

think so. But something more than wishful thinking at the White House and apparent disinterest on Capitol Hill will be necessary if anything is to be done before the present legislation expires.

NEW ASSOCIATION OF BLACK CONSULTANTS CHARGES FEDERAL AGENCIES SUPPORT RACIAL BIAS IN CONTRACT AWARDS—NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BLACK CONSULTANTS AND URBANOLOGISTS

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1969

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the National Association of Black Consultants, a newly formed group of black-owned private consultant firms, announced today that—

A petrified pattern of black discrimination, collusion, and white favoritism controls the awarding of contracts by Federal agencies to private white consulting firms.

The association charged:

There is a prima facie case of blatant favoritism in the awarding of Federal contracts to pre-selected white firms and a callous contempt for black consulting firms.

An amount of \$500,000,000 in Federal funds for consulting services will be expended during FY 1970. Of the approximately 400 firms in the consulting industry, a mere 20 firms or 5 percent will receive 60 percent of the expenditures. On the other hand, the 80 black-owned firms which comprise 20 percent of the total number of firms, will receive less than 1 percent of these same Federal expenditures.

Member firms of the NABCU have over \$10 million worth of pending proposals with various Federal agencies. They indicated:

During the next few weeks the Association will examine very closely the actions of those agencies in the awarding of these contracts.

If there is to be any implementation of this Administration's commitment to the black community to generate more community-controlled programs and more black self-help in developing a viable economic base for the black community's growth, one way to begin is with the maximum utilization of black professionals.

NABCU does not claim any kind of a priori expertise on the black experience. But by the same token, it vigorously opposes the prevailing plantation psychosis in the Federal government that only white experts, white consultants and white urbanologists are able to program the economic, educational and social growth of the black community.

Unless white tokenism ceases in the awarding of Federal contracts to all black companies, corporations and firms, an irreversible alienation between black and white will become endemic.

NABCU suggested that the Federal Government could take affirmative action in three areas to implement a policy of equal achievement in the consulting industry:

1. Enforcement of the equal opportunity programs of Federal agencies by reviewing all contracts awarded and determining whether a pattern of favoritism exists for certain pre-selected white firms.

2. Maximization of small business participation in Government procurements through section 8(A) of the Small Business Act.

3. An investigation by the Department of Justice to determine violations of antitrust regulations in the awarding of consulting contracts and to determine the extent of col-

lusion of certain segments of industry with officials in the Federal Government.

NABCU said it was currently in the process of securing meetings with administration leaders and agency heads to present documentation of their charges and to demand an immediate end to this pattern of discrimination and bias in the awarding of Government contracts.

The National Association of Black Consultants and Urbanologists is a Washington-based organization of black-owned consulting firms and urban planning companies. It was formed as the result of a meeting in Atlanta, Ga., in December 1968.

A partial listing of member firms include:

1. Association Control Research Analysis, James Gee, President.
2. B.L.K. Group, Inc., Kenneth Vallis, President.
3. Burrell Associates, Berkeley G. Burrell, President.
4. Curber Associates, Dr. Bert Phillips, President.
5. Impact Studies, Inc., Phillip A. Chase, President.
6. Sam Harris Associates, Ltd., Samuel E. Harris, President.
7. Koba Enterprises, Inc., Ford T. Johnson, Jr., President.
8. Roy Littlejohn Associates, Roy Littlejohn, President.
9. The Match Institution, Timothy L. Jenkins, Chairman.
10. Nellum Associates, Al Nellum, President.
11. Opportunity Systems, Inc., George H. Walker, President.
12. SACAPS, Napoleon Rhodes, President.
13. Supportive Services, Inc., Edward Scraggs, President.
14. J. Cameron Wade & Associates, Inc., Jay C. Wade, President.
15. 2MJQ Environmental Research and Development, Development Corporation, Casey Mann II.

SENATE—Thursday, July 10, 1969

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

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

Almighty God, King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, from whom proceeds all power and dominion in heaven and on earth, we beseech Thee to look with favor upon Thy servants, the President of the United States, the Members of the Congress, the diplomats in distant places, the leaders of our military forces, and all others whom we have set in authority. Imbue them with the spirit of wisdom, goodness, and truth; and so rule their hearts and bless their endeavors that they may lead us in high achievement and steadfast righteousness. May these days of crisis be times of spiritual renewal and moral resurgence when the nations of the earth find their way to true brotherhood and lasting peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of

Wednesday, July 9, 1969, be dispensed with.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order previously entered, the Chair recognizes the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) for not to exceed 40 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. HOLLINGS. I yield.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR HOLLAND

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the distinguished senior Senator from Florida (Mr. HOLLAND) be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

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

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLINGS. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Just for an inquiry. Under a previous order, the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON) is to speak after the morning hour. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised that the Senator from Nevada is to be recognized at the conclusion of the morning business, under the order heretofore entered.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLINGS. I yield.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

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

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

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR THURMOND

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLINGS. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if it is proper and in order, I should like to request of the Chair that the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) be recognized for 30 minutes after the Senator from Nevada speaks.

Mr. MANSFIELD. On the bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. On the bill; yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the senior Senator from South Carolina will be recognized for 30 minutes at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Nevada.

EFFECT OF U.S. FOREIGN TRADE POLICY ON BASIC MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, we are in the 7th month of the 91st Congress and of the new administration. Congress has been patiently awaiting the development of administration programs in many areas before rolling up its own sleeves and getting down to the task of legislating solutions to the difficult problems which challenge the health, welfare, and economic security of the American people.

Included in the major problems requiring our attention is that of our Nation's foreign trade policy, especially as it relates to our basic manufacturing industries. Many of America's basic industries are facing strong and increasing import competition. Some indication of the wide-ranging extent of this problem is given in a recent report of the Trade Relations Council of the United States.

Using U.S. Government statistics, the council made a computer analysis of employment, output, and foreign trade of 349 of the Nation's 425 manufacturing industries as defined at the 4-digit level of the standard industrial classification. The correlation of foreign trade data with domestic employment and output data at this level of industry classification is a difficult undertaking. Data were available to make such an analysis possible for the period 1958 through 1966 for a total of 313 industries.

Mr. President, the 313 industries accounted in 1966 for about two-thirds of total employment in all U.S. manufacturing industries. They supplied 85 percent of the value of shipments of manufactured goods in 1966. Products like

or competitive with the output of these 313 industries accounted for 99 percent of total U.S. imports of manufactured goods in 1966, and of 85 percent of U.S. exports. These data show that the 313 industries are quite representative of the manufacturing sector of the U.S. economy.

Of the 313 industries, the council found that there were 128 which experienced a balance of trade deficit in 1967. These 128 industries accounted for 25 percent of total employment in all manufacturing industries in 1966, and for 29 percent of the value of shipments of manufactured goods. Imports of manufactures were concentrated in the product lines of these industries to such an extent that articles like or competitive with their output accounted for about two-thirds of the total imports of manufactured products in 1966, but their exports accounted for only 12 percent of total U.S. exports.

From the point of view of the impact of this imbalance in foreign trade on the United States, it is most significant that the balance of trade deficit in these industries was equivalent, at the value of shipments per worker in each industry, to a net loss of nearly 368,000 jobs. For the most part, these 128 industries are labor-intensive industries, so that the lost employment opportunities represent the waste of an especially precious asset to the Nation; namely, job opportunities for comparatively unskilled workers.

It is our hard-core unemployed, residents of economically distressed inner city areas, and the less developed sectors of our Nation such as the Appalachian region, who are the principal victims of the loss of job opportunities represented by the extreme foreign trade imbalance in the products of these 128 industries.

Mr. President, Members of this body are aware that I have been vigilant, in season and out of season, in my efforts to secure relief from excessive import pressures for the textile industry. My efforts to contribute to a solution of the textile import problem should not be taken, however, as any indication that I am less interested in the comparably distressed position of other basic manufacturing industries in my State and in the Nation.

Mr. President, economic hardship to U.S. manufacturing industries stems primarily, though not exclusively, from our trade with Japan. The previously mentioned study of the Trade Relations Council shows that in 1967, of our foreign trade in manufactured products, we experienced a deficit of \$1.3 billion in our trade with Japan. Our next largest deficit was incurred in our foreign trade in manufactures with West Germany, where we suffered a deficit of nearly \$600 million—large but less than half as great as that we experienced in our trade with Japan.

Mr. President, the experience of my own State is a reflection of what is happening broadly in the Nation as a result of the inordinate volume and rate of increase of imported manufactured

goods. South Carolina has made strenuous and highly successful efforts to attract manufacturing industries to establish facilities and jobs within the State. This is part of the major and important efforts which the entire South has made to escape from the limiting economic effects of being merely an agricultural economy.

We currently have 786,000 residents of our State who are employed on nonagricultural payrolls, and 330,000 of them are employed in manufacturing occupations. During the past 10 years, employment in manufacturing industries in South Carolina has increased more rapidly than total employment on nonagricultural payrolls. In 1967, there were nearly 3,300 manufacturing establishments operating in South Carolina with an annual payroll of about one and a half billion dollars. Of the major industries located in our State, the following experienced a foreign trade deficit nationally in 1968:

Textile mill products, \$437.3 million. At the output per worker shown by the 1967 Census of Manufactures of \$21,232, this foreign trade deficit represented the loss of 20,600 jobs.

Apparel and related products, \$674.5 million. At an output per worker of \$15,224, this foreign trade deficit represented the loss of 44,316 jobs.

Lumber and wood products, \$317.2 million. At an output per worker of \$19,316, this foreign trade deficit represented the loss of 16,418 jobs.

Paper and allied products, \$431 million. At an output per worker of \$32,546, this foreign trade deficit represented the loss of 13,240 jobs.

Stone, clay, and glass products, \$515.1 million. At an output per worker of \$24,412, this foreign trade deficit represented the loss of 21,103 jobs.

Iron and steel mills and foundries, \$1,430.9 million. At an output per worker of \$32,613, this foreign trade deficit represented the loss of 43,880 jobs.

Miscellaneous manufactured articles, \$416.7 million. At an output per worker of \$19,889, this foreign trade deficit represented the loss of 20,951 jobs.

These seven basic manufacturing industries are of major importance to the economy of South Carolina. Together they provide employment for 222,000 residents of our State, over 70 percent of the manufacturing jobs in the State. Neither my State nor the Nation can afford to ignore the fact that U.S. foreign trade in products like or directly competitive with the articles produced by these seven industries resulted in a deficit of \$4.2 billion. Further, we must be concerned about the loss of 180,508 new or existing jobs in these industries.

Mr. President, to this point in my remarks I have not alluded to the very serious import problems affecting the domestic footwear industry. There are no footwear manufacturing plants in the State of South Carolina, but in view of my general interest in the national aspects of the foreign trade problems affecting our basic manufacturing industries, I am, of course, familiar with the serious plight of the domestic footwear industry.

In 1968, our Nation had a balance of trade deficit of \$377.3 million in footwear. In that year, domestic consumption of leather footwear amounted to 804.0 million pairs of shoes, of which imports supplied 175.4 million pairs. Thus in 1968, imports were equivalent to 21.8 percent of domestic consumption, up sharply from the import penetration ratio of 5.8 percent in 1961. There can be no question about the fact that the domestic footwear industry is faced with a very serious problem.

The rapid increase in the penetration of the domestic market by imports has contributed to an absolute loss of 3,100 jobs in the industry during the 1961-68 period. The latest data for the month of May 1969 shows that employment has decreased by an additional 6,000 jobs in comparison with the average employment in 1968.

Mr. President, my priority of attention to the import problems of the textile industry is based upon the fact that the textile and apparel group accounts for 182,000 of the 222,000 jobs provided by this group of industries in South Carolina.

It is not merely on the basis of employment in South Carolina that the textile import problem calls for priority of attention. With 2,525,000 workers, the textile mill products, apparel, and man-made fiber producing industries are by far the Nation's largest employers of workers among manufacturing industries.

But I say to my friends from other States who are concerned, as I am, not only with textiles but with steel, footwear, glass, wood products, paper, chinaware and pottery, synthetic organic chemicals, and electronic products, that the national policy we establish in the textile import area should be useful in guiding the way to a legislative solution in these other basic industrial product areas. I ask them, therefore, to join with me in setting about to exercise in a constructive way the initiative which belongs to the Congress under our Constitution to fashion a policy for the regulation of foreign commerce in the textile area with the realization that in so doing, they will also be contributing to the establishment of national policy for the regulation of imports in the product areas of these other basic and import-sensitive manufacturing industries.

Mr. President, this brings me in my remarks to a specific consideration of the policy problems which some people believe to exist in applying a corrective to the excessive importation of textile articles into the United States.

When Secretary of Commerce Stans together with his associates traveled to Western Europe and then to the Far East to consult with our Nation's trading partners concerning the textile import problem, he found that he had been preceded by an advance man not of his choosing who had undertaken to brief representatives of the foreign governments and their textile industries concerning that

person's concept of the textile import problem. I refer, Mr. President, to the general counsel for the American Importers Association who traveled in advance of Secretary Stans to present information evidently intended to fortify the other nations to resist the invitation of the United States, expressed through Secretary Stans, to engage in meaningful consultation in regard to the U.S. textile import problem. These views on behalf of the American Importers Association are set forth in a memorandum which, with unanimous consent, I ask to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, as Members of this body are aware, those of us who have been concentrating on the search for a solution to the textile import problem during this and preceding administrations encounter frequently arguments conceived by Americans who act as apologists for maintaining the status quo in defense of the assumed economic interests of those foreign countries who are the principal suppliers of imported textile articles into the U.S. market.

These arguments have a sameness in quality and in concept. Much of the content of the paper distributed on behalf of the American Importers Association consists of such arguments, newly adorned with statistical array.

Mr. President, the memorandum of the American Importers Association serves a useful purpose by bringing out into the open and reducing to writing the arguments being used behind the scenes in opposing the achievement of an agreeable solution to the textile import problem. It deserves our careful study, and it is now my purpose to take up one at a time the contentions of the importers' paper and to refute them with incontrovertible fact. I shall support my analysis of that paper with statistical data compiled from official sources and ask unanimous consent that my numbered tables be inserted at the appropriate places in my remarks.

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

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, first, the importers assert that "the textile industry has enjoyed a phenomenal growth from 1961 through 1968." The word "phenomenal" means extraordinary or remarkable, according to Webster's Third International Dictionary. The record shows that the textile industry's growth has been neither extraordinary nor remarkable. In the data presented in my table 1, it is established that during the period 1961 through 1968 the average annual rate of growth in the sales of textile mill products and apparel was below that of the average of all manufacturing industries in the United States. Can a below-average rate of growth fairly be described as "phenomenal," Mr. President?

TABLE 1.—U.S. SALES OF TEXTILE MILL PRODUCTS AND APPAREL COMPARED WITH ALL MANUFACTURING, 1961-68
(Sales in millions of dollars)

	Textile mill products		Apparel		All manufacturing	
	Sales	Change (percent)	Sales	Change (percent)	Sales	Change (percent)
1961	\$13,398		\$12,365		\$356,424	
1962	14,449	+7.84	13,241	+7.08	389,917	+9.40
1963	15,092	+4.45	13,696	+3.44	412,678	+5.89
1964	16,249	+7.67	14,880	+8.64	443,072	+7.37
1965	18,028	+10.95	16,263	+9.29	492,201	+11.09
1966	19,513	+8.24	18,110	+11.36	554,180	+12.59
1967	18,672	-4.31	18,170	-0.33	575,427	+3.83
1968	20,841	+11.62	20,718	+14.02	631,911	+9.82
Average annual change (percent)		+6.64		+7.74		+8.57

Source: FTC-SEC quarterly financial report for manufacturing corporations.

Second, the importers' memorandum, under the heading "Analysis," offers the statement that "every indicator of performance shows a picture of health and growth in the textile and apparel industries." I have just shown that this is not the case when measured by the sales of the industry. Now let me turn to the next indicator referred to by the importer, that of profits.

