ought to try to work out a solution—and this bill can be a good beginning.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

S. 809

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 809) to provide Federal leadership and grants to the States for developing and implementing State programs for youth camp safety standards.

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

S. 1471

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1471) to amend chapter 13 of title 38, United States Code, to increase dependency and indemnity compensation for widows and children.

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

S. 2391

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the senior Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2391) to provide for more effective coordination of Federal air quality, water quality, and solid waste disposal programs, for the consideration of environmental quality in public works programs and projects, for the coordination of all Federal research programs which improve knowledge of environmental modifications resulting from increased population and urban concentration, and for other purposes.

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

S. 2470

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. SAXBE) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 2470) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 to authorize elderly persons to exchange food stamps under certain circumstances for meals prepared and served by private nonprofit organizations, and for other purposes.

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

S. 2545

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2545) to amend title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to authorize the Commissioner of Education to arrange for community service programs seeking solutions to national and regional problems.

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

S. 2482

CORRECTION OF ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) was added as a cosponsor to the wrong bill. I now ask unanimous consent that his name be stricken as a cosponsor of S. 2457 and that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2482), the National Kidney Disease bill.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR INOUYE AT DEFENSE STRATEGY SEMINAR OF THE NATIONAL WAR COLLEGE

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, on June 27, 1969, a distinguished member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the Honorable DANIEL K. INOUYE, gave the graduation banquet address at the 1969 Defense Strategy Seminar of the National War College.

It was a very incisive and forthright analysis of the very core of the problem with which the Senate is faced today on the defense authorization bill that is before us. It had a deep impact on the members of the seminar—nearly 250 civilians from every section of our country who had taken 2 weeks out of their busy schedules to go on active duty as reservists from all of the Armed Forces.

Senator INOUYE brilliantly analyzed four important steps involved in determination of military expenditures. He rightly observed that people have been throwing stones at the wrong target.

Most impressive to me was his insight to the inescapable tie between foreign policy and military implementation of that policy. I have never seen it expressed as well as he did when he said:

> It is imperative that the Department of State play a more active role in informing Congress and the American people on our foreign policy—on the negotiations leading up to the formulation of treaties, on the commitments we have made, and on the possible scope and nature of the military involvements which may be required to fill such commitments. The Department of Defense is required to submit a posture statement each year to Congress. Likewise, I believe it is important that the Department of State be required to submit a similar statement.

Because of the timeliness and the great value of this outstanding address, I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the body of the RECORD and I urge a very careful reading of it by every Member of Congress and by the top officials of the State Department and the Defense Department.

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

MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

Vietnam, Safeguard system, SEATO, NATO, North Korea, Thailand . . . These words appear in our newspapers; they are heard over radio and television; they constantly pop up in our daily conversation. They echo hauntingly in the chambers of our minds until we want to yell "stop".

Yes, I am afraid the patience of the American people has been tried. I, too, share their impatience with the seemingly endless number of military involvements in which we find ourselves, the gigantic military projects in which we are engaged, and the huge defense spendings which devour our national budget. I, too, would like to see an end to our high defense expenditures. However, reason compels me to suggest that we spend a few moments to calmly and rationally analyze the reasons for our enormous outlays for our military defense.

I was encouraged to see that President Nixon's decision to develop and deploy an $8 billion anti-ballistic missile system has produced a most important spinoff effect of increasing our scrutiny of our $80 billion military budget and stimulating congressional debate on the relationship between the strength of the "military industrial complex" and high military defense spendings. This debate is healthy. It is good and necessary.

This debate has successfully triggered public attention on the problem and stimulated genuine and widespread discussion on the subject. Everyday letters pour into my office imploring Congress to trim the defense budget down to the nice round figure of $50 billion or to reduce it by 20 percent.

I have now been a Member of Congress for ten years. And like every Member, I am deeply concerned with the heavy expenditures we make each year to support our military establishment.

It is, however, from my association with the problem as a Member of the Senate Armed Services Committee that I have come to the conclusion that people have been throwing stones at the wrong target. To redirect the attack to what I consider the salient point at issue here, let me suggest that there are four important steps involved in the determination of military expenditures. The Nation, as a whole, and Congress, in particular, have debated rather extensively the last step but very seldom the first three.

Let me share with you the four steps involved in arriving at our level of military expenditures. Discussion of the steps will assist us in analyzing the decisionmaking process involved here.

It seems to me that the first step in the process is the initial determination of our commitments abroad. Our military expenditures are, after all, designed to satisfy the obligations we have incurred as a result of our foreign commitments.

Over the years we have entered into eight bilateral and multilateral defense agreements with 42 foreign countries. We are at this moment committed by treaty to come to the defense of each of the following countries in the event of an armed attack.

On September 2, 1947, we entered the Rio Treaty and agreed to come to the aid of Mexico, Haiti, Dominican Republic, Honduras, Guatemala, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Panama, Colombia, Venezuela, Ecuador, Peru, Brazil, Bolivia, Paraguay, Chile, Argentina, Uruguay, Trinidad and Tobago.

On April 4, 1949, we entered the North Atlantic Treaty and agreed to come to the aid of Canada, Iceland, Norway, United Kingdom, Netherlands, Denmark, Belgium, Luxembourg, Portugal, France, Italy, Greece, Turkey, and the Federal Republic of Germany.

On August 30, 1951, we entered the Philippine Treaty and agreed to come to the aid of the Philippines.

On September 1, 1951, we entered the Anzus Treaty and agreed to come to the aid of New Zealand and Australia.

On October 1, 1953, we entered the Republic of Korea Treaty and agreed to come to the aid of the Republic of Korea.

On September 8, 1954, we entered the Southeast Asia Treaty and agreed to come to the aid of the United Kingdom, France, New Zealand, Australia, Philippines, Thailand, and Pakistan.

On December 2, 1954, we entered the Republic of China Treaty and agreed to come to the aid of the Republic of China.

On January 19, 1960, we entered the Japanese treaty and agreed to come to the aid of Japan.

These commitments resulted from negotiations carried out by our State Department, ratified by the Senate, and approved by the President. The Department of Defense has played a secondary role in determining our commitments abroad.

In your daily activities, I am sure you have found that the most important step taken in any venture is generally the first. So it is in the case of foreign policy and national commitments. The critical step lies in the initiation of the commitment. It is, after all, our commitments which, to a large extent, determine the character of our Military Establishment—our requirements for troops, equipment and supplies.

In proportion to the magnitude of the step, there has been very little public and congressional debate on this step. This is surprising inasmuch as it is certainly clear that we have crossed the Rubicon as soon as the ink dries on the treaty.

History has shown that the cost of making military commitments is low while the price of living up to them can be very high. We simply cannot afford to write blank checks for military commitments without seriously considering the consequences of the commitments—the scope of our involvement.

The Vietnam war should have taught us how frightfully easy it is to find ourselves dangerously overcommitted by a treaty unless we have a very clear idea of the nature and scope of our commitment at the outset. Our involvement in Vietnam is a classic example of our dangerous practice of writing blank checks, hoping that the day will never come when the checks will be cashed for American lives and resources.

I am sure that few Americans envisioned the day we would send two million of our young men overseas to defend South Vietnam when President Eisenhower signed the Southeast Asia treaty on September 8, 1954. Fifteen years ago, when our former President signed this document promising that the United States would respond to any agression by armed attack in the treaty area, few of us would have anticipated that in the short span of the last four years—from 1965 to 1969—we would have lost 33,800 men in uniform, or carried 216,644 wounded soldiers off the battlefields or spent nearly $100 billion living up to this commitment.

This leads me to the second step involved in this process—arriving at a determination of the kinds of contingencies for which we must be prepared in order to fulfill our treaty obligations. We must know in advance what kinds of contingencies we have to be prepared for in the Pacific basin, in Europe, in South America and in Asia. This is a difficult and unpleasant matter. However, the difficulty we experience in making this determination is matched only by the dire consequences we face as a nation if the determination is not made.

This very important determination of the contingencies for which we must have forces ready is made by military experts in the Pentagon. I hasten to point out that the Defense Department's conclusions on this matter are no secret. The most recent defense posture statement released by the Secretary of Defense covered this very point. This posture statement maintained that the United States must be prepared to simultaneously fight a land war in Asia, a land war in Europe and a small war in Latin America. The tragedy is that despite their importance, the decisions made here are accepted without meaningful debate. I certainly did not hear any loud debate when the posture statement was released.

The third step involves determining our general defence requirements to meet specified contingencies. At this stage, decisions are made relative to the type of military establishment required to meet these contingencies, especially our manpower requirements.

We must, for example, decide how many divisions are required to satisfy each of our commitments. Will 20 divisions satisfy our commitments in Asia? Or 24? Or are 10 divisions sufficient? These are specific questions which require specific answers. Yet, we have had very little public or congressional discussion on the level of inputs required to satisfy our commitments to our 42 treaty partners.

It is the fourth step which arouses heated discussions. This step involves the determination of how best to equip our men to meet our commitments. It is this discussion of details which incites the great debates. The debates concern such questions as whether we should purchase the TFX or fixed winged planes, or whether to use the M–14 or M–16 rifle. While these are important considerations involving billions of dollars in our national budget, they are not the critical issues. I can assure you that going through the voluminous $80 billion defense budget at this stage is a staggering task. At this point we are nit-picking over details after the major decisions have been made.

Let me suggest that we all too often concern ourselves with the technical military question of how to meet our commitment abroad and ignore the much larger question of deciding whether the commitment itself is vital to our national interest. We forget that the question of the kind of equipment our military needs only arises because bilateral and multilateral defense treaties have been signed, because commitments have been made, because contingencies must be prepared for.

However, despite the fact that those decisions which necessitate high defense costs have already been made at this stage, debate continues to focus primarily on this fourth step.

I am compelled to add at this point that most of our defense dollars are spent on "general purpose forces"—the planes, ships, and aircraft carriers used in limited wars. It is this section of the budget which is most closely related to our military commitments abroad. The greater the number of our commitments, the larger our budget for general purpose forces must be. By the same token, the fewer our commitments, the smaller our budget.

We must realize that it is too late at step four to attempt to significantly reduce the military budget. Significant reduction in defense expenditures require reductions at each prior step—steps one to three.

We appear to be seeing the trees but missing the forest in our attacks on the military industrial complex. It seems to me that if one wants to seriously discuss the military budget and military spendings, one should begin discussing the issue at the first point where the decision leading to the ultimate purchase of equipment is made—at the stage when the initial decision is made to enter into "X" number of defense commitments abroad, when the decision is made to prepare for "Y" number of contingencies, when the decision is made to deploy "Z" number of divisions. We must be realistic and realize that once these commitments are made, our military is compelled and responsible for preparing for these contingencies and for arming our men as adequately as it can.

The basic question involved here is really related to our foreign policy. Thus, it is imperative that the Department of State play a more active role in informing Congress and the American people on our foreign policy—on the negotiations leading up to the formulation of treaties, on the commitments we have made, and on the possible scope and nature of the military involvements which may be required to fulfill such commitments.

The Department of Defense is required to submit a posture statement each year to Congress. Likewise, I believe it is important that the Department of State be required to submit a similar statement. Congress should know the exact status of each of our foreign commitments. It is, for example, important that we know the extent of our commitment to Thailand and Laos now and after Vietnam. Are we committed to fight another "Vietnam" type war in Indo-China?

The status of our commitments abroad has never been clearly explained to either Congress or the American people. There exists today a dangerous void of information on this very critical issue. I find it most alarming that we lack detailed information on so important a subject—a subject which consumes the largest single slice of our national budget and which continues to deny us the resources we so desperately require to meet our pressing domestic needs.

It is time to place the question of foreign policy and the military budget in true perspective and bring debate into that arena, at that point, where it will have its greatest impact. The existence of our Nation, no less the world, depends on it.

DOMINION DAY IN CANADA

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, last Tuesday, July 1, Canada celebrated Dominion Day—the anniversary of the confederation of Canadian Provinces as the Dominion of Canada in 1867.

I feel a special bond with our neighbor to the north, for on the border of my State of North Dakota and the Province of Manitoba is the International Peace Garden, dedicated to more than 150 years of peace between our two nations.

As a tribute to the good people who share with us the longest unfortified boundary in the world, I would like to repeat the inscription on the cairn that marks our common border:

To God in His glory we two nations dedicate this garden and pledge ourselves that as long as men shall live, we shall not take up arms against one another.

Surely, this is the goal of all peaceful nations. Dominion Day has passed for another year. But the people of the United States should not let it pass without an expression of gratitude that Canada is our neighbor nation.

HUBERT HUMPHREY DECRIES THE ADMINISTRATION'S LOW PRIORITY FOR EDUCATION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have repeatedly expressed my disappointment about the wholly inadequate budget requests of the Nixon administration for educational programs. I am pleased to be joined in these observations by the distinguished former Vice President, Hubert Humphrey.

In one of his nationally carried news articles, which appeared in the San Antonio Express recently, Mr. Humphrey eloquently noted:

There are two ways to cripple an educational system—one way is to disrupt it, another way is to starve it. President Nixon's proposed 1969–70 budget is a starvation diet for American education.

An example of how our educational programs have been condemned to preterition by the Nixon administration can be illustrated by the fact that although Congress authorized $40 million under the Bilingual Education Act, which I sponsored and was enacted by the 89th Congress, only 25 percent of that amount, or $10 million, has been requested in the administration budget.

I commend Mr. Humphrey's article to my colleagues with the hope that it will make us all more conscious of the educational needs of this country and the priority we must give them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by former Vice President Humphrey, entitled "Rank Education High in National Priorities," appearing in the San Antonio Express, July 6, 1969, be printed in its entirety at this point in the RECORD.

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

RANK EDUCATION HIGH IN NATIONAL PRIORITIES

(By Hubert H. Humphrey)

Public attention to education today is focused on a handful of extremists on our college campuses. If they were to burn out a local library or school building, there would be a public outcry. Community leaders would demand that something be done about it.

But there are two kinds of destroyers—the violent destroyers and the do-nothing destroyers.

There are two ways to destroy books—one way is to burn them, another way is never to print or buy them.

There are two ways to cripple an educational system—one way is to disrupt it, another way is to starve it.

President Nixon's proposed 1969–70 budget is a starvation diet for American education. It cuts education funds by 25 per cent and slashes library funds by 66 per cent. The Nixon budget cuts in education are proportionally larger than in any other major area.

These cuts will seriously hurt local school districts and come at a time when local property taxes to support the schools have become almost more than the average homeowner can bear.

Now, local educators who planned local programs and budgeted local money to be supplemented by federal help suddenly find themselves about to be cut off by Washington.

Educational programs must have continuity. They must not be turned on and off every few years.

The Nixon education budget is $3.2 billion, almost a full billion dollars under the $4.1 billion requested by President Johnson. The Johnson request was modest enough, just $158 million over what was spent last year, and a million dollars under what has been authorized by Congress.

An example of the Nixon cuts was $40 million to aid states in the vocational training of the mentally retarded.

We have six million mentally retarded in this country, and over five million are trainable. Two million now hold jobs, which means another three million could be trained and employed.

The jobs are available. In the food service industry alone, it is estimated there are 300,000 jobs waiting to be filled in the next 10 months.

With $400 million in vocational education funds, about 100,000 mentally retarded could be trained each year to hold jobs. Each now costs the government some $3,500 a year for welfare benefits. Each could earn at least that much if properly trained, so the economy would gain by some $7,000 a year every time a mentally retarded person gets a job and goes off welfare.

Thus an investment of $40 million a year could add $700 million a year to the economy, and the training programs and resulting jobs would give new dignity to the lives of the mentally retarded.

President Nixon, going at the education budget with an axe, recommends that these training funds be completely eliminated. Instead of training people to get off welfare, President Nixon would ignore them in the name of "economy."

Other Nixon cuts will prevent many needy young people from going on to college. The Nixon budget reduced student loans from $270 million to $155 million.

In his campaign, candidate Nixon promised that every child would have "the best education that our wisdom and schools can provide, and an equal chance to go just as high as his talents will take him." He added, "My administration will commit itself to the proposition that no young American who is qualified to go to college will be prevented from doing so because he cannot afford it."

President Nixon is not living up to his promises.

I encountered another example of Nixon priorities recently when I attended a convention of the American Library Association. Have you ever seen a librarian fighting mad, ready to organize and mobilize, wanting to storm Congress? I did.

During the campaign, candidate Nixon called our libraries "a vital educational resource" and "a vital national asset."

This spring President Nixon proclaimed National Library Week, and during that same week, asked Congress to cut library funds from $135 million to $46 million!

The librarians were fighting mad. I don't blame them.

For years, our libraries have been understaffed and underfinanced. We have 40,000 schools with no libraries at all.

The Democratic administration had proposed spending $135 million, less than the cost of one day's fighting in Vietnam. The funds would have helped local communities build new public and school libraries and buy books and other library resources. Funds to bring library services to rural and inner city areas were cut in half—from $35 million to $17.5 million. Higher education library funds were also cut in half—from $25 million to $12.5 million.

Nothing is left for library construction. Billions for highways? Yes. Billions for new weapons systems? Yes. But not one cent for new libraries.

What can be done about these unconscionable cuts?

First, you can let your congressman know how you feel. Congress will restore these education funds—if the message from its constituents comes through loud and clear.

Second, after many years as a teacher, mayor, senator and vice-president, I have concluded that education is so vital to our national interest that it should be separated from the Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare and made into a cabinet-level Dept. of Education.

Third, since we have been providing too little and too late for a first-rate educational system, and since education is becoming such a difficult burden for the local taxpayer to bear alone, we should create a national educational trust fund, similar to our highway and social security trust funds.

Financing of the educational trust fund could come from development of oil shale deposits on federally-owned lands. Such development now makes economic sense for oil companies, and billions could be earned each year for education if the oil shale rights are not given away.

We must increase our investment in education. Too many of our children are not getting a fair chance. When we neglect these young people, they grow up to neglect themselves, their families, and their country.

For the long-range economic growth and security of the nation, our federal education budget should be no less than $10 billion a year—three times what the Nixon Administration has budgeted this year. This would do more to eliminate poverty and build a stronger America than anything else we could do.

We can do it. Congress should look at our national priorities and put education near the top, where it belongs.

THE TAX-EXEMPT STATUS OF MUNICIPAL BONDS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, tax reform occupies the mind of each and every one of us in the Senate. I think that we are all committed to correcting many of the inequities which plague our present tax structure. I certainly hope we are.

However, there are times when well-intentioned legislation can lead to ill-founded laws—times when the attempt to eliminate one injustice leads to the creation of a far greater one. This would happen, Mr. President, if this body were to heed the advice of those who would advocate the elimination of the tax-exempt status of the interest paid on municipal bonds.

Those who advocate such an approach have a laudable goal in mind. They feel that no individual receiving substantial income in our country should be allowed to totally escape income tax liability. It is then argued that because some individuals place all their money in municipal bonds and consequently pay no income tax on the interest received from those bonds we should eliminate the tax-exempt status of municipal bonds. Then, so the argument goes, a "loophole" will be closed, and these few wealthy individuals will be paying taxes again.

Mr. President, I submit that this argument is wide of the mark. It completely misses one essential point. That point is that municipalities simply cannot survive if they are forced to pay the prevailing market interest rate on taxable bonds.

It is clear then that an outright elimination of the tax-exemption on interest from municipal bonds would create such a financial burden on the municipalities of the various States that they would either become insolvent or levy huge taxes on their residents.

Just how great would these new taxes be? In order to state the minimum imaginable costs, let us assume that municipal bond rates would only rise to parity with corporate bonds, say, at 8 percent. In a typical State, $250 million is raised yearly by municipalities. With the present interest rate of 5½ percent, $13,750,000 is paid in interest in the first year of a bond issue with a typical 22-year average life. A 40-percent increase in this would be $5,500,000 for the first year and approximately $41,250,000 over

the life of the bond issue. The additional costs then to the taxpayers of the municipalities of this State would be $5½ million next year if we were to remove the tax-exemption on municipal bonds.

While it is very difficult to tell who would buy municipal bonds if the tax-exemption were eliminated, it is reasonably safe to assume that the same people who buy taxable bonds now would be the buyers of municipal bonds when they become taxable. It is interesting to note that the average tax bracket of investors in taxable bonds is only 13.4 percent. This tax rate is surprisingly low because of the fact that the greatest buyers of bonds are private pension funds and other low-bracket entities such as life insurance companies and mutual savings banks.

In our hypothetical state, we find that the $13,750,000 interest from municipal bonds will only yield $1,842,000 worth of revenue to the Federal Government—$13,750×134. Since the tax changes which will enable the Federal Government to collect that amount will cost the taxpayers of the municipalities in that state some $5½ million, the change is not economically sound.

I am aware of proposals to replace the benefit received by the municipalities as the result of the tax exemption with a Federal subsidy. Not only is it patently ludicrous to close a so-called loophole by granting a subsidy, but it is also senseless to introduce the Federal Government, with all its attendant redtape, into a system which functions quite well without it.

Last year, some $16,500 million of private capital was funneled into municipalities without any cost to the Federal Government for administering the capital flow. I hesitate to think of the costs we would encounter in attempting to regulate this movement of capital at the Federal level. I think our urban areas and rural municipalities have enough problems in dealing with the Federal bureaucracies as things stand now. We would hardly be justified in increasing the problems they face just for the sake of catching a few more tax dollars. This is especially true when there is evidence that the elimination of the tax exemption for municipal bonds might well result in Federal expenditures well in excess of any increase in Federal tax revenues.

Finally, I would call the attention of those who advocate a Federal subsidy to enable municipalities to survive the financial havoc they would create by eliminating the tax-exempt status of the bonds to the fact that the minimum conceivable amount of this subsidy would be $250 million per year—an amount in excess of the moneys to be collected in tax revenues as a result of the elimination of the exemption.

Mr. President, it simply does not make sense to institute such a program when the present municipal financing system is working well. I, for one, will never lend my vote to a proposal which suggests that this Government should take money from taxpayers in a town or city, spend part of it to pay salaries for the bureaucracy to collect it, and then send what is left back to the community as a "subsidy."

Unless a clear and present need for this type of financing can be demonstrated, I shall oppose it with all the resources at my command.

The fact that the proposed plans for the elimination of the tax exemption granted on the interest paid on municipal bonds is economically unsupportable is not the cause for my greatest criticism of them, however.

Those who would eliminate the tax-exempt status on municipal bonds completely ignore the desirable economic and social results of the exemption. While the economic absurdity of removing the tax exemption of municipal bonds is apparent, this is not the strongest reason for retaining it.

The strongest argument in favor of retention of the tax exemption stems from a very simple but very correct maxim: There is no such thing as freedom without financial independence. Transferred into the context of municipalities and taxes, this maxim tells us that no municipality will have truly local government unless it has local financial solvency. Local concepts of government will not long prevail over uniform, Federal ones if the municipality is financially dependent on the Federal Government.

I do not think we can overemphasize the importance of the concept of local government, or more accurately, of local control over local government. In an age when people are striking out against a society which they feel attempts to conform their ideas and reduce their existence to a computer card, it is incumbent upon us to limit the ever-increasing imposition of the Federal will upon individual local communities.

Individual communities often have unusual problems which demand unique solutions. Many of these solutions involve plans which cannot be made if the community must first justify its decisions to some higher bureaucratic body. What appears to be a questionable solution to a man sitting at a desk in Washington may be a quite reasonable approach to the problems when viewed from the point of view of a local mayor or city manager who knows the intricate workings of his community.

If we deny the municipalities the right to issue tax-exempt bonds, we will have eliminated their financial base, the financial base without which they cannot function independently of the Federal Government. And, Mr. President, they cannot solve local problems in any manner other than a uniform one if they cannot provide the financing necessary to implement the solution.

Mr. President, I do not pretend that preserving the exemption granted on the interest from municipal bonds will, taken alone, guarantee the continued independence of the towns and cities of our several States. I do know, however, that, if we eliminate the exemptions, we will have effectively destroyed one of the most important institutions of Government in this land—that of viable local governments which are operated and financed by citizens of the community at hand. That institution has served us too well to be cast aside in an ill-considered attempt to tax a few wealthy individuals.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the resolution passed by the Texas legislature be inserted in the RECORD at this time.

Mr. President, I also request unanimous consent that a copy of the resolution which has been passed by many municipalities in Texas be inserted in the RECORD, along with a list of those Texas municipalities which have already contacted me to express their support of this resolution.

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

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 173

Whereas, The Congress of the United States has under consideration several proposed plans which would limit the exempt status for income tax purposes of interest paid on bonds issued by state and local governments; and

Whereas, Among those suggestions under consideration by the Congress are proposals which would (1) include interest paid on state and local bonds in the base income for a proposed minimum income tax, (2) require allocation of deductions between taxable income and income from interest paid on state and local government bonds, (3) include interest paid on state and local bonds among income which would have tax preference limitations, and (4) provide a guaranty subsidy in exchange for the surrender of all or part of such traditional tax exemption; and

Whereas, It has long been considered unconstitutional for the Federal government to tax a state or local government; and

Whereas, Any of the foregoing plans or any other plan which would directly or indirectly tax interest paid on state or local government bonds would be an impairment of such constitutional immunity; and

Whereas, Any limitation on tax exemption of interest paid on state and local bonds would result in higher interest rates to be paid by state and local governments in their borrowing; and

Whereas, Any increase in cost of borrowing is paid directly by the taxpayers of the community borrowing or by the users of publicly owned facilities; and

Whereas, any limitation on tax exemption of interest paid on state and local bonds would limit the market for such bonds; and

Whereas, Any limitation of the market in which state and local bonds are sold would handicap state and local governments in providing funds for urgently needed public improvements; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 61st Legislature, the Senate concurring, That the Texas legislature by this Resolution expresses its opposition to any plan by the Congress of the United States that would in any way limit the tax exempt status of interest paid on bonds issued by state or local governments; and, be it further

Resolved, that upon adoption of this Resolution, the Secretary of State is requested to deliver forthwith copies of this Resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and each member of Congress from the State of Texas.

_____,
Speaker of the House.
BEN BARNES,
Lieutenant Governor.

I hereby certify that H.C.R. No. 173 was adopted by the House on May 30, 1969.

DOROTHY HALLMAN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

I hereby certify that H.C.R. No. 173 was adopted by the Senate on May 30, 1969.

CHARLES SCHNABEL,
Secretary of the Senate.

Approved: June 18, 1969.

PRESTON SMITH,
Governor.

A RESOLUTION IN OPPOSITION TO ANY LIMITATION ON THE TAX-EXEMPT STATUS OF INTEREST PAID ON MUNICIPAL BONDS

Whereas, the Congress of the United States is considering several plans which would limit the exempt status for income purposes of interest paid on bonds issued by cities; and

Whereas, any limitation on tax exemption of interest paid on municipal bonds will result in higher interest rates to be paid by cities, and limit the market for such bonds; and

Whereas, such limitation on tax exemption of interest paid on municipal bonds will handicap local government in securing funds for public improvements, and increase the burden on local tax payers and on users of public facilities; now therefore

Be it resolved by the ——— of the City of ——— that it go on record as opposing any plan by the Congress of the United States that would in any way limit the tax exempt status of interest paid on bonds issued by State or local governments; and

Be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be mailed to the United States Senators from Texas, and to the Member(s) of Congress in whose district the City of ——— is located.

Jasper, La Marque, White Settlement, Robstown, Yorktown, Angleton, Hitchcock, Hempstead, Spring Valley, Pampa, Granger, Stamford, San Antonio, Teague, Dalhart, Canadian, Mansfield, Sherman, New Braunfels, Hillsboro, Rockdale, Eldorado, West, Richardson, Killeen, Iowa Park, McKinney, Ferris, Dayton, Weslaco, Haskell, West Columbia, Pecos City, Terrell, Farmers Branch, Kermit, Gatesville, Crockett, Stratford, Temple, Beeville, Glen Rose, Port Lavaca, Nederland, Carrizo Springs, Bryan, Winnsboro, Munday, Lake Worth, Lewisville, La Grange, Temple, Houston, Farmers Branch, Hurst, Austin, Diboll, Fort Worth, Universal City, Harlingen, Arlington, Henderson, Laredo, Fort Stockton, El Paso, Muleshoe, Edinburg, Sulpher Springs, Borger, Elgin, Azle, and Groves.

Alba, Alto, Athens, Atlanta, Beckville, Bogata, Bullard, Carthage, Center, Clarksville, Cooper, Daingerfield, DeKalb, Easton, Gilmer, Gladewater, Hawkins, Henderson, Kooks, Hughes Springs, Jacksonville, Jefferson, Kilgore, Lakeport, Linden, Lone Star, Longview, Marshall, Maud, Mineola, Mount Pleasant, Mount Vernon, Nacogdoches, Naples, New Boston, New London, Ore City, Omaha, Overton, Palestine, Paris, Pittsburg, Queen City, Quitman, Rusk, Scottsville, Sulphur Springs, Tatum, Texarkana, Timpson, Troup, Tyler, Uncertain, Wake Village, Warren City, Waskom, and Winnsboro.

SURTAX AND INFLATION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I have constantly reiterated my belief that the surtax is not needed to "fight inflation." Rather than fighting inflation, it adds to it. The surtax has directly contributed to a whole cycle of inflationary price raises—raises that large corporations transfer to small companies and to the general public.

The small businessmen and the average taxpayer cannot escape. This tax burden is not only greater, but he must pay more for his unavoidable purchases.

Not surprisingly, the surtax has failed to achieve any of its stated goals. Instead of stabilizing or decreasing inflation, cost of living and interest rates have skyrocketed.

In a recent letter to the editor of the Washington Post, Joseph A. Beirne, president of the Communication Workers of America, eloquently states his opposition to any further extension of the surtax. He also mentioned that any increases in the existing tax rates must further increase the regressive nature of our inequitable tax code.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Beirne's fine letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

A UNION OFFICIAL VIEWS THE SURTAX

In recent days I have read many stories and interpretative columns in the Washington Post dealing with the need "to extend the surtax on individual and corporate incomes, so as to "fight inflation." Unfortunately, these items are long on rhetoric and short on information and fact.

Since this is a public issue of some controversy, I wish to address the other side—the opposition to any further extension of the surtax. The Communications Workers of America, of which I am president, and the AFL–CIO has stated their flat-out opposition to the surtax because its defects so greatly outweigh its benefits. The only apparent benefit is that it does produce revenue.

The defects include regressivity, in that it is only levied on income now subject to taxation. The surtax has allowed the Congress to delay assumption of its duty to examine the Federal tax structure in order to ensure equality of sacrifice and burden, based on ability to pay. (I am aware that some changes in the tax laws may come about this year, thanks to public outrage over the billions of untaxed dollars in income.)

The surtax feeds inflation. It devalues the dollar. I cite as the most respectable authority for this assertion Mr. H. I. Romnes, chairman of the board of American Telephone & Telegraph Co., at the April 16 annual stockholders' meeting. Mr. Romnes cited the surtax as one of the major factors which will dictate rises in both interstate and intrastate communications service tariffs.

My point is that if the surtax were doing the intended job of controlling inflation, it would not be necessary for AT&T to launch an effort to offset the effects of the "anti-inflation" surtax. Rate increases in a company of the magnitude of AT&T must automatically be reflected throughout the economy in higher prices, since the communications services provided are so vital.

Over the last weekend, the Administration has become shrill in its predictions about what will happen if the surtax extension is rejected. The only thing not said—so far—by the Administration's spokesmen is that the economy will collapse into another 1929-type depression.

There are some of us, without political constituencies, who can look at this issue somewhat more calmly. Two years ago, organized labor gave its qualified support to the surtax, with that support conditioned on the immediate beginning of the long-neglected job of tax revision for equity. The surtax was to be used as a revenue source to tide the Government over until a new Tax Code could begin yielding the necessary revenue.

The Congress and Administration can make the necessary radical changes in the Tax Code within a relatively short time. The studies have been in preparation for a number of years. A revision of the Tax Code for both equity and production of revenue can be the prime alternative to extension of the surtax, which only compounds the inequities of the present Code. All that is required is the determination to do the job right.

Despite passage of the surtax, inflation and cost of living and interest rates have shot upward alarmingly. Dr. Arthur F. Burns, Counselor to the President, warns that the dollar may have to be devalued unless the surtax is extended. This is a rather strong statement, with which I cannot agree. The dollar already has in effect been very sharply devalued by inflation, cost of living and high interest rates. Now, after a year of the surtax, the facts are that the surtax has not done the intended job. Something went wrong. The Administration has looked around for someone to blame. The "Red Scare" and the "Yellow Peril" won't work. The latest "bad boys" in economics seem to be the Members of the Federal Reserve Board, who allegedly have vitiated the good effects of the surtax.

What we actually are seeing now is the politics of extremism, the shrill repetition of the "unquestionable assumption" that the surtax is all that is keeping the Nation economically and militarily safe.

There simply has not been sufficient questioning of these "eternal truths." If the surtax is extended once again, the inflation will continue upward. Wage earners will be paying effective mortgage interest rates of about 9 per cent. Cost of living, which has shot up 6½ per cent since January 1969, will not level off. Each segment of the economy will cite the surtax as a causative factor.

There is a great need for rational thinking in economic policy, a factor lacking for some time. The high incidence of economic sloganeering today is much akin to making a person suffering with appendicitis go to a psychiatrist. In both, it is a "nice try."

EXTENSION OF THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, on June 26 Attorney General John N. Mitchell proposed to a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee that coverage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 be extended nationwide and expanded to ban all literacy tests as a qualification for voting.

The present act, scheduled to expire in 13 months, applies only to seven Southern States and has been of great assistance to the Negro in securing his right to vote in these States. The Attorney General states that he could not support a simple extension of the present regional legislation, that the right to vote is not a regional issue but a matter of national concern, and that accordingly the present statute should be extended to ban literacy tests in all, not just seven, States.

In addition to the proposal to ban literacy tests nationwide, the Attorney General's recommendations also included a proposed ban on State residency requirements for Presidential elections. I have previously introduced a measure of this nature, and I support this recommendation with great enthusiasm. Approximately 6 million otherwise qualified Americans will be barred from voting in the next Presidential election by State residency requirements unless some measure is adopted. In my judgment, residence requirements of 6 months to 2 years constitute a patently unjust impediment to voting in nationwide elections and must be removed.

Subsequent to his testimony the Attorney General has been subjected to a barrage of criticism from newspapers, Senators, and Representatives, including many Members of Congress from the 13 States outside the South that maintain literacy tests for voting. I believe this criticism to be unwarranted.

I do not object to vigorous enforce-

ment of voting rights in the South, and for this reason I would not object to a simple extension of the present act under which 800,000 Negroes have been added to the voter registration lists. At the same time, however, as a consistent supporter of the extension and securing of the franchise, I intend to enthusiastically support the good faith effort of the Attorney General to extend this right still further to all Americans in all parts of the country.

Mr. President, the Nashville Tennessean on July 1 published an editorial expressing views on this matter quite similar to my own. This newspaper is a respected middle Tennessee publication that has traditionally supported liberal Democratic candidates for public office. I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

TIME FOR VOTERS RIGHTS ON A NATIONWIDE SCALE

The Nixon administration has dropped a bombshell of sorts into Congress with its first major civil rights proposal, a nationwide attack on barriers to voting.

Appearing before the House Judiciary Committee, Attorney General John Mitchell said the administration will oppose extension of the 1965 Voting Rights Act because it is regional legislation.

The 1965 act, which expires 13 months from now, applies to seven southern states, Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, Virginia and 39 counties in North Carolina. Since its enactment more than 800,000 Negroes have been added to the poll books in those states.

A good many northern liberals support a simple five year extension of the 1965 act. During his campaign, President Nixon wooed southern votes by promising that the region would not be singled out for special treatment on civil rights.

Against this background, the administration could have simply balked at the extension. It has, instead, come up with some worthwhile proposals to protect the privilege of voting across the nation.

The administration wants a nationwide ban on literacy tests for voters, which are still on the books in 13 states—Alaska, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Oregon, Washington and Wyoming.

Another part of the package would ban state residency requirements for voters in presidential elections, which barred 5.5 million Americans from the polls last November.

The attorney general also asked for authority to send federal examiners into any part of the country to investigate violations of voting rights and broader authority to challenge local voting regulations.

It was interesting that some of the immediate opposition to the plan came from congressmen representing states with literacy tests. Apparently it is one thing to assure that southern Negroes have the right to vote and quite another to apply the same standards to the black, the poor, the Indians and the Spanish peoples of other areas.

The 1965 act was a needed step in the struggle for equality of all Americans. It has accomplished a good part of its goal, but federal authorities should not let up in their efforts to eliminate voter discrimination in the south.

At the same time, additional steps are needed to insure voting rights for other Americans. In an age of instant communications, formal literacy is not an essential measure of the ability to make informed judgments about candidates and issues. Nor is there any excuse for barring those who participate in a mobile society from the polls for one or two years in national elections.

Congress should make sure there is no letup in enforcement of voting rights in the south. But it should not stand in the way of extending even broader rights to all citizens in all parts of the nation.

ROOM TO ROAM

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, at a time when Americans are searching for new and diversified recreational opportunities, the Bureau of Land Management of the U.S. Department of the Interior administers 450 million acres of public land on which there is plenty of wonderful room to roam.

Last year the first edition of the Bureau's booklet Room to Roam sold over 200,000 copies. A new issue has recently been published.

Mr. Byron Fish, writing in the Seattle Times on June 16 succinctly describes some of the major public land issues as he writes about this excellent booklet which describes the wonderful recreational opportunities on the public lands.

This recreation guide book divides the West into six major areas, then proceeds to highlight major outdoor attractions in each. For outdoor-minded Americans, these public lands of colorful history, scenic wonders and magnificent open spaces certainly provide ample room to roam. Our public lands are truly a great national asset belonging to all of the people of the United States. This great resource is a trust which must be administered not only for this generation but for succeeding generations of Americans. I know the Congress will live up to its repsonsibility in this regard as issues relating to the administration of our vast public domain come before us. I congratulate the Bureau of Land Management on what I am sure will be another best seller in its second edition of Room to Roam.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Byron Fish's article be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

LAND BUREAU HAS ROSY VIEW

(By Byron Fish)

Perhaps the Bureau of Land Management views its own domain through four-color-process glasses. It is not really exempt, either, from the conflicts over environment that keep increasing in pitch.

Still, its second edition of "Room to Roam, a Recreation Guide to the Public Lands," is a welcome relief to the constant wrangling over recreation areas, dams, air pollution and interpretations of "multiple use."

Like a Disney movie, the booklet leaves the reader in a happy frame of mind, his faith restored that wide open spaces still exist and that man, nature and commercial interests can be in tune.

The Bureau of Land Management was formed in 1812 as the General Land Office, to administer all the government's real estate. Thus it is far older than the National Park Service, the Forest Service, the Bureau of Reclamation or other such federal agencies.

During more than 150 years, government land was taken over by many public and private uses—homesteaders, railroads, mineral claims, timber claims, parks, wildlife refuges, national forests.

As a result, all the B.L.M. has left is 450 million acres, or the equivalent of about 500 Olympic National Parks. Most of the acreage is in the Western states and Alaska.

Nine-tenths of Alaska is federal land. It is in the throes of tug-and-haul over who will get large portions of it. Congress promised several million acres to the state but the natives put in overlapping claims. A freeze is in effect until the matter is settled.

None of that wrangle intrudes upon "Room to Roam." The bureau is equally unbothered (at least to outward appearances) by rabid conservationists or strip miners, by hunters or birdwatchers.

"Each to his own" seems to be the philosophy. Room for all still remains, and it is the public's.

Very little bureau land has salable timber on it. The bureau had that resource removed from its jurisdiction many years ago, even in Alaska. No doubt being free of the wilderness-versus-logging controversies contributes to the bureau's cheerful tone.

It is not responsible for the use of national parks or Forest Service camps, nor with all the "don'ts" that go with official recreation areas—don't pick flowers or rocks, no hunting, stay on the trail, camp only in authorized spots. . . .

The Bureau, of course, is concerned with conservation and good outdoor manners. It is against pollution and litter, and for the preservation of archeological sites and natural scenery.

It does not begrudge amateur pothunters their stray arrowheads and pestles, though, and its maps guide rockhounds to the best areas for that hobby. It does the same for hunters and fishermen.

Prospectors may search land for whatever interests them. Cattlemen and their herds are accepted as part of the scene.

There are no "keep out" signs posted against jeep or motorcycle explorers, but they are urged to stick to existing tracks and not cut up the desert needlessly.

While the bureau is not charged with furnishing campsites—at least not to the extent National Parks and the Forest Service are—it has developed a number and it pinpoints others as "undeveloped."

From there on, explorers of the outdoors are on their own. Go camp 40 miles northwest of Winnemucca, Nev., if you want to. Just bring your own water and other supplies.

"Room to Roam" has a nostalgic appeal to anyone old enough to remember when camping sites were chosen individually wherever they could be found and there was lots of choice.

Not much bureau roaming room is left in this state, except for patches in the Columbia Basin and in the Okanogan Highlands. The closest "wide open spaces" are in Eastern Oregon.

The booklet with its maps (which include all other federal recreation areas, too) can be bought for 75 cents from the Superintendent of Documents, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

THE NORTH AMERICAN WATER AND POWER ALLIANCE PROPOSAL

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, it has been nearly 5 years since the special Subcommittee on Western Water Development, which I headed, issued their report on the concept of constructing a gigantic project to divert water from Alaska and northern Canada to Canada's prairie Provinces and the United States.

While recognizing the potential value of such a grand project to many of our Western States, much of the Midwest

and even the Great Lakes States, many observers looked upon it as "the impossible dream," partly because of Canadian opposition.

In the intervening period, a great deal of thought has gone into this concept, and several individuals have advanced variations of the original North American Water and Power Alliance—NAWAPA—proposal. Particularly, the Canadians have been taking a serious and factual look at the concept.

One recently expressed Canadian view should be of great interest to those in the Senate who follow water developments closely.

I refer to a speech given by Bert Hargrave, of Walsh, Alberta, at the annual symposium in conservation and water resource management and planning which is held in Wenatchee, Wash., and sponsored by the Wenatchee Daily World.

Let me quote just two paragraphs from Mr. Hargrave's statement:

Canada contains more fresh water than any other country on earth, more than 7 per cent of our area is represented by water.

Professor E. Kuiper, who is probably Canada's foremost authority on this subject has suggested that even after allowing for our long term water needs an average flow of more than 100,000,000 acre-feet per year could be exported to the South.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the insertion of the speech of Mr. Hargrave, as reported in the Canadian publication Reclamation, at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

CANADIAN PRAIRIE WATERS

(From a speech by Bert Hargrave, Walsh, Alberta, in Wenatchee, Apr. 7, 1969)

As an invited guest at this year's congress may I first pay a well deserved tribute to those people and agencies responsible for these very fine annual symposiums on conservation and water resource management and planning. The interest of the Wenatchee Daily World and the Woods family, together with their associates, notably Chester Kimm, in international conservation matters is well known in Canada and especially Western Canada.

There are two main phases I would like to discuss:

1. A brief summation of Canadian Prairie Water Resources.

2. The question of Canadian Water Export.

I am sure this group is very much aware of Canada's very fortunate position with regard to our fresh water resources.

Canada contains more fresh water than any other country on earth, more than 7 per cent of our area is represented by water.

On our Canadian mainland there are 41 primary river basins.

Our mean annual run-off into four regions amounts to almost 2,000 million acre feet available for development.

Our total dependable supply is less than 30 per cent of our total available supply due to a lack of development.

It is only since 1930 that our Prairie provinces have controlled their own natural resources. Prior to this our federal government exercised full control. Water resource development on the prairies appears to have centred around three resource developments in our administration.

First of these was the Prairie Water Board formed in 1948. It consisted of representatives from the three provincial governments and the federal government.

Fifteen years of off-and-on discussions of this board resulted in the formation of a second committee, a Ministerial Action Committee consisting of the three prairie ministers of agriculture and a federal representative.

The major activity of this committee was the formation of a third group, the Saskatchewan Nelson Basin Board, "to study the water resources of the Saskatchewan-Nelson Basin system, including potential additional supply by diversion or storage."

I am sure by now you are aware that we have a divided jurisdiction between our provinces and our federal government as far as water is concerned. Our provinces own their water and yet our federal government is the ultimate authority over boundary waters and the regulation of interprovincial and external trade, a matter of extreme significance if water export is ever to become a reality.

We have two recent developments that will help this problem of divided jurisdiction. The first was the formation several years ago of the Canadian Council of Resource Ministers, a group of all the provincial and federal resource ministers who will recommend long range resource planning to all governments. The second development is the pending federal legislation that will create the Canada Water Act. This will provide for two main powers: first, for a much more effective water program within the federal government and second, for new forms of joint relationship between the provinces and Canada for carrying out comprehensive water development studies and programs.

Proposals for water export have had a reception ranging from cool to hostile. Let me quickly add that in my personal opinion the broad cross section of Canadian population is very ignorant of our water resources. I suggest the reason for this attitude might be:

1. A feeling we should look after our own interests first.

2. The opinion that when water is exported, it is lost forever.

3. The suggestion that exported water might promote economic development in your country at the expense of Canadian development.

4. The seemingly cut and dried aspects of the N.A.W.A.P.A. scheme specifically aroused resentment.

I have attempted to determine an accurate assessment of our various government official views on this matter. Saskatchewan's policy is quite clear as indicated by this quotation: "We view with deep concern the suggestion that the water in our national rivers is a continental resource." Manitoba's minister indicates support for the December 1968 position statement of the Canadian Council of Resource Ministers: "that until Canadian needs were much more clearly defined by massive studies, the Canadian Government should not be actively pursuing this matter."

Premier Strom, of Alberta, told me that there can be no export talks until at least the Saskatchewan-Nelson Basin study is completed.

In 1966 Canada held its own "Water for Peace" conference in Ottawa at which all governments agreed not to make public comment on the matter of water export until sufficient studies were completed and after Canada's needs have been assessed.

The messages here are loud and clear as far as our various Government policies are concerned. However there is now some positive interest from our academic and economic people in the tremendous potential value of our water resources when viewed as an exportable commodity like gas and oil. Professor E. Kuiper, who is probably Canada's foremost authority on this subject has suggested that even after allowing for our long term water needs an average flow of more than 100,000,000 acre-feet per year could be exported to the South.

Western Canadian oil and gas interests and especially those in Alberta, have quite recently showed some concern over your Alaska discoveries at Prudhoe Bay, as we feel this vast new discovery may cut into our present export quota to your country. The companion philosophy of continental water resources is generally thought to be continental energy resources. Does this not suggest the possibility of amalgamation of resource development interests?

If Canadian water export is to come, its time of arrival will be measured not in decades but in generations. Capital costs involved for most of our future export will have to come from your budgets in addition to the actual price of water at the point of export.

We are moving into an age when almost more important to know than where we are going is to get there quickly. Let us not confuse activity with genuine progress and achievement.

CEASE-FIRE

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, with a growing number of people searching for solutions to our involvement in Vietnam, and as the continuing list of casualties becomes increasingly intolerable to bear, I find the suggestions of a former distinguished Member of Congress a very feasible and refreshing approach to the problem. Hamilton Fish was a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives for 25 years. He offers what I feel is an interesting and enlightened proposal for bringing an expedient end to the Vietnam war. I recommend this proposal as worthy of our serious consideration and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF HAMILTON FISH

As one who believes that our involvement in virtually a civil war in Vietnam, ten thousand miles away, is in the wrong place, at the wrong time, and in the wrong war, I am convinced that the time has come for immediate action to end the war.

Fifteen years ago, in opposing the SEATO Treaty before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I stated that the signatories would run out on us and leave us holding the bag, which they did, including France and Britain. I further stated that if we became involved in a civil war in Southeast Asia, and sent our Armed Forces there, "that the Communist Politbureau and the Communist General Staff would get drunk for a week, as they would like to keep our Armed Forces in the jungles and swamps of Vietnam." And that is exactly what they have succeeded in doing by draining our financial resources while they are taking over economically, politically and militarily, the Arab Nations in the Eastern Mediterranean Area.