My table 2 shows that profits of both the textile mill products and apparel industries, whether measured before taxes or after taxes, expressed as a percent of sales, persisted far below the average of all manufacturing industries, and below profits of the nondurable goods industries, to which textiles and apparel are most closely identified, throughout

the 1961-68 period. The ratio of profits after taxes to sales for the apparel industry remained less than half that of the nondurable goods and all manufacturing industries throughout the period, while those of the textile mill products industry failed to rise above 60 percent of the average of all manufacturing and nondurable goods industries by the end of that period.

Mr. President, can two basic manufacturing industries be said to evidence "a picture of health and growth" from the standpoint of profits when their earnings rate remains from 40 to 50 percent below that of the average of all manufacturing industries and of the nondurable goods sector of manufacturing industries throughout the most recent 8-year period?

TABLE 2.—THE COMPARATIVE "PROFIT" PERFORMANCE OF THE TEXTILE MILL PRODUCTS AND APPAREL INDUSTRIES 1961-68

	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968
[Dollar amounts in millions]								
Textile mill products:								
Profits before taxes.....	\$589	\$724	\$721	\$947	\$1,268	\$1,272	\$982	\$1,276
Profits after taxes.....	\$280	\$354	\$354	\$507	\$694	\$702	\$540	\$654
Profits as a percent of sales:								
Before taxes (percent).....	4.4	5.0	4.8	5.8	7.0	6.5	5.3	6.1
After taxes (percent).....	2.1	2.4	2.3	3.1	3.8	3.6	2.9	3.1
Apparel:								
Profits before taxes.....	\$331	\$415	\$414	\$553	\$644	\$740	\$728	\$931
Profits after taxes.....	\$157	\$212	\$189	\$318	\$377	\$432	\$420	\$507
Profits as a percent of sales:								
Before taxes (percent).....	2.7	3.1	3.0	3.7	3.9	4.1	4.0	4.5
After taxes (percent).....	1.3	1.6	1.4	2.1	2.3	2.4	2.3	2.4
Nondurable goods industries:								
Profits before taxes.....	\$13,862	\$15,114	\$16,421	\$18,324	\$20,260	\$22,610	\$22,050	\$24,756
Profits after taxes.....	\$8,450	\$9,150	\$10,011	\$11,611	\$12,983	\$14,564	\$14,429	\$15,546
Profits as a percent of sales:								
Before taxes (percent).....	7.6	7.8	8.1	8.5	8.6	8.6	8.0	8.4
After taxes (percent).....	4.7	4.7	4.9	5.4	5.5	5.5	5.3	5.3
All manufacturing industries:								
Profits before taxes.....	\$27,508	\$31,863	\$34,924	\$39,567	\$46,487	\$51,787	\$47,772	\$55,405
Profits after taxes.....	\$15,308	\$17,727	\$19,481	\$23,208	\$27,521	\$30,934	\$29,008	\$32,069
Profits as a percent of sales:								
Before taxes (percent).....	7.7	8.2	8.5	8.9	9.4	9.3	8.3	8.8
After taxes (percent).....	4.3	4.6	4.7	5.2	5.6	5.6	5.0	5.1

Source: FTC-SEC quarterly financial report for manufacturing corporations.

Third, the importers point to the fact that shipments in 1968 were larger than shipments in 1961 by some 55 percent as though that in some way corroborated their claim of "phenomenal growth" by the U.S. textile industry. The fact of the matter is, as my table 3 establishes, that shipments of textile mill products and apparel increased at a slower rate than

the average of all manufacturing industries. Again, Mr. President, the question may fairly be posed: Is an expansion in the value of shipments at a rate below that experienced by the average of all manufacturing industries any evidence of "phenomenal growth"? In my book "below average" is not equal to "extraordinary" or "phenomenal."

TABLE 3.—VALUE OF SHIPMENTS BY THE TEXTILE MILL PRODUCTS AND APPAREL INDUSTRIES COMPARED WITH ALL MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES, 1961-68

	Textile mill products		Home goods and apparel		All manufacturing	
	Value of shipments	Change (percent)	Value of shipments	Change (percent)	Value of shipments	Change (percent)
1961.....	13,999		36,997		370,612	
1962.....	15,154	+8.25	39,555	+6.91	399,696	+7.85
1963.....	16,537	+9.13	39,759	+0.52	417,291	+4.40
1964.....	17,808	+7.69	41,750	+5.01	445,552	+6.77
1965.....	19,318	+8.48	44,909	+7.57	483,343	+8.48
1966.....	20,407	+5.64	49,609	+10.47	528,448	+9.33
1967.....	19,241	-5.71	51,206	+3.22	548,542	+3.80
1968.....	21,458	+11.52	55,126	+7.66	603,718	+10.06
Average annual change.....		+6.43		+5.91		+7.24

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, "Business Statistics," 1967; "Survey of Current Business," June 1969.

Fourth, the importers' text is unclear but implies that production of textile mill products and apparel increased rapidly over the period. The fact of the matter is that in production, as in the case of the other indicators which I have discussed, the performance of the textile mill products and apparel industries was significantly below the average of all manufacturing industries. A rate of in-

crease well below the average of all manufacturing industries cannot fairly be characterized as a rapid increase. The word "rapid" connotes some relative measure. If we gage the pace of production by the benchmark of the average of all manufacturing industries, we find that production of textile mill products and apparel increased relatively slowly, not rapidly. This is shown by my table 4.

TABLE 4.—INDEX OF PRODUCTION IN THE TEXTILE MILL PRODUCTS AND APPAREL INDUSTRIES COMPARED WITH ALL MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES, 1961-68

	Textile mill products		Apparel		All manufacturing	
	Index	Change (percent)	Index	Change (percent)	Index	Change (percent)
1961.....	107.1		112.1		109.6	
1962.....	115.3	+7.66	118.9	+6.07	118.7	+8.30
1963.....	116.9	+1.39	125.6	+5.63	124.9	+5.22
1964.....	122.9	+5.13	134.1	+6.77	133.1	+6.57
1965.....	134.9	+9.76	145.1	+8.20	145.0	+8.94
1966.....	142.5	+5.63	150.1	+3.45	158.6	+9.38
1967.....	142.0	-0.35	147.6	-1.67	159.7	+0.69
1968.....	150.4	+5.92	149.4	-1.22	166.2	+4.07
Average annual change.....		+5.02		+4.24		+6.17

Source: Federal Reserve Board.

Fifth, the importers cite a gain of about 300,000 workers in the textile mill products and apparel industries as additional evidence of "phenomenal growth" between 1961 and 1968. The facts are again contrary to the impression which the importers' statement purports to convey.

In my table 5 I have traced the growth in employment in the textile mill products and apparel industries compared with all manufacturing and compared with the growth in the Nation's total labor force. It is very significant, I believe, that the average annual rate of change in employment in the textile mill products industry is only about half that of all manufacturing industries, and is well below the rate of growth in the Nation's total labor force. Clearly the textile mill products industry is being retarded in its capacity to generate new employment to accommodate its share of the responsibility for providing jobs for the Nation's ever-increasing labor force.

It is of interest that while the apparel industry is increasing employment at an average annual rate far below that of the average of all manufacturing industries, it has maintained a growth of employment in excess of the rate of growth in the Nation's labor force. Realistically we must recognize that the tremendous quantities of broadwoven and knitted fabric being imported into the United States are the raw material for apparel plants, where it is cut and sewn into finished textile products. The apparel industry is being forced, as other American industries before it have been forced, to attempt to stay alive in the face of import competition by reducing its costs wherever possible, including the substitution of cheap foreign-produced fabric for the more expensive domestic article.

The employment growth rates in my table 5 clearly suggest that the victim of these combined pressures is the textile mill products industry whose employment growth rate is significantly below that of the apparel industry—though, as I have already pointed out, growth in apparel employment is far below the rate of growth in all manufacturing industries.

In any event, Mr. President these data certainly do not support the use which the importers attempt to make of the overall change in employment; namely, as support for their thesis that the textile industry has enjoyed a "phenomenal growth" during the past 8 years.

Sixth, the importers turn to statistics concerning the mill consumption of fibers in a further effort to bolster their notion that the textile industry has enjoyed phenomenal growth and is the picture of health. They content themselves with calling attention to the fact that the amount of fiber consumed in 1968 was 47 percent greater than that consumed in 1961 and calling attention to the increased use of manmade fibers in U.S. textile operations.

It is not surprising, Mr. President, that U.S. textile mill consumption reflects an increased use of manmade fibers in comparison with cotton and wool. The American textile industry has pioneered, innovated, and promoted the use of manmade fibers, alone and in blends, in con-

ventional and new fabric constructions in an imaginative effort to gain and hold the allegiance of consumers for increased expenditures for textile articles. To a de-

gree this effort was successful in the past, and it is this success that for a time helped cushion the blow of the rising import competition.

TABLE 5.—EMPLOYMENT IN THE TEXTILE MILL PRODUCTS AND APPAREL INDUSTRIES COMPARED WITH ALL MANUFACTURING AND WITH THE NATION'S TOTAL LABOR FORCE, 1961-68

[Employment data in thousands]

	Textile mill products		Apparel		All manufacturing		The Nation's total labor force	
	Employment	Change (percent)	Employment	Change (percent)	Employment	Change (percent)	Employment	Change (percent)
1961	893.4		1,214.5		16,326		73,031	
1962	902.3	+1.00	1,263.7	+4.05	16,853	+3.23	73,342	+0.43
1963	885.4	-1.87	1,282.8	+1.51	16,995	+0.84	74,571	+1.68
1964	892.0	+0.75	1,302.5	+1.54	17,274	+1.64	75,830	+1.69
1965	925.6	+3.77	1,354.2	+3.97	18,062	+4.56	77,178	+1.78
1966	961.5	+3.88	1,398.8	+3.29	19,186	+6.22	78,893	+2.22
1967	951.5	-1.04	1,390.7	-0.58	19,434	+1.29	80,793	+2.41
1968	984.9	+3.51	1,416.8	+1.88	19,740	+1.57	82,272	+1.83
Average annual change		+1.43		+2.24		+2.76		+1.72

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics.

As the liberally administered restraints of the Long-Term Cotton Textile Arrangement placed some limitations, however generous, on exports of cotton textiles to the United States, the principal supplying nations shifted increasingly to the use of manmade fibers, alone and in blends, in part to escape the restraints under the LTA, and in part to take advantage of the consumer demand which had been stimulated by the developmental and promotional programs of the U.S. textile industry.

As in the case of the other alleged indicators of phenomenal growth cited by the importers, it is not sufficient, as they do, merely to call attention to the fact that there has been an increase in the consumption of fibers. I can accept for purposes of discussion the thesis of the importers that overall fiber consumption should be considered rather than a segmented study of cotton, wool, and manmade fibers. Indeed, I am happy to see the importers take this position, as it is precisely this fact which has been the basis for the efforts of the American industry and textile State Members of Congress to persuade the executive branch of the Government to recognize that the textile industry complex is interdependent from a fiber point of view and that all-fiber regulation is required, not merely imports of cotton textiles.

The fact is, however, Mr. President, that the rate of increase in mill consumption of all fibers in the United States has lagged seriously behind the increase in consumer disposable income and of personal consumer expenditures for clothing articles in the United States. It is also significant that textile sales valued in constant dollars have grown at a rate very close to that of mill consumption, both being far off the pace of the growth in consumer disposable income and expenditures for clothing.

As will be shown in a subsequent section of my remarks, the mill consumption of fibers standing alone is an insufficient indication of the pace of activity in the textile mill products industry. The heart of this industry is represented by the establishments en-

gaged in the production of fabric for use in apparel. A substantial part of the fiber consumed in the United States goes into floor coverings and industrial textiles. The growth rate in these sectors, including, notably, tufted carpets and rugs, has been exceptional and the amount of fiber consumed in such manufacturing activity tends to invalidate the use of mill consumption data standing alone as an index of textile mill activity. This point is emphasized by the data in my table 6 concerning the production of broadwoven goods, where the annual average rate of change is far, far below the increase in the mill consumption of fibers.

These facts, established by my table 6, refute the suggestion contained in the importers' memorandum that in some way the change in mill consumption of fibers supports their general thesis. The facts as set forth in my table 6 show that in this area, as in the case of the other factors cited by the importers, the truth is opposite to the impression they seek to create.

Seventh, the importers next contend that "imports have increased modestly in comparison with the spectacular growth in mill consumption." They in-

sist that data pertaining to the apparent domestic consumption of textiles and to imports be evaluated on an overall pound equivalent basis. They then point to the smaller increase in the quantity of textile imports than they assert occurred in the textile mill consumption of fibers as support for their contention that "there has been no injury to domestic production due to imports."

The importers' argument is facile: By substituting the concept of "injury to domestic production" for the more appropriate test of "injury to the domestic industry" the importers seek to avoid the implications of the retarded growth rate in employment and sales, and the marginal earnings performance of the textile mill products and apparel industries in comparison with the average of all manufacturing industries which I have previously discussed and documented.

Their stratagem should not succeed, Mr. President, because it is addressed superficially and in a misleading way to a fragment of the data reflective of the industry's situation which is far less cogent in evaluating the industry's position than the systematic analysis which I have presented in these remarks.

A study of the relationship of imports to the mill consumption of fibers can be helpful, Mr. President, if it is approached with a correct understanding of the structural nature of the textile import problem and with appropriate methodology. This I shall now undertake to do.

A fair analysis of the textile import problem must begin with the recognition that manmade staple fiber, filaments, and filament yarn are textile articles, recognized as such by the United Nation's Standard International Trade Classification, the Brussels Nomenclature, the Tariff Schedules of the United States, the Tariff Commission in its January 1968 report on "Textiles and Apparel" made at the joint behest of the President and the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, by the textile industry itself in its testimony before congressional committees and the Tariff Commission, and in the definitions of all of the pending textile import quota bills.

TABLE 6.—TEXTILE MANUFACTURING ACTIVITY AS MEASURED BY MILL CONSUMPTION OF FIBERS, BROADWOVEN GOODS PRODUCTION, AND TEXTILE SALES IN CONSTANT DOLLARS, 1961-68

	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	Average annual change (percent)
Mill consumption of all fibers (millions of pounds)	6,561.0	7,042.1	7,246.1	7,782.1	8,494.4	9,007.5	8,982.0	9,781.7	+5.92
Percent of change		+7.33	+2.90	+7.40	+9.15	+6.03	-0.28	+8.90	
Broadwoven goods production, all fibers (millions of linear yards)	11,863	12,301	12,104	12,766	13,431	13,304	12,753	12,968	+1.34
Percent of change		+3.69	-1.60	+5.47	+5.21	-0.95	-4.14	+1.69	
Textile sales, 1961 (millions of dollars)	\$13,973	\$14,971	\$15,510	\$16,673	\$17,910	\$19,311	\$19,279	\$20,708	+5.82
Percent of change		+7.14	+3.60	+7.50	+7.42	+7.82	-0.17	+7.41	
Consumer disposable income (billions of dollars)	\$364.4	\$385.3	\$404.6	\$438.1	\$473.2	\$511.6	\$546.3	\$589.0	+7.11
Percent of change		+5.74	+5.01	+8.28	+8.01	+8.11	+6.78	+7.82	
Personal consumption expenditures:									
Clothing and shoes (billions of dollars)	\$27.9	\$29.6	\$30.6	\$33.5	\$35.9	\$39.8	\$42.1	\$45.7	+7.33
Percent of change		+6.09	+3.38	+9.48	+7.16	+10.86	+5.78	+8.55	

Source: Textile Organon, March 1969; Bureau of the Census; Bureau of Labor Statistics

This recognition leads necessarily to the inclusion of imports of manmade fibers in the data which undertake to measure in pound equivalents, imports of textile articles. Just as imports of apparel articles have an impact upon the textile mills which weave fabric by displacing the consumption of domestic fabric by domestic apparel plants, so, too, the importation of apparel, fabric, yarn, and staple of manmade fiber have an impact upon the manmade fiber producers, part of the textile industry complex, by displacing domestically produced fiber in textile articles destined for consumption in the U.S. market.

The importers ignore this basic fact in their memorandum and, hence, their

data significantly understate the true extent of import penetration of manmade fibers as measured by the ratio of imports to domestic consumption of fiber. My table 7 sets forth the data pertinent to this measurement. The importers have undertaken to measure only the ratio of imports of secondary textile articles to domestic consumption, whereas the true measure must be based upon the ratio of total imports of textile articles, including manmade fibers, to domestic consumption. Thus, the correct measurement of the import penetration of textile articles on an all-fiber basis in the year 1968 is 10.5 percent rather than the 7.7 percent claimed by the importers in their memorandum.

TABLE 7-A.—RATIO OF IMPORTS OF TEXTILE ARTICLES TO DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION, 1961-68

[Amounts in millions of pounds of fiber]

	Domestic consumption	Imports		Total	Ratio of imports to domestic consumption (percent)	
		Primary manmade fiber products	Secondary cotton, wool, and manmade fiber products		Secondary	Total
1961.....	6,564.0	60.1	339.8	399.9	5.2	6.1
1962.....	7,206.4	87.6	486.0	573.6	6.7	8.0
1963.....	7,422.2	145.2	493.0	638.2	6.6	8.6
1964.....	7,938.0	158.2	491.3	649.5	6.2	8.2
1965.....	8,758.9	159.3	595.7	755.0	6.8	8.6
1966.....	9,425.4	212.7	772.2	984.9	8.2	10.4
1967.....	9,339.0	196.3	697.8	894.1	7.5	9.6
1968.....	10,235.5	293.2	784.3	1,077.5	7.7	10.5

Source: Textile Organon, March 1969.

But these data, even when corrected as by my table 7-A, still conceal the true extent of the import penetration of textile articles in the most seriously affected area of the industry; namely, the apparel manufacturing sector with the supporting textile mill products operations which supply the yarn and fabric which ultimately become apparel articles. It is possible to determine that portion of the mill consumption of textile fibers in the United States which has apparel as its end use. Imports of yarn, fabric, and apparel on a fiber pound equivalent basis can then be related to the domestic consumption of fiber for apparel use to derive a more accurate indication of the extent of import penetration in this major and most sensitive sector of the textile industry. This analysis is presented in my table 7-B, which establishes that in 1968 imports accounted for nearly 18 percent of domestic consumption of textile fiber in apparel manufacture, more than double the extent of import penetration in 1961.

Mr. President, the use of overall statistics concerning imports and domestic consumption on an all-fiber basis not only tends to obscure the heavy impact of imports in the apparel sector of the industry and those sectors of the textile mill products and fiber industry which support apparel manufacturing; it also obscures the very grave position of the woolen and worsted industry in the United States as a result of inordinate import pressures. My table 7-C shows that the penetration of textile articles of wool has risen to the extraordinary level of 31.3 percent in the year 1968, up sharply from the already excessive level

of imports which existed in 1961 of 23.8 percent.

TABLE 7-B.—RATIO OF THE AGGREGATE IMPORTS OF YARN FABRIC, AND APPAREL TO THE DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION OF FIBER IN APPAREL END USE, 1961-68

[Amounts in millions of pounds]

	Domestic consumption of fiber in apparel end use	Imports of yarn, fabric, and apparel	Ratio of imports to domestic consumption (percent)
1961.....	2,883	270.2	9.4
1962.....	3,065	408.1	13.3
1963.....	3,152	430.5	13.7
1964.....	3,342	424.5	12.7
1965.....	3,469	526.1	15.2
1966.....	3,618	680.3	18.8
1967.....	3,623	612.7	16.9
1968.....	13,971	699.6	17.6

¹ 1968 consumption calculated based on ratio of apparel end use to total consumption in 1967, applied to 1968 domestic fiber consumption as reported in source.

Source: Textile Organon, March issues, 1964, 1966, 1969; January 1969.

TABLE 7-C.—RATIO OF IMPORTS TO DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION FOR WOOL, 1961-68

[Amounts in millions of pounds]

	Domestic consumption	Imports	Ratio of imports to domestic consumption (percent)
1961.....	535.0	127.4	23.8
1962.....	570.3	145.6	25.5
1963.....	558.6	152.5	27.3
1964.....	490.8	141.1	28.7
1965.....	527.5	156.1	29.6
1966.....	500.4	142.9	28.6
1967.....	423.5	121.7	28.7
1968.....	466.4	146.0	31.3

Source: Textile, Organon, March 1969

Mr. President, the issue posed by the contentions of the American Importers Association and the currency which those contentions gained as a result of their energetic distribution and exposition by that association's representatives in advance of Secretary Stans' visit to the nations whose representatives he consulted in regard to the U.S. textile import problem can be stated as follows: Does the Congress wish, as a matter of policy, to leave without remedy basic American industries whose rate of growth is retarded under the pressure of excessive and rapidly increasing import competition to a degree where such industries fall below the average rate of growth of the manufacturing sector of the American economy and below the rate of growth required if the industry is to contribute proportionately to the employment of the growing labor force of the Nation?

The importers seek to obscure this fundamental issue by simplistic presentation of absolute growth figures over an 8-year period without in a single instance relating such growth to the growth of the Nation's work force, or of its economy, or of the manufacturing sector of the economy, or to the earnings performance of other industries. The essence of the importers' position is that the Congress ought not to inquire into the relative performance and growth of the textile industry in comparison with the rest of the American economy nor be concerned about a submarginal growth rate for a basic American industry.

Mr. President, I believe that the issue is clearly joined by the type of attack which the American Importers Association is making upon the U.S. textile industry and the manner in which the importers have set about to obfuscate the essential facts.

To my colleagues in this body I state that the time has come when we must cleanly and squarely face up to our responsibilities. It is we who are charged with the regulation of foreign commerce. It is we who are expected to strike a balance between the legitimate interests of foreign nations intent upon trading with the United States and benefiting by our open market, on the one hand, and the equally legitimate interests of American industries to sustain on a reasonable basis their work force and economic growth so that they may continue to contribute to the strength and well-being of our Nation.

It is not, Mr. President, a heinous act for Members of this body to respond to their constitutional responsibilities. It is not an unworthy act for a Congress which has always been keenly sensitive to our Nation's moral and legal obligations to other members of the community of nations to act now to develop a policy based upon concepts of fairness and equity which will afford our basic domestic industries at least an equal opportunity to share in the economic life and progress of our Nation.

In view of our traditions, we recognize as Americans that freedom is accompanied by responsibility. The right to freedom of choice does not give any of us the right to shout "fire" in a crowded

theater, nor the right to drive at a reckless rate of speed irrespective of the right of others on a public highway. By act of Congress our free enterprise system does not give any American manufacturer the right to pay wages below the statutory minimum nor to require his employees to work in excess of the maximum hours without the payment of the prescribed overtime. Our free enterprise system must also yield to the strictures of the antitrust laws and to the prohibition contained in the Federal Trade Commission Act against the use of unfair practices in commerce.

Why is it that we in the Congress, with the full realization that no responsible member or group in society have the right to exercise their liberty in a way that does positive harm to their neighbors, refuse to recognize the true nature of excessive import competition based upon the competitive advantage of wage scales and working conditions which are outlawed in this country? Opponents of import regulation choose to state the problem in terms of simplistic alternatives, using expressions such as "shutting out imports." That type of dialog does a disservice to the difficult task which is our responsibility as Members of the Congress to recognize the problems, to study and understand them, and to have the courage to undertake their solution.

It is no longer sufficient, given the widespread exposure of our basic industries, for us to take refuge in the thought that the best solution, as implied in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, is for the Federal Government to subsidize the relocation of entire industries and their workers to some other line of endeavor. Mr. President, it is manifestly impossible to "relocate" the textile and apparel industries: they are spread across the face of America in literally hundreds of communities. It is difficult to retrain the workers in the textile industry for some other occupation. In many cases the textile mill represents the only source of gainful employment for miles around the community in which it is located. In Appalachia and a 50-mile belt surrounding it, employment in the textile mill products, apparel, and manmade fiber industries accounts for one out of every four jobs in manufacturing industries available to that depressed economic area.

Mr. President, for many years the United States has based its foreign trade policy on the myth that our capital-intensive industries whose technological sophistication enables them to compete in world trade will supply jobs for all of the workers who are displaced by rising import competition in the product sectors of our labor-intensive industries. The study to which I referred at the outset based on a computer analysis performed on behalf of the Trade Relations Council of the United States demonstrates conclusively that this assumption is fallacious.

I have already alluded to the fact that the labor-intensive industries included in the Trade Relations Council study suffered a net loss of 367,552 jobs as a result of the balance of trade deficit experi-

enced in our foreign trade in products like or competitive with the output of those industries in 1966 alone. The Council's study also established that the foreign trade surplus of the capital-intensive industries generated employment equivalent to only 201,532 jobs, leaving the U.S. economy with a net job deficit in manufacturing of 160,000 jobs. While the capital-intensive industries generated in dollars a trade surplus of \$10.4 billion, somewhat greater than the trade deficit of \$9 billion of the labor-intensive industries in 1967, the net favorable dollar balance of \$1.4 billion will not supply a surplus of jobs as a result of our foreign trade in manufactured products.

Mr. President, this Nation will always require a complete range of manufacturing industries, including the labor-intensive as well as the capital-intensive, if our responsibilities to provide employment for all of the members of our work force are to be met. The Nation's labor force does not now, nor will it ever, consist entirely of persons possessing the types of technical skills which are needed in the sophisticated capital-intensive industries; nor will those industries ever be able to employ the entire portion of the work force which must find its employment in the manufacturing sector of the economy.

What we are witnessing is a strong erosion of jobs and job opportunities in labor-intensive industries because our foreign trade policy exposes those industries to unrelieved pressure from sharply rising imports without hope for limitation. Unless we promptly undertake to create a realistic foreign trade policy that will preserve for our labor-intensive industries equal opportunity to share in the growth of the American market with foreign products, we are dooming our basic manufacturing industries to a slow death and their workers to an insecure and uncertain future.

I say to the Members of this body that the time is overdue in which we manfully face our responsibilities and undertake to act in the interests not only of the textile mill products, apparel, and man-made fiber industries, but also the other basic industries which are similarly affected by excessive imports. To this end, Mr. President, I shall shortly introduce as an amendment to an appropriate bill pending before this body a legislative solution not only to the textile import problem, but also to the problems besetting any other American industry which is being harmed in its employment or economic health by excessive import competition. I shall at an appropriate time ask the distinguished Members of this body who have displayed leadership on these problems to join with me in the sponsorship of this important new approach to the solution of these problems.

EXHIBIT 1

AMERICAN IMPORTERS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
New York, N.Y.

Attached is a revised copy of our earlier Memorandum entitled "Memorandum on the Performance of the United States Textile and Apparel Industries and the Impact of Imports." The revisions include several 1968 fig-

ures which had been estimated or were preliminary. Most of them apply to sales and profits, Table 1, Figures 1 and 2.

MICHAEL P. DANIELS,
General Counsel.

MEMORANDUM ON THE PERFORMANCE OF THE U.S. TEXTILE AND APPAREL INDUSTRIES AND THE IMPACT OF IMPORTS

[Figures referred to not printed in RECORD]

The purpose of this memorandum is to summarize the reasons of AIA-TAG for asserting the complete lack of economic justification for controls on imports of textiles and apparel products, whether by way of legislative quotas or a negotiated international agreement. A more extensive treatment is contained in the statement of AIA-TAG before the Committee on Ways and Means on Foreign Trade and Tariff Proposals (Part 6, pages 2415, 2417, et seq. 1967).

Foreign governments, it is believed, will reject approaches to enter into an international agreement controlling world trade in textiles and apparel because of the absence of data supporting the United States industry's special pleas for such controls.

SUMMARY

The textile industry has enjoyed a phenomenal growth from 1961 through 1968. This growth was briefly interrupted by a slight recession in the general economy in 1967 resulting in a minor downturn from the record levels achieved by the industry in 1966. In 1968, the industry completely recovered from this recession and surpassed, in almost every instance, the record performance of 1966. Indications are that 1969 will be another record year for the textile industry. This depends largely upon general economic factors and the overall condition of the American economy.

Imports over the period have also grown, but such growth has been commensurate with the growth in domestic production. Imports also declined during the slight recession of 1967, but picked up in 1968. During 1968, and at the present time, imports have been stimulated by extraordinary demand conditions within the United States and inflationary price levels. Nonetheless, imports represent a very modest and stable proportion of domestic consumption of textile and apparel products.

Import growth must be seen within the context of the growth in domestic production and domestic consumption of such products. Figures showing the growth of imports in percentage terms without reference either to the absolute volume of increase or outside of the context of overall domestic consumption are misleading and considerably distort reality.

Another major distortion engaged in by the domestic industry is analyses by each fiber: cotton, man-made, and wool. Man-made fibers are substituting for both cotton and wool. This is clearly admitted by the United States textile industry. The consequence of that admission, however, is that one must look to the overall performance of all fibers in making valid comparisons.

ANALYSIS

An analysis of every indicator of performance shows a picture of health and growth in the textile and apparel industries. These indices are shown on the attached tables and charts.

SALES AND PROFITS

Sales of the textile mill products industry grew from 13.4 billion dollars in 1961 to 20.8 billion dollars in 1968, an increase of 55.6 percent. Sales for 1968 were 11.6 percent above the level for 1967.

Profits of the textile mill products industry grew from 589 million dollars in 1961 to 1,276 million dollars in 1968, an increase of

116.6 percent. The increase in profits for 1968 compared to 1967 was 29.9 percent.

Apparel industry sales grew by 67.6 percent from 1961 to 1968. Profits grew by 181.3 percent over this period from 331 million dollars to 931 million dollars. These figures are shown on Table 1 and are plotted on Figures I and II.

SHIPMENTS

Shipments from the textile mill products industry grew from 14.0 billion dollars in 1961 to 21.7 billion dollars in 1968, an increase of some 55 percent. These figures are shown on Table 2 and Figure III.

PRODUCTION

Industrial production increased rapidly over the period. For the apparel industry there was a slight decline in 1967 but a pickup in 1968 almost to the peak level of 1966. The textile mill products industry also showed a slight decrease from 1966 to 1967, but a strong upward turn in 1968 with an increase of about 8 points in the index of industrial production. These figures are shown on Table 3 and Figures IV and V.

EMPLOYMENT

Employment has also shown an increase over the period with a gain in almost 300,000 workers from 1961 to 1968. During 1968 alone, there was a gain of 50,000 workers. These figures are shown on Table 4 and Figure VI.

MILL CONSUMPTION OF FIBERS

Mill consumption of cotton, wool, man-made and other fibers are shown on Table 5 and Figure VII. It should first be noted that total consumption of all fibers, which is a measure of overall textile activity, increased from 6.6 billion pounds in 1961 to 9.7 billion pounds in 1968, an increase of 47 percent. What the figure illustrates so graphically is the switch from the natural fibers to the man-made fibers. Thus, the performance of wool has remained fairly static with some decline evident and there was a drop in cotton consumption. Man-made fibers, on the other hand, have increased from 2.1 billion pounds to 5.2 billion pounds, an increase of 115 percent. In 1968 for the first time, man-made fibers surpassed cotton consumption. It is this dramatic switch to the man-made fibers which has made analysis by separate fibers irrelevant.

The domestic industry can point to a declining performance of cotton and wool. This is not attributable to imports, however, but to the competition from man-made fibers. Total consumption, as shown on Figure VII, has increased.