I believe in the integrity and sincerity of President Nixon in his determined efforts to end the war in Vietnam on the basis of a fair and honorable peace. I commend him for taking the first step by the withdrawal of 25,000 American troops from Vietnam and believe that within a year it will be reduced by 100,000. But why continue the killing of American soldiers, those of our allies and our enemies in Vietnam for a single day in this tragic war; the longest in the history

of the United States and the fourth deadliest.

I urge President Nixon to immediately offer a cease fire by all our Armed Forces and those of the enemy without any reservation of any kind on the basis of the status quo. Such an offer by the President would be welcomed by most Americans, except a few militants who insist on all-out victory regardless of the cost in lives. It would be acclaimed by all neutral nations as a definite act by the United States to secure peace in Vietnam and to stop the bloodshed.

President Nixon in answering a question at the press conference on June 19, 1969, stated that he was in favor of a cease fire, but indicated there might be difficulty in supervision of the Viet Cong and guerrillas. If this is so, the United Nations from its very nature, ought to be willing to cooperate to provide the necessary supervisory forces. If not, both sides maintain the status quo of their armed forces and that should provide sufficient supervision.

If North Vietnam and the Viet Cong turn down a peace offer based on cease fire, then all the neutral nations will place the stigma for any continued fighting and killing upon the Communists in North Vietnam and the Viet Cong. There may be some risks, but there are always risks in war. But, as a former member of the General Staff, I think they have been grossly exaggerated and am inclined to think that many of our top Generals would favor a cease fire. Actually a cease fire may be a military advantage for us, as a major part of North Vietnam is a sanctuary against air bombing. If more North Vietnamese troops invade South Vietnam or Laos, they would be a constant target for our bombing if the war of attrition continues.

The fundamental concept of military tactics is to get your enemy into an area of your own choosing. This our enemies have done. And I firmly believe that we are playing into the hands of the Communists by being there.

If President Nixon publicly urged a cease fire, it would stop all the Vietnam War sniping going on in the United States, and change overnight our prestige and influence with the free nations of the world. "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the sons of God."

BENEFITS AVAILABLE TO THE RETURNING VIETNAM VETERANS

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, as the first group—some 814—of combat troops recalled from Vietnam arrive in the United States today, it is fitting that we turn our attention to the services and benefits that will be available to them to heal their wounds and to otherwise ease their readjustment to civilian life. Whatever one's view of this tragic and enormously costly war, we must not turn our backs on the men whom our country has called to fight this war—many of whom are particularly in need of these services and benefits administered by the Veterans' Administration.

It is our duty to insure that today's veterans are not saddled with yesterday's veterans programs; rather, we owe them a program that will fully meet their present medical, hospital, educational, and rehabilitational needs as well as the opportunities of tomorrow. Toward this end, Mr. President, the Veterans' Administration seems to have taken—on tiptoes—a timid, but hopeful, first step. I was pleased to learn that the Veterans' Administrator yesterday in testimony before an Appropriations Committee subcommittee accepted the $34.6 million which the House of Representatives had properly restored to the medical and hospital program in the VA budget in the Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development appropriation bill, 1970. This sum eliminates approximately one-half the cut recommended by President Nixon in his April 15, 1969, budget message and raises the medical care item to the full amount recommended in the Johnson budget for medical care—$1,541,701,000.

This amount, if accepted by the Senate Appropriations Committee and this body, will provide for 123,700 beds—of an authorized total of 125,000—in Veterans' Administration facilities; treatment of 864,695 inpatient beneficiaries; and 7,474,000 medical outpatient treatments. The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs found that the amount requested in the Nixon budget revision for these services was not sufficient for the provision of adequate levels of medical care. As was recently pointed out on the floor by my distinguished colleague from Georgia, Senator HERMAN E. TALMADGE, the chairman of the Veterans' Legislation Subcommittee of the Finance Committee, over 14,000 more veterans were admitted to VA hospitals in the first 9 months of fiscal year 1969 than during a comparable period in fiscal year 1968. This, then, is no time to be cutting back on this vital program as would have been required without the $17.6 million restoration. It is for this reason that I cosponsored with Senator TALMADGE his recent amendment—which was adopted—to H.R.11400, the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1969, in order to exempt the VA medical care and education programs from the fiscal year 1970 overall spending ceiling that that bill would impose.

I thus support the action of the House of Representatives, and now of the Veterans' Administration, in seeking to provide enough money to pay for the increasing medical care demands that our Vietnam returnees will, unfortunately, of necessity, be making on the VA hospital and medical program.

The other $17 million restored to the budget is for hospital, domiciliary and State nursing home construction and modernization. The new amount, although still some $28.2 million below the Johnson budget request, would permit continuation of the State nursing home grant program at the same level as in fiscal year 1969 and the inclusion of certain important projects of modernization already on the drawing boards for three VA hospitals.

For these reasons, I urge the Appropriations Committee to accept the $34.6 million restoration in the VA budget in order to insure that the quality and level of VA health care for our young men coming home from Vietnam is fully adequate to their needs.

In closing, I wish to place in larger context the Veterans' Administration's more responsible approach to the task of requesting and supporting adequate program levels for vital veterans benefits and services. Its new position on medical and hospital program expenses contrasts markedly with its recent position before the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee, which I chair, in hearings on education and training bills. There, despite clear and uncontradicted evidence that substantial increases are necessary in the GI educational assistance and training allowances in order to restore comparability with Korean conflict rates, the VA Administrator recommended that the Congress take no action pending receipt of the views of the just-created Presidential Committee on the Vietnam Veteran which would, in effect, defer action until next session.

As I said at that time, I do not feel that the Congress can properly abdicate its legislative responsibilities in this manner, and, along with the distinguished chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH of Texas, who is also the ranking member of the subcommittee and who served as the subcommittee chairman for 7 years, I am dedicated to pushing ahead to achieve these needed increases during this session of Congress.

Thus, I strongly urge that the administration reconsider its recommendation for delay on raising the education and training allowance rates.

NEWS CORRESPONDENT JOSEPH McCAFFREY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the month of July marks the 25th year that news correspondent Joseph McCaffrey has been covering Capitol Hill. During his tenure as one of the Nation's first-rank newsmen, Mr. McCaffrey has probably accomplished something unique among Washington reporters. That is, he has not incurred the enmity of a single Senator or Representative whom I know.

After arriving in the Capitol in 1958, I quickly came to respect Joe McCaffrey's judgment on the issues, and to recognize his fairness in reporting. This conviction has only been strengthened through the passage of time. I am hopeful he will enjoy many more rewarding years on Capitol Hill.

VIETNAM—A REALISTIC APPRAISAL

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I was privileged to be in Wichita, Kans., to hear Vice President SPIRO T. AGNEW address the Midwest Governors' Conference on Tuesday, July 1.

The Vice President's remarks were not only timely but, in my opinion, expressed a forthright and realistic view of our position in the Vietnam conflict. To the critics who can find only fault, and to those who want peace at any price, the Vice President's remarks may not have been welcome. The vast majority of Americans, however, will view the Vice President's speech in its proper perspective, as did David Lawrence in an editorial entitled "Agnew Hailed on Viet Policy Views," published in the Evening Star of Thursday, July 3.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

AGNEW HAILED ON VIET POLICY VIEWS

(By David Lawrence)

Vice President Agnew made a speech before the Midwestern Governors' Conference in Wichita, Kan., on Tuesday in which he said that, while some of the opposition to the Vietnam war is sincere, it is nevertheless "undermining our negotiations for peace and prolonging the war."

Sen. J. William Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, retorted that Agnew's speech was "especially offensive coming from a man with so little background and so little experience in the field he is talking about."

But how much background and how much experience does anybody need in order to understand that, when the United States is in a war and influential members of the opposition party—which commands a majority in both houses of Congress—demand that our troops be withdrawn and the war ended on virtually a "peace-at-any-price" basis, the enemy would not be likely to make any important concessions in the negotiations for peace and would wait it out instead?

The vice president, like many other citizens, has been watching the course of the negotiations at Paris. He also has had the benefit of private briefings and meetings of the National Security Council. So he certainly has had an opportunity to gain a good deal of "background."

Agnew declared in his speech that "self-professed experts" want to end the fighting at any cost and are leading the North Vietnamese to overestimate the strength of anti-war sentiment in America and its power to force a surrender by American and allied forces in Vietnam. He added:

"The Viet Cong (the ally in South Vietnam of the Hanoi government) remains intransigent because of the slender hope that the voices of dissent at home will force us to alter—perhaps even abdicate—our policy of proving that confrontation with the United States is costly."

The vice president assured his listeners that the President is anxious to end the war but does not favor peace "at the price of abdication." He said American policy means staying in Vietnam long enough to secure "self-determination for the people of South Vietnam."

It doesn't take much imagination or background to recognize that, if the United States pulls out of Vietnam without achieving its goal, the Soviet Union and Communist China will feel free to invade other countries in Asia and Europe. The impression will prevail that America has abandoned the humanitarianism which it exhibited in both World War I and World War II and in Korea in helping countries which were the victims of aggression.

Unfortunately, too much attention has been paid to statements by some of the critics which are palpably harmful to the American cause at the Paris peace conference. The negotiations have been deadlocked because of a belief by the Communists that sooner or later President Nixon will withdraw all American troops from South Vietnam, irrespective of whether our adversaries take any reciprocal steps. This is a mistaken thesis, and is only prolonging the war.

Week after week casualties continue in a conflict that could have been ended long ago if restrictions here had not been placed on the military forces of the United States. They were never permitted to bomb all the targets they wanted to strike. The American strategists have been ordered to confine operations largely to South Vietnam. It doesn't take much experience or knowledge of foreign affairs to learn that in every war the use of maximum force, including unlimited bombardment of enemy territory and bases, is considered the logical way to fight.

When the Vietnam war is over and the record is finally revealed, the American people may well wonder why bombing of North Vietnam was limited and then finally halted without obtaining from the enemy a cessation of its hostilities.

Even while the negotiations have been going on for more than a year, the enemy has pursued intensively its war operations. In recent months it has felt more and more convinced that victory would be forthcoming because the Democratic party in Congress is ready, for political reasons, to insist that America pull out its forces from Vietnam.

Appeasement is usually the predecessor of a major conflict. This is what occurred prior to World War I and World War II. It doesn't take any "background" or "experience" to know that when you cringe before an enemy, you are not likely to win the battle.

BIG THICKET NATIONAL PARK SUPPORTED BY TEXAS FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, public support for the preservation of a portion of the Big Thicket area in southeast Texas has been growing steadily since I introduced the first Big Thicket bill in Congress in 1966. Many persons, groups, and organizations have endorsed my bill, S. 4, which calls for the establishment of a Big Thicket National Park of not less than 100,000 acres. They have recognized the value of this beautiful and unique land, and are working diligently to preserve the remaining forest lands, river bottoms, and wildlife habitat areas.

Today it is my privilege to submit to the RECORD an article entitled "The Big Thicket Special Project" published in the September–October 1968 issue of the Texas Clubwoman.

It speaks of the importance of making the Big Thicket a national park. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Texas Clubwoman, September–October, 1968]

THE BIG THICKET SPECIAL PROJECT

Have you ever seen a roadrunner break out of a mass of wild azaleas and trot down a path among pitcher plants? Have you ever seen the world's largest American holly or Eastern red cedar or Chinese tallow? Have you ever walked on a thick carpet of mosses and fern where palmettos towered above your head? Or, have you driven down a road at night where phosphorescent lights dance like an old-time brakeman swinging his lantern on a railroad?

Then you've never seen the Big Thicket of Texas—that impenetrable wonderland of plants and animals where only bloodhounds can find lost people. Between Beaumont and the Alabama-Coushatta Indian reservation lies this phenomenally beautiful botanical paradise. Twenty-one varieties of wild orchids dot the towering cypress, water oak and pine forest. This area combines the Everglades of Florida, the Okefenokee Swamp with jungles typical of Tamaulipas and Vera Cruz. Here is one of the last stands of the nearly extinct Ivory-billed Woodpecker—a huge black and white bird; the male having a flaming rest crest. About 300 other species make this their home. Bear and panther, although rarely seen, are present in this jungle country of yaupon, red bay, black hickory and spackleberry.

Float down Village Creek or Mill Creek or the Neches River itself and feel the peace of still untrammelled woodland. Driving back roads is not enough to appreciate the beauties of delicate mosses and colorful fungi. Hikers or canoers reap the greatest pleasures of this wonderland.

But civilization is rapidly eating into and eroding our Texas Eden. Every day 50 acres of the Big Thicket disappear by means of the developers, bulldozers or the lumber company saws. We must start now to save this area by creating a National Park that will preserve those pieces which are still near virgin.

On October 20, 1966, Senator Ralph Yarborough introduced the first bill in Congress to create this park. No action was taken and at the very beginning of the present Congress he introduced a new bill, S4, to set aside suitable areas in Polk, Hardin and Tyler counties to create a "chain of pearls" including the most unique and beautiful of the Big Thicket areas. He has striven long and hard for this park and has been aided by the Big Thicket Association and many other conservation organizations over the state who helped secure Padre Island National Seashore and Guadalupe Mountains National Park.

It is to be hoped that members in the Texas Federation will have a large hand in persuading Congress to enact S4 thereby creating the Big Thicket National Park.

The Big Thicket Association has obtained an option on 548 acres of the only remaining virgin area. What can our membership do to support and help them raise the rest of the $250,000 purchase price?

Here are some of the reasons why our TFWC president, Mrs. Henry Shaper has declared preservation of the Big Thicket a special project for her administration. She feels that such a natural area must not be destroyed but must be kept for posterity. In order to let the clubwomen of Texas know about the Big Thicket she has appointed a special committee under the chairmanship of Mrs. Jud Collier and Mrs. William C. Hancock to draw up and present to the club presidents and to their individual club members an action program. The Program includes writing letters to Senators and Congressmen urging passage of S4, the bill to create the Big Thicket National Park. It suggests the purchase and sale of informational material—*The Big Thicket Story* by Dempsie Henley, *Farewell to Texas* by U. S. Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, reprints from *Texas Parade magazine* and from Sierra Club magazine.

The action program also suggests that each club devote one meeting to seeing slides or the movie, or having a speaker talk about the Big Thicket. (This suggested program material was mailed to club presidents on July 15th.) It also urges support of the Big Thicket Association's land purchase plan—lands to be deeded to the Park when established—by becoming members of this active group, selling note paper depicting the Ivory-billed Woodpecker, or donating money.

Let us work together to interest all the other citizens of our state and nation in preserving what has been called the biological crossroads of North America.

THE SPECIAL FOOD AND MILK PROGRAMS

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, recent floor debate centering on the special food service program and the special milk program reinforced my belief that the entire problem of malnutrition merits concentrated study.

An editorial appearing in the Toledo, Oreg., Lincoln County Leader pointed out the connection between unemployment and malnutrition. We all must be aware of this hand-in-hand relationship. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent to insert this editorial into the RECORD.

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

MALNUTRITION—HERE?

We are rather terrified by the story we carried last week concerning malnutrition in Lincoln county. While we might be able to believe this is a problem in the deep south among poor blacks, it's hard to understand how such a problem can exist in Oregon, in a period of state-wide affluence.

This has been one of the fastest growing counties in the state in the past years in terms of family income, but it is also obvious that a switch to an industrial (pulp mill), tourist expansion (Salishan, etc.) and education (Oregon State) based economy has left a residue population of under-employed woods workers, and to some extent, agricultural workers.

If the problem is anywhere near as serious as suggested by the school staff of the county, it would appear absolutely necessary for the county board of commissioners to order a study of the problem, and then take steps to correct the problems.

Such a study might well be made by the health department in cooperation with the department of public welfare and the schools.

When we learn that 37 of 212 Eddyville pupils are being aided by the school district's free lunch program, and another 80 to 125 are being aided at Siletz, we know we have a problem. And it is a problem no citizen of good conscience can ignore.

When we are told some 2000 such free lunches are served each month in the county, then we know this is a problem which must be faced and solved.

These people may need retraining, or simply an understanding of what is proper diet.

Because, while many jobs go unfilled in this county for want of skills, there seems to be a persistant area of underemployment in Lincoln county and it appears to us there must be a connection between being out of work and lack of a proper diet.

If we can afford billions for a war in Vietnam, it seems only simple logic to be able to afford a few thousands to help those in need in Lincoln county.

ONE STANDARD OF HEALTH

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I was astounded to read in my newspaper this morning that Dr. Roger O. Egeberg, the man President Nixon has chosen to fill the Nation's top medical post, says it is not sound to expect we can have "one standard of health care for the entire Nation."

I gather from that remark that Dr. Egeberg believes we can only assure the best medical care in this country to the rich and that those in the middle and lower economic strata must be satisfied with second-best care, and the poor to just about any care left.

I do not think the American people will like this statement, Mr. President. Our citizens believe in equality of opportunity, and this includes not only an equal opportunity to get quality education, and equal opportunity to aspire to any job the country can offer, but also equal opportunity to get the best medical advice and care our medical profession knows how to give when a person becomes ill.

Dr. Egeberg's kind of America would mean that a child born blind in a poor family would not have the same opportunity to have his sight restored as would the child born in a rich family.

Dr. Egeberg's kind of America means that a rich person ill with cancer can get the most thorough diagnosis and the most skilled treatment which medical science has developed, but a poor person must take his chances with whatever time and treatment the overworked doctor in a crowded, understaffed, poorly equipped hospital can give him.

Dr. Egeberg's kind of America means that whether a badly injured person ever walks again, or talks again, or even whether he lives, depends to a great extent on what is in his pocket or his bank balance.

I do not think this is the kind of America most people want.

Dr. Egeberg qualified his statement by saying that he does not feel it is "realistic" to expect full equality of medical care in America today with our present medical and hospital resources, and furthermore that it will not be a "reasonable goal" for about "50 years."

Mr. President, the American people will not wait 50 years and I do not think they should be asked to wait. We all know that equality of medical care is not a complete reality in the United States today, but we are much closer to it than we were 10 years or even 5 years ago. Through medicare and medicaid and other programs to provide Federal aid for hospital construction and to train nurses and doctors to establish neighborhood medical centers, and through vast medical research programs we make progress each month, each week.

The American people want to be assured that their Government is going to do everything possible to continue that progress. They want an equal break on medical care now, no matter what their economic status, no matter what the size of their weekly paycheck, no matter if they are on welfare.

Some of the discontent in the United States can be ascribed to the fact that even though we are trying to create a more equal America, we are not moving fast enough.

It is discouraging to think that the man whom President Nixon has recommended as Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is a man who thinks it is not "realistic" to expect to equalize health opportunities for the American people for 50 years, and that "the first challenge is going to be to save some money."

It is discouraging to see the Nixon administration move farther and farther to the right—to move away from the progressive and forward-marching attitudes which have marked America in the past 8 years.

ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH NOTES SECRETARY LAIRD'S INCONSISTENCIES ON ABM

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch recently carried an editorial which brings out some of the very concern I have had about the administration's Safeguard ABM proposal. I think that the Post-Dispatch is absolutely right; the rules have been changed in the middle of the game and this administration has not served its cause well by so doing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "The Foot in Mr. Laird's Mouth" which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch June 1969, be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE FOOT IN MR. LAIRD'S MOUTH

The collapse of the Administration's case for deploying antiballistic missiles is now complete. Secretary of Defense Laird, who tried to scare the country into believing that the Soviets "are going for a first-strike capability," has been compelled to revise and extend his remarks.

"First-strike capability" in any language means the ability of one nation to destroy another's offensive missiles so completely that the second nation would be unable to retaliate for a nuclear attack. That is what Mr. Laird was talking about when he argued that we need the Safeguard system to "protect our deterrent." The implication was that without Safeguard our ability to retaliate could be wiped out in a first strike—which the Soviets therefore, by the curious logic of war-games, would be powerfully motivated to undertake.

The hole in this argument was always enormous. It was and is incredible that the Soviets or any other nuclear power could at one blow knock out all our Minuteman missiles, all our bombers, all our Polaris submarines, all our intermediate missiles based in Europe. Mr. Laird murmured darkly that the Polaris fleet might be neutralized in the future, but he has been unable to make this view stick, and our own intelligence apparatus declines to support his scary talk of all our nuclear power being simultaneously in jeopardy at some future date. So now Mr. Laird is saying that by first-strike capability he means only the power to attack our Minuteman missiles, and it is this we must counter with Safeguard.

But there is a hole in this argument, too. Senator Symington quotes Dr. Wolfgang Panofsky, the Stanford physicist whom the Administration once incautiously claimed as a supporter of Safeguard, as follows:

"If the threat to Minuteman grows at the rate projected by the Defense Department, and if Minuteman became vulnerable at a certain time several years hence, then if the Safeguard system were installed and if it functioned perfectly, Minuteman would be just as vulnerable as before only a few months later." In other words, the Soviets could offset any protection offered by Safeguard simply with a few more months' production of offensive missiles.

Dr. Panofsky, who has been cleared for top-secret information, points out that if things are really as ominous as Secretary Laird and President Nixon contend, an enlargement of our Minuteman force would be the best way of making sure that some of it survived a nuclear attack. The cost of this response would be a great deal lower than Safeguard, and "what is more important," says Dr. Panofsky, "we could afford to wait several years because production time of additional Minuteman missiles is very much shorter than for the new, complex ABM defense."

President Nixon at his news conference last week referred mysteriously to "new intelligence" of Soviet testing of multi-warhead missiles which he said bolsters the case of Safeguard. This is the old game of trying to frighten Congress and the public with secrets too awful to be told. As Dr. Panofsky remarks, the Administration declassifies the magnitude of the threat against Minuteman, but keeps secret the degree to which the threat would actually be reduced by Safeguard. If it is true, as we believe, that the threat would be reduced very little, and

that in any case ample retaliatory forces would survive even an all-out attack on Minuteman, then Safeguard is an unconscionable waste of money and an indefensible escalation of the arms race. The Senate should say "No."

* * * * *

This month Hamburger Hill is back in the hands of the North Vietnamese, and a U.S. general is vowing to fight for it again "if it takes an entire division." Does that kind of record support Mr. Nixon's claim that "we have only responded to what the enemy has done"?

Mr. Clifford and Ambassador Harriman are right: the search-and-destroy orders should be rescinded in order to scale down the fighting. And President Nixon will find no refuge in the argument that in refusing to do so he is only repeating the mistakes of his predecessor.

AMMUNITION REGISTRATION REPEAL DRAWS SUPPORT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, as the original sponsor of S. 845, a bill that would amend the ammunition provisions of the 1968 Gun Control Act, I wish to submit for inclusion in the RECORD a resolution passed by the Outdoor Writers Association of America during its recent meeting at Duluth Minn. The resolution places the association on record in support of my bill, the major purpose of which is to remove the undue restraints placed upon sorting ammunition by the 1968 Gun Control Act.

I might also point out that support for this legislation is growing at a very fast pace and I am convinced that if the 1969 hunting season comes along before this bill is enacted, Congress will hear from the American sportsman as never before.

The ammunition provisions in the 1968 act and the Treasury regulations accompanying them are unnecessary and a harassing burden to the law-abiding sportsman.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION

Whereas proposals to require the registration of privately owned firearms were decisively defeated in the Ninetieth Congress, and

Whereas Congress has declared that it is not the purpose of the Gun Control Act of 1968 "to place any undue or unnecessary Federal restrictions or burdens on law-abiding citizens with respect to the acquisition, possession, or use of firearms appropriate to the purpose of hunting, trap shooting, target shooting, personal protection, or any other lawful activity," and that it "is not intended to discourage or eliminate the private ownership or use of firearms by law-abiding citizens for lawful purposes," and

Whereas the regulations prescribed by the U.S. Department of the Treasury for the administration of the Gun Control Act provide that records be kept by dealers on all ammunition sales showing the purchaser's name and address, date of birth, and the caliber or gauge of ammunition purchased, and

Whereas the recording of such data constitutes, in effect, "Backdoor legislation" of the firearms owned by ammunition purchasers, and

Whereas these record keeping requirements serve no worthwhile purpose insofar as law enforcement is concerned, and

Whereas such record keeping constitutes an unnecessary burden on both dealer and consumer,

Therefore be it resolved that the OWAA go on record in support of the objectives of S. 845 (Bennett, Utah) and similar bills which would remove ammunition for sporting firearms from the Gun Control Act.