COMPARISON OF IMPORTS AND DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION

Table 6 and Figure VIII show mill consumption, apparent domestic consumption, (mill consumption, plus imports, minus exports) imports and exports. Imports have increased modestly in comparison with the spectacular growth in mill consumption. It is here that the "percentage game" is belied. It is true that imports have increased by 135 percent from 1961 to 1968, whereas mill consumption has increased by 47 percent. However, the absolute magnitudes are the important factor. While imports increased by 450.7 million pounds, mill consumption increased by 3.1 billion pounds. Thus, the growth in mill consumption was about seven times the growth in imports. Of the total growth in mill consumption plus imports, imports accounted for only 12.7 percent, while domestic mill consumption accounted for 87.3 percent.

Certainly as Figure VIII illustrates, there has been no injury to domestic production due to imports. The slight decline in mill consumption in 1967 was matched by a greater decline in imports (see Table 6). As

Table 6 also shows, the ratio of imports to domestic consumption has remained fairly stable, certainly since 1962. The ratio in 1968 was only one point above the 1962 ratio and in 1967 and 1968 there was an actual decline from the highest ratio reached in 1966. This overall measurement has a number of imperfections so that the ratio should not be taken as accurate in the absolute sense; however, as an index it measures the relative performance of the domestic industry compared to imports.

ANALYSIS BY FIBER

As pointed out above, analysis by separate fibers is unfair and misleading.

The situation in wool and cotton is impossible to illustrate because of the rapid substitution of man-made fibers for the natural fibers on the cotton and the woolen and worsted systems. Thus, simple minded comparisons of imports, chiefly of cotton or wool with domestic production by chief fiber, are completely misleading.

The domestic industry has made a large point of the growth in imports of man-made fiber products. These figures compared with mill consumption and apparent domestic consumption are shown on Table 7 and Figure IX. Imports have grown from 23.2 million pounds in 1961 to 172.4 million pounds in 1968. Mill consumption, however, during the same period grew from 2.1 billion pounds in 1961 to 5.2 billion pounds in 1968. Thus, while imports increased by 149.2 million, mill consumption increased by 3.1 billion. As the figure also illustrates, the ratio of imports to domestic consumption has remained at extremely low rates, at its highest, 3.3 percent in 1968.

COMPARISONS BY SEGMENT

Even in the overall figures discussed above, there are a number of distortions when all imports and domestic products are combined in terms of weight. The most valid and revealing comparisons are separate comparisons by the major categories of yarns, fabrics, and apparel. Unfortunately, it is almost impossible to compute figures for 1968 because of the time lag in statistical reporting, and even in 1967, there are difficult problems. Judgments as to conversion factors and other technical matters complicate the matter. The most reliable computations available are those by the United States Tariff Commission. The Commission found that the ratio of imports to consumption in 1966 for yarns was 1.4 percent, for broad woven fabrics, 6.5 percent, and for apparel (in 1965), 5.1 percent.

Given the general relative performance of imports and domestic production for 1967 and 1968, we do not believe that these percentages would have materially changed. Indeed, the overall analysis showing a higher ratio in 1966 than in 1967 or 1968 (see Table 6), can be taken as an indication that in some areas the ratios might also have declined.

ANALYSIS BY INDIVIDUAL PRODUCTS

The domestic industry has often cited particular products, for example, white shirts, with very high ratios of imports to domestic consumption as reason for overall quotas. Such particular instances, however, affecting a minute portion of the trade, cannot be utilized to support overall controls. In many instances, even with a very high ratio of imports to consumption, imports cannot have been deemed to have caused any injury to domestic production. This depends on the particular nature of the trade and the nature of the product, where, in many instances, one is dealing with specialties traditionally imported in large proportion from overseas.

Such particular products should, in our view, be handled through the Escape Clause mechanism, first to determine whether imports have caused or threatened serious in-

jury, and second, to determine what relief might be appropriate if injury is found.

To this end, we have endorsed the general notion of an Escape Clause amendment suggested by the report of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations and by the Hon. Wilbur Mills, Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, as the appropriate method of dealing with the problems of particular products. Such problems, if any, will certainly not support the overall quota relief sought by the domestic industry.

TABLE 1.—SALES AND PROFITS: U.S. TEXTILE AND APPAREL INDUSTRIES, 1961-68

[Dollar amounts in millions]

	Textile mill products		Apparel and other finished products	
	Net sales	Net profits before Federal income tax	Net sales	Net profits before Federal income tax
1961-----	\$13,398	\$589	\$12,365	\$331
1962-----	\$14,449	\$724	\$13,241	\$415
1963-----	\$15,092	\$721	\$13,686	\$414
1964-----	\$16,249	\$947	\$14,880	\$553
1965-----	\$18,028	\$1,268	\$16,263	\$644
1966-----	\$19,513	\$1,272	\$18,110	\$740
1967-----	\$18,672	\$882	\$18,170	\$728
1968-----	\$20,841	\$1,276	\$20,718	\$931
Increase 1961 to 1968 (percent)....	55.6	116.6	67.6	181.3
Increase 1967 to 1968 (percent)....	11.6	29.9	14.6	27.9

Source: Federal Trade Commission, Securities and Exchange Commission.

TABLE 2.—U.S. MANUFACTURERS' SHIPMENTS: TEXTILE MILL PRODUCTS, 1961-68

[Millions of dollars]

1961-----	13,999
1962-----	15,179
1963-----	15,734
1964-----	16,998
1965-----	18,294
1966-----	19,608
1967-----	19,241
1968-----	21,742

Increase: 1961-68, 55 percent.

Increase: 1967-68, 13 percent.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

TABLE 3.—INDEX OF INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION

	Textile mill products		Apparel products	
Annually:				
1961-----	107.1		112.1	
1962-----	115.3		118.9	
1963-----	116.9		125.6	
1964-----	122.9		134.1	
1965-----	134.9		145.1	
1966-----	142.5		150.1	
1967-----	142.0		147.6	
1968-----	150.3		149.9	
	1968	1967	1968	1967
Monthly:				
January-----	147.6	141.4	145.2	150.2
February-----	148.8	139.2	146.4	147.1
March-----	149.9	139.2	148.5	146.3
April-----	146.3	138.3	148.9	142.5
May-----	147.2	138.3	149.6	142.6
June-----	148.8	136.9	151.4	142.4
July-----	150.9	135.8	150.4	144.2
August-----	151.4	137.9	149.0	146.4
September-----	152.0	140.6	149.9	146.8
October-----	153.3	144.3	152.1	146.2
November-----	155.1	147.1	152.5	148.6
December-----	153.5	151.9	149.2	150.9

Note: Monthly figures seasonally adjusted.

Source: Federal Reserve Board.

TABLE 4.—EMPLOYMENT: U.S. TEXTILE AND APPAREL INDUSTRIES

[In thousands]

	Textile	Apparel	Total
Annually:			
1961	893	1,215	2,108
1962	902	1,264	2,166
1963	885	1,283	2,168
1964	892	1,303	2,195
1965	926	1,354	2,280
1966	964	1,402	2,366
1967	957	1,400	2,357
1968	985	1,417	2,402
1968 monthly:			
January	972	1,399	2,371
February	981	1,403	2,384
March	979	1,408	2,387
April	979	1,417	2,396
May	982	1,422	2,404
June	990	1,433	2,423
July	987	1,416	2,403
August	990	1,412	2,402
September	987	1,422	2,409
October	988	1,426	2,414
November	992	1,419	2,411
December	994	1,425	2,419

Note: Seasonally adjusted.
Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

TABLE 5.—U.S. MILL CONSUMPTION OF FIBERS, 1961-68

[In millions of pounds]

	Cotton	Wool	Man mades	Others	Total
1961	4,081.5	412.1	2,057.7	12.7	6,567.0
1962	4,188.0	429.1	2,418.5	12.4	7,048.0
1963	4,040.2	411.7	2,787.8	13.1	7,252.8
1964	4,244.4	356.7	3,174.3	14.2	7,789.6
1965	4,477.5	387.0	3,624.1	13.3	8,501.9
1966	4,630.5	370.2	4,002.2	14.7	9,017.6
1967	4,423.0	312.5	4,240.4	10.4	8,986.3
1968 ¹	4,136.1	345.0	5,175.0	11.9	9,668.0

¹ Estimated.
Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 6.—U.S. MILL CONSUMPTION OF ALL FIBERS, COMPARED TO THE FIBER CONTENT OF IMPORTS AND EXPORTS OF ALL SEMI-MANUFACTURED AND MANUFACTURED TEXTILE AND APPAREL PRODUCTS, AND APPARENT DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION, 1961-68

[In millions of pounds]

Year	Mill consumption	Imports	Exports	Apparent domestic consumption	Imports as a percent of domestic consumption
1961	6,567.0	333.6	326.0	6,574.6	5.1
1962	7,048.0	485.4	313.4	7,220.0	6.7
1963	7,252.8	492.7	307.6	7,437.9	6.6
1964	7,789.6	491.2	325.5	7,955.3	6.2
1965	8,501.9	595.7	320.2	8,777.4	6.8
1966	9,017.6	771.4	342.8	9,446.2	8.2
1967	8,986.3	697.7	333.0	9,351.0	7.5
1968 ¹	9,668.0	784.3	321.0	10,131.3	7.7

¹ Preliminary.
Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 7.—U.S. MILL CONSUMPTION OF MANMADE FIBERS, COMPARED TO THE MANMADE FIBER CONTENT OF IMPORTS AND EXPORTS OF SEMIMANUFACTURED AND MANUFACTURED TEXTILE AND APPAREL PRODUCTS, AND APPARENT DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION

[In millions of dollars]

Year	Mill consumption	Imports	Exports	Apparent domestic consumption	Imports as a percent of domestic consumption
1961	2,057.7	23.2	82.5	1,998.4	1.2
1962	2,418.5	30.0	89.0	2,359.5	1.3
1963	2,787.8	35.9	95.1	2,728.6	1.3
1964	3,174.3	49.9	105.7	3,118.5	1.6
1965	3,624.1	79.0	131.2	3,571.9	2.2
1966	4,002.2	121.5	141.0	3,982.7	3.1
1967	4,240.4	137.5	134.4	4,243.5	3.2
1968 ¹	5,175.0	172.4	124.0	5,223.4	3.3

¹ Estimated.
Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLINGS. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I compliment the distinguished Senator from South Carolina for this masterly analysis of the desperate situation which confronts the textile industry, as well as other industries in this Nation. I commend him not only for his analysis, but particularly for the concluding words of his speech, in which he justifiably states that the time has come for something more than words. It is time for action on the part of Congress.

As the distinguished Senator knows, I have been in conference with him, and shall wish to join him when he introduces the bill which he is preparing. I have two bills of my own before the Senate on this subject.

In my own State, where we have lost the bulk of our textile industry, we find we are now going down the same road with the shoe industry, which is vital to my section of the country. Eleven plants have recently closed, seven of them within the last 3 years. Nearly 3,000 jobs have been destroyed, and, in the last 6 months, the trend has speeded up to the point where we have lost over a thousand more jobs in the shoe industry alone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator's time be extended 5 minutes.

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

Mr. COTTON. I shall only use 2 of those minutes.

Mr. President, I shall not take the further time of the Senate, except to repeat, in a few sentences, what I said when the Senator from Georgia made his speech to the Senate on this subject the other day.

This is not in any way a reflection upon the very able speech of the Senator from South Carolina—but time after time we have had a field day in the Senate, and Senators have delivered speech after speech about this situation, but it has ended here and been limited to talk.

Now the straws in the wind indicate that the present administration is preparing or is inclined, at least, to follow the example of the administrations of President Johnson, President Kennedy, and President Eisenhower, and place our foreign relations and the attitude of the State Department ahead of the preservation of American jobs.

I am a friend and admirer of the President of the United States, and I am with him 98 percent of the time, I hope. But the time has come to do something more than talk; and the opportunity will be before the Senate within a very few days to indicate our intent to do something about this situation. I think such an indication would strengthen the administration rather than hurt it, because it is time that the world should know and the country should know that Congress is prepared to perform its duty

to save the jobs provided by American industry.

I commend the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for his remarks. The Senator from New Hampshire has given most distinguished leadership in Congress over a period of a decade or more in an effort to present to Congress the desperate situation of textile industry employment in America.

The Senator from New Hampshire as the senior committee member on the minority side, and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE), as a member of the Special Textile Committee and as the senior committee member on the majority side, have led the fight over the years.

Rather than talk, we have given hard statistical information and gotten down to the root of the problem and told it like it is.

As the Senator from Missouri stated the day before yesterday with reference to the importers' position in his brief remarks:

Let us lay the facts on the table and then talk in adjectives and specific language.

I thought it was time to get to the facts.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLINGS. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator. I have never heard the case stated more clearly and the problem put forth in a more practical and understandable way.

In my State, the manufacturing industry depends upon the textile industry as the eighth largest in the State. It has a payroll of \$280 million a year. It is worthy of all our consideration. The industry employs 68,000 people, of whom 50,000 people are employed in my particular area of Los Angeles.

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

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 2 minutes.

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

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I point out that there are 230,000 businesses, mainly small. They form the main strength and backbone of this industrial complex that we call America. Large numbers of the members of the minority groups who need special help are employed in the industry.

I point out to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina that as the story is told and as the bill comes up for consideration, I would like to do whatever I can to join enthusiastically with the Senator and others in this most needed concern for this particular industry.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY) was a strong worker and supporter of a similar measure in the past. There is industrywide support in California. As we emphasize the need for this measure and as we see southern support

for the northern textile industry, we are talking about a national industry.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I would like to associate myself with the concern for the textile import problem that the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina has expressed. The textile industry is the largest manufacturing employer in the State of Tennessee, with many plants being located in rural areas. I am particularly concerned that jobs for workers in these areas may be jeopardized. I am most hopeful that the Nixon administration will be able to negotiate a fair and reasonable voluntary import quota system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Florida for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I understand that the distinguished majority leader wishes me to yield briefly.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Without losing his rights to the floor.

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

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT OF 1969

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 287, S. 1075.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1075) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct investigations, studies, surveys, and research relating to the Nation's ecological systems, natural resources, and environmental quality, and to establish a Council on Environmental Quality.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 1. That this Act may be cited as the "National Environmental Policy Act of 1969".

PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The purposes of this Act are: To declare a national policy which will encourage productive and enjoyable harmony between man and his environment; to promote efforts which will prevent or eliminate damage to the environment and biosphere and stimulate the health and welfare of man; to enrich the understanding of the ecological systems and natural resources important to the Nation; and to establish a Board of Environmental Quality Advisers.

TITLE I

DECLARATION OF NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY

SEC. 101. (a) The Congress, recognizing that man depends on his biological and physical surroundings for food, shelter and other needs, and for cultural enrichment as well; and recognizing further the profound influences of population growth, high-density urbanization, industrial expansion, resource exploitation, and new and expanding technological advances on our physical and biological surroundings and on the quality of

life available to the American people; hereby declares that it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practicable means, consistent with other essential considerations of national policy, to improve and coordinate Federal plans, functions, programs, and resources to the end that the Nation may—

(1) fulfill the responsibilities of each generation as trustee of the environment for succeeding generations;

(2) assure for all Americans safe, healthful, productive, and esthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings;

(3) attain the widest range of beneficial uses of the environment without degradation, risk to health or safety, or other undesirable and unintended consequences;

(4) preserve important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage, and maintain, wherever possible, an environment which supports diversity and variety of individual choice;

(5) achieve a balance between population and resource use which will permit high standards of living and a widening of life's amenities; and

(6) enhance the quality of renewable resources and approach the maximum attainable recycling of depletable resources.

(b) The Congress recognizes that each person has a fundamental and inalienable right to a healthful environment and that each person has a responsibility to contribute to the preservation and enhancement of the environment.