SNAKEBITE VACCINE

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the University of Utah College of Medicine has pioneered in many fields of medical research. One of the recent advances of the healing arts is in the field of immunization by development of a vaccine against snakebites. Dr. Clifford C. Snyder, Veterans' Administration, and Gary R. Hunter, a third year medical student, have collaborated in the research. The Veterans' Administration Hospital staff and the University of Utah have a most desirable working relationship to the benefit of both. I ask unanimous consent that a release on Snakebite Vaccine be printed in the RECORD.

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

SNAKEBITE VACCINE DEVELOPED IN UTAH

A new vaccine which provides immunization against poisonous snakebites has been developed by researchers at the University of Utah and the Veterans Administration Hospital in Salt Lake City.

Dr. Clifford C. Snyder, principal investigator on the research project, and Gary R. Hunter, third-year medical student who has conducted much of the laboratory work, say the vaccine has already proven effective in experimental animals and will be ready for requested trial among a few selected veterinarians this fall.

Dr. Snyder is chairman of the Division of Plastic Surgery at the University of Utah College of Medicine and chief of surgery at the VA Hospital. Mr. Hunter is one of Dr. Snyder's research students who presented an award-winning paper on the treatment of envenomation at the Student Scientific Seminar sponsored by the Student American Medical Association earlier this year.

"Our experiments have shown that it is possible to immunize humans against snake venom," Dr. Snyder said. "Such a vaccine would be valuable to outdoorsmen, game conservation officers, serpentologists, armed forces personnel and others who are exposed to possible poisonous snakebites."

One member of the research team who has already tried the vaccine on himself has shown no ill effects, and the level of antibodies in his blood remains high after more than a year.

The researchers are also working on an antivenin—the serum given to victims after they are bitten by poisonous snakes—that will be less likely to produce allergic reactions. Antivenin now on the market is derived from the blood of horses that have been injected with snake venom, but many people are allergic to it. The serum developed by the U research team is taken from the blood of humans who have suffered natural snakebites. When the new vaccine is perfected for humans, the antivenin can also be derived from the blood of persons that have been vaccinated, according to Dr. Snyder.

The vaccine comes from pure venom that is extracted from several species of snakes kept at the VA Hospital's animal research facility by the researchers. The venom is purified and its severe toxic characteristics removed by a special process. When the toxoid is injected into animals it still produces the desired antibodies without destroying tissue.

Fifteen dogs received vaccinations during clinical tests last summer, Mr. Hunter said. All fifteen dogs, when later challenged by double lethal doses of pure rattlesnake venom, survived with only slight soreness and minor swelling at the injection sites. Though each dog received much more venom than a snake would deliver in a natural bite, the animals showed only minor discomfort. Nonvaccinated dogs if given half the amount of venom would experience immediate excruciating pain, respiratory difficulty and death within 24 hours.

Dr. Snyder says there is much to be learned before the vaccine can be made available for human use, but he foresees no insurmountable obstacle in achieving this goal. When the vaccine is finally perfected and tested by the Food and Drug Administration, Dr. Snyder plans to turn it over to the University which in turn can negotiate for commercial manufacture with a pharmaceutical company.

"I would like to emphasize that the vaccine is still very much in the experimental stages," Dr. Snyder said. "Even though we are pleased with the preliminary results, it may be some time before it is generally available to veterinarians or ready for trial in humans."

Dr. Snyder foresees the day when mankind will no longer have to fear poisonous snakes. Thousands of people now die every year from snake envenomation, most of them in Asia. About 7,000 persons are bitten every year in the U.S. by rattlesnakes, copperheads, cottonmouths and coral snakes. While the death rate in this country is less than 15 per year, many people are disfigured for life because of the toxic effects of the venom.

The U researchers are now working with several species of rattlesnakes but in the future plan to make a toxin that will provide protection against the other three poisonous snakes found in the U.S.

MOISE TSHOMBE, FORMER PRIME MINISTER OF THE CONGO

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, among the numerous items that have been written about the tragic death of Moise Tshombe, former Prime Minister of the Congo, perhaps the most pertinent and eloquent I have come across is a column by William F. Buckley, Jr., which appeared in the Washington Star of July 7, 1969.

According to the Algerian Government, Mr. Tshombe died of a heart attack almost 2 years to the day after he was kidnaped in midair over Spanish territory and flown to Algiers.

Mr. Buckley has some harsh things to say about the manner in which the Boumedienne government handled the Tshombe matter. He points out that while Boumedienne did not send Tshombe back to the Congo to be killed, "neither would he release him. Worse, he held him incommunicado. He could not be seen by his wife nor by his lawyers. He was moved about from prison to prison, it was said."

I would add to this the information that letters addressed to him via the International Red Cross were not delivered. And when his family at one point requested a physical examination by a European doctor, this request, too, was refused.

Commenting on the fact that 11 Algerian doctors signed the death certificate, Mr. Buckley said:

Now Tshombe is dead, and Houari Boumedienne called in 11, count them, 11 Algerian professors to testify to his having died of natural causes. Myself, I would have insisted on 15 Algerian professors, but then that's the way I was brought up—never trust less than 15 Algerian professors, my mother warned me.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD at this point the full text of Mr. Buckley's column. I also ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD a UPI item of July 5 describing Tshombe's funeral in Brussels.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 7, 1969]

TSHOMBE: A VICTIM OF THIRD WORLD

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

Shortly after Moise Tshombe was kidnaped, a grim joke made the rounds. The Algerians tortured and truth-drugged Tshombe, at the request of Joseph Mobutu (Uhuru!). The idea was to get from Tshombe whatever information he had which would be useful to Mobutu in tracking down and liquidating potential enemies. But the questioners were over-diligent, and when they asked Tshombe who actually had murdered Patrice Lumumba, he confided to them, in his truth-trance, that it had been Mobutu.

We do not know whether that piece of intelligence was communicated to Kinshasa or Lumumbaville or Mobutuplats, or whatever they are calling Leopoldville nowadays. In fact it is just possible that this particular revelation had something to do with Boumedienne's decision not, after all, to deliver Tshombe to the executioners in the Congo, though it isn't known, as it happens, whether he did Tshombe's a favor.

Now Tshombe is dead, and Houari Boumedienne called in 11, count them, 11 Algerian professors to testify to his having died of natural causes. Myself, I would have insisted on 15 Algerian professors, but then that's the way I was brought up—never trust less than 15 Algerian professors, my mother warned me.

Really, it is astounding how the savages of this earth cling to bourgeois forms when they are troubled. First Boumedienne accepts custody, of an alien who is delivered into his hands by professional bandits employed by a foreign government. Then he has him tortured.

Then his court sycophantically "rules" that Tshombe may indeed be legally shipped to the Congo to be executed. Then something happens—something we are not privy to. The working of some mysterious pressures, probably American in source (the heroes of the save-Tshombe movement were a few Americans who labored privately to help him), that kept Boumedienne from handing Tshombe over to Mobutu.

But Boumedienne responded petulantly to those pressures. He did not send Tshombe off to be killed, but neither would he release him. Worse, he held him incommunicado. He could not be seen by his wife, nor by his lawyers. He was moved about from prison to prison, it was said.

Rumors were rife, even as they were about Ben Bella, now forgotten. A few months ago it was reported that he would soon be released. Immediately after his death two lawyers reported they had just completed ransom arrangements.

But it is not doubted that Tshombe is now dead. And it is not doubted that healthy men do not die of old age at 49. In Latin America, in the revolutionary heyday, the practice of reporting that important prisoners had been "shot while trying to escape" became so routine that one general with a sardonic mind and a palpable contempt for public opinion, reported that his prisoner had been poisoned while trying to escape.

Boumedienne, on the contrary, seems to care about public opinion. That is why he brought in 11 Algerian professors who, of course, reported that Tshombe died of a latent heart defect.

There is a terrible sadness to it all. For the one thousandth time we think of the awful resonance of Strausz-Hupe's remark that conservatives do not retrieve their wounded. Tshombe fought for the maintenance of certain standards of life in the Congo which were and indeed are threatened by totalist barbarism. He believed that whites and blacks should work together. He was plainspokenly Christian. He was a natural leader of men. A friend of the West.

And yet when Tshombe was kidnapped over Spanish soil, flying from one part of Spain to another, there was no protest from official Spain. For months, the friends of Tshombe endeavored to persuade the government of Spain to assert a quite natural legal claim against Algeria for husbanding someone kidnapped from Spanish soil.

But Franco was apparently uninterested, like just about everyone else. Can anyone imagine the United Nations interrupting a session on the human rights of mankind in order to plead the human rights of one man, victimized by their beloved Third World?

Alfgerie Algerienne! Well, the "government" of Algeria, liberated from French colonialism, in the hands of a military dictator, has exercised its sovereignty. No doubt 11 Algerian professors could be got to write the history of Algeria's blamelessness in the handling of the final two years in the crowded life of Moise Tshombe.

TSHOMBE BURIED IN BRUSSELS RITE—SONS OF CONGOLESE LEADER TRY TO LEAP INTO GRAVE

BRUSSELS, July 5—Former Premier Moise Tshombe of the Congo was buried today in a suburban Brussels cemetery. His sobbing sons tried to leap into his grave when the coffin was lowered.

The Algerian Government announced last Monday after an autopsy that Mr. Tshombe, 49 years old, died Sunday of a heart attack in Algiers, where he had been held for the last two years after having been kidnapped during a flight over the Mediterranean.

The politician from the province of Katanga, one of the Congo's main political leaders following the attainment of independence from Belgium, could not be buried in his native country, where he had been branded a traitor.

The present Congolese military regime, which had tried Mr. Tshombe for treason in his absence and had sought unsuccessfully to have him extradited from Algiers to face death sentence, refused permission for burial.

Today's burial in Etterbeek cemetery outside Brussels was provisional in hopes that a later one in the Congo would be possible, a family spokesman said.

Hundreds of black and white mourners paid their final respects to Mr. Tshombe inside and outside a small Methodist church.

Weeping women members of the family touched his coffin and his sons tried to leap into the grave after it had been lowered. Friends led them away and a board was put over the opening.

Mr. Tshombe's eldest son, Jean, sank almost to his knees wailing and sobbing, as he was led away.

Mr. Tshombe, one of the most controversial Congolese leaders, spent many years in exile. After independence was achieved in 1960, he led the copper-rich Katanga province in secession and became president of the independent state of Katanga.

United Nations forces overturned the secession early in 1963 and Mr. Tshombe sought exile in Europe. In 1964 he was summoned back to become the Congo's Premier but fled once again when Gen. Joseph D. Mobutu, the current Congolese strong man, seized power in November, 1965.

ABOUT 2,000 ATTEND THE FUNERAL

BRUSSELS, July 5—About 2,000 Africans and Belgians attended Mr. Tshombe's funeral. Behind his widow, Ruth, seven sons and daughters and many family members, friends and former aides stood two Belgian Senators, a university dean, a general, a lieutenant colonel and several former mercenaries who fought for Mr. Tshombe in Katanga.

FEDERAL LIBRARY PROGRAM ESSENTIAL; HOUSTON POST STATES NEED

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the June 27 issue of the Houston Post carries an effective and timely editorial on appropriations for the Library Services and Construction Act.

As the editorial points out, the Nation's libraries are an important and vital element in our national education system. They are becoming more important as the need increases for information that can be stored and recalled upon demand.

This is no time to be cutting back on library buildings, services, and equipment. I endorse the position expressed by the Houston Post.

In my 12 years in the Senate, I have supported every Federal appropriation act to support school libraries and also public libraries in communities, towns, and cities. In my 11½ years on the Education Subcommittee, I have participated in each conference with the House of Representatives on libraries, and have cosponsored or participated in hearings on most of these bills.

This is no time to abandon books. To abandon books is to turn our backs on learning and the stored knowledge of the human race. To abandon support of libraries is to say that knowledge is no longer essential. This administration has turned its back on appropriations for books and libraries. Such action, in effect, is turning our backs on civilization. It is time to restore all appropriations for books and libraries to their former levels, and to increase those appropriations to fit the growing needs of mankind.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial "Federal Library Program Essential," which appeared in the June 27 issue of the Houston Post be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

FEDERAL LIBRARY PROGRAM ESSENTIAL

One of the budget cutbacks proposed by the Nixon administration which hopefully can be prevented is in the Library Services and Construction Act.

The Washington budget makers have decreed a 50 percent cut in Title I of the act, which provides funds to strengthen public library collections, and the elimination of the Title II program, which provides matching funds for local library construction.

Concerned that the slash in funds will disrupt and cripple a needed program, the Texas Library and Historical Commission has asked the President and Congress to review the impact of the program in communities across the nation.

For the past two years, 1968 and 1969, grants to Texas cities and counties for library service under Title I have amounted to more than $2.5 million. If the cutbacks proposed by President Nixon are approved, this amount will be cut in half. Under the Title II program in Texas 80 public library buildings have either been approved for construction or completed since 1965. These projects represent a total of $17.5 million, of which Title II matching funds accounted for $6.5 million.

In 1969–70 no funds at all are proposed by President Nixon for public library construction.

Dr. Dorman H. Winfrey, Texas state librarian, pointed out that the LSCA program has had years of solid planning and it is possible we are now on the threshold of an imperative goal—modern public library services for all citizens of the United States. "Abrupt changes in programs of this sort create a waste of already accomplished progress," he said.

Libraries are no longer only a haven for book-lovers who like to browse through the stacks in search of entertaining reading, or the regulars who pore over newspapers in the periodicals room, though they are still that too. They are essential to this age of constant change; they hold the knowledge needed to cope with the scientific and technological, as well as the social and economic developments of the world we live in. They offer learning, understanding, and to some a release from the cares and anxieties of today's world.

Library service within reach of every American is an eminently desirable goal, and it is false economy to impede progress toward it.

THE RIGHT TO VOTE WITHOUT REGARD TO RESIDENCY REQUIREMENTS

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two resolutions adopted by the International Institute of Municipal Clerks.

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

RESOLUTION BY THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MUNICIPAL CLERKS

Resolution for appointment of a Presidential committee to study implementation of Federal legislation to afford all citizens voting rights regardless of local residency requirements during national elections

Whereas, the result of relocating within any of the fifty states of our country may, by virtue of local or state residency requirements, deprive a United States citizen of his franchise to cast a vote for the President and Vice-President of our Country, and

Whereas, many of our states have enacted legislation to implement the voting procedure to protect that inalienable right of our citizens to vote without fear or prejudice, and

Whereas, the demands upon our citizens require greater mobility in pursuit of a livelihood thereby jeopardizing the right to cast a vote in the state of their former residence and, lacking residency duration in their newly adopted state, are equally deprived of said right to vote;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the International Institute of Municipal Clerks entreat our President of these United States to consider the appointment of a committee to study and make recommendations for the purpose of introducing legislation which will enable all citizens of the United States of America to accept and exercise their franchise to vote for the two highest and most important offices in our Country, namely; President and Vice-President, on the basis of total residency within the boundaries of the United States of America.

This resolution to take effect this 21st day of May, 1969.

I hereby certify that this Resolution was unanimously adopted by the International Institute of Municipal Clerks at their Conference held in St. Louis, Missouri on Wednesday, May 21, 1969.

JOSEPH T. CARNEY,
President.

Attest:

FRANK DOTSETH,
Executive Director.

RESOLUTION BY THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MUNICIPAL CLERKS

Resolution establishing the availability of free mail privileges for absentee applications and ballots in national elections

Whereas, the function of the office of the Clerk of a City, Village and Township is to service the community in the broadest area possible, and

Whereas, in the field of election services the intent of the American principle of participation in government should be as encompassing as possible, and

Whereas, with the travel necessary in the economy of the world today many citizens do not have firm residential roots, and

Whereas, all people should be encouraged to participate in any and all elective processes,

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the International Institute of Municipal Clerks endorse the proposition that all absentee applications and absentee ballots receive free mail privileges available to national governmental functions for the prompt processing of voting material, and

Be it further resolved, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the proper congressional committee for enactment of legislature, and

Be it further resolved, that the International Institute of Municipal Clerks express its appreciation to the City of Dearborn Heights and its Clerk, Robert G. McLachlan for having submitted this resolution.

This resolution to take effect this 21st day of May, 1969.

I hereby certify that his Resolution was unanimously adopted by the International Institute of Municipal Clerks at their Conference held in St. Louis, Missouri on Wednesday, May 21, 1969.

JOSEPH T. CARNEY,
President.

Attest:

FRANK DOTSETH,
Executive Director.

IMPORTS OF FOREIGN FOOTWEAR

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE), I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Maine.

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

JOINT RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE HONORABLE MAURICE H. STANS, SECRETARY OF COMMERCE AND, THE MAINE CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION TO RESTRAIN IMPORTS OF FOREIGN FOOTWEAR

We, your Memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine of the One Hundred and Fourth Legislative Session assembled, most respectfully present and petition the Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Maurice H. Stans, and the Maine Congressional Delegation, as follows:

Whereas, the footwear manufacturing industry of the State of Maine faces continuing and expanding foreign competition from imports as the result of lower wage scales; and

Whereas, over 28,000 citizens are employed in over 139 factories throughout the State, many of these factories being located in small towns where they supply the major source of income and employment; and

Whereas, imports of leather and vinyl shoes have expanded dramatically from 7.8 million pairs in 1955 to 175 million pairs in 1968, adversely affect our domestic shoe manufacturing industry by curtailing its growth and eliminating many jobs opportunities; now, therefore, be it

Resolved: That we, your Memorialists, recommend and urge the Secretary of Commerce and the Members of the United States Congress from the State of Maine to take appropriate action to promptly restrain the importation of foreign footwear and to provide adequate safeguards which will protect our domestic shoe industry and the citizens it employs; and be it further

Resolved: That copies of this resolution, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State, be immediately transmitted by the Secretary of State to the Secretary of Commerce and each Senator and Representative from Maine in the Congress of the United States.

House of Representatives: Read and adopted, June 27, 1969.

Sent up for concurrence; ordered sent forthwith:

BERTHA W. JOHNSON,
Clerk.

In Senate Chamber: Read and adopted, June 27, 1969.

In concurrence:

JERROLD B. SPEERS,
Secretary.

Attest:

JOSEPH V. EDGAR,
Secretary of State.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

RECESS

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 2:30 o'clock p.m. today.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until 2:30 o'clock p.m., the same day.

On the expiration of the recess, the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BURDICK in the chair).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4153) to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11582) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other pur-

poses; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. STEED, Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. MAHON, Mr. CONTE, Mr. ROBISON, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama and Mr. BOW were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

STATEMENT ON ISRAEL AND THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) be associated with the statement on Israel and the Middle East which was placed in the RECORD on April 25, 1969.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970 FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, AND FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF MISSILE TEST FACILITIES AT KWAJALEIN MISSILE RANGE, AND RESERVE COMPONENT STRENGTH

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2546) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1970 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to authorize the construction of test facilities at Kwajalein Missile Range, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the pending business of the Senate is S. 2546, which is the annual legislation authorizing appropriations for military hardware and research and development for fiscal year 1970. In precise terms, the bill would do the following: It would authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1970, first, for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles; second, for all research, development, test and evaluation in the Department of Defense; third, for the construction of certain Safeguard missile test facilities at Kwajalein; fourth, continue the authority for merging military assistance financing for South Vietnam and free world forces in that area with the funding of Department of Defense appropriations; and fifth, the bill would authorize the personnel strengths of the Selected Reserve for fiscal year 1970 for each of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces.

Mr. President, let me say this: I think this is a very important measure, and that it comes at a time which is critical in many respects. It looks further toward the future, as will appear in the development of these weapons that we propose, than one might realize.

My purpose will be to try to put this on the table and before the Senate, and outline all the main provisions of the bill, together with its purposes and the recommended figures. I hope then that other committee members will join in making presentations. I believe they will.

I am thinking immediately of the Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH), who is the ranking minority member. I am thinking, of course, of all committee members, but I particularly specify two others, the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE), who served as chairman of a subcommittee which conducted hearings and held briefings of its own on the vast area of research and development, and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), who held hearings and briefings and did a great deal of work—he and the subcommittee—in the field of tactical air power. As I say, however, I want all members of the committee to join in the discussion to get full representation of the committee and a full presentation of our recommendations.

In the course of things, we can and will have a full debate and, at the pleasure of the Senate, proceed to voting and passing on matters and specific issues with respect to the figures and policies.

The committee has devoted the most intensive consideration to this bill. Public hearings began on March 19 and continued practically every week through June 4. In addition, many executive sessions were held, some extending past June 4. The printed hearings now before each Senator total 2,277 pages.

In addition to the efforts of the full committee there were three subcommittees which also held hearings and briefings which contributed to the results of this legislation. These ad hoc subcommittees were as follows:

Subcommittee on Bomber Defense, composed of myself as chairman, and Senators INOUYE, MCINTYRE, SMITH, DOMINICK, and MURPHY;

Subcommittee on Research and Development, composed of Senator MCINTYRE, chairman, and Senators YOUNG of Ohio, BYRD of Virginia MURPHY, and BROOKE;

Subcommittee on Tactical Air Power, composed of Senator CANNON, chairman, and Senators SYMINGTON, JACKSON, YOUNG of Ohio, THURMOND, TOWER, and GOLDWATER.

Their recommendations were submitted to the full committee and largely accepted.

NO FURTHER CLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION RELATING TO AIRCRAFT

Mr. President, one of the criticisms of this legislation over the past years has been the fact that much of the detailed information is classified and therefore excluded from discussion in the bill and report. I must confess that a substantial amount of this information, especially as it relates to missiles, remains classified. I am able to report to the Senate, however, that under a new policy the detailed information on aircraft procurement for the fiscal year involved is now unclassified. For the first time Senators will find printed in the committee report charts showing the numbers of each aircraft by type which is proposed for procurement for the next fiscal year. Heretofore all numbers of aircraft have remained classified and only the total figures have been subject to publication.

I think that Senators will find the report to be full, complete, and comprehensive. It is our position that this is all public property and that each individual Senator is entitled to have the facts and figures as well as any additional information that we can give.

This change will enable the Senate to engage in a more complete discussion of this program.

Total aircraft inventory positions still remain classified.

PREMISE FOR COMMITTEE APPROACH TO THIS LEGISLATION

All members of the committee are aware of the serious financial condition of the Nation, budgetary problems of the Federal Government, and the need for economy in all Federal activities, including the Department of Defense. The aim of the committee has been to reduce this bill to the very minimum consistent with what we believe to be the esssential needs of our national security.

Several things come to mind in this regard.

First. We are still engaged in the Vietnam war, which is costing at least $25 billion per year. So long as American boys are in battle, they must receive the best weapons we are able to produce, and whatever quantities are required, with some to spare.

I thought there were some missiles and other items that could be eliminated. I am talking particularly about small missiles. However, when we get down to the nub of things and mark up the bill, and remembering all the time that there is a shooting war going on, regardless of how much we might hope that we can see light at the end of the tunnel, matters appear dim. We know the war is still going on and that much of the money is for the replacements of weapons and equipment. We pray that these expenditures will not be necessary, but if the war does go on, the only way to insure that the weapons are ready when they are needed is to authorize the money now.

With this critical fact confronting us, we said: "We will have to allow that, but we will put words in the report to show that it is the legislative intent that the Department of Defense, if the losses do not occur for any reason, must stop the purchase of these items as soon as it can."

I think this would have been done in any event. However, we wanted the legislative intent to be expressed. That is in the report.

Second. Printed in the hearings is a document which shows that this Nation has some form of defense treaty arrangements with 46 nations. So long as we have these commitments, Mr. President, we must attempt to maintain, at least in some degree, the forces required to fulfill our part of these commitments.

We have had to go along almost alone. We find ourselves with very little company. Despite that, however, we cannot turn our back on commitments which we have solemnly assumed.

As one Senator, I would be perfectly willing to open the issue of national commitments and debate them. I would say that it would be in order to review and renegotiate these commitments.

I would note, Mr. President, that at the present time about 1,000,000 men in uniform are serving outside the United States. Also, about 17 of our ground divisions out of a total of 23⅔ are serving outside the United States. I think we should be fair in recognizing, therefore, that a large portion of our defense cost is for meeting our commitments outside this country.

My immediate point is that these commitments exist and we cannot turn our back on them and arbitrarily strike the required funds from the bill.

In terms of personnel, it is my position that after the Vietnam situation has been resolved the Armed Forces must be reduced at least to their approximate level of 2.5 million men as it existed before the large buildup in Vietnam, and if possible perhaps even less. I am satisfied we cannot continue to maintain in the years ahead a defense establishment at the 3½-million-manpower level we now have and at the same time buy the necessary firstline essential weapons with the continuing growing unit cost. There is no way to get these weapons without this high price tag on them as compared to a few years ago. We can do the same job with less personnel in uniform, especially if we maintain an effective reserve system. The cost of this personnel and the day-to-day operation cost of the services total about 60 percent of every military dollar. It is here that substantial savings must come.

That 60 percent is not contained in this bill. Less than one-third of all the military costs are in this bill. The 60 percent—and these are round figures—is in personnel, salaries, transportation, operation, and maintenance in a broad sense. As I say, less than one-third of the dollars is for hardware, research, and development.

CONCERN OVER THE COST OF WEAPONS SYSTEMS

Mr. President, the committee members, as all other members of the Senate, are greatly concerned over the high increase in the cost of our Defense weapons systems. This problem basically divides itself into two parts. First, the so-called overruns and excess costs of weapons presently being produced over what the original costs were contemplated to be by way of estimates, and, second, the large cost of the new weapons such as the F–14 now just going into production.

The bill before the Senate contains substantial authorizations for funds solely for the purpose of financing cost overruns. I want to bring this out clearly. There is $71.4 million to authorize over-target costs for fiscal year 1969 and prior for the F–111A–E. There is $225 million for similar costs for the C–5A and there is $167 million to finance claims and cost growth for the Navy shipbuilding program. These are only the overruns which are expected to become due for fiscal year 1970.

Secretary Laird has furnished to the committee a report indicating that the total of the overruns so far identified approximate $1,561,000,000. We will have to make further payments on these overruns next year.

PRECEDENTS

Mr. President, while none of us likes the overrun problem, I would point out that this problem has existed for many years. The B–52—our big bomber—was under contract over a period of 16 years. The last lot of these aircraft, the B–52H, averaged $9.3 million each. They came off the line in 1962. That cost of $9.3 million each was 3.2 times the estimated original cost of the last 40 aircraft. The increase in cost is further emphasized by the fact that the first ones came off the line in 1952 at a cost of less than $3 million apiece; the last ones came off the line in 1962 at a cost of $9.3 million apiece.

The reasons were many, aside from the large inflation during these years. Much of the increase resulted from changes and improvement in the aircraft itself.

The B–52 has been a good plane, and has given little trouble. Of course, it has required modification over the years to keep it effective. Many electronic features were added to make it a more effective weapon system, and the cost of these were increased by inflation of the times and the competition for skilled manpower.

Another example has been the Minuteman II program which is estimated to be $1.6 billion greater than the original estimates made at the start of the program. The original estimate was $3,555,000,000 as compared to the present estimates of $5,145,000,000.

While the committee has not had the time to investigate this latter program in detail, the biggest reason for that increased cost appears to result from changes in technology, the force structure, and program for the Minuteman.

MAIN REASONS FOR OVERRUNS

The committee has found as a general proposition that the principal reasons that the original cost estimates in these programs have been invalid in recent years are as follows:

First. Subsequent to the original estimates there were changes in the weapons programs, that is, revisions to the total number of weapons to be produced and the schedule at which they would be produced, both factors causing an increase in the unit cost.

It is possible to alter these two factors in such a manner that unit costs will be reduced. However, such decisions in recent years have resulted in increasing the costs of these programs. The assumptions on which original estimates were made were therefore invalidated to the extent of these changes.

I think we have moved too rapidly from research into procurement with respect to some of these goods. In some cases, the need exists, accentuated by the war. So we had to move forward regardless of cost.

Second. The military services themselves have requested changes in the weapons through either a change in technology or a policy decision which caused an increase over the original estimate.

Third. There appears to have been a lack of sufficient management supervision over these various programs to take timely action to either correct or recognize, early, the overrun problem.

Fourth. There has been the fact of abnormal inflation since 1964, which has reduced the Defense procurement dollar to a substantial degree. There is no precise index on the effect of the Vietnam war on the procurement dollar itself. Some estimates, however, indicate that the overall loss of purchasing power of the defense procurement dollar would approximate 25 percent.

Inflation since 1964 has affected not only Defense moneys but many other activities in the economy.

Between 1964 and 1968 the interest rate on 3 months Treasury bills rose from 3.5 to 6.15 percent or an increase of 75 percent; the interest yield on FHA home mortgages from 5.45 to 8.05 percent, or an increase of 48 percent; services—less rent—rose 21.6 points from 117 to 138.6 or an increase of 18 percent; the cost of food rose 12.9 points from 106.4 to 119.3 or an increase of 12 percent.

I point this out not by way of excuse. I am not defending any of those contracts. The military as such and civilian groups as such were given some of the hard reasons why some of the increase occurred and have been given some comparison.

COST OF NEW WEAPONS SYSTEMS

Mr. President, the serious problem we face in terms of new weapons costs might be illustrated by two examples pertaining to Navy aircraft. A total of 52 new high-cost aircraft are included in the pending bill for a total cost of $865 million which results in an average cost of $16.6 million each. The average cost of the original aircraft in the program is slightly less than $5 million each.

That is a good weapon; it is a needed weapon. If there is one thing as to which I am unyielding and unbending, it is that we must have the best weapons that science and technology can produce. In battle, when one runs second best, he does not come back. If one runs second best, the other man wins. So when it comes to a showdown, I would rather have fewer men and fewer older planes and less of everything else than to have to sacrifice a frontline weapon.

The next example relates to the F–14A aircraft. This is the new aircraft being produced for the Navy. The average cost of this aircraft is approximately $15.5 million based on a total program of 287 aircraft. The cost of the F–4, which it will replace, is approximately $3 million. Mr. President, these examples merely il-

lustrate that there is a limit to which the cost of these new aircraft can be controlled if they are to possess the available technology. Technology is what makes performance. The Navy plane we are talking about is long overdue.

Last year, the Senate was the first to require production of the old Navy version of the TFX be stopped. The Navy and the Department of Defense objected, but we ordered it taken out of production. We provided the lead money for the F–14, knowing then something about what the cost would be. But we thought enough money had gone down the drain for the Navy version of the TFX, and time had already run out.

So we have provided in the bill for a firstline weapon, when it is in production.

WHAT CAN THE COMMITTEE DO?

On behalf of the Committee on Armed Services, I wish to make clear that the committee has the responsibility and the duty to extend beyond the passage of the authorization legislation to closely oversee the military expenditures as these funds are spent on the various weapons systems. I want the committee to follow the dollar to see that the Government gets a dollar's worth for every dollar spent. This is exactly what we propose to do. I know that that feeling is shared by all other Senators.

The committee has therefore established a reporting system under which the Department of Defense is required to file quarterly reports with the committee setting forth up-to-date information on major weapons systems. There are now on the list 31 different weapons programs. The committee intends to maintain close surveillance over the cost, performance, and scheduling of these major systems within the Department of Defense. When conditions warrant, the committee will request the assistance of the General Accounting Office, with which we have already made arrangements, to provide a more detailed analysis of particular elements of the program. The committee staff has already been augmented by competent auditor investigators from the GAO now on duty since February of this year. These particular men are on leave from the General Accounting Office on a reimbursable basis, but we are going to take at least two or three individuals—the exact number is not yet determined—as permanent members of our staff, men with this kind of skill, to follow this money. It is my idea that we can save more by following these contracts from the time they originate on through than we can by trying to pick up the spilled milk from the floor.

I practiced law for awhile and I had two groups of clients. First there was the spilled milk group. They are the ones who come looking for the lawyer after the bad things happen and after the milk has been spilled. It is not often that the lawyer can pick it up successfully. Then we have the save-the-milk group. They come in and ask advice of counsel and ask what the law is in order to avoid losses.

I think we can render and we are already rendering this service. I mentioned the F–14A contract which was let about 60 days ago. That is one item on the list we are going to watch all the time. If these overruns start showing up we will know why. We will get an answer because they have to come back next year in order to get more money for that contract. We follow the dollar.

The committee proposes to inform both the Congress and the public on the cost and performance of these weapons systems as revealed through the quarterly reporting system. In this manner we hope to identify cost overruns at an early date and avoid the surprise of huge cost increases that have occured in the past. Hopefully, this system will also assist in the internal management and control of weapons systems programs by the Pentagon.

I can say that the Secretary of Defense is in complete accord with this system. We originated it, we started it in the committee, and he has cooperated fully. He sends these reports in to us. We have these men I referred to. Wherever there is any showing of anything that may be coming up that should not be coming up, those men will go in and we will get additional help.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I do not wish to usurp the floor, but I would like to present the entire matter to the Senate and briefly relate what we have done and why we have done it.

I had hoped that this afternoon, as a part of this discussion, we could go into executive session for the purpose of bringing out the rest of the facts that caused us to act as we did. I am not referring now to the ABM. I think we might skip that discussion this afternoon, anyway, if it is agreeable to the Senate, and just get to the rest of the bill for the present time. That will depend. When I finish, I shall make a motion.

Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Florida that if I yield to him I would have to yield to other Senators, and the only way to complete this rather lengthy bill and the speech is to continue. I do not wish to be rude to the Senator. I thank the Senator very much for his attitude.

DISCUSSION OF BILL

RELATION OF AUTHORIZATION TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS GENERALLY

Mr. President, I would emphasize that the total of $20,059,500,000 in authorizations being recommended in this bill provides an important part, but only a part, of the $77,620,547,000 in new obligational authority being requested under the present revised budget of April 15, 1969.

As Senators know, not all Department of Defense appropriations require authorization such as those relating to military personnel, operations and maintenance and part of the procurment functions. As I have indicated previously, this bill constitutes those portions of the Department of Defense bill which do require an authorization as a condition precedent to the appropriation.

This is a relatively new procedure. I think it was 7 or 8 years ago that we passed a law requiring the authorization. In the old days only the Committee on Appropriations passed on these matters. They did a good job on both sides of Congress. However, I think the Committee on Armed Services has some responsibility to pass on these matters preliminarily. The procedure has worked very well but it is getting more and more difficult to get an authorization bill passed.

SUMMARY OF ENTIRE AUTHORIZATION LEGISLATION

Mr. President, on page 3 of the committee report there is printed a summary of all of the new obligational authority being proposed in this bill. There is a grand total of $20,059,500,000 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles and all funds for research, development, test and evaluation. There is a copy of the report on the desk of each Senator. The committee also authorized in addition to the foregoing sum, $12,700,000 for the construction of certain test facilities at Kwajalein relating to the Safeguard missile.

The committee recommendation should be compared to $21,963,000,000 which was requested by the revised budget of April 15, 1969, and also should be compared to the request of $23,151,000,000 contained in the Department of Defense authorization request of January 14, 1969, the so-called Clifford budget. There is a reduction of approximately $1.9 billion as compared to the April 15 request and over $3 billion as compared to the January 14 request.

PROCUREMENT OF AIRCRAFT

Mr. President, I shall now proceed to discuss the details of the legislation itself.

PROCUREMENT—ARMY AIRCRAFT

Mr. President, the committee recommends an authorization of $484.4 million for 881 Army aircraft. This authorization will permit the purchase of 802 helicopters and 79 fixed wing aircraft. Our helicopter losses in South Vietnam have been enormous.

I should emphasize that over 95 percent of these aircraft would be to replace the anticipated losses in Southeast Asia and the operational losses elsewhere throughout the world. If hostilites should cease, the number of actual purchases will be scaled down accordingly.

The committee made the following adjustments:

First, deleted $429 million for funds proposed for the Cheyenne helicopter in recognition of the Department of Defense decision to cancel the production contract. We also had some ideas on that when the Department of Defense announced its decision.

Second, reduced the authorization for the Mohawk observation aircraft from $33.4 million to $5.3 million. The present inventory position together with the available moneys from prior years will permit the cancellation of this request except for the $5.3 million necessary for ground equipment avionics.

Out of the $484.4 million authorization, there is proposed for aircraft spares and repair parts $161.7 million, and for modification of aircraft, $68.5 million. These sums are large in all aircraft programs and are subject to little change if we are

to keep the aircraft in first class condition. I point this out as one of the problems involved in reducing the request.

There is printed on page 12 of the report a complete summary of the Army aircraft authorization of this bill.

PROCUREMENT—NAVY AIRCRAFT

Mr. President, the committee is recommending new obligational authority in the amount of $2,287 million for 401 aircraft and associated costs including $568.4 million for spare parts and $325.9 million for modifications. This modification is something that goes on all the time with planes. Even if they do not have to be modified and do their job well, they have to be kept up to date for continued usage.

The committee request represents a reduction of $122 million from the Department of Defense revised program of April 15, 1969. These reductions, as I shall point out, result from the committee deletion of slightly over $100 million for the procurement of 27 A–7 medium attack fighters and a reduction of $18 million in the authorization for medium transport helicopters. In comparison with the Department of Defense request of January 14, the committee action represents a reduction of approximately $282 million.

SIGNIFICANT ASPECTS OF NAVY AIRCRAFT PROGRAM

The Navy program being proposed for procurement contains the smallest number of aircraft for procurement by the Navy in any year since 1946. This is an austere program.

One thing certain about expensive planes. They do more than their former cousins or ancestors could do but they cost more in order to perform better.

The entire fiscal year 1970 procurement will be used for two purposes: To replenish the anticipated battle and operational losses and to permit a small degree of modernization in Navy aircraft. Even with this purchase, however, the average age of the Navy aircraft will have increased from 7.8 years to 9.1 years by the time the planes in this bill have been delivered—in other words, we are still losing time on the age of our planes.

The Navy procurement program this year points up the serious problem of the high cost of new aircraft. As I have indicated previously, of the total of 52 so-called high-cost aircraft in this legislation whose cost will total approximately $865 million, the average unit cost will be approximately $16.6 million per unit. The average cost of the other aircraft is approximately $4.9 million.

I might point out that the new F–14 under the presently approved program would cost about $15.5 million per aircraft as compared to approximately $3 million in cost for the F–4 which it will replace.

NEED FOR F–14 NAVY FIGHTER

Mr. President, this bill contains the first procurement money for the new F–14 Navy fighter. This aircraft is essential if the Navy is to have a fighter aircraft in the early and middle 1970's capable of competing with Russian aircraft of that period. The F–4 Phantom while still a good aircraft was designed 15 years ago and has about reached the limit of its improvement potential. They are known to be good fighters by possible antagonists, but they cannot cope with present day needs.

While I will not go into detail, as the Senate knows, the TFX represented an attempt to produce a fighter for both the Navy and the Air Force. This aircraft did not meet Navy requirements. The committee refused requested authorizations for the Navy version last year. The F–14 is a follow-on to the TFX effort.

CANCELLATION OF A–7 AIRCRAFT FOR THE NAVY

Mr. President, the committee deleted the request of $99.6 million for 27 A–7 aircraft plus lead funds of $4.4 million. The reason for this action by the committee directly results from the deletion of the funds for the Air Force version of this aircraft in the Air Force procurement request. The Air Force has approximately 74 of A–7 aircraft now under contract and this small number is not sufficient to constitute a part of the active inventory of the Air Force. The committee is directing that arrangements be made for the Navy to receive at least an equivalent number for its needs out of those under contract to the Air Force.

We denied the A–7A for the Air Force, and we denied the new ones that were in the bill, and provided that those the Air Force already has would be transferred over to the Navy. We will come back to that when we get to the related part of that change.

REDUCTION IN HELICOPTERS

The committee reduced the number of medium transport CH–46E helicopters from 60 to 48 with a net saving of $18 million. In view of the stringent budgetary conditions, the committee felt that a stretch-out of this procurement was possible and a reassessment of the program can be made next year.

CHART IN COMMITTEE REPORT

There is printed on page 15 of the committee report a complete list of all elements making up the Navy aircraft procurement request.

PROCUREMENT—AIR FORCE AIRCRAFT

The committee is recommending new obligational authority in the amount of $3,965,700,000 for 592 aircraft for the Air Force. Included in this sum is the variety of expenses associated with aircraft, including $885 million for spares and repair parts and $510 million for modification costs. We went into these matters very carefully. That is a lot of spare parts, but spare parts are very essential when a plane is first built, and a supply of spare parts must continue to come in. We also have modifications to take into consideration, which I have already discussed.

The committee recommendation may be compared to the April 15 recommendation of the Department of Defense of $4,100,000,000 and the January 14 recommendation of the Department of Defense of $4,406,000,000.

This is the smallest number of aircraft being procured for the Air Force since 1939.

Notice how far back the figures go. For the Navy, the smallest number since 1946; for the Air Force, the smallest number since 1939. These new aircraft perform better and do more, but they cost a great deal more money.

DETAILED CHART ON AIR FORCE PROCUREMENT

The committee report on page 19 sets forth a detailed summary of the numbers of aircraft and the amounts recommended for fiscal year 1970.

COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS AND VIEWS

Mr. President, I should like to point out several reductions recommended by the committee.

First, a reduction of $50 million in aircraft spares because of the 6 months slippage in the C–5A production.

Second, reduction of $40 million in the modification of aircraft program which results from the cutback in the SRAM missile program. The $40 million was for the purpose of adapting B–52's to this missile.

Third, a reduction in the A–37B aircraft from 96 to 36 with the authorization being reduced from $38.5 million to $16 million. This aircraft is intended for use in Southeast Asia by the active Air Force and would be turned over to the National Guard, subject to their return, since the first aircraft from this buy would not enter the inventory until December 1970. The committee felt justified, under the circumstances, in reducing the request.

Fourth, the request of $28.1 million for two navigational trainers was reduced to $6.1 million, which will permit the purchase of ground simulators but not aircraft. The committee felt that this item was not of a great priority and other less expensive means might be examined for the two aircraft. Old planes could be used and we did give them the ground simulators.

DELETION OF REQUEST FOR A–7D AIRCRAFT

The committee recommends the cancellation of the request of $348.2 million for 128 A–7D fighters and $26.5 million for advance procurement for this aircraft, and further that these same funds be used for the procurement of F–4E aircraft. This sum will permit purchase of approximately 120 of the F–4E's.

After a thorough examination of the Air Force requirement for tactical aircraft the committee concluded that the cancellation of the A–7 was a proper one for the following reasons—and I give the reasons because I know Senators will be interested in this matter as it affects both the Air Force and the Navy:

First. The A–7 can operate in only a Vietnam-type environment where our forces have control of the air. The F–4, on the other hand, can to a large degree do the same job as the A–7, but in addition, do unescorted interdiction and deep penetration missions, which the A–7 cannot do.

Second. At the time that the A–7 program was conceived in the Air Force, it was viewed to be an inexpensive subsonic aircraft to support ground forces. As a result of many changes, the costs have more than doubled to the point that the more versatile F–4 can be procured for approximately the same amount.

Third. Under the circumstances, it is more economical for the Air Force to buy more F–4's which is already in the in-

ventory, instead of the A–7's which will require a new logistical and training base of its own within the Air Force.

The committee recognizes that the Air Force out of prior moneys has procured approximately 74 aircraft with most of these undelivered. The committee is requesting, however, that the Secretary of Defense make the necessary arrangements to have at least a portion of these aircraft delivered to the Navy, rather than to the Air Force, and to make the necessary budgetary adjustments.

THE C–5A TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT

We come now to the C–5A transport aircraft. That is the one on which so many hearings have been held, including 2 days of open hearings, in addition to others we had.

Mr. President, the committee is recommending the funds for the C–5A as requested by the Department of Defense. These amounts total slightly over $1 billion and are made up of the following cost elements. That is the big plane that is going to carry so many men and some light equipment.

First, $481 million for 23 aircraft to complete four squadrons. They are on order.

Second, $52 million for long leadtime items for procurement of 20 aircraft in fiscal year 1971. Those are under direct order.

Third, $34 million for continued research and development effort. That plane is going to be in use by December, but still, as is true of all successful planes, we have to keep spending money for research and development.

Fourth, $210 million for spares.

Fifth, $225 million to cover over-target costs in fiscal year 1969 and prior years.

As the Senate knows, this aircraft has been the subject of intensive discussion, both in and out of the Congress. In addition to the normal testimony received in the authorization request, the committee devoted 2 days of separate hearings to this particular aircraft.

As most of us know, at the time of the original contract the estimated target price was $2,985,000,000 for 120 aircraft, excluding spares and ground equipment. The latest Air Force estimate for the same work is $4,348,000,000. Despite the problems connected with the nature of the contract and the huge overruns, the committee is recommending the approval of the authorization request except for the $50 million reduction for spares.

Mr. President, the decision of the committee was based on the fact that this aircraft is needed and so far it is proving to be a good plane. On a ton-mile cost, it is expected to haul cargo at about one-half the cost of its nearest competitor, the C–141. The important issue now relates to what can be done to improve the management of these contracts and bring the entire system of the control of weaponry under better control. The committee will have a further report on this matter.

I have outlined what the committee intends to do through its quarterly reports. The committee report, on pages 4 and 5, discusses in detail some of the issues connected with total package procurement and some of the steps which must be taken to improve this system. With the contractual obligations under run A already approximating $2.5 billion, the only sensible recourse is to proceed with the program and obtain the airplanes and at the same time improve our system of contracting and managing this vast operation.

This contract is what is called a total package contract. It certainly is not an ideal contract, particularly when it is for the production of such a plane, over so long a period of time. However, it was a contract under which the Government is obligated. It remains to be seen how many of these planes the Defense Department will be ready to buy. But we are really in the first increment now. If it is a good plane—and we think it is—the need is here. So we are making these recommendations. That will be touched on further.

F–111D—MARK II AVIONICS

The committee is recommending approval of the request of $599,800,000 of 68 F–111D advanced tactical fighters, plus an additional $56 million of leadtime procurement funds.

The F–111D is the most modern version for the Air Force out of the old TFX contract. There have been no modern bombers or anything to fill the role in this field, or similar lines, except for this one, for a long, long time. That will be explained further in the debate by Senators who were especially charged with duties in the tactical air field.

Basically, the committee approved this request, despite the long history of technical trouble and cost overruns for this aircraft, because it is the only one of its type now in the Air Force for night and all-weather interdiction.

The committee was advised that the Mark II avionics which is included as a part of each aircraft will not be used in the F–111D's beyond the first 96, of which only two are in the 1970 procurement program. In lieu of the Mark II, a simpler avionics system will be used. There will be savings, yet undetermined, resulting from this change. Preliminary estimates have ranged from $25 million to $60 million. The committee agreed that any savings resulting from this program could be used for slightly increasing the procurement program of the F–111D's. The committee report beginning on page 5 discusses in detail the F–111D matter.

The Mark II avionics will also be discussed further.

PROCUREMENT OF MISSILES

Mr. President, I shall now discuss briefly the authorization for missile procurement for fiscal year 1970. I will omit at this time the discussion of the Safeguard program, which will be discussed as a separate item.

PROCUREMENT—ARMY MISSILES

Mr. President, the committee is recommending for the total missile request for the Department of the Army $922.5 million. This amount includes $345.5 million for Safeguard. Exclusive of Safeguard, therefore, the committee is recommending $577 million for Army missile procurement. This request will include five systems, as described in the committee report on page 21. The purpose of the missile request is to build up the necessary inventory and to replace those missiles now being utilized for training purposes. The committee made the following reductions in the Army missile request.

Here is where we thought we were going to make some more reductions. When battles are going on, in a war of unknown duration, and when items have to be made up in advance, while men are dying every day, one's fingers more or less become paralyzed when he goes to check those items out of the bill.