SEC. 102. The Congress authorizes and directs that the policies, regulations, and public laws of the United States, to the fullest extent possible, be interpreted and administered in accordance with the policies set forth in this Act, and that all agencies of the Federal Government—

(a) utilize to the fullest extent possible a systematic, interdisciplinary approach which will insure the integrated use of the natural and social sciences and the environmental design arts in planning and in decisionmaking which may have an impact on man's environment;

(b) identify and develop methods and procedures which will insure that presently unquantified environmental amenities and values may be given appropriate consideration in decisionmaking along with economic and technical considerations;

(c) include in every recommendation or report on proposals for legislation and other major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, a finding by the responsible official that—

(i) the environmental impact of the proposed action has been studied and considered;

(ii) any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided by following reasonable alternatives are justified by other stated considerations of national policy;

(iii) local short-term uses of man's environment are consistent with maintaining and enhancing long-term productivity; and that

(iv) any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources are warranted.

(d) study, develop, and describe appropriate alternatives to recommended courses of action in any proposal which involves unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of land, water, or air;

(e) recognize the worldwide and long-range character of environmental problems and lend appropriate support to initiatives, resolutions, and programs designed to maximize international cooperation in anticipating and preventing a decline in the quality of mankind's world environment; and

(f) review present statutory authority, administrative regulations, and current policies and procedures for conformity to the purposes and provisions of this Act and propose to the President and to the Congress

such measures as may be necessary to make their authority consistent with this Act.

SEC. 103. The policies and goals set forth in this Act are supplementary to, but shall not be considered to repeal the existing mandates and authorizations of Federal agencies.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. To carry out the purposes of this Act, all agencies of the Federal Government in conjunction with their existing programs and authorities, are hereby authorized—

(a) to conduct investigations, studies, surveys, research, and analyses relating to ecological systems and environmental quality;

(b) to document and define changes in the natural environment, including the plant and animal systems, and to accumulate necessary data and other information for a continuing analysis of these changes or trends and an interpretation of their underlying causes;

(c) to evaluate and disseminate information of an ecological nature to public and private agencies or organizations, or individuals in the form of reports, publications, atlases, and maps;

(d) to make available to States, counties, municipalities, institutions, and individuals, advice and information useful in restoring, maintaining, and enhancing the quality of the environment;

(e) to initiate and utilize ecological information in the planning and development of resource-oriented projects;

(f) to conduct research and studies within natural areas under Federal ownership which are under the jurisdiction of the Federal agencies; and

(g) to assist the Board of Environmental Quality Advisers established under title III of this Act and any council or committee established by the President to deal with environmental problems.

SEC. 202. (a) In carrying out the provisions of this title, the President is authorized to designate an agency or agencies to—

(1) make grants, including training grants, and enter into contracts or cooperative agreements with public or private agencies or organizations, or individuals, and to accept and use donations of funds, property, personal services, or facilities to carry out the purposes of this Act;

(2) develop and maintain an inventory of existing and future natural resource development projects, engineering works, and other major projects and programs contemplated or planned by public or private agencies or organizations which make significant modifications in the natural environment;

(3) establish a system of collecting and receiving information and data on ecological research and evaluations which are in progress or are planned by other public or private agencies or organizations, or individuals; and

(4) assist and advise State and local government, and private enterprise in bringing their activities into conformity with the purposes of this Act and other Acts designed to enhance the quality of the environment.

(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$500,000 annually for fiscal years 1971 and 1972, and \$1,000,000 for each fiscal year thereafter.

SEC. 203. In recognition of the additional duties which the President may assign to the Office of Science and Technology to support any council or committee established by the President to deal with environmental problems and in furtherance of the policies established by this Act, there is hereby established in the Office of Science and Technology an additional office with the title "Deputy Director of the Office of Science and Technology." The Deputy Director shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall perform such duties as the Director of the Office

of Science and Technology shall from time to time direct, and shall be compensated at the rate provided for level IV of the Executive Schedule Pay Rates (5 U.S.C. 5315).

TITLE III

Sec. 301. (a) There is created in the Executive Office of the President a Board of Environmental Quality Advisers (hereinafter referred to as the "Board"). The Board shall be composed of three members who shall be appointed by the President to serve at his pleasure, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Each member shall, as a result of training, experience, or attainments, be professionally qualified to analyze and interpret environmental trends of all kinds and descriptions and shall be conscious of and responsive to the scientific, economic, social, esthetic, and cultural needs and interest of this Nation. The President shall designate the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Board from such members.

(b) Members of the Board shall serve full time and the Chairman of the Board shall be compensated at the rate provided for Level II of the Executive Schedule Pay Rates (5 U.S.C. 5313). The other members of the Board shall be compensated at the rate provided for Level IV of the Executive Schedule Pay Rates (5 U.S.C. 5315).

Sec. 302. (a) The primary function of the Board shall be to study and analyze environmental trends and the factors that effects these trends, relating each area of study and analysis to the conservation, social, economic, and health goals of this Nation. In carrying out this function, the Board shall—

(1) report at least once each year to the President on the state and condition of the environment;

(2) provide advice, assistance, and staff support to the President on the formulation of national policies to foster and promote the improvement of environmental quality; and

(3) obtain information using existing sources, to the greatest extent practicable, concerning the quality of the environment and make such information available to the public.

(b) The Board shall periodically review and appraise Federal programs, projects, activities, and policies which affect the quality of the environment and make recommendations thereon to the President.

(c) It shall be the duty and function of the Board to assist and advise the President in the preparation of the annual environmental quality report required under section 303.

(d) The Board and the Office of Science and Technology shall carry out their duties under the provisions of this Act at the direction of the President and shall perform whatever additional duties he may from time to time direct.

Sec. 303. The President shall transmit to the Congress, beginning June 30, 1970, an annual environmental quality report which shall set forth: (a) the status and condition of the major natural, manmade, or altered environmental classes of the Nation; and (b) current and foreseeable trends in quality, management, and utilization of such environments and the effects of those trends on the social, economic, and other requirements of the Nation.

Sec. 304. The Board may employ such officers and employees as may be necessary to carry out its functions under this Act. In addition, the Board may employ and fix the compensation of such experts and consultants as may be necessary for the carrying out of its functions under this Act, in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code (but without regard to the last sentence thereof).

Sec. 305. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$1,000,000 annually to carry out the purposes of this title.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the bill was reported unanimously from the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT), is here. He will concur that the committee went into this matter in great detail. We have had it under consideration for some time, and the bill was given the unanimous support of the committee.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, that is entirely correct. I add that I concur in the statement which I believe the distinguished chairman of the committee is going to make for the RECORD.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, S. 1075, the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended and as reported by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on July 8, 1969, is in my judgment the most significant and important measure in the area of long-range domestic policymaking that will come before the 91st Congress. Without question, it is the most significant measure in the area of natural resource policy ever considered by the Congress.

As reported by the committee, S. 1075 provides a considered congressional statement of national goals and purposes for the management and preservation of the quality of America's future environment. The bill directs that all Federal agencies conduct their activities in accordance with these goals, and provides "action-forcing" procedures to insure that these goals and principles are observed. The bill specifically provides that its provisions are supplemental to the existing mandates and authorizations of all Federal agencies. This constitutes a statutory enlargement of the responsibilities and the concerns of all instrumentalities of the Federal Government.

Title II grants new authority to agencies of the Federal Government to engage in research and to incorporate the results of this ecological and environmental quality research into all of their planning and development activities. In addition, title II strengthens the Office of Science and Technology's capabilities in the area of coordinating Federal environmental management activities by adding the new position of Deputy Director.

Title III, of the measure creates a Board of Environmental Quality Advisers in the Executive Office of the President. Both the Board of Environmental Advisers and the Office of Science and Technology are to carry out their duties under the bill at the direction of the President.

The Board is directed to provide a continuing study and analysis of environmental trends, the factors which effect these trends, and to relate each area of study and analysis to the conservation, social, economic, and health goals of the Nation.

Finally, S. 1075 requires the submission by the President to the Congress and to the American people of an annual environmental quality report. The purpose of this report is to provide a statement of progress, to establish some baselines, and to tell us how well—or as some suspect, how bad—we are doing in manag-

ing the environment—the Nation's life support system.

In many respects, the only precedent and parallel to what is proposed in S. 1075 is in the Full Employment Act of 1946, which declared an historic national policy on management of the economy and established the Council of Economic Advisers. It is my view that S. 1075 will provide an equally important national policy for the management of America's future environment.

Mr. President, a statement of environmental policy is more than a statement of what we believe as a people and as a Nation. It establishes priorities and gives expression to our national goals and aspirations. It serves a constitutional function in that administrators may refer to it for guidance in making decisions which find environmental values in conflict with other values.

What is involved is a congressional declaration that we do not intend, as a government or as a people, to initiate actions which endanger the continued existence or the health of mankind. That we will not intentionally initiate actions which will do irreparable damage to the air, land, and water which support life on earth.

An environmental policy is a policy for people. Its primary concern is with man and his future. The basic principle of the policy is that we must strive, in all that we do, to achieve a standard of excellence in man's relationships to his physical surroundings. If there are to be departures from the standard, they will be exceptions to the rule and the policy. And as exceptions, they will have to be justified in the light of public scrutiny.

The Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has devoted a great deal of time to this legislation over the past few years. The members of the committee and the Senate as a whole can be justifiably proud of this measure. It returns to the Congress the responsibility and the initiative for domestic policymaking in this important area of national concern. At the same time, the measure is designed to complement the President's recently established inter-agency, Cabinet-level Council on the Environment and the responsibilities of the Federal agencies in the field of environmental management.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that selected portions of the committee's report on this measure be printed in the RECORD.

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

EXCERPT FROM COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS REPORT ON S. 1075

INTRODUCTION

It is the unanimous view of the members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee that our Nation's present state of knowledge, our established public policies, and our existing governmental institutions are not adequate to deal with the growing environmental problems and crises the Nation faces.

The inadequacy of present knowledge, policies, and institutions is reflected in our Nation's history, in our national attitudes, and in our contemporary life. We see increas-

ing evidence of this inadequacy all around us: haphazard urban and suburban growth; crowding, congestion, and conditions within our central cities which result in civil unrest and detract from man's social and psychological well-being; the loss of valuable open spaces; inconsistent and, often, incoherent rural and urban land-use policies; critical air and water pollution problems; diminishing recreational opportunity; continuing soil erosion; the degradation of unique ecosystems; needless deforestation; the decline and extinction of fish and wildlife species; faltering and poorly designed transportation systems; poor architectural design and ugliness in public and private structures; rising levels of noise; the continued proliferation of pesticides and chemicals without adequate consideration of the consequences; radiation hazards; thermal pollution; an increasingly ugly landscape cluttered with billboards, powerlines, and junkyards; and many, many other environmental quality problems.

Traditional national policies and programs were not designed to achieve these conditions. But they were not designed to avoid them either. And, as a result, they were not avoided in the past. They are not being avoided today.

Traditional policies were primarily designed to enhance the production of goods and to increase the gross national product. As a nation, we have been very successful at these endeavors. Our gross national product is approaching \$900 billion a year. The American people enjoy the highest standard of living in the world. Our technological ability is unrivaled. But, as a nation, we have paid a price for our material well-being. That price may be seen today in the declining quality of the American environment.

As the evidence of environmental decay and degradation mounts, it becomes clearer each day that the Nation cannot continue to pay the price of past abuse. The costs of air and water pollution, poor land-use policies and urban decay can no longer be deferred for payment by future generations. These problems must be faced while they are still of manageable proportions and while alternative solutions are still available.

If the United States is to create and maintain a balanced and healthful environment, new means and procedures to preserve environmental values in the larger public interest, to coordinate Government activities that shape our future environment, and to provide guidance and incentives for State and local government and for private enterprise must be devised.

In spite of the growing public recognition of the urgency of many environmental problems and the need to reorder national goals and priorities to deal with these problems, there is still no comprehensive national policy on environmental management. There are limited policies directed to some areas where specific problems are recognized to exist, but we do not have a considered statement of overall national goals and purposes.

As a result of this failure to formulate a comprehensive national policy, environmental decisionmaking largely continues to proceed as it has in the past. Policy is established by default and inaction. Environmental problems are only dealt with when they reach crisis proportions. Public desires and aspirations are seldom consulted. Important decisions concerning the use and the shape of man's future environment continue to be made in small but steady increments which perpetuate rather than avoid the recognized mistakes of previous decades.

Today it is clear that we cannot continue on this course. Our natural resources—our air, water, and land—are not unlimited.¹ We no longer have the margins for error that we once enjoyed. The ultimate issue posed by shortsighted, conflicting, and often selfish

demands and pressures upon the finite resources of the earth are clear. As a nation, and as a world, we face these conditions:

A population which is doubling at increasingly shorter intervals;

Demands for resources which are growing at a far greater rate than population; and

A growing technological power which is far outstripping man's capacity to understand and ability to control its impact on the environment.

The committee believes that America's capacity as a nation to confront these conditions and deal more effectively with the growing list of environmental hazards and problems resulting from these conditions can be improved and broadened if the Congress clarifies the goals, concepts, and procedures which determine and guide the programs and the activities of Federal agencies. Moreover, this can be done with the reasonable prospect that State, local, and private action will also be favorably influenced.

The committee is aware, as are other committees of both Houses which handle environmental legislation, that it is extremely difficult in our increasingly complex Government to achieve coordinated responses among the numerous Federal agencies² (aside from private enterprise and State and local agencies) involved in the multiple uses of our Nation's natural resources unless there are established common approaches to determine what actions are necessary to advance the public interest in healthful and quality surroundings. To provide a basis for advancing the public interest, a congressional statement is required of the evolving national objectives of managing our physical surroundings, our land, air, water, open space, and other natural resources and environmental amenities.

In view of this situation, the committee considered, amended and reported S. 1075 to the floor of the Senate.

PURPOSE

The purpose of S. 1075, the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, is to establish, by congressional action, a national policy to guide Federal activities which are involved with or related to the management of the environment or which have an impact on the quality of the environment.

Recent years have witnessed a growing public concern for the quality of the environment and the manner in which it is managed. The cause of this concern appears to be twofold: First, the evidence of environmental mismanagement is accumulating at an ever-increasing rate as a result of population growth, increased pressures on a finite resource base, and advancing technological developments which have enlarged man's capacity to effectuate environmental change. Second, the American people—as a result of growing affluence, more leisure time, and a recognition of the consequences of continuing many present environmental trends—are placing a much higher value on the quality of the environment and their surroundings than ever before.

The public's growing concern has figured prominently in many different areas of Federal activity. Most often it is seen in the form of citizen indignation and protest over the actions or, in some cases, the lack of action of Federal agencies. Examples of the rising public concern over the manner in which Federal policies and activities have contributed to environmental decay and degradation may be seen in the Santa Barbara oil well blowout; the current controversy over the lack of an assured water supply and the impact of a super-jet airport on the Everglades National Park; the proliferation of pesticides and other chemicals; the indiscriminate siting of steam fired powerplants and other units of heavy industry; the pollution of the Nation's rivers, bays, lakes, and estuaries; the loss of publicly owned sea-

shores, open spaces, and other irreplaceable natural assets to industry, commercial users, and developers; rising levels of air pollution; federally sponsored or aided construction activities such as highways, airports, and other public works projects which proceed without reference to the desires and aspirations of local people.

S. 1075 is designed to deal with many of the basic causes of these increasingly troublesome and often critical problems of domestic policy. A primary purpose of the bill is to restore public confidence in the Federal Government's capacity to achieve important public purposes and objectives and at the same time to maintain and enhance the quality of the environment. It is the Committee's belief that S. 1075 will also provide a model and a demonstration to which State governments may look in their efforts to reorganize local institutions and to establish local policies conducive to sound environmental management. This objective is of great importance because many of the most serious environmental problems the Nation faces are within the scope and, often, within the exclusive jurisdiction of State action and State responsibility.

S. 1075 is also designed to deal with the long-range implications of many of the critical environmental problems which have caused great public concern in recent years. The challenge of environmental management, is, in essence, a challenge of modern man to himself. The principal threats to the environment and the Nation's life support system are those that man has himself induced in the pursuit of material wealth, greater productivity, and other important values. These threats—whether in the form of pollution, crowding, ugliness, or in some other form—were not achieved intentionally. They were the spinoff, the fallout, and the unanticipated consequences which resulted from the pursuit of narrower, more immediate goals.