We have a very strong paragraph in our report for a special study to be made of all these small missiles by the Department of Defense, to help us decide, next year particularly, about the possibility of reductions and a lower inventory.

The committee took the following actions:

First, reduced the TOW missile request by $14 million, from $156 million to $142 million on the basis that a slower production rate is justified under present circumstances.

That is a classic illustration of how costs will run up. This is a superior antitank missile. It is just in the beginning stages. We have just a few on hand. They will be used in training. I was amazed to find that the ultimate request for funds for this missile alone will be $1.2 billion—just for that one small antitank missile. The services are going to inventory 240,000. That looked like far too many.

Second, reduced the Hawk missile by $9.2 million, from $98.7 million to $89.5 million, on the basis that a slower build-up rate was justified to correct certain technical problems.

Third, made further reductions totaling $12 million in the missile account relating to an item known as the radar Interrogator and a launcher conductor of fire which is an element in the M60A1E2 tank, which has been subject to certain problems and is undergoing modifications.

MAIN BATTLE TANK

Mr. President, I think it is appropriate at this point to mention the action taken by the committee with respect to the so-called main battle tank, which is designated as the MBT–70. The only funds in this bill for this item is for research and development.

The committee reduced the request for this tank from $44.9 million to $30 million, with the reduction being $14.9 million.

As many Senators know, this is a tank that is being built in cooperation with the German Government and it is intended for use in the mid-1970's. The development, however, has been underway since April 1963—6 years—and a number of problems have been encountered. The committee thought it was only wise and prudent that these funds be reduced in order to make certain that the many problems can be worked out on an orderly basis.

I have about lost patience with this situation. Six years with no more progress than presented. However, it may be the only way. It is being done in conjunction with the German Government,

and it involves a contract. It is supposed to be the "dream" tank, if it can be perfected along the lines they are driving for. But we made that reduction, and I hope they will move forward next year. The House has made a very good investigation into this tank, I think. I talked with their chairman over there, and he made some good suggestions, which will be published soon in their committee report. At any rate, we felt safe in making this recommendation.

PROCUREMENT—NAVY MISSILES

The committee is recommending new obligation authority of $851.3 million for the procurement of Navy missiles. The largest single item in missile procurement for the Navy is $491 million for the Poseidon. The remainder of the Navy missiles are being procured either to maintain present inventory positions or, with respect to certain advanced types, to improve their presently modest inventory.

The missile programs requiring funding are printed in the committee report, beginning on page 22.

Senators will remember that the Poseidon is the successor to the Polaris. It is necessary to transform the Polaris submarine itself. That process is going on now.

PROCUREMENT—MARINE CORPS MISSILES

The committee recommends $20.1 million for the procurement of missiles for the Marine Corps, most of which would be used for procurement of the Hawk missile.

They get some of their missiles from the Army, as I understand.

PROCUREMENT—AIR FORCE MISSILES

The committee is recommending new obligational authority for the procurement of Air Force missiles for fiscal year 1970 in the amount of $1,466 million.

The largest single missile request for the Air Force is $679.14 million for Minuteman II/III which, as pointed out in the committee report, will provide the funding for the necessary elements connected with this program. It might be noted that this program was reduced by Mr. Laird to the extent of almost $157 million which will result in a somewhat slower deployment rate.

The missiles requiring funding for the Air Force for fiscal year 1970 are listed on pages 24 and 25 of the committee report.

That is big money. As Senators know, this is the ICBM, and they are in a continuous process of improvement and addition.

It should be noted that the committee deleted $20.4 million for the SRAM missile in view of the reduction of the SRAM development effort in the Department of Defense. That will be explained more fully later.

PROCUREMENT—TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES—ARMY AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. President, the committee is recommending $276.9 million for tracked combat vehicle procurement for fiscal year 1970. The vehicles by item are listed on page 38 of the committee report together with the funds requested for each item.

The committee made certain reductions in this request as follows:

First. The Sheridan Army reconnaissance vehicle which looks like a tank but is not a tank—was reduced by $5.1 million from $52.8 million to $47.7 million in order to permit more orderly procurement and adjustments to present modifications.

Second. The M60A1 tank was reduced by $20 million from $67.5 million to $47.5 million for the reason that other moneys already appropriated to purchase chassis for another advanced tank, the M60A1E2, can be used on the former tank due to the delay in development and production of the more advanced type.

The committee will furnish a further rundown on this tank problem. This is tanks that has been built, but there is a problem with the turrets, and they are stored somewhere in the Detroit area, several hundred of them. We took some of the chassis to use on this more advanced model, and picked up $20 million in savings.

The tracked combat vehicles are each described in the committee report and represent the normal program for inventory maintenance and buildup in certain areas.

The bill also includes $37.7 million for Marine Corps combat vehicles which would be used principally for the modernization of the 175 gun and certain other elements connected with the Marine Corps tracked combat vehicle program.

NAVAL VESSELS—NEW CONSTRUCTION AND CONVERSION

Mr. President, the committee is recommending new obligational authority in the amount of $2,568,200,000 for the construction and conversion of naval vessels. This amount together with funds available in prior years would be applied to the construction of 14 new vessels and the modernization of 17 others.

As many Senators know, the modernization of vessels and construction of more modern vessels for the Navy has been put off year after year. This time, there is provided a beginning on the necessary new types of vessels that will represent a beginning on our having a new Navy.

On pages 32 and 33 of the committee report, a detailed summary of the entire shipbuilding and conversion program for fiscal year 1970 is set forth.

PREMISE FOR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The premise of the committee recommendation is that the condition of the U.S. Navy has reached the point where a modernization program of the size in this bill is essential if the Navy is to avoid obsolescense of its ships and the weapons the ships employ.

Of approximately 900 ships in the active fleet, 58 percent are over 20 years of age. Five of 15 attack carriers in the active fleet are 25 years of age. About 63 percent, or 168 of the 268 destroyer types in the active fleet are based on designs of the late 1930's and were built in the 1940's.

Moreover, Mr. President, there is a limit to which these older vessels can be modernized, due to the lack of space and volume in their hulls and the lack of electrical power resources to accommodate new weapons.

COMMENTS ON SPECIFIC PROGRAMS

NEW AIRCRAFT CARRIER

The committee recommends approval of $377.1 million, which represents the remaining amount necessary for full funding for one nuclear attack carrier.

This is the second of three attack carriers planned for the modernization program. We have already put $133 million into this carrier, and this amount is for the final payment. This carrier, with the other new ones, will replace the older carriers built during World War II. Several of the new naval aircraft, including the F–4 Phantom and the A–6 Intruder, cannot operate from the older carriers.

One thing I like about carriers is that when you put a new one in, like a football coach, you have to take out an old one. That not only keeps the maintenance costs from running up, but in many instances decreases the costs.

DELETION OF FLEET FAST DEPLOYMENT LOGISTICS SHIPS (FDL'S)

The committee is recommending the deletion of $186.7 million for the procurement of three FDL's.

These ships are of lesser priority than the remainder of these being proposed and can be omitted from funding in the fiscal year 1970 program, without prejudice to their consideration in the future.

NUCLEAR SUBMARINES

The committee has increased the departmental request with respect to nuclear attack submarines. I think the reason will become more obvious later. The committee is recommending funds in the amount of $504.5 million for three nuclear attack submarines plus $90 million which will provide lead funds for five additional submarines. The revised budget of April 15 proposed $383.3 million for two nuclear attack submarines plus $119.2 million for lead funds for four additional submarines with one of those being funded on a leadtime basis at an accelerated rate. The effect of the committee revision is to increase the request for funds for submarines by $123.5 million. The committee's view is that the growing Russian submarine program and the potential threat it causes to our Polaris program justifies this action. The committee report on page 7 discusses the committee action and the Soviet submarine force.

CONVERSION OF FLEET BALLISTIC SUBMARINES

Mr. President, I should note that the bill contains an authorization of $301.4 million for the conversion of six fleet ballistic submarines to the Poseidon program. I mention this in connection with the other figure, because this is the figure for the conversion; the other was for the new type of missile involved. In addition, there is $157.5 million being recommended for leadtime funds on 12 additional submarines to be converted. This program is essential in order to acquire the capability of our Poseidon program. These are not new submarines; they are conversions.

OTHER PROGRAMS

Mr. President, the committee sets forth in some detail on pages 32 and 33 of the report the remaining elements of the shipbuilding and conversion program relating to the new destroyers, the nuclear

guided missile frigate, the general purpose assault ships—LHA's—and various other elements of the program.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

I shall be fairly brief on this subject, simply to bring it into focus. The plans, as Senators know, all originate in the research and development program, which also includes tests of the engineering. The Senator from New Hampshire held special hearings on research and development, and recommended reductions, which were adopted by the committee, totaling, in round figures, $1 billion.

Mr. President, the Congress must authorize as a condition precedent to appropriations, funds for all research and development in the Department of Defense. The committee is recommending a reduction of approximately 12.7 percent, or slightly over $1,042,000,000. The final figure recommended by the committee is $7,179,500,000, which should be compared to $8,222,400,000. The committee fully recognizes that all future weapons programs are dependent on the quality and extent of the research and development program within the Department of Defense.

At the same time the committee believes that the research and development activity can be reduced to the extent recommended and at the same time protect the essential elements of this program as required by our national security.

Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. McINTYRE) was chairman of the ad hoc Subcommittee on Research and Development, and I shall not attempt to dwell in great detail on the committee actions since he will make some remarks on the research and development program.

I shall, however, enumerate briefly some of the actions taken with respect to the R. & D. requests.

1. ELIMINATION OF FUNDS FOR THE SAM–D SURFACE-TO-AIR PROGRAM

The committee deleted the request of $75 million for R. & D. funds for the SAM–D surface-to-air antiaircraft missile. The total R. & D. and procurement program for this weapon would exceed $2 billion. The committee did not feel that defense against enemy bombers was sufficient priority to justify research on this system of the magnitude requested.

2. THE RF–111 RECONNAISSANCE AIRCRAFT

The committee eliminated the Air Force request of $15 million for research and development on the RF–111 reconnaissance aircraft. This total program, if ultimately completed with procurement, would cost about $821 million. Since the Air Force has already purchased substantial quantities of other reconnaissance aircraft—RF4C's, RF101's, and SR–71's, the committee felt that there is sufficient capability at the present time to perform this role for the future.

3. AGM–X3, AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE

The committee deleted $3 million requested by the Air Force for this new tactical air-to-ground standoff missile. This is a small item, but I bring it to the attention of the Senate because of the fact that the total R. & D. cost alone would be about $200 million and there is no estimate of production cost. It may be that we did not need the missile. It did not look as if we did. The committee felt that the taxpayers might well be saved over $1 billion unless the Department of Defense can more amply justify the requirement to proceed with this program. This is a case where by "nipping in the bud," large economies can result.

4. AWACS—AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM

The committee reduced the request for the airborne warning and control system for defense against bombers from $60 million to $15 million. The funds approved in 1969 will permit the radar technology to be kept alive. At the same time the committee is requesting the Department of Defense to restudy the entire bomber defense program with respect to its relative priority for defense spending and to resolve the differences of opinion as to how this program, if funded, should be carried out. In addition, Mr. President, the committee reduced the request for the air defense interceptor—CONUS—$16 million, from $18.5 million to $2.5 million, as a part of this same deferment.

I would emphasize, Mr. President, that there was a conflict of testimony between the Department of the Air Force on the one hand and the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, on the other, as to the selection of the appropriate aircraft for the improved interceptor.

Those things were put in a special study category for more definite assignment of needs, first of missions and then of needs. That will be discussed later by other Senators.

AVAILABILITY OF $100 MILLION IN EMERGENCY FUNDS FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

I would emphasize that in section 202 of the bill there is authorized to be appropriated $100 million in emergency funds for the Secretary of Defense for research, development, test, and evaluation or procurement or production related thereto.

If conditions change with respect to research and development matters covered under this authorization, the Secretary of Defense would be empowered to utilize these funds for research and development purposes.

LIMITATION OF $45,000 ON SALARIES OF NONPROFIT CONTRACT CENTERS UNLESS THERE IS A PRESIDENTIAL EXCEPTION

Mr. President, I would also call to the attention of the members an amendment by the Senator from Virginia (Mr. BYRD), which provides that salaries paid from appropriations at the Federal Research Contract Centers may not exceed $45,000 unless the President approves the higher salary and thereafter reports his reasons to the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services.

That will be discussed fully in the amendment that was offered in committee and agreed to on the motion of the Senator from Virginia.

AMSA—ADVANCED MANNED STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT

The committee approved the revised request for research and development funds in the amount of $95.2 million for the advanced manned strategic aircraft. It is emphasized that there is no provision in this authorization for production funds for this aircraft. This sum will shorten the competitive design phase and permit the design of full-scale engineering and development in fiscal year 1970. This leaves a clear-cut decision to Congress as to whether we will proceed to procurement. If the decision is made later to proceed with the production of this aircraft it will enter the Air Force inventory 1 year earlier by virtue of the increase of approximately $23 million which was added by Mr. Laird to the Clifford request on this item.

OTHER ITEMS

Mr. President, I shall not discuss further the details of the actions taken by the committee with respect to research matters, but shall leave this to the Senator from New Hampshire.

I would point out that beginning on page 42 of the committee report are a series of charts which set forth in detail the actions of the committee with respect to the research and development requests.

PERSONNEL STRENGTHS OF THE SELECTED RESERVES

Mr. President, as the Senate knows, the personnel strengths of the Selected Reserves of each of the Reserve components must be authorized on an annual basis as a prior condition for the pay and allowances of the Reserve components. That is a term that is well known to those that have to do with this regulation. This provision has a long legislative background which was to provide the authorizing committees with the authority for reviewing and determining on an annual basis the Selected Reserve strengths.

The bill recommends the following average strengths for each of the Reserve components for fiscal year 1970:

First, the Army National Guard of the United States, 395,291.

Second, the Army Reserve, 256,264.

Third, the Naval Reserve, 129,000.

Fourth, the Marine Corps Reserve, 49,489.

Fifth, the Air National Guard of the United States, 86,999.

Sixth, the Air Force Reserve, 50,775.

Seventh, the Coast Guard Reserve, 17,500.

The committee report on pages 54 through 57 discusses in some detail the Reserve personnel strengths for fiscal year 1970.

CONTINUATION AUTHORITY FOR THE USE OF FUNDS FOR VIETNAM, LAOS, AND THAILAND

The committee in section 401 of this bill continued the authority authorized in last year's bill which would permit the use of Department of Defense funds for assistance to Vietnam and other free world forces in Vietnam and local forces in Laos and Thailand. Funds in this bill to be used for this purpose are slightly in excess of $100 million. The committee report on page 57 sets forth the legislative background on this matter.

I have been asked some questions about this matter. I can assure the Senate that it is old law being brought forward. Insofar as this bill is concerned

it pertains to hardware only on items that we might see fit to use in Laos, Vietnam, or Thailand.

SAFEGUARD ANTI-BALLISTIC-MISSILE SYSTEM

Mr. President, I now turn to the provisions of the bill relating to the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system.

Many details and ramifications of the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system will be discussed during the course of this debate. Initially, I think, however, it is highly important that the Senate understand the extent and the purpose of the funds in this bill as they relate to the Safeguard system.

The Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH) paid me a compliment once by saying that I explained a bill better by saying what was not in it than by saying what was in it. This is not arguing the ABM on its merits but just outlining how the money contained in the bill applies.

I shall therefore outline these appropriate facts at the outset. The authorizations for appropriations for Safeguard are contained in three different elements of the bill.

First. There is the authorization for funds for research and development in the amount of $400.9 million which is included as a part of the research and development authorization for the Army and which as reported by the committee totals $1,638,600,000.

Second. There is an authorization contained in section 203 of the bill in the amount of $12,700,000 which would authorize the construction of certain test facilities for Safeguard at the Kwajalein Missile Range. Frankly, that was just drawn out of the military construction bill and put here to go along with the rest of the Safeguard system.

Third. As a part of the authorization for missiles for the Army, the total of which is $922,500,000 there is new obligational authority in the amount of $345.5 million which authorizes procurement funds for the Safeguard system.

The total of these three elements is $759.1 million. Within the committee there was really no controversy on the matter of the research and development funds, nor for the related activity for research and development of $12,700,000 for the construction of the test facilities at Kwajalein.

PRECISE USE OF THE FISCAL YEAR 1970 PROCUREMENT FUNDS FOR ABM

Mr. President, on pages 25, 26, and 27 of the committee report there is a detailed discussion on the use of the fiscal year 1970 procurement funds. I would like to emphasize the following points.

First. The fiscal year 1970 moneys in this bill do not contain funds for operational missiles, except for a total of $600,000 which is for long leadtime components on a small part relating to the guidance system in the missile. In other words, except for this small amount which is relatively insignificant, there are no funds for operational Sprint and Spartan missiles in the bill.

Second. The procurement funds in this bill represent what is really only a partial funding of phase 1 procurement costs. They would be used for the five elements set forth below: One missile site radar, Grand Forks; one missile site radar data processor, Grand Forks; training equipment; advance procurement for one other Perimeter Acquisition Radar—PAR—and one other missile site radar, Malmstrom; leadtime missile parts, $600,000.

Third. I would emphasize, Mr. President, that up through fiscal year 1969 there had already been appropriated in the form of procurement funds for the Sentinel-Safeguard system a total of $611,700,000, although reprograming has reduced this sum to $468 million. The major items to be procured with fiscal year 1968 and fiscal year 1969 funds are as follows: One perimeter acquisition radar, Grand Forks; one perimeter acquisition radar data processor, Grand Forks; one perimeter acquisition radar data processor—initial use at tactical software control site; final use at Malmstrom; data processor—tactical software control site, at Bell Labs, Whippany, N.J.

Fourth. Mr. President, I would also point out that the funding in this bill does not complete all of the funds required for phase 1. The committee report on page 26 sets forth the other elements which must be funded in future years, including the Sprint and Spartan missiles themselves.

FURTHER DETAILS OF FISCAL YEAR 1970 PROCUREMENT

Mr. President, on page 27 of the committee report a further detailed breakout of the use of the fiscal year 1970 procurement moneys is set forth. I would emphasize the following points:

First. Except for the $600,000 which I have already discussed, all of the moneys for Sprint and Spartan missiles go for various activities which occur prior to the production of the missiles themselves. These include all of the preproduction expenses as set forth in the chart.

Second. Of the total of $345.5 million, $249.3 million will be spent for items relating to the ground equipment and the radars for phase 1 sites.

Mr. President, the foregoing comments describe the use to which the funds proposed for fiscal year 1970 would be used for Safeguard. In other words, the details of the bill itself.

I have additional comments and justification for the Safeguard system which will be given at a subsequent time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table setting forth, in even more and greater detail than I have outlined, a breakdown of the vast increase of funds already obligated, and funds for fiscal year 1970 and for subsequent years. This is furnished because there has been some confusion about the subject, and the committee believes that all Senators are entitled to the information. We believe that the information as presented is correct. If any Senator finds otherwise, we should be glad to have him report it, and we will make the proper correction.

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

1. The DOD costs of Phase I including RDT&E, PEMA, MCA, O&MA and MPA for the period FY 1968 through FY 1974 are as follows:

[In millions]

	Fiscal year 1968	Fiscal year 1959	Fiscal year 1970	Fiscal years 1971–74	Total
R.D.T. & E	$383.9	$311.5	$400.9	$976.4	$2,072.7
PEMA	137.9	330.6	360.5	793.3	1,622.3
MCA	55.2	183.0	97.1	154.9	490.2
O. &M.A	10.3	30.3	23.2	170.1	233.9
MPA	4.1	6.0	9.8	61.0	80.9
Total	591.4	861.4	891.5	2,155.7	4,500.0

2. Of the amounts already approved in FY 1968, and FY 1969, the amounts obligated and expended are as indicated by the following table. (Obligation and Expenditures as of 31 May.)

[In millions]

	Obligated			Expended		
	Fiscal year 1968	Fiscal year 1969	Total	Fiscal year 1968	Fiscal year 1969	Total
R.D.T. & E	$383.9	$303.9	$687.8	$375.8	$109.2	$485.0
PEMA	131.2	302.3	433.5	79.5	55.6	135.1
MCA	35.9	5.4	41.3	24.4	2.1	26.5
OMA	6.5	22.6	29.1	6.5	14.6	21.1
MPA	4.1	8.4	12.5	4.1	8.4	12.5
Total	561.5	642.6	1,204.2	490.3	189.9	680.2

3. With regard to the amounts in paragraph 2 above, obligations for:

a. RDT&E have carried on the extensive development, test and test program which has been underway for a number of years.

b. Those for PEMA have been committed for preproduction engineering, the initiating of readiness of facilities and lines for production, and for the actual procurement of the following:

Perimeter Acquisition Radar (PAR) (Grand Forks)

PAR Data Processor (Grand Forks)

Data Processing Equipment for the Tactical Software Control Site at Bell Labs Whippany, N.J.

c. The amounts for MCA have been Architectural Engineering, design effort, construction activities at Boston, procurement of power equipment and construction of facilities at Kwajalein.

d. The amounts for O&MA are for civilian personnel costs to include salaries and travel, building rentals, and for contracts for defense analyses and deployment planning.

e. The amounts for MPA are for pay and

allowances of military personnel directly associated with the SAFEGUARD program.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I observe the distinguished majority leader in the Chamber. I wish to make some rather informal remarks about procedure. I also observe in the Chamber the distinguished Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON), the distinguished Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), and the distinguished Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER). I mentioned this matter to the Senator from Kentucky as we came into the Chamber.

I consider this to be a very important and difficult bill, even apart from the ABM, and that, of course, is especially difficult. There may be added issues with respect to it. But the bill is highly complicated. In a way, it marks a turning point.

The committee members are unusually well qualified to discuss all phases of the bill. I hope that in time the distinguished Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH), the ranking Republican, will address the Senate on the bill; in fact, I know she will. Then it may be that the chairmen of the subcommittees would have an opportunity to discuss their work, to be followed by any other Senators who wish to speak. I would not wish to exclude any Senator. I am speaking as I am because the committee wants to make a complete presentation.

It seems to me that we might just as well leave the ABM out of the bill now and consider it more or less as a special order, for that is what it has grown to be. We could then determine whether we might reach an agreement to take X days of debate on it. I do not know how many days, but X days. That would include, as any Senator, under the rules, has the right to seek, a closed-door session, if that is desired; and then we might determine Y time when we might vote.

I propose this plan without seeking any advantage. I do not think any advantage would be gained by any Senator in this procedure. I have merely mentioned it and am bringing it up informally. I would hope that a plan of that kind could be arranged.

Many Senators are asking me, "When will a vote come?" I do not know. No Senator knows when the debate on the ABM will end. I cannot answer that. We all have some troubles along that line.

This thought occurred to me about noontime. I do not make it in the form of a request now, but I believe that it would be the most practical way for the Senate to proceed.

I would like to continue my presentation of these matters this afternoon, leaving out the ABM, but having a closed session to give me a chance to call the attention of the membership to some other facts that I think have a direct bearing on other major parts of the bill. I do not have in mind discussing or considering ABM. I shall not go into that subject at all, if it can be understood that we will have another closed session with respect to it.

I had understood that some Senators might not be quite ready to discuss ABM now, either in or out of a closed session. I make that statement as an observation. I hope we may have a closed session this afternoon to discuss other items in the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The distinguished Senator from Mississippi, chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, has made a most interesting suggestion about a possible time limitation. I think, though, as the Senator has indicated, that is something which might well wait until the debate gets underway and we see how we progress.

With the permission of the Senator from Mississippi, I should like to ask the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky what his plans are as to amendments, which I think are expected to be offered sometime this week.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President the Senator from Mississippi has been very open in discussing the matter. I do not speak solely for myself, but also for the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) and other Senators who are interested in the ABM and Sentinel.

This is largely our purposes: We expect to submit an amendment tomorrow. We reserve to our own judgment whether it will be called up for action on the following day, which will be Thursday. It is possible that it will be called up on that day.