The purpose of S. 1075 is, therefore, to establish a national policy designed to cope with environmental crisis, present or impending. The measure is designed to supplement existing, but narrow and fractionated congressional declarations of environmental policy.

The "National Environmental Policy Act of 1969" would contribute to a more orderly, rational, and constructive Federal response to environmental decisionmaking in five major ways. These are briefly set out below:

1. Management of the environment is a matter of critical concern to all Americans. Virtually every agency of the Federal Government plays some role in determining how well the environment is managed. Yet, many of these agencies do not have a mandate, a body of law, or a set of policies to guide their actions which have an impact on the environment. In fact, the authorizing legislation of some agencies has been construed to prohibit the consideration of important environmental values.

Section 101 of S. 1075 rectifies this by providing a congressional declaration that it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practicable means, consistent with other essential considerations of national policy, to improve and coordinate Federal planning and activities to the end that certain broad national goals in the management of the environment may be attained.

2. A statement of national policy for the environment—like other major policy declarations—is in large measure concerned with principle rather than detail; with an expression of broad national goals rather than narrow and specific procedures for implementation. But, if goals and principles are to be effective, they must be capable of being applied in action. S. 1075 thus incorporates certain "action-forcing" provisions and procedures which are designed to assure

¹Footnotes at end of article.

that all Federal agencies plan and work toward meeting the challenge of a better environment.

3. One of the major factors contributing to environmental abuse and deterioration is that actions—often actions having irreversible consequences—are undertaken without adequate consideration of, or knowledge about, their impact on the environment. Section 201 seeks to overcome this limitation by authorizing all agencies of the Federal Government, in conjunction with their existing programs and authorities, to conduct research, studies, and surveys related to ecological systems and the quality of the environment. This section also authorizes the agencies to make this information available to the public, to assist State and local government, and to utilize ecological information in the planning and development of resource-oriented projects.

Recognizing the leading role which the President has delegated to the Office of Science and Technology for the coordination of Federal activities in the area of environmental administration, the committee has adopted provisions designed to assist and strengthen this office. The committee also authorizes the President to designate one or more lead agencies to carry out a grant program, to maintain an inventory of development projects which make significant environmental modifications, to establish a data collection system, and to assist State and local governments.

4. Title III establishes an independent, high-level, three-member Board of Environmental Quality Advisers in the Executive Office of the President. The Board is patterned very closely after the Council of Economic Advisers which was established by the Full Employment Act of 1946.

The Board's function is to provide a continuing study and analysis of environmental trends and the factors which affect these trends, and to relate each area of study and analysis to the social, economic, health, and conservation goals of the Nation. The Board will provide an overview of how effectively the Nation is maintaining a quality environment for future and present generations. In addition, it will be uniquely equipped to serve an early warning function by identifying emerging environmental problems at an early date so that proper responses may be prepared before situations reach crisis proportions and before the costs of dealing with problems grow large.

The Board would also strengthen the Office of the President by providing advice, assistance, and staff support on the formulation of national policies and other measures to improve the quality of the environment. In addition, the Board would assist the President in the preparation of an annual environmental quality report.

5. Section 303 requires the President to submit to the Congress an annual environmental quality report on the current status and condition of the major natural, man-made, and altered environmental systems of the Nation. In addition, the report is to identify current and foreseeable trends in quality, management, and the utilization of these environmental systems and the effects of these trends on the social, economic, and other requirements of the Nation.

At present, there is no report available which summarizes and brings together in one convenient place an authoritative and periodic statement on the status of the environment. Instead, there are hundreds of reports which deal with some small aspects of environmental management. More often than not these are technical in nature and do not provide meaningful measures of how well the Nation is meeting environmental goals and objectives. The annual report required by S. 1075 would provide a baseline and

a periodic objective statement of national progress in achieving a quality environment for present and future generations of Americans.

BACKGROUND

Legislative history

S. 1075, the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, was introduced in the 91st Congress on February 18, 1969, by Senator Jackson. Hearings on this and two related bills introduced by Senators Nelson (S. 1752) and McGovern (S. 237) were held on April 16, 1969, before the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.³ Following a staff study and consultations with the staff of the Office of Science and Technology and with representatives of a number of the Federal departments, the committee considered S. 1075 in executive session on June 18, 1969. Following the adoption of a number of committee amendments, the measure was ordered reported to the Senate on June 18, 1969. At the request of the Director of the Office of Science and Technology and representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, the committee voted, on July 8, 1969, to reconsider the measure for the purpose of considering additional amendments. The amendments were proposed by the Bureau of the Budget in a July 7, 1969, letter to the chairman of the committee. The proposed amendments to titles I and II of S. 1075 were adopted. Amendments proposed to title III by the Bureau of the Budget were adopted in part and rejected in part. Following the adoption of other amendments suggested by members of the committee, the measure was ordered reported to the Senate on July 8, 1969.

S. 1075, as introduced, was substantially the same measure as S. 2805 which was introduced in the 90th Congress on December 15, 1967, by Senators Jackson and Kuchel. The far-reaching objectives of S. 2805 and similar legislation introduced in the 90th Congress by Members of both Houses were considered at a unique joint House-Senate colloquium convened by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the House Committee on Science and Astronautics on July 17, 1968, to discuss a national policy for the environment.⁴

Many of the concepts and ideas incorporated in S. 1075 were drawn from ambitious measures introduced in previous Congresses. Of particular relevance were S. 2549, the Resources and Conservation Act, introduced by Senator Murray in 1959 and S. 2282 introduced by Senator Nelson in the 89th Congress. The Murray bill, endorsed by a distinguished group of Senators in the 86th and subsequently in the 87th Congress, called for the establishment of more efficient machinery in the resident's Office to coordinate resource conservation on the basis of national goals. The Nelson bill included broad provisions to cope with inadequate use and application by Federal agencies of ecological knowledge and research methods for attaining better management of our physical environment. Extensive hearings were held on each of these and other environmental measures before the Senate Interior Committee.⁵

Other concepts and ideas incorporated into S. 1075 were drawn from the proceedings of the previously mentioned joint House-Senate colloquium, from technical reports, conferences and symposia, and from books and journals dealing with environmental problems.⁶

In addition, the committee has reviewed and drawn upon concepts and ideas incorporated into many measures introduced in this and previous Congresses related to various aspects of environmental management.⁷

Need for the measure

This committee has compiled a great deal of testimony demonstrating instances of shortcomings, problems, and even national crises arising in many respects from the in-

adequacies of the Nation's environmental management policies and practices. Similar evidence has been compiled by other congressional committees and is a recurrent topic in the news media and in popular and technical publications.

Extensive collections of commentary regarding specific examples of environmental problems along with commentary by recognized spokesmen and authorities in the field have been published by this committee in the transcripts of the joint House-Senate colloquium to discuss a national policy for the environment (90th Cong., second sess.), in the hearing on a national environmental policy (91st Cong., first sess.), and elsewhere.⁸ The latter document includes an appendix entitled "Bibliography on Environmental Issues," which lists numerous books, papers, articles, and other published material dealing with the critical problems of the environment.

It would be impracticable to attempt a summary of this voluminous data in this report. Drawing upon the testimony presented to this and other committees, however, the committee believes that the following basic propositions summarize the situation of contemporary America and the Federal Government regarding the management of the environment:

1. Population growth and increasing per capita material demands are placing unprecedented pressures upon a finite resource base.

2. Advancing scientific knowledge and technology have vastly enlarged man's ability to alter the physical environment.

3. The combination of the foregoing conditions presents a serious threat to the Nation's life support system. The pursuit of greater material wealth and increased productivity, the quest for scientific knowledge, and the requirements of worldwide responsibilities have had unplanned and often unforeseen consequences in the form of resource depletion, pollution, ill conceived urbanization, and other aspects of environmental degradation.

4. The attainment of effective national environmental management requires the Nation's endorsement of a set of resource management values which are in the long-range public interest and which merit the support of all social institutions. The Federal role will involve in some measure nearly every Federal agency. Successful Federal leadership in environmental management must be based upon the best possible information and analyses concerning the status and trends of environmental conditions. Federal action must rest upon a clear statement of the values and goals which we seek; in short, a national environmental policy.

There is no general agreement as to how critical the Nation's present environmental situation has become. Some respected scholars insist that a number of crises already exist. Others maintain that there is yet time to prevent them. There is nearly unanimous agreement, however, that action is needed and that, at least in some instances, dangerous conditions exist.

The Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has not concluded that the complex environmental problems we face are susceptible of easy solution. It is however, clear that the Congress cannot disavow its responsibility to establish basic policies and to exercise supervisory powers over the agencies it has created. The Senate Committee on the Judiciary stated this responsibility clearly:

"Policymaking is not a function that can be performed properly by a small group of appointed officials, no matter how able or well intentioned. Only in Congress, where the Members are directly answerable to the electorate, can competing political interests be adequately represented and properly accommodated."

Footnotes at end of article.

In gathering testimony on various aspects of national environmental policy over the past decade, the Senate Interior Committee has received broad support and encouragement from diverse segments of American society—from the scientific community, the universities, business and labor, and from public affairs groups. The committee believes that it is necessary to move ahead to define the "environmental" desires of the American people in operational terms that the President, Government agencies at all levels, the courts, private enterprise, and the public can consider and act upon.

RELATIONSHIP OF S. 1075 TO EXISTING POLICIES AND INSTITUTIONS

Existing policies

Congress over the past decade has passed a procession of landmark conservation measures on behalf of recreation and wilderness, national recreational planning, national water planning and research, wilderness preservation, review of public land policies, establishment of a system of national trails and a system of national scenic rivers, air and water pollution control, noise abatement, preservation of endangered wildlife, urban planning for open space, oceanography, beautification of highways, protection of shorelines and estuaries, and other related areas. Many of these measures originated in the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.⁸ Others originated in other committees of both the Senate and House. All of them, in specific and specialized ways, constitute congressional mandates on various aspects of environmental policy. Taken together, these measures provide an impressive record of congressional action and concern.

Nevertheless, on the basis of recent hearings, seminars, colloquia, and staff studies conducted by the committee, it is clear that there is very real reason for concern for those areas in which no policies have been established or in which the conflicting operational policies of different agencies are frustrating and complicating the achievement of environmental quality objectives which are in the interest of all. Many older operating agencies of the Federal Government, for example, do not at present have a mandate within the body of their enabling laws to allow them to give adequate attention to environmental values. In other agencies, especially when the expenditure of funds is involved, an official's latitude to deviate from narrow policies or the "most economical alternative" to achieve an environmental goal may be strictly circumscribed by congressional authorizations which have overlooked existing or potential environmental problems or the limitations of agency procedures. There is also reason for serious concern over the activities of those agencies which do not feel they have sufficient authority to undertake needed research and action to enhance, preserve, and maintain the qualitative side of the environment in connection with development activities.

S. 1075, as reported by the committee, would provide all agencies and all Federal officials with a legislative mandate and a responsibility to consider the consequences of their actions on the environment. This would be true of the licensing functions of independent agencies as well as the ongoing activities of the regular Federal agencies.

In addition, by providing a statement of national environmental goals, policies, and procedures, S. 1075 would give renewed and vigorous emphasis to the importance of existing environmental programs and legislation.

The problem of providing for better Federal environmental management practices is not totally caused by the lack of a policy. As noted earlier, there are many specific and specialized legislative policies on some as-

pects of the environment. The present problem also involves the need to rationalize and better coordinate existing policies and to provide means by which they may be continuously reviewed to determine whether they meet the overall goal of a quality life in a quality environment for all Americans.

Titles II and III of S. 1075 provide coordinating and oversight measures which are designed to insure that a coordinated Federal response to the problems of environmental management are prepared.

Existing institutions

The Federal Government, at present, is not well structured for the administration of complex environmental issues or to offer meaningful alternatives to past methods of coping with environmental problems.¹⁰ Compensatory measures have been sought through interagency agreements and understandings which require joint consultation and planning in specified cases of natural resources administration.¹¹

While this represents an improvement in some areas of environmental administration and policymaking, the compensatory measures are more in the nature of palliatives than basic reforms, more in the nature of administrative statesmanship rather than basic policy determinations. In effect, they treat the symptoms rather than the basic problems.

Functions of oversight and assessment, insofar as they are presently fulfilled, are vested with a number of committees of the Congress and with the Bureau of the Budget. Budget's concern has proven to be more fiscal than policy oriented. The segmented committee structure of Congress, coupled with inadequate time and staff to survey the broad range of environmental quality problems, make it improbable that all of the committees of Congress will, or can be expected to provide a continuous and informed substitute for legislation through which a comprehensive environmental public policy can be developed and applied.¹²

The present administration has recognized that dealing with complex environmental questions requires the establishment of a focal point for the consideration of environmental values within the Federal Government. On June 3, 1969, President Nixon established by Executive Order 11472 an interagency Environmental Quality Council to be composed of six Cabinet officers and to be chaired by himself. The Executive order also established a Citizens' Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality, revoked a number of prior Executive orders, and delegated certain staff functions to the Director of the Office of Science and Technology.

During the April 16 hearings on S. 1075, members of the Committee expressed approval of the announcement by the Secretary of the Interior and the President's science adviser of the President's intent to establish this interagency Council on the environment. There was general agreement that the Council could be effective in dealing with environmental problems which were of concern to more than one Department of the Federal Government and which required "action."

Many members of the Committee did, however, question whether an interagency council alone could provide the objective and impartial advice and adversary support the President needs in dealing with environmental problems.

Senator Jackson, in a dialog with Dr. DuBridge, noted that—" * * * the advice, with all due respect, that the President would receive from the departments will be advice that will not be adverse to them. It will be compromised advice. This has been the history of the agencies. It is hard for the President to get objective advice. This is why the Bureau of the Budget plays such an important role. This is why your office [Office of

Science and Technology] plays an important role. You have science in every department of the Government, and the President really needs to be armed with information with which he can effectively deal with the Cabinet departments. He needs to be armed with impartial advice, even advice of an adversary nature which will place the options for decision before the President.

"What I am concerned about, you see, is whether or not the President is going to be presented with a series of options that stem from an impartial source. This is casting no reflection on any department, but every Cabinet officer gets pressures right from the bottom on up."

Concern was also expressed by other members of the Committee over whether the President and the Cabinet officers involved would have the time and energy to provide the continuity of effort required. Concern was voiced over the level of staff support which the Office of Science and Technology would be able to make available to assist the President's Council.

Based upon a review of the strengths and weaknesses of both the President's Council and an independent board of environmental advisers as proposed in S. 1075, the Committee believes that both are needed. Their functions and activities as expressed in the Executive order and in title III of S. 1075 are not in conflict. They are complementary bodies: one action-oriented and composed of those Cabinet officers chiefly concerned with environmental matters, and the other providing objective and impartial advice as well as a long-range overview and problem identification function.

SUMMARY

Although historically the Nation has had no considered policy for its environment, the unprecedented pressures of population and the impact of science and technology make a policy necessary today. The expression "environmental quality" symbolizes the complex and interrelated aspects of man's dependence upon his environment. Most Americans now understand, far better than our forebears could the nature of man-environment relationships. The evidence requiring timely public action is clear. The Nation has in many areas overdrawn its bank account in life-sustaining natural elements. For these elements—air, water, soil, and living space—technology at present provides no substitutes. Past neglect and carelessness are now costing us dearly, not merely in opportunities foregone, in impairment of health, and in discomfort and inconvenience, but also in a demand upon tax dollars upon personal incomes, and upon corporate earnings. The longer we delay meeting our environmental responsibilities, the longer the growing list of "interest charges" in environmental deterioration will run. The cost of remedial action and of getting on to a sound basis for the future will never again be less than it is today.¹³

Natural beauty, increased recreational opportunity, urban esthetics and other amenities would be important byproducts of a national environmental policy. They are worthy and important public objectives in their own right. But the compelling reasons for a national policy are more deeply based. The survival of man, in a world in which decency and dignity are possible, is the basic reason for bringing man's impact on his environment under informed and responsible control. The economic costs of maintaining a life-sustaining environment are unavoidable. We have not understood the necessity for respecting the limited capacities of nature in accommodating itself to man's exactions, nor have we properly calculated the cost of adaption to deteriorating conditions. In our management of the environment we have exceeded its adaptive and recuperative powers, and in one form or another we must

Footnotes at end of article.

now pay directly the costs of maintaining air, water, soil, and living space in quantities and qualities sufficient to our needs. Economic good sense requires the declaration of a policy and the establishment of a comprehensive environmental quality program now. Today we have the option of channeling some of our wealth into the protection of our future. If we fail to do this in an adequate and timely manner, we may find ourselves confronted, even in this generation, with an environmental catastrophe that could render our wealth meaningless and which no amount of money could ever cure.