As the majority leader has said, we are not prepared now to make any agreement at all about a limitation of time. A great many Senators have expressed a desire to speak on the amendment. Other Senators may desire to offer amendments, as, of course, they have a right to do. So I should think it would not be until after there had been rather extensive debate that we would be ready to consider a limitation of time. I think the distinguished Senator from Michigan, who is a cosponsor of the amendment, will confirm that statement.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. The able Senator from Kentucky states quite accurately the feeling of all of us who have spent many months considering ABM. The day may come when some limitation can be agreed upon; but each of us, as does the Senator from Mississippi, wants to insure that there will be available to all of us the fullest, most complete record, on which, then, we can all make what will be a prudent judgment. When that day will be, I think time will indicate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Do I correctly understand that the distinguished Senator from Mississippi intends to move shortly that the Senate go into closed session for the purpose of being advised of certain types of information apart from the ABM?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, entirely apart from the ABM. That is my intention.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I assume that, very likely, the distinguished Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH), the ranking minority member of the committee, will lead off tomorrow, to be followed by subcommittee chairmen and other Senators who will wish to speak.

Mr. STENNIS. We could not ask for more, and that will get the bill before the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think it should be said, for the information of the distinguished chairman and the Senate, that there will be a motion to go into closed session when the subject of the ABM becomes most pertinent.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, in referring to the members of our committee, and the presentation of the bill, I did not intend to exclude anyone. There were other Senators who worked on the bill a great deal and I think there will be appropriate time for all Senators.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move now that under rule——

Mr. MURPHY and Mr. DOMINICK addressed the Chair.

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, so that I may understand clearly, it is my understanding that the chairman will ask that the Senate go into closed session in connection with the discussion of the basis of the bill and then there is the possibility of a second closed session in connection with the ABM.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. There will be a second request on the question of the ABM.

Mr. DOMINICK and Mr. GORE addressed the Chair.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Colorado, who had already spoken to me.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senator from Mississippi not only on his presentation of the bill today but also on the work he has done in connection with a very complex and very difficult series of requests of the administration for authorization.

Without equivocation I would say that this bill was discussed in the Committee on Armed Services without any partisanship whatsoever. It has been a wholly bipartisan effort. There has been an effort on the part of all members to scrutinize the request, to try to avoid duplication of effort between the services, and to try to make cuts where feasible in light of circumstances around the world.

I think the Senator from Mississippi did a masterly job in leading this effort and in developing a bill which will provide for the defense and security of the people of the United States and still effect cuts in the process.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his generous remarks. I was only one Senator who worked on the bill. Another Senator who worked on the bill and who did an outstanding job was the Senator from Tennessee. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. As I understand it, the Senator intends to make a motion, not a unanimous-consent request, and, therefore, once in closed session, if any other Senator wishes to bring up any matter of security information, it would be within the discretion of that Sena-

tor so to do unless the Senate should by vote dissolve the closed session, although it is the intention of the Senator from Mississippi to discuss only matters other than the ABM in this session he now proposes to suggest.

Mr. STENNIS. It might be that a Senator could make a motion under rule XXXV to go into a closed session for only one purpose or to exclude other purposes such as the ABM. That, perhaps, is an open question under the rule.

Mr. GORE. Then, the Senator is not suggesting that now?

Mr. STENNIS. I wish to add that, rather than stand on that, I would like to request if we could, that we go in and discuss anything that is in the bill this afternoon except the ABM. I wish to cover some of the high points such as the F–14 and F–15, and a few other items, something about the cost of the bill and why there is so much coming up.

Mr. GORE. I would not be prepared to accede to that. I want to be free throughout the debate, in secret or in public session, to present any informa-

Mr. STENNIS. Very well.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I would be glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri, but the Senator from Florida had asked me to yield to him earlier, and I was not able to do so. I yield to him first, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I would have preferred that the Senator yield to me then because my question related to something he had just said.

Mr. STENNIS. We will go back.

Mr. HOLLAND. The distinguished Senator made mention several times of the large amounts in this bill to cover over-target costs. For instance, there is an item of $225 million in the middle of page 4 to cover over-target costs in the fiscal year 1969 and prior years for the C–5A aircraft.

What is the total amount, if the Senator can tell us, allowed in the bill for over-target costs, meaning costs that have gone above the estimates in the contract amounts?

Mr. STENNIS. There are those the Senator just mentioned. There are some items for ships. There is about $167 million in the bill for ship overruns. But that is not all the picture. The report sets out in full the total amount of the alleged overrun that would be paid this year or from here on if it works out that way. These figures cannot be accurate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Would it be possible for the Senator and his staff to furnish in one place the list of so-called over-target costs or overruns—the cost items—so that we will have that information?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator has made a very good point. We have that information either in the report or in some other place and we shall be glad to provide the information. We estimated on page 11 that the amount would be approximately $1.5 billion. We will specify the items.

Mr. HOLLAND. I would appreciate it if that could be furnished at a convenient place in the RECORD.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Coming to the other horn of the dilemma, I understand the renegotiation process is still available and still used on occasion by the Department of Defense. Is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct, and also when a contract is terminated that is in the picture.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, may we have order in the Chamber? We cannot hear.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest that the Chamber be cleared so that Senators can hear the debate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think I am asking questions which every Senator who is not a member of the committee would be interested in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All personnel not required to be present in the Chamber will leave.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator indicated that on page 11 of the report there is an indication that, perhaps, there is $1.5 billion overcharge or overrun to be provided this year. The Senator has just kindly advised us that the renegotiation process is still in force by law and that it has been availed of at times by the Department of Defense.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is the Senator able to state to us for the RECORD the items of renegotiations savings or recoveries which have been made on some of these projects in the bill?

Mr. STENNIS. No. These matters come to figures only after there is an actual renegotiation or completion of the contract. The contract carries a right for the Government to terminate but there is always much debate. The renegotiation law applies, but with uncertain results. We do have hard estimates as far as we can go on these overruns and that is on page 11.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator have a similar hard estimate for recoveries under the renegotiation process?

Mr. STENNIS. No, we do not.

Mr. HOLLAND. My information has been that at times in the past there have been large recoveries in behalf of the Department of Defense in certain cases. It seems to me that when we are talking here about a bill that goes into billions of dollars that we should have not only the statements of over-target amounts which are exceedingly large and are of serious importance to the Nation, but also that we have any real evidence of activity under the renegotiation process.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I hope the distinguished Senator will have his staff check on that matter and advise the Senate for the RECORD what the information is on both aspects of this matter how much the Government has found its estimates to be over-run, and then how much it has been able to recover, if anything.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. We will do just that. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I respectfully commend the able Chairman for the superb job he has done in connection with the presentation of this complicated, complex, and expensive legislation.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator and thank him also for the aid he has given us.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I appreciate that comment.

Mr. President, one aspect that worries me is the statement I thought I heard the able Senator make about segregating the ABM from the rest of the military authorization bill. It would seem that this year, more than any other year since I came to the Senate, we now face a question of priorities with respect to our now obviously limited resources. Therefore, if we decide to deploy the ABM at this time, we will not be able to do other things which otherwise could be done in the defense field.

When the distinguished Director of Research and Engineering of the Defense Department, Dr. John Foster, came before the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, I said that, in my opinion, if he pushed ahead with deployment of the ABM against the growing opposition, it would result in cancellation of the MOL program. He assured me that that would not be the case. But it so turned out.

Having been on the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee since its inception, since the beginning I have been somewhat apprehensive about how little was being done in the space field from the standpoint of national security. This condition would be even worse if it had not been for the foresight of the late Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. Bridges.

I, for one, am worried about this tendency toward digging a lot of holes in the ground as against, in this nuclear space age, reaching up into the high atmosphere and space.

When one of the ablest military men it has ever been my privilege to know retired some years ago as Chief of Staff of the Air Force, Gen. Thomas White, he made a short retirement speech which would seem pertinent at this time.

General White observed that there was a time when those who controlled the ground controlled the world as it was then known. Later, those who controlled the sea controlled the world. Today, those who control the air control the world.

General White closed:

> I would leave with you this prediction tonight: Tomorrow, those who control space will control the world.

Therefore, it was with regret that I noted the last manned military venture into space was canceled the other day; and I am certain it was canceled against the advice of the Joint Chiefs.

The reason I bring this up at this time is to emphasize that I believe we have now come to a position in the Senate never before characteristic of the years in which I have served; namely, this need to establish priorities. Another word for priorities is values, what we are to do with respect to the increasingly limited resources of the United States.

Although I fully understand why the distinguished chairman—and I say this with sincerity and respect—might prefer

to segregate the ABM from the rest of the military budget, I do not think that this can be done. There are other programs which can be accomplished, abroad and in this country; and also things in the military budget itself which appear more important, if the ABM is not approved.

If this ABM is deployed at this time, I believe there will be many worthy projects in the future which cannot be accomplished, around the world, and in connection with pressing problems in this country.

That is the thrust of these few remarks. There will be matters, I believe, far more important to the ultimate security of our country which will have to go by the board.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for yielding.

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to have yielded to the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

Mr. President, I state this to Senators—including the leader—that I requested as a matter of time, for convenience of the Senate, that we could have a closed session, in which I could give some additional facts, as I see them, received from the intelligence community, and which have a bearing on other parts of the bill. It was only a request, because I think if I made it as a motion, it would bring on a great deal of debate, because the rule is not clear.

The discussion that I should like to have occur will take some time. If there is no agreement on it, perhaps it might be better to go over now and come in earlier in the morning than the Senate ordinarily meets.

I would expect to make a motion, then, for a closed session to continue my arguments on the other items in the bill. I would then leave out the ABM, but if it is brought up by others, why, I might go into it, if that is the wish of the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We have already set a meeting for the committee in the morning. It would be inconvenient at this late date to be told that we have a meeting of the Senate earlier tomorrow, because we cannot possibly change it. I hope the Senator will not ask for the Senate to come in earlier tomorrow, because my committee is meeting at 10 o'clock and will expect to run at least until noon. If the Senator is going to discuss these matters, we are all interested in them, of course; and I would not like to be absent.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator would not miss anything. We will have a live quorum.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And have morning business?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not object to that, but I do not wish to miss the statement of the Senator from Mississippi.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to suggest, if the Senate is willing, and the leadership on the other side agrees, that the Senate convene at 11 o'clock tomorow morning, that we have a period for the transaction of routine morning business, and then have a live quorum call, so that all Senators will be on notice and be prepared.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With the understanding that it would not come before noon, it would be fine.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is right.

Mr. STENNIS. Not before 12 o'clock.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on that basis, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. tomorrow morning.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—because of various hearings tomorrow, would it be possible for the distinguished majority leader to agree that 12:30 o'clock would be the time instead of 12 o'clock after the transaction of routine business, so that we could continue this discussion at 12:30 o'clock?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That would be all right with me. Of course, it would give us an opportunity for a live quorum, which may take some time.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the majority leader.

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

LIMITATION ON MORNING BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the morning business on tomorrow not exceed the hour of 12:15, and that following that, there be a live quorum call, to be concluded, hopefully, at the hour of 12:30.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I wonder if the distinguished Senator would include in that request that, under rule XXXV, there be a closed session.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would prefer that the distinguished chairman of the committee do that. I am perfectly willing to do it, but I think it is his responsibility.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, it is understood, then, that at 12:30, and not before, we may proceed, and the Senator from Mississippi will have the floor for that purpose.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. At that time I assume the Senator would make his motion to go into a closed session.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, under the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 9, 1969, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 8, 1969:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Henry A. Byroade, of Indiana, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Philippines.

J. Raymond Ylitalo, of South Dakota, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Paraguay.

IN THE NAVY

Having designated Rear Adm. C. Edwin Bell, Jr., U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

IN THE AIR FORCE

Laverne F. Huston, [redacted] for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Air Force, in the grade of lieutenant colonel, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of sections 1210 and 1211, title 10, United States Code.

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

CHAPLAIN CORPS

To be captain

Balint, Robert J., [redacted]
Barber, Gary D., Sr., [redacted]
Bendig, James C., [redacted]
Corbitt, James C., [redacted]
Crosby, George K., [redacted]
Fash, Vernon L., [redacted]
Johnson, Arnold G., [redacted]
Martin, Christian H., Jr., [redacted]
Reinke, Friedrich W., [redacted]
Schoenborn, Ernest F., [redacted]
Seastrunk, Charles E., Jr., [redacted]
Sturch, George T., [redacted]

To be first lieutenant

Arnold, Charles L., [redacted]
Bogaard, Calvin L., [redacted]
Brodeur, Richard E., [redacted]
Drag, Rayner R., [redacted]
Fruechte, Leland L., [redacted]
Grosse, David G., [redacted]
Holtzclaw, Morris J., [redacted]
Hunter, Donald E., [redacted]
Kelly, Michael J., [redacted]
Kennedy, Clayton M., [redacted]
Luck, Robert O., [redacted]
Midile, Anthony R., [redacted]
Millsaps, James W., [redacted]
Oatis, Stephen J., [redacted]

Okeefe, Francis J., XXXX
Scherf, James C., XXXX
Schuermann, William S., XXXX
Solano, John O., XXXX
Stephenson, Norman D., XXXX
Swanson, Richard A., XXXX
Whelan, Gerald M., XXXX
Wiegele, Lloyd W., XXXX

DENTAL CORPS

To be captain

Beidler, Donald B., XXXX
Bochenko, Thomas J., XXXX
Brigleb, Richard C., XXXX
Brooks, Keith A., XXXX
DeWitt, Dennis H., XXXX
Kelley, Charles D., XXXX
McIlwain, James E., Jr., XXXX
Moretsky, Howard, XXXX
Morlang, William M., II, XXXX
Olson, Stephen A., XXXX
Phillips, Donald C., XXXX
Puma, Anthony Raymond, XXXX
Reinboldt, Robert Walter, XXXX
Roane, James B., XXXX
Sanders, Arthur R., XXXX
Sano, Lawrence N., XXXX
Shibuya, Francis S., XXXX
Smith, Jared Harvey, XXXX
Solberg, Peter Edward, XXXX
Spinelli, Frank J., XXXX
Tanaka, Marvin M., XXXX
Wheatley, Ronald S., XXXX
Worch, Jay R., XXXX

To be first lieutenant

Anselmo, Joseph A., XXXX
Curtis, Howard F., XXXX
Dufrane, Michael H., XXXX
Federico, Roland A., XXXX
Fielding, Daniel E., XXXX
Fox, Gerald L., XXXX
Hallinan, Thomas J., XXXX
Page, Dennis G., XXXX
Parsley, John M., XXXX
Spott, Roger J., XXXX
Strosnider, Roger K., XXXX

JUDGE ADVOCATE CORPS

To be captain

Barbara, Raul F., XXXX
Bridge, Robert I., XXXX
Cooke, Donald J., XXXX
Donovan, John K., XXXX
Riley, Byron B., Jr., XXXX
Smith, Earl C., XXXX
Stanton, James L., XXXX

To be first lieutenant

Abbott, Herschel L., Jr., XXXX
Adams, Andrew J., Jr., XXXX
Amos, John R., XXXX
Anderson, Bruce H., XXXX
Angle, Swanson W., XXXX
Barrow, James R., XXXX
Bebermeyer, Robert R., XXXX
Bennett, Charles D., Jr., XXXX
Boardman, Harold F., Jr., XXXX
Brophy, Joseph M., XXXX
Brouillette, Gary J., XXXX
Brown, Frank E., Jr., XXXX
Carter, Alfred W., XXXX
Childress, David W., XXXX
Churchill, James M., XXXX
Cummins, Arthur B., Jr., XXXX
Cutts, John A., III, XXXX
Dakin, Timothy J., XXXX
Dolan, Brian T., XXXX
Ellis, Charles F., Jr., XXXX
Falconer, John P., Jr., XXXX
Fennell, Floyd W., XXXX
Flatten, Daniel V., XXXX
Frick, Lyman L., Jr., XXXX
Fullem, Donald R., XXXX
Gales, Robert R., XXXX
Garnett, Griffin T., III, XXXX
Gold, Ned C., Jr., XXXX
Graham, Frederick T., XXXX
Grebeldinger, Nicholas, Jr., XXXX
Greenberg, Harvy, XXXX
Hardin, Charles V., XXXX
Hardy, William A., III, XXXX
Hemschoot, Paul J., XXXX
Herron, Philip B., XXXX
Honn, Carver E., XXXX
Howell, Ronald W., XXXX
Hume, Edward C., XXXX
Irons, William L., XXXX
Jahnke, Lawrence E., XXXX
Joyce, Kenneth G. B., XXXX
Lacy, Mell J., Jr., XXXX
Larson, Robert V., XXXX
Marvel, Keneth R., XXXX
May, Robert A., Jr., XXXX
McDonnell, Patrick H., XXXX
McKelvey, James A., XXXX
Metsch, Lawrence R., XXXX
Mullis, James M., Jr., XXXX
Nichols, Charles L., XXXX
Opper, Loren M., XXXX
Pacifico, Paul J., XXXX
Perino, Michael E., XXXX
Phillips, William R., XXXX
Piper, James P., XXXX
Reenstra, Donald R., XXXX
Rickenbaker, Dudley G., XXXX
Roberts, Thomas F., Jr., XXXX
Rubin, Alan J., XXXX
Ruffner, Jay S., XXXX
Schnitzer, Mark C., XXXX
Scott, Robert H., Jr., XXXX
Sklute, Nolan, XXXX
Smith, Tommie S., XXXX
Smith, Wendell K., XXXX
Stevenson, Charles E., Jr., XXXX
Stine, Alan C., XXXX
Stoudemire, Julian L., XXXX
Taylor, Marcus D., XXXX
Thompson, Anthony J., XXXX
Thompson, Russell D., XXXX
Throckmorton, Rex D., XXXX
Tillman, Wheeler M., XXXX
Townsend, Frank M., Jr., XXXX
Turner, Martin S., XXXX
Vandoren, Emerson B., XXXX
Waitman, Lemuel R., XXXX
Wallis, Olney G., XXXX
Warren, Stephen A., XXXX
Weisfield, William M., XXXX
Whisenant, Herman A., Jr., XXXX
Witt, Clarence H., Jr., XXXX
Yagley, John A., III, XXXX
York, Christopher C., XXXX
Zolezzi, Thomas P., XXXX

MEDICAL CORPS

To be major

Bellamy, Henry M., Jr., XXXX
Chong, Vernon, XXXX
Downs, Spencer R., XXXX
Gregory, Joseph E., XXXX
Romberger, Wesley F., XXXX
Skinner, Odis D., XXXX
Swift, James T., XXXX
Young, Duane A., XXXX

To be captain

Aclin, Richard R., XXXX
Adelmann, Eugene Russell, XXXX
Alexander, Clyde W., Jr., XXXX
Anderson, Edgar R., Jr., XXXX
Anderson, Sheridan T., XXXX
Applestein, Bruce, XXXX
Armstrong, Joseph R., XXXX
Bickel, Rudolph G., XXXX
Bitseff, Edward L., XXXX
Bladowski, John R., XXXX
Blankenship, Robert M., XXXX
Boineau, Maxcy C., XXXX
Booth, Donald J., XXXX
Borota, Ray W., XXXX
Brada, Donald R., XXXX
Breschi, Louis C., XXXX
Bristow, John W., XXXX
Britt, Darryl B., XXXX
Brown, Frederic M., XXXX
Brown, Mike J., Jr., XXXX
Buelow, Robert G., XXXX
Callen, Kenneth E., XXXX
Carroll, Herma G., Jr., XXXX
Carter, Robert L., XXXX
Caudill, Robert G., XXXX
Davies, Chesley R., XXXX
Dinenberg, Stephen, XXXX
Dorr, Maurice M., XXXX
Dudley, Ainsworth G., XXXX
Duggar, Perry N., XXXX
Edwards, David A., Jr., XXXX
Emeis, William F., XXXX
Ferguson, William T., XXXX
Fetzek, Joseph F., XXXX
Fielding, Steven L., XXXX
Fiore, Joseph P., XXXX
Fisher, James M., XXXX
Fong, William, XXXX
Frank, Sanders T., XXXX
Gabel, Joseph C., XXXX
Gendel, Charles L., XXXX
George, Harold C., XXXX
Giacobazzi, Peter F., XXXX
Gigax, John H., XXXX
Goldston, William R., XXXX
Gregg, Paul T., XXXX
Grode, Michael J., XXXX
Hagen, William M., XXXX
Hanna, William R., XXXX
Hargis, Robert J., XXXX
Harlan, John R., XXXX
Harper, Douglas M., XXXX
Harvey, William C., XXXX
Haynes, Max G., XXXX
Heffron, John P., XXXX
Heraper, Peter D., XXXX
Hoff, Ted E., Jr. XXXX
Holmes, James H., XXXX
Huey, James R., Jr., XXXX
Hughes, Thomas J., XXXX
Jackson, Arnold J., XXXX
Johnson, Randall E., XXXX
Kimble, Edward T., III, XXXX
King, Roy D., XXXX
Kirk, Clifford C., Jr., XXXX
Koch, Howard F., XXXX
Krege, John W., XXXX
Kutnick, Joel, XXXX
Lawrence, Leonard E., XXXX
Lederer, James F., XXXX
Lee, Robert K., XXXX
Longnecker, Morton F., Jr., XXXX
Lovelace, Raymond E., XXXX
Lykes, Frederick F., XXXX
Maier, Robert C., XXXX
Margolis, Irwin, XXXX
Martindale, Richard E., Jr., XXXX
Maurice, Robert H., XXXX
May, Gerald G., XXXX
May, Robert O., XXXX
McConnell, Whitman E., XXXX
McCray, David S., XXXX
McDonough, Gilbert L., XXXX
McGee, James W., IV, XXXX
McGovern, Thomas B., XXXX
McGowen, John H., III, XXXX
McIntyre, Leonard J., XXXX
McNaughton, Grant B., XXXX
Mendoza, Edward, XXXX
Michaelson, Edward D., XXXX
Miller, James B., XXXX
Mosman, John O., XXXX
Mulvaney, Thomas J., XXXX
Munsell, William P., XXXX
Murphy, Jerry L., XXXX
Neimanis, Andris, XXXX
Orren, Jerry M., XXXX
Paget, Edward T., XXXX
Pala, Stanley J., XXXX
Payne, John F., XXXX
Perkins, Robert S., XXXX
Peterson, Francis K. D., Jr., XXXX
Pfeifer, William F., XXXX
Pletincks, John R., II, XXXX
Poston, Alexander, XXXX
Powell, Jerry R., XXXX
Price, James H., XXXX
Ramey, Ralph, Jr., XXXX
Ransom, Richard W., XXXX
Ray, Jerry L., XXXX
Ray, John W. C., XXXX
Rayman, Russell B., XXXX
Riveracorrea, Hector P., XXXX
Rodriguezlopez, Ensur, XXXX
Rosenthal, David S., XXXX
Ruggeri, Robert W., XXXX
Schimke, Thomas H., XXXX
Schull, Jerry I., XXXX
Schwegler, Raymond A., XXXX

Scott, Wayne R., [redacted]
Sessions, Charles R., [redacted]
Shankle, Nelson E., [redacted]
Shiesl, Jon A., [redacted]
Simson, Laurence R., [redacted]
Singal, Sheldon, [redacted]
Singer, Karl L., [redacted]
Smith, Bobby W., [redacted]
Sonntag, Richard W., Jr., [redacted]
Sorrells, Timothy L., [redacted]
Sowell, Ellis M., [redacted]
Spence, Michael B., [redacted]
Sproles, Elij T., III, [redacted]
Stabler, Larry G., [redacted]
Staker, Lynn L., [redacted]
Stetten, Maynard L., [redacted]
Stieg, Richard L., [redacted]
Strutton, William H., [redacted]
Sueoka, William T., [redacted]
Taylor, William M., [redacted]
Tchou, Howard P., [redacted]
Terry, Ward M., [redacted]
Tobias, Thurman E., [redacted]
Totaro, Ralph J., [redacted]
Touhey, John E., [redacted]
Towler, Henry H., Jr., [redacted]
Trabalsantos, Jose F., [redacted]
Verwest, Hadley M., Jr., [redacted]
Walker, Ronald F., [redacted]
Wankmuller, Robert T., [redacted]
Ware, Robert E., [redacted]
West, Barbour D., [redacted]
Wildemann, Mark F., [redacted]
Willard, James F., [redacted]
Williams, Charlie B., Jr., [redacted]
Williams, Larry R., [redacted]
Willis, John C., [redacted]
Wooddell, William J., [redacted]
Wunder, James F., [redacted]
Yassin, John G., [redacted]
Yeste, Dixon, [redacted]
Zeiner, George B., [redacted]