FOOTNOTES

¹ An excellent up-to-date assessment of our present resource posture has been prepared by the Committee on Resources and Man, National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council. The summary of findings and recommendations is presented as appendix 1 of the hearings before the Senate Interior Committee, "National Environmental Policy," Apr. 16, 1969.

² A recent analysis conducted by the staff of the Senate Interior Committee showed that environmental programs are presently administered by 63 Federal agencies located within 10 of the 13 departments as well as 16 independent agencies of the executive branch.

³ National environmental policy, hearings held before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, 91st Cong., first sess., on S. 1075, S. 1752, and S. 237, Apr. 16, 1969, S. 1752, as introduced by Senator Nelson, would create a five-member Council on Environmental Quality in the Office of the President. This Council would be responsible for assisting the President in preparing an annual environmental quality report which would be transmitted to Congress. The report would be reviewed by a Joint Committee on Environmental Quality. The measure would also authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct studies of the natural environment, evaluate and disseminate such information, and consult with and provide technical assistance to departments and agencies of the Government.

S. 237, as introduced by Senator McGovern, would require that the President transmit to the Congress an annual report on the state of the environment. The measure would also authorize the creation of a Council of Advisers on Resources, Conservation, and the Environment which would be in the Executive Office of the President. The three-member Council would assist the President in the preparation of the annual report and in developing and recommending national policies to maintain and improve the environment. For the purpose of consideration of the annual report and plan, this bill would establish in the Senate and the House, special committees to be known as the Select Committees on Resources, Conservation, and Environment.

⁴ The proceedings were published under the title: "Joint House-Senate Colloquium To Discuss a National Policy for the Environment," hearing before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, and the Committee on Science and Astronautics, U.S. House of Representatives, 90th Cong., 2d sess., July 17, 1968.

Following the colloquium, a "Congressional White Paper" was prepared at the request of Cochairman Henry M. Jackson and George Miller by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress. This document, issued as a joint committee print by the Senate Interior Committee and House Science and Astronautics Committee and distributed to the entire Congress in October 1968, summarized the key points raised in the dialog between Members of the Congress and the colloquium participants which included five Cabinet Secretaries, the President's Science Adviser, Mr. Laurance Rockefeller, and Dean Don K. Price of Harvard.

A special report to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on "A National Policy for the Environment" was prepared for the committee's use and was printed as a committee print on July 11, 1968. The report was prepared by Dr. Lynton K. Caldwell of Indiana University and William J. Van Ness, special counsel to the committee. The report was used as a background document for the colloquium. It raises and discusses in detail many of the issues and questions implicit in establishing a national environmental policy.

⁵ Proposed Resources and Conservation Act of 1960, hearings before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, 86th Cong., second sess. on S. 2549, Jan. 25, 26, 28, and 29, 1960, Ecological Research and Surveys, hearings before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, 89th Cong., second sess., April 27, 1966, on S. 2282.

⁶ For a detailed listing of these documents see app. A, entitled "A Documentation on Environmental Problems," p. 25, in A National Policy for the Environment, committee print, Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, July 11, 1968; see also the "Bibliography on Environmental Issues," pp. 192-204 in National Environmental Policy, hearing before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, 91st Cong., on S. 1075, S. 237, and S. 1752, Apr. 16, 1969.

⁷ In the closing days of the 90th Cong., the Legislative Reference Service tabulated over 100 bills which were directly concerned with environmental issues, covering a broad area of interest—cleaning up the Nation's rivers and better approaches to smog control, improving the use of open space and prevention of disorderly encroachment by superhighways, factories and other developments, improved protection of areas of high fertility, wiser application of pesticides, whose residues affect both man and wildlife, and the control of urban sprawl, unsightly junkyards, billboards, and power facilities that lower the amenities of landscape.

In the present Congress, an initial tabulation indicates that over 40 bills have been introduced which are concerned either with a national policy for the environment or the establishment of machinery to study the overall problems of the human environment. Of the 18 standing committees of the Senate, eight have broad jurisdiction of this type of legislation. Of the 21 House standing committees, 11 are similarly involved. See "A National Policy for the Environment," app. B, p. 29, committee print of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, July 11, 1968; "Congressional White Paper on A National Policy for the Environment," app. p. 17, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, October 1968; and Legislative Reference Service Multilith, TP 450, SP 170 entitled "Environmental Quality: Selected Bills and Resolutions," June 20, 1969.

⁸ See, for example, "Selected Excerpts on Environmental Management Policy," in the Congressional Record, Feb. 6, 1968, by Senator Jackson, and the committee publications cited in previous footnotes.

⁹ See or example, "A Brief Presentation of the Committee's History and Jurisdiction, and A Summary of its Accomplishments During the 90th Congress," committee print, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, 90th Cong., 2d Sess.

See, also the existing legislation which affects coordination of Federal, air quality, water quality, solid waste disposal, and related public works projects cited in S. 2391, introduced by Senator Muskie and others on June 12, 1969.

¹⁰ This deficiency has been thoroughly discussed in two documents of the National Academy of Sciences: Paul Weiss, "Renewable Resources: A Report to the Committee on Natural Resources" (NAS-NRC Publ. No. 100A, 1962; "Resources and Man," NAS-NRC. (In press.) Also see Lynton K. Caldwell, "Ad-

ministrative Possibilities for Environmental Control," in The Future Environments of North America (Natural History Press, 1966), and the hearings on S. 1075.

¹¹ The inadequacies of such compensatory measures are discussed in the following: Stephen K. Bailey, "Managing the Federal Government," in Agenda for the Nation (Brookings Institution, 1968).

¹² This fundamental issue was fully discussed in the "Congressional White Paper on a National Policy for the Environment," op. cit.

¹³ For a discussion of the economic and social costs of continuing past environmental management practices see page 5, "A National Policy for the Environment," Committee Print, Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, July 11, 1968.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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 establish a national policy for the environment; to authorize studies, surveys, and research relating to ecological systems, natural resources, and the quality of the human environment; and to establish a Board of Environmental Quality Advisers."

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I express my thanks to the distinguished senior Senator from Florida for making time available.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank my friend, the Senator from Washington. I was happy to yield, and I support the measure which he has just carried through to passage.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 133— INTRODUCTION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION REDESIGNATING CAPE KENNEDY AS CAPE CANAVERAL

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the tragic death of our late, beloved President John F. Kennedy, by an assassin's bullet, left this Nation and other free nations throughout the world stunned with grief. Along with millions of others, I shared the grief on that sad occasion.

Understandably, during our period of mourning some things were done without our properly thinking through the actions taken. Upon reflection and further study, we find that the action taken by the Board of Geographic Names of the Department of the Interior, upon the request of President Johnson, redesignating Cape Canaveral in Florida as "Cape Kennedy," was ill-advised. However, the President's Executive Order 11129, dated November 29, 1963, design-

nating the facilities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Department of Defense located on Cape Canaveral as the John F. Kennedy Space Center, was most fitting.

Mr. President, the people of Florida are in complete accord with the action taken by President Johnson in designating the NASA and Department of Defense facilities on Cape Canaveral the John F. Kennedy Space Center. It is a proper and lasting memorial to a dearly loved President whose every effort was to aid his fellow man, his country, and the people of the world to a better and more peaceful way of life and whose inspired leadership did so much to advance our exploration of outer space. Our Florida people are proud to have on our soil the John F. Kennedy Space Center.

However, Mr. President, I do not believe that John F. Kennedy, who was a historian of note and who cherished the heritage of this Nation, would have wanted action taken that would in any way cause us to lose any of our historical background attained throughout the years. The name Cape Canaveral is one of the oldest known and most continuously used place names on the American Atlantic coast. The discovery of this landmark is accredited to Ponce de Leon and its name is recorded on many of the earliest known Spanish and French maps and charts before even Cape Cod, Cape Hatteras, and Jamestown bore their proud names. It was in use on maps and charts of world navigators from the days of the discovery and exploration of Florida until 1963, well over 400 years.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am today submitting a resolution for myself and my distinguished colleague, Senator GURNEY, which would redesignate Cape Kennedy as Cape Canaveral. I emphasize that this is a joint, bipartisan, and even nonpartisan resolution offered jointly by the two Senators from Florida. This resolution also provides that the facilities of NASA and the Department of Defense referred to in Presidential Executive Order 11129 dated November 29, 1963, shall continue to be known permanently as the John F. Kennedy Space Center.

I might add that I have personally discussed the introduction of this resolution with the senior Senator from Massachusetts so that he would be apprised of the fact that the Florida State Legislature recently passed a resolution requesting that Cape Kennedy be officially redesignated Cape Canaveral and would understand the attitude of the people of the State of Florida regarding the proposal as reflected in numerous newspaper editorials throughout the State, and by the resolution of the Florida State Historical Society and by numerous other historical and civic bodies.

I ask that this resolution be received and appropriately referred to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 133), to redesignate the area in the State of Florida known as Cape Kennedy as Cape Canaveral, introduced by Mr. HOLLAND

(for himself and Mr. GURNEY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs (by unanimous consent).

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I now yield to my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY).

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I am most happy to cosponsor this resolution with my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Florida.

I reiterate what he has said, that this represents the overwhelming sentiment of the people in the area of Cape Canaveral, Cape Kennedy, and the Kennedy Space Center, as well as other parts of Florida. I perhaps know the area better than any other Member of Congress, because I represented it for 6 years in the House of Representatives, before I began my service in the Senate. I know personally a great many of the people who work in the space center and who work outside of the space center.

I can attest to the fact that it is the overwhelming sentiment of the people of the area that the name be changed back to its former name, Cape Canaveral, from its present name.

As the senior Senator from Florida has pointed out, this sentiment is overwhelmingly supported not only by the people of the area but also by resolutions of the Florida Legislature, bipartisan and nonpartisan, joined by Democrats and Republicans. It also represents the wishes of the congressional delegation from Florida.

Actually, I think the change of the name of the geographical point, Cape Canaveral, was probably a mistake. I did quite a bit of research in this matter some years ago, in 1963, when the name was changed. The Executive order of the President, which was referred to by Senator HOLLAND, makes no mention, of course, of Cape Canaveral. It simply refers to the Air Force station and to the NASA installation and designates them as the Kennedy Space Center—something with which the people of Florida agree; and we are very proud that it bears the name of the late President Kennedy.

Actually, however, further research that I did on this matter 5 years ago indicated to my satisfaction that the name change accomplished by the Board of Geographic Names, which is the Federal agency charged with this responsibility, was really a mistake.

Without going into the details of the facts and circumstances, there were no hearings at the time as required by law. As a matter of fact, there was not even a meeting of the full Board. How it came about, I do not know. But I do not think the intention at that time was really to change the name of the geographic area.

I might further point out—and I think this is really the meat of the situation; the Senator has touched upon it, and I will emphasize it—that the historical significance of the name "Cape Canaveral" goes back well over 400 years. As a matter of fact, the earliest date is 1530, so the Library of Congress has informed me, and the name then appeared upon an early map of that date. It appeared on other maps, also. It

may well be the oldest geographical point in the United States. It certainly is one of the earliest in the United States and the Western Hemisphere, for that matter.

The people who desire the name change really want to preserve the historical significance of the name "Cape Canaveral." That is the reason for the introduction of the resolution, and that certainly is the reason for the unanimous support behind it. Everybody wants the name of the space installation to remain as it is today—the Kennedy Space Center. But the overwhelming sentiment is that the geographical point now known as Cape Kennedy be changed back to Cape Canaveral.

I would hope that the Senate would early consider and speedily and favorably pass upon this resolution.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague for his able and very fine remarks.

I yield the floor.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the transaction of routine morning business, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

THE ABM SYSTEM

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the point of concentration in the pending debate is upon the ABM and its deployment, yet the issue is wider. One cannot deal with the question of the ABM in isolation, but of necessity must consider it in its relationship to our strategic force levels and its companion and supplemental systems. For example, it is impossible to consider the ABM unless at the same time we contemplate the implications of MIRV's.

Much has been said about the action-reaction effect of the nuclear arms race. Ineed, none of our actions and none of our systems are unrelated to the behavior of other nuclear powers; nor are they unrelated to our military or diplomatic responsibilities around the globe. Mr. President, there are hopes within this Chamber that some compromise on the present issue can be reached. The distinguished Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER) and the able Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) have proposed a sound alternative.

Yet, let us project our thoughts beyond the debate today. It seems essential that we consider the forthcoming arms limitation talks with the Soviet Union and their prospects. All approach these negotiations with profound hope; but good intentions are nothing more than good dreams unless they are accompanied by action.

How can we create the best conditions and best attitude to commence these talks?

I would suggest the Senate proceed with the military procurement bill now before us but delay or set aside action upon the ABM system. I would suggest that the administration announce that we would cease all testing of the MIRV system. Indeed it might be advisable to

proclaim that we will cease all production of strategic forces, continuing only on those essential for the war in Vietnam, and that these things would be done upon the condition that the Soviet Union take reciprocal action. This would be a moratorium in effect upon strategic weapons development. It would allow us to enter negotiations under what I deem to be the best circumstances. We could begin these talks under conditions superior to those in Paris, where negotiations must labor under "fight and talk" conditions. Moreover, Mr. President, this is a position that would show our good faith, our good will, test the good faith of the Soviet Union, and in fact put us in an aggressive position in the fight for peace. It would represent a posture of putting us in a strong affirmative position as we enter these negotiations.

Mr. President, this proposal has been presented, in an indirect manner, to the Executive. I am assured it will be seriously received and considered. Yet, I emphasize that it bears no mark of approval by the President or by his administration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEARSON. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Kansas for his remarks on the ABM and the suggestions he has made.

As always, the Senator has come to the point. He has made a proposal which in my opinion has a great deal of merit. It indicates that there is a need for a compromise on the situation relative to the ABM. The compromise which will be before the Senate at the appropriate time is the Cooper-Hart amendment, which he thinks, as I do, has a good deal of merit.

I would hope that the administration would pay serious attention to what the distinguished Senator has had to say. As always, what he has had to say is worth noting.

Mr. PEARSON. I thank the majority leader.

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

Mr. PEARSON. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I also desire to compliment the distinguished senior Senator from Kansas for the remarks he has just made. Not only do I compliment him, but also, I associate myself with the views he has expressed.

Mr. PEARSON. I thank the distinguished Senator.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 minutes.

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

VIETNAM IS A NATIONAL TRAGEDY—LET US LEARN FROM OUR MISTAKES

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in my lifetime I have served as both a

private and an officer in the Armed Forces of our Nation in time of war. In World War II, I served for 37 months. During that period I was in North Africa and Italy most of the time. While I personally found it much harder to be a private than to be an officer, the facts are I never attained a very high rank in our Army being discharged early in 1946 with the rank of lieutenant colonel. I have always held the officers of our Armed Forces in the highest admiration. The truth is that in 1945 I toyed with the idea of remaining in the Army and making that service my career.

I have no personal knowledge that military officers of our Nation have been much maligned nor that they are currently the whipping boys of critics of our involvement in a civil war in South Vietnam, of whom I certainly am one.