To be first lieutenant

Bedingfield, John R., Jr., [redacted]
Beman, John W., Jr., [redacted]
Blain, Raymond L., [redacted]
Burke, Pat S., [redacted]
Daniels, David H., Jr., [redacted]
Denmark, Thomas C., [redacted]
Dietz, James W., [redacted]
Froelicher, Victor F., Jr., [redacted]
Galbert, Michael W., [redacted]
Garcia, Raymond, [redacted]
Garrott, Thomas C., [redacted]
Golomb, Roger S., [redacted]
Green, Charles E., [redacted]
Harford, Francis J., Jr., [redacted]
Hawley, William J., [redacted]
Hopkins, Ralph D., Jr., [redacted]
Kay, James E., [redacted]
Kocher, David B., [redacted]
Linehan, Timothy E., [redacted]
Luetje, Charles M., II, [redacted]
Masters, Charles J., [redacted]
Maulsby, Gilbert O., [redacted]
Murphy, Matthew P., II, [redacted]
Olson, Barry E., [redacted]
Rector, William R., [redacted]
Reider, Daner R., [redacted]
Sapp, Philip B., [redacted]
Sharp, John R., [redacted]
Sorauf, Thomas J., [redacted]
Tardy, Walter J., Jr., [redacted]
Trick, Lorence W., [redacted]
Wasserman, James M., [redacted]
Wicks, Dennis R., [redacted]
Wiley, John K., [redacted]
Wilson, James M., [redacted]

NURSE CORPS

To be captain

Arndt, Carole L., [redacted]
Babcock, Beth F., [redacted]
Baker, Darline J., [redacted]
Barber, Willie F., [redacted]
Bohandy, Annie, [redacted]
Boyd, Mary R., [redacted]
Bradley, Patricia F., [redacted]
Cajigasjavier, Angelica, [redacted]
Caldwell, Sally A., [redacted]
Campbell, Thomas R., [redacted]
Caskey, Eleanor E., [redacted]
Cei, Marie T., [redacted]
Chambless, Rosalie B., [redacted]
Cieslak, Joanna, [redacted]
Cleveland, Shirley L., [redacted]
Coombs, Marilyn R., [redacted]
Corrado, Carol J., [redacted]
Cote, Klarika J., [redacted]
Deogburn, Charlotte M., [redacted]
Dubie, Carl T., [redacted]
Dudley, Mary L., [redacted]
Dye, Beverly J., [redacted]
Florio, Carol A., [redacted]
Ford, Joan D., [redacted]
George, Mary M., [redacted]
Godfrey, Laura F., [redacted]
Graves, Nancy L., [redacted]
Guarino, Vincent A., [redacted]
Hanley, Mary G., [redacted]
Hargrave, David R., [redacted]
Heil, Rosella C., [redacted]
Hilbert, Arlene M., [redacted]
Holt, Maurita F., [redacted]
Joyce, Claire S., [redacted]
Keene, Ruby, [redacted]
Klecka, Dorothy M., [redacted]
Kuhl, Shirley A., [redacted]
Least, Thomas S., [redacted]
Lee, Florence L., [redacted]
Lumpe, Albert, Jr., [redacted]
Maurer, Elizabeth I., [redacted]
McCleary, Carol M., [redacted]
McEntee, June E., [redacted]
Meath, Leo R., [redacted]
Mellott, Mary L., [redacted]
Messer, Marsha L., [redacted]
Mulhollen, Joanne R., [redacted]
Murray, Mae J. M., [redacted]
Norris, Helen M., [redacted]
Palausky, Edward J., [redacted]
Palmer, Rebecca J., [redacted]
Parrish, Sarah I., [redacted]
Pocoski, Cecelia C., [redacted]
Powell, Minnie M., [redacted]
Pratt, Dorothy O., [redacted]
Pufnock, Mary L., [redacted]
Pulte, Janet M., [redacted]
Replogle, Mary A., [redacted]
Roland, Camilia M. A., [redacted]
Rollins, Deloris J., [redacted]
Rovnyak, Eleanor C., [redacted]
Scott, Joan M., [redacted]
Shinn, Patsy F., [redacted]
Shrum, Sadie A., [redacted]
Smilek, Franklin R., [redacted]
Spencer, Barbara L., [redacted]
Strachan, Shirley A., [redacted]
Stuckert, Ruth A., [redacted]
Sturim, Constance B., [redacted]
Tierney, Agnes C., [redacted]
Todd, John L., [redacted]
Vak, Elaine J., [redacted]
Velasquez, Martha A., [redacted]
Wells, Patricia C., [redacted]
Williams, Dorothy S., [redacted]
Williams, Patricia L., [redacted]
Wolbert, June, [redacted]
Wyatt, Betty J., [redacted]

To be first lieutenant

Adams, Annette, J., [redacted]
Aldridge, Patricia D., [redacted]
Allen, Bonnie C., [redacted]
Alston, Georgia M., [redacted]
Andino, Maria I., [redacted]
Andrews, Kay E., [redacted]
Armstrong, Frances P., [redacted]
Atwood, Nancy L., [redacted]
Ayers, Lowell E., [redacted]
Baiocchetti, Loreto A., [redacted]
Bernard, Carolyn F., [redacted]
Blanchard, Charles C., III, [redacted]
Blasczyk, Lois K., [redacted]
Bouchard, Roberta C. C., [redacted]
Brant, Alice M., [redacted]
Breasure, Margaret E., [redacted]
Brom, Janice L., [redacted]
Brooks, Barbara M., [redacted]
Brown, Rosemary, [redacted]
Butz, Lois Mary, [redacted]
Cadieux, Arthur J., [redacted]
Caldwell, Nancy L., [redacted]
Campbell, Thomas W., [redacted]
Casey, Kathleen F., [redacted]
Chaisson, Mary L., [redacted]
Christian, Betty A., [redacted]
Clark, Christopher M., [redacted]
Cline, Elizabeth K., [redacted]
Colwell, Barbara, M. S., [redacted]
Conley, Margaret A., [redacted]
Conley, Shirley M., [redacted]
Cook, Rosa L., [redacted]
Cummings, Myra F., [redacted]
Cunningham, Donna J., [redacted]
Davis, Barbara M., [redacted]
Davis, Bettye H., [redacted]
Davis, Joy A., [redacted]
Deem, Cynthia M., [redacted]
Deemer, Mary T., [redacted]
Dehart, Martha A., [redacted]
Dewolff, Judith F., [redacted]
Didick, Joanna, [redacted]
Donahue, Joanne T., [redacted]
Dumoulin, Claire F., [redacted]
Elliott, Mitchele A., [redacted]
Fadusko, Jeanne A., [redacted]
Fegan, Geraldine F., [redacted]
Feneley, Patricia A., [redacted]
Forbes, Janyce I., [redacted]
Forgach, Margaret M., [redacted]
Fox, Jacqueline G., [redacted]
Franklin, Barbara A., [redacted]
Fritts, Mary C., [redacted]
Galford, James R., [redacted]
Gallagher, Mary E., [redacted]
Gemma, Elaine M., [redacted]
Goldman, Sheila A., [redacted]
Gonzalez, Awilda, [redacted]
Hagens, Robert L., [redacted]
Hahn, Mary M., [redacted]
Hall, Jerrie J., [redacted]
Haluska, Lois A., [redacted]
Hanson, Priscilla A., [redacted]
Hartwick, Rayna L., [redacted]
Hatton, Carol J., [redacted]
Hill, Connie M., [redacted]
Huber, Priscilla J., [redacted]
Hughes, Ellen A., [redacted]
Hull, Kathleen V., [redacted]
Jackson, Harold W., [redacted]
Jackson, Helissa R., [redacted]
Jensen, Theresa I., [redacted]
Jewell, Jean A., [redacted]
Jones, Carol A., [redacted]
Jones, Frances P., [redacted]
Juergens, Barbara D., [redacted]
Kaczmark, Susanne I., [redacted]
Kerr, Nancy J., [redacted]
Kovach, Leslie L., [redacted]
Kuhn, Larry L., [redacted]
Kuroly, Barbara E., [redacted]
Lacoursiere, Jane M., [redacted]
Lagasse, Linda M., [redacted]
Last, Geraldine M., [redacted]
Latham, Bessie W., [redacted]
Lees, Virginia K., [redacted]
Legault, Albert L., [redacted]
Lightfoot, Margaret L., [redacted]
Link, Vincent H., [redacted]
Liscomb, Barbara J., [redacted]
List, Sara F., [redacted]
Long, Bridget E., [redacted]
Loper, Elaine A. F., [redacted]
Lucisano, Michael J., [redacted]
Mannette, Barbara A., [redacted]
Marick, Thomas D., [redacted]
Marino, Mary L., [redacted]
Martin, Donna C., [redacted]
Martinez, Hilario D., [redacted]
Matt, Louis A., [redacted]
McCabe, Mary J., [redacted]
McElrath, Luella, [redacted]
Miller, Janet E., [redacted]
Miller, Joyce P., [redacted]
Miller, Linda B., [redacted]
Murphree, Kay R., [redacted]
Murray, David, [redacted]
Nagy, Helen B., [redacted]
Neal, Connie L., [redacted]
Neason, Laura G., [redacted]
Nelson, Jean E., [redacted]
Norgaard, Gayle D., [redacted]
Norton, Charlene J., [redacted]

O'Donnell, Madge M., XXXX.
Ollino, Tiiu, XXXX.
Ortona, Antoinette, XXXX.
Osha, Patricia J., XXXX.
Paup, Sonja M., XXXX.
Pellish, Josephine, XXXX.
Phillips, Sylvia J., XXXX.
Piergrossi, Maryann, XXXX.
Purdy, Patricia A., XXXX.
Ramsborg, Glen C., XXXX.
Reich, Ila R., XXXX.
Reichenbach, Georgianna, XXXX.
Reilly, Michael D., XXXX.
Reske, Kathleen A., XXXX.
Reynolds, Zelma W., XXXX.
Richardson, Lillian, XXXX.
Riggs, Carolyn K., XXXX.
Robertson, Theresa M., XXXX.
Rosenbery, Nancy J., XXXX.
Runda, Mary A., XXXX.
Salmons, Freddie E., XXXX.
Scardina, Anna V., XXXX.
Schulze, Carol A., XXXX.
Schuster, Veronnica T., XXXX.
Segura, Charles F., XXXX.
Shelton, Patsy R., XXXX.
Shockley, George E., Jr., XXXX.
Smith, Carole S., XXXX.
Smith, Elaine R., XXXX.
Smith, Martin O., XXXX.
Smith, Mary A., XXXX.
Solander, Rita M., XXXX.
Solari, Katherine R., XXXX.
Somers, Pauline E., XXXX.
Stange, Melba J., XXXX.
Steffens, James J., XXXX.
Stratton, Maureen, XXXX.
Taylor, Leah L., XXXX.
Teesdale, Thomas E., XXXX.
Vancavage, Caroline J., XXXX.
Vanpelt, Roberta J., XXXX.
Villemure, Vivian M., XXXX.
Vincent, Anita L., XXXX.
Vorhes, Paul W., Jr., XXXX.
Weatherford, Sara E., XXXX.
Wegmann, Diane A., XXXX.
Wells, Elinor J., XXXX.
Wenzel, Sandra, XXXX.
Wetta, Rebecca S., XXXX.
Whelihan, Ethel M., XXXX.
Wilkerson, Eleanor R., XXXX.
Wilson, Bertha M., XXXX.
Wilson, Charles L., XXXX.
Woods, Fannie F., XXXX.
Wyman, Craig A., XXXX.
Yamashita, Agueda C., XXXX.
Yates, Donna M., XXXX.
Yonker, Barbara J., XXXX.
Zadareky, Alana L., XXXX.
Zoost, Jacquelyn M., XXXX.

To be second lieutenant

Caldwell, Joe E., XXXX.

MEDICAL SERVICE

To be majors

Baumer, Chester J., XXXX.
Beasley, David W., XXXX.
Becker, Kenneth E., XXXX.
Borho, Joseph A., XXXX.
Freistedt, Calvin H., XXXX.
Gonzalez, Norbert, XXXX.
Gottlieb, Harold J., XXXX.
Harmon, Charle C., Jr., XXXX.
Jacko, Paul P., XXXX.
Klotsko, John A., XXXX.
Morgan, Josephine A. L., XXXX.
Reichel, George J., Jr., XXXX.
Scheihing, Theodore R., XXXX.
Symons, John W., XXXX.

To be captains

Anderson, Claire, J., XXXX.
Bertsch, John E., XXXX.
Boes, Robert L., XXXX.
Briggs, Edgar M., Jr., XXXX.
Burton, Donald F., XXXX.
Bussy, Joseph T., XXXX.
Fairless, David S., XXXX.
Glenn, Clark L., XXXX.
Gregory, Joseph B., XXXX.
Hill, Robert D., XXXX.
Jobe, George W., XXXX.
Middleton, Richard V., XXXX.
Nestor, Aloysius F., XXXX.
Poole, Nathan E., XXXX.
Powell, Robert L., XXXX.

To be first lieutenants

Andrews, Edwin J., Jr., XXXX.
Ashkenase, Donald L., XXXX.
Avants, Mervin T., Jr., XXXX.
Bjerken, Paul A., XXXX.
Bruce, John M., Jr., XXXX.
Cox, Jan G., XXXX.
Drummond, Robert D., XXXX.
Fisher, Richard L., XXXX.
Fleming, George E., XXXX.
Gallman, James J., XXXX.
Grinstaff, Harold W., XXXX.
Hare, Charles E., XXXX.
Hurysz, Edwin E., XXXX.
Hutchins, Robert P., XXXX.
Jacobson, Phil F., Jr., XXXX.
Langenberg, Stephen L., XXXX.
Metcalf, Ned W., Sr., XXXX.
Meyer, Alvin F., III, XXXX.
Milton, James L., Jr., XXXX.
Nash, George W., XXXX.
Petit, Ronald E., XXXX.
Pharris, Richard D., XXXX.
Porter, John F., XXXX.
Ray, Rolland R., Jr., XXXX.
Renoudet, Donald D., XXXX.
Rodriguez, Albert D., XXXX.
Semanko, John H., XXXX.
Thornton, Felix F., XXXX.
Tow, James G., XXXX.
Weishaar, Gary L., XXXX.
Welbes, Earl J., XXXX.
Wilson, Carl W., XXXX.
Winfree, Robert G., XXXX.
Wise, Larry D., XXXX.
Yacone, Frank, XXXX.

To be second lieutenants

Balesky, Joseph V., XXXX.
Eckerson, Charles C., XXXX.
English, Manuel L., XXXX.
Hill, Gordon C., XXXX.
Moore, William W., XXXX.
Treible, Kirk, XXXX.

VETERINARIAN

To be captain

Dear, James R., XXXX.

To be first lieutenants

Adams, George E., XXXX.
Amster, Robert L., XXXX.
Cardin, David E., XXXX.
Davis, Jerry W., XXXX.
Ekstrom, Merlin E., XXXX.
Gentzler, Ronald P., XXXX.
Heading, Thomas D., XXXX.
Hubbard, Gene B., XXXX.
Kent, Warren W., Jr., XXXX.
Lance, William R., XXXX.
Myers, Ronald D., XXXX.
Obeck, Douglas K., XXXX.
Rogers, James E., XXXX.
Sullivan, Raymond F., XXXX.
Tate, Samuel W., XXXX.
Wilson, William C., XXXX.

BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES CORPS

To be major

Dunsky, Irving I., XXXX.
Farrell, Dorothy G., XXXX.
Levinson, Samuel, XXXX.
Weinberg, Carl J., XXXX.

To be captain

Arledge, Robert L., XXXX.
Behling, Edward A., XXXX.
Daniel, Thomas N., Jr., XXXX.
Desjardins, Robert J., XXXX.
Dobbs, Carroll R., XXXX.
Floyd, David R., XXXX.
Hayden, Andrew T., XXXX.
Hodge, Larry G., XXXX.
Lacoe, Robert E., XXXX.
Levinson, Lewis S., XXXX.
Mobley, Howard R., Jr., XXXX.
Mulligan, Hugh F. II, XXXX.
Murphy, John G., XXXX.
Trumbo, Richard B., XXXX.
White, Joyce S., XXXX.

To be first lieutenant

Auchter, Saundra A., XXXX.
Banner, Edwin C. III, XXXX.
Blochberger, Charles W., Jr., XXXX.
Conner, Roy M., XXXX.
Duffy, Shelah G., XXXX.
Innes, Steven S., XXXX.
Jacobs, Sandra I., XXXX.
Jones, Wayne D., XXXX.
Latosi, Mary A., XXXX.
Lynch, Thomas P., Sr., XXXX.
Mikeal, Judith M., XXXX.
Mikesell, George W., Jr., XXXX.
Noll, Nancy R., XXXX.
Provines, Wayne F., XXXX.
Pryse, Georgia A., XXXX.
Ricker, Philip P., XXXX.
Turner, Ronald W., XXXX.
Tykocki, David N., XXXX.
Webb, Thomas S., XXXX.

To be second lieutenant

Alter, William A., III, XXXX.
Goodson, Richard A., XXXX.
Hawks, Robert L., XXXX.
Key, James A., XXXX.
Miller, Stephen A., XXXX.
Reinert, Bruce D., XXXX.
Sayre, Larry E., XXXX.
Shaffstall, Robert M., XXXX.
Weber, Leo R., XXXX.
Wells, Robert L., XXXX.

The following distinguished graduates of the Air Force officers training school for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Atlee, William K., Jr., XXXX.
Baran, John D., XXXX.
Beauchamp, Jack R., XXXX.
Berry, Robert L., XXXX.
Blejwas, Thomas E., XXXX.
Boyd, Frank L., Jr., XXXX.
Campbell, Michael D., XXXX.
Carper, William B., XXXX.
Clark, Larry D., XXXX.
Deland, Gerald W., XXXX.
Deroos, Richard J., XXXX.
Deters, Joel E., XXXX.
Enzone, Danny J., XXXX.
Everett, Christopher M., XXXX.
Faught, David F., XXXX.
Finks, Franklyn F., XXXX.
Forton, Hugh J., XXXX.
Gould, Richard C., XXXX.
Graves, Henry L., Jr., XXXX.
Haslam, Robert T., III, XXXX.
Hayes, Daniel F., XXXX.
Hisatomi, John A., XXXX.
Hodgdon, Leigh A., XXXX.
Hogsette, Robert R., III, XXXX.
Hunter, James L., XXXX.
Icenogle, Robert E., XXXX.
Johnson, Andrew J., XXXX.
Johnson, Russell H., XXXX.
Jones, Larry M., XXXX.
Jubin, John C., III, XXXX.
Junck, Rodger N., XXXX.
Krueger, Dean W., XXXX.
Lemke, William A., Jr., XXXX.
Lewis, Scott W., XXXX.
Livingston, John H., XXXX.
Lougee, Christopher R., XXXX.
Mayfield, James R., XXXX.
McCloud, David J., XXXX.
Miller, Harold U., XXXX.
Mullis, Asa D., Jr., XXXX.
Nelson, Gordon P., XXXX.
Parker, James R., XXXX.
Reed, Michael V., XXXX.
Roberts, Gary A., XXXX.
Ruth, Robert F., Jr., XXXX.
Simpson, Arthur T., XXXX.
Spiegel, Robert S., XXXX.
Stanley, Ronald E., XXXX.
Stricklen, Raymond, XXXX.
Surber, Frank J., XXXX.

Taylor, Thomas I., [redacted]
Thieke, Christopher D., [redacted]
Treadway, William G., [redacted]
Vrablick, Michael S., [redacted]
Walters, David C., [redacted]
Wangsgard, Brian K., [redacted]
Watts, James F., Jr., [redacted]
Weisman, Michael C., [redacted]
Williams, David E., [redacted]
Williams, Paul F., [redacted]
Wilson, Bruce D., [redacted]
Young, Freddy, R., [redacted]
Zartner, Donald C., [redacted]

U.S. ATTORNEY

Frederick B. Lacey, of New Jersey, to be U.S. Attorney for the district of New Jersey for the term of 4 years, vice David M. Satz, Jr., resigning.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 8, 1969:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Philip H. Trezise, of Michigan, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be an assistant Secretary of State.

John Richardson, Jr., of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

David D. Newsom, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

John R. Stevenson, of New York, to be legal adviser of the Department of State.

AMBASSADORS

John C. Pritzlaff, Jr., of Arizona, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Malta.

Ridgway B. Knight, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Portugal.

Joseph Palmer 2nd, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Libya.

Adolph W. Schmidt, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Canada.

Terence A. Todman, of the Virgin Islands, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Chad.

John A. Calhoun, of California, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Tunisia.

Luther I. Replogle, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iceland.

Kenneth Rush, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Republic of Germany.

J. Fife Symington, Jr., of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Trinidad and Tobago.

Samuel Z. Westerfield, Jr., of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Liberia.

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE OAS

Joseph J. Jova, of Florida, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Council of the Organization of American States, with the rank of Ambassador.

U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

William F. Buckley, Jr., of Connecticut, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information for the term of 3 years expiring Jan. 27, 1972.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

W. Byron Sorrell, of Maryland, to be an associate judge of the District of Columbia court of general sessions for the term of 10 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, July 8, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. J. Theodore Alam, Irvington United Presbyterian Church, Fremont, Calif., offered the following prayer:

James 1: 5: *If any of you lacks wisdom, let him ask God, who gives to all men generously and without reproaching, and it will be given him.*

O God, as we come to Thee this day we thank Thee for this great Nation of ours. We thank Thee that we can have a small part in determining the destiny of that Nation. But when we realize the magnitude of this responsibility we feel very humble in Thy sight, and turn to Thee for Thy divine guidance.

We bow in the shadows of those great men who have gone before.

We are sure that they too felt their need of Thy guiding hand.

We have faith to believe that even as Thou didst direct their decisions Thou wilt help us in ours.

Out of the uncertainty, confusion, and chaos we find in the world today, help us to bring order and harmony to all people.

May the peace of God that passeth all understanding be with us this day. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 11612. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 11612) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. MUNDT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE LATE JULIA EDITH KUNS ASPINALL

(Mr. ROGERS of Colorado asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I announce the death of Julia Edith Kuns Aspinall, wife of our beloved Member, the gentleman from Colorado, WAYNE N. ASPINALL.

Mrs. Aspinall died this morning at 8:15. Prayer services will be tomorrow night at 8 p.m. at the Gawler's Funeral Home on Wisconsin Avenue and Harrison Street NW. Services later will be in the State of Colorado.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to express to WAYNE ASPINALL and the members of his family my very sincerest sympathy on this loss. I knew Mrs. Aspinall, and I am certain all of us are sorry to hear of her passing.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished gentleman from Colorado in expressing the sympathy of all of us in the House to our wonderful colleague, WAYNE ASPINALL, who has this day lost his dear wife. We all love WAYNE. He is one of our finest Members, and one of the most competent committee chairmen that I have ever known. Our hearts go out to him and his children in this hour of their great sorrow. May our Heavenly Father comfort them in their grief.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I join with the distinguished gentleman from the great State of Colorado in mourning the death of such a fine and outstanding lady as the wife of the chairman of our great Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL). I extend to the gentleman and to his family the sympathies of Mrs. Haley and myself.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened by the passing of the beloved wife of our colleague, the gentleman from Colorado, WAYNE ASPINALL. WAYNE and I came to the Congress in the same Congress on January 3, 1949. Our offices were across the corridor from one another. As a consequence, I became a close personal friend of WAYNE ASPINALL,