In recent years irresponsible optimistic statements on the progress of the Vietnam war have been made by civilian officials in the executive branch of our Government and also by some of our generals and admirals. I assert that these generals, admirals, and civilian officials in the executive branch of our Government have been proven tragically wrong. Their unjustifiably optimistic predictions were proven so thoroughly wrong that no doubt public confidence in the credibility of our military and civilian leaders has undermined to some extent public confidence in the credibility of our Government.

Mr. President, in October 1965, I spent nearly a month in Southeast Asia, and in that period I visited every area in South Vietnam, visiting Army, Marine, and air bases and also our naval base at Cam Ranh Bay not yet completed at that time. I visited all our air and coastal bases in Thailand and had the experience of being flown by helicopter over the South China Sea, landing on the U.S. carrier *Bon Homme Richard* and observing our bomber planes returning from their missions.

Last year I was again in South Vietnam, also in Laos and Thailand. Again, I was in every area in South Vietnam and also in Laos. It was frightening to me to be told that Laos might well be the next place in Southeast Asia where Americans would be fighting and dying. I was on a factfinding mission. It was my endeavor to be objective, fair and impartial. In the course of my visits in Vietnam I had the opportunity to interview that flamboyant Air Marshal Ky who as an officer in the French Air Force fought with the French seeking to reestablish their lush Indo-Chinese Colonial Empire against the forces of the National Liberation Front then termed Viet Minh, now termed VC. This fellow is now vice president of the militarist Saigon regime headed by General Thieu.

In my judgment this regime lacks the support of more than 20 percent of the Vietnamese living in South Vietnam. Except for the support of half a million fighting men of our Armed Forces, I am convinced that the present Saigon regime lacking support of its own people could not exist 1 week.

I recall distinctly that Gen. William C. Westmoreland stated in 1965:

All I can say is that we Americans are no longer losing the war.

I wish to pay tribute to Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway under whom I served in World War II. General Ridgway said:

It is my firm belief that there is nothing in our code that requires us to bomb a small Asian nation back into the stone age.

Also, to Gen. James Gavin, former chief of Army plans and operations and later American Ambassador to France who said during the period of our heaviest escalation of the war:

To increase the bombing and to bomb Hanoi will add to our problems rather than detract from them, and it will not stop the penetration of north Vietnamese troops into the south.

Gen. Omar Bradley, a heroic commander in World War II and former Chief of Staff, wisely stated:

For the United States to be drawn into a war on the Asian mainland would be the wrong war in the wrong place at the wrong time against the wrong enemy.

Another great American, Gen. David M. Shoup, former Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps in 1966 stated:

In my judgment, the whole of Southeast Asia as related to the present and future safety and freedom of the American people is not worth the life of a single American.

In an article in the April 1969 edition of *Atlantic Monthly*, General Shoup charged that an ambitious elite of high-ranking officers from all branches of our Armed Forces prefer war to peace and are turning the United States into a militaristic and aggressive nation. He has asserted that the search for promotion, interservice rivalry, and an eagerness to test military doctrines were the prime factors behind our involvement in Vietnam. General Shoup charges that military, naval, Marine, and Air Force leaders were so eager and so obsessed to test new equipment and tactics in Vietnam that they encouraged the Johnson administration to mire the United States in the quagmire of Vietnam. This, from one of our Nation's greatest fighting men and a former member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. President, I could go on at length citing great American military and naval leaders who have been critical of our involvement in the immoral, undeclared war in Vietnam. I could also spend a great deal of time recalling the remarks of generals and admirals who supported that effort. Senators will recall that in a recent issue of the *Reader's Digest*, Adm. U.S. Grant Sharp, former commander of our naval forces in the Pacific, stated that our air power could have won the war in Vietnam. He assailed former Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara as the principal villain for our failing to do so. The admiral claimed that had we bombed railroad yards and power stations in Hanoi and the docks in Haiphong "we could have quickly broken North Vietnam's resistance." He failed to mention that had we done so we would have killed hundreds of thousands of civilians—children, women, and men, including no doubt some officers and crew members of freighters of foreign nations including Poland, the United Kingdom,

the Soviet Union, West Germany, and other nationals. Also, that such aggressive action might have precipitated world war III. Also, that we would have run the dangerous risk of Communist Chinese intervention and our involvement in a land war in Asia with Communist China and its 800 million people. This myopic admiral chose to ignore almost completely the fact that this would very likely have led to nuclear war and perhaps the killing of 40 or 50 million Americans and the end of civilization as we know it. Civilian policymakers did not veto the bombing of Haiphong Harbor because, as the admiral claimed, "it would not affect the enemy's capability of waging war in South Vietnam," but because they retained the foresight and good sense to realize that this might widen the war into a worldwide nuclear holocaust. Our civilian leadership realized that this little agrarian country, 10,000 miles from our shores, is of no strategic or economic importance to the defense of the United States and was not worth this fantastic risk.

Admiral Sharp's reasoning was perhaps not only a mere misconception and distortion of history, but the beginning of an attempt by some military and naval leaders to exonerate themselves completely for our failure in Vietnam and to place the blame on civilian leadership.

Mr. President, it is clear that no one person, civilian or military, is responsible for the tragedy, in fact for the insanity, of our involving more than half a million young Americans now engaged in fighting a war in Vietnam and more than 2 million young Americans who have fought there in recent years. All those who participated in the decisionmaking processes of Government during our escalation and expansion of this civil war into an American air and ground war from the President, the Secretary of State, the generals of our Joint Chiefs of Staff on down bear heavy responsibility. All who stood idly by and did not speak out as we became ever more mired down in the Vietnam quagmire also bear some responsibility.

Vietnam is a national tragedy of immense proportions. Let us hope that the war will soon come to an end. Then, let us as a united people begin to correct the evils which it has perpetrated and prolonged in our society. Let us then begin to rebuild our society and to restore confidence in America and in our foreign policies.

Most important, we must be temperate in placing responsibility and blame on any one group of policymakers, whether they be civilian or military, for our mistakes in Vietnam. Likewise, if we are to learn from our mistakes of the past we must resist the temptation to whitewash those responsible for this tragedy.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 6508) in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

THEY WERE NOT LISTENING

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, it has come to my attention that two of my distinguished colleagues, the Senator from Ohio (Mr. SAXBE) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK), have been subjected to one of the oldest and most tattered of charges known in political life; namely, of campaigning one way and voting another.

These two distinguished Senators need no defense from me. Jesse R. Shaffer, the Cincinnati Enquirer's bureau chief, has set the record straight in an article he wrote on July 6, 1969, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

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

"THEY WEREN'T LISTENING"

(By Jesse R. Shaffer)

WASHINGTON.—When Marlow W. Cook, Republican candidate for the U.S. Senate from Kentucky, finished speaking before a state Chamber of Commerce luncheon in Louisville last August, one of the ladies in the audience exclaimed: "My, what a wonderful speaker!"

"Did you like what he said?" she was asked.

"I'm not sure what he said," came the reply, "but he sure is a wonderful speaker."

During that same campaign period, across the Ohio River, a Portsmouth, Ohio, resident was asked his views on the race between Senate candidates William B. Saxbe and John J. Gilligan.

"I don't really know how they stand," he said, "but I do know that I'd never vote for that Gilligan."

Multiply this inattentiveness, this lack of interest—call it what you will—by thousands of times and it is easy to understand why both Cook and Saxbe now find themselves being cast in the role of publicity seekers, mavericks, traitors to their Republican party or, as one Ohioan referred to Saxbe recently, "A Republican Frank Lausche."

(This latter description, of course, refers to Saxbe's predecessor in the U.S. Senate, Frank J. Lausche who, while running as a Democrat, voted more often with the Republicans.)

Conservatives in both Ohio and Kentucky now are accusing the two freshmen lawmakers of changing horses after they arrived in Washington to take up the posts to which they were elected last November.

Yet both claim that they have not changed.

"I haven't done anything down here (in Washington) I didn't indicate I would do during my campaign," Saxbe declared recently, adding: "If they (his critics) don't know that, they weren't listening."

Cook agrees.

"I don't know of anything that I've changed my position on since the campaign," the Kentuckian said. "I think Saxbe's right, they just were not paying any attention to what we said."

A check of speeches and position papers drafted by the candidates during the campaign, as well as statements made by them since the election indicate that the two may have hit upon the answer—the people weren't listening.

Most of the criticism stems from the public stands the two have taken on the Vietnam war, military spending and welfare issues.

Yet both men last fall were speaking out against over-commitment in Vietnam; the need to "win or get out."

Almost as though the two had the same campaign speech writer, both said early in their campaign that the United States could

no longer serve as a world policeman. They are both repeating the same beliefs now.

Both said the 10% surtax should be abolished, and both continue to say it here.

They called for saving millions of dollars being wasted on unproductive programs, both in the military and nonmilitary fields. They are still calling for these same cutbacks.

And both men called during the campaign for reordering the national priorities with a view toward paying more attention to solving domestic problems. That is still their stand.

Probably the most criticism has come because of the united stand Saxbe and Cook have taken on one big controversial issue, the Nixon administration's plan to deploy an anti-ballistic missile system.

While the Ohio and Kentucky lawmakers are vehemently opposed to the administration's plan, they were on record as being opposed long before President Nixon reached a decision on deployment.

So far, Mr. Nixon and his advisors have been unable to convince Messrs. Saxbe and Cook that he's right, they're wrong.

Unlike many of the liberals with whom they're lumped and who oppose the ABM on moral or emotional grounds, Cook and Saxbe maintain their opposition is technical and that their position is, despite what the critics claim, the position of a true conservative.

"I came to Washington on record as being opposed to wasteful spending," Cook said recently.

"I will not vote to spend billions of dollars for a system that will not work, or that will be outmoded before it's completed."

"If that isn't the view of a true fiscal conservative, then I don't know what it is."

Saxbe, likewise, said he opposed the ABM because he doesn't believe it will work, and, therefore, isn't worth the money.

The two senators believe that their position is much more defensible than that of so-called conservatives who vote for huge military spending programs, then vote against such legislation as the surtax extension bill which would provide at least a portion of the money that goes to pay for the programs.

"We're consistent conservatives, at least," remarked Cook.

Studying the two men and their records, it appears that both were voted into office by an electorate not fully—or, in some cases, not even remotely—aware of their positions on various issues.

Neither man was ever as conservative as many Republicans believed, but the ultra-liberal opposition both faced last November did nothing to mar that image.

Except for their differing opinions on one or two major issues, both are cast in the moderate mold that seems to also suit President Nixon.

They are not, nor do they need to be, as willing to make political concessions to either the liberal or conservative factions as Mr. Nixon seems to be on the basis of their records thus far.

While both seem a bit surprised that they have been tabbed as mavericks by many of the people back home, they feel that this image will change.

Saxbe claims that by the end of the current session, he will have voted with the administration more than he has voted against it.

Cook says he, too, believes it's too early for anyone to be attacking his voting record. He'll speak up for the administration whenever his conscience allows.

However, the question again is: Will anyone be listening?

LATEST AMERICAN CASUALTIES IN VIETNAM

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, today I inquired of the Department of Defense

with respect to the casualties in Vietnam, and it has reported that there were 1,737 casualties last week in killed and wounded.

This brings the total, since President Nixon's inauguration, to more than 48,000 American casualties in Vietnam.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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.

CALIFORNIA DISASTER RELIEF ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after clearing this matter on both sides, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on H.R. 6508.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate H.R. 6508, to provide assistance to the State of California for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent storms, floods, and high waters, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all after the enacting clause of H.R. 6508 be stricken and that there be substituted therefor the full text of S. 1685, as passed by the Senate on July 8, 1969.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

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

THE ABM

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the Senate soon will turn to the amendment—submitted yesterday by Senators COOPER and HART—to prohibit deployment of the Safeguard ABM. A number of other Senators and I have joined with the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Michigan in sponsoring this amendment, because of our belief

that deploying this weapons system at this time would be a serious error.

A number of discussions on the Senate floor yesterday picked up the outlines of the arguments for and against deployment which have been before us for more than a year. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee noted in his remarks, for example, that the emphasis of the arguments of those favoring deployment appears now to have shifted to Safeguard's hypothetical utility as a bargaining card—or, as it has sometimes been referred to, as a multibillion-dollar poker chip.

It is not surprising that this particular "bargaining card" argument has been resurrected. For the searching examination the ABM in recent months has uncovered deep cracks in the other arguments—particularly the one that Safeguard will protect our deterrent.

I have recently read a short paper which describes graphically and dramatically this serious flaw in the Safeguard Phase I deployment, as recommended by the administration and approved by the Armed Services Committee. This flaw is the relative ease with which the Soviets could neutralize Safeguard. The paper is not technical; it is, rather, based primarily on commonsense. Because of its significance, I shall ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD so that all Senators may study it.

It points out that Safeguard Phase I—the ABM recommended—will not be completed for at least 60 months. Yet, in from 6 to 12 months, the Soviets could build enough new ICBM's—on top of those they already have—to make it entirely ineffective and useless. These new ICBM's would simply exhaust our defending missiles, laying bare the hypothetical target—our own Minutemen missiles.

To me, this argument appears irrefutable, at least as it applies to the potential threat. As it applies to a hypothetical threat from another source—as, for example, an irrational Chinese attack—it is hard to understand why the Chinese would attack precisely those two sites where we had defensive missiles. They would be much more likely, I should think, to attack our cities, which would be undefended—and which cannot be defended.

This is a compelling argument to vote against the funds for deploying Safeguard Phase I. We would be better advised, it seems to me, to continue our research into the problem of ballistic missile defenses generally, as amendment No. 68 would require. We may yet develop an effective ballistic missile defense—but Safeguard does not appear to be the one.

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

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

THE SAFEGUARD ABM: ITS ESSENTIAL WEAKNESS

The Defense Procurement Authorization bill presently before the Senate would au-

thorize \$345.5 million for deployment of the Safeguard ABM in fiscal year 1970. To this \$345.5 million would be added \$15 million in carry-over appropriations, bringing the total procurement funds to \$360.5 million for the current fiscal year.

This sum would permit the Army to begin construction work on Phase I of Safeguard—two operational ABM sites at our Minuteman ICBM fields in Montana and North Dakota. The Administration has recommended deployment of only these two sites, and the Committee on Armed Services has authorized only those funds for FY 1970 necessary to carry deployment through June 30, 1970. The remaining funds for Phase I deployment—some \$940 million—will have to be authorized in subsequent years.

The essential weakness of the Safeguard ABM can be readily demonstrated if we assume the completion of Phase I. Secretary of Defense Laird has estimated the "equipment readiness date" for the Grand Forks site as January, 1974, and for the Malmstrom site as July, 1974. Past experience with complex military weapons systems indicates that these dates will probably not be met, but will actually be at least 6 months to a year later than estimated.

The Minuteman fields at Grand Forks and Malmstrom have roughly one-third of our 1000 Minuteman missiles. Yet Secretary Laird has testified that Safeguard Phase I will provide a "fairly thick cover" for "10-20 percent of our Minuteman force," or 2 of the 6 Minuteman wings. A "fairly thick cover" is protection by both the Spartan and Sprint missiles—or a "point defense". Thus, Safeguard Phase I would protect only from 100 to 200 of our 1000 Minuteman missiles—at a cost of \$2.1 billion.

The number of Sprint and Spartan missiles we would employ in Safeguard Phase I remains classified. Yet we can be certain that once construction of our Sprint and Spartan missile silos begins, the Soviets will, through satellite reconnaissance, know with certainty how many we intend to deploy. The Soviets would then have a simple task before them to neutralize Safeguard Phase I—which of course their defense planners will seek to do just as we have plans to neutralize their ABM. Pentagon witnesses have testified that our neutralizing technique is saturation: if they have 70 anti-ICBM missiles, then we fire at these 70 missiles 70 warheads of our own, thus exhausting the defense and wiping out the protection of the target.

This is the simplest way of countering an ABM, and the surest. There are, of course, others—utilizing mechanical and electronic penetration aids. But this saturation technique is so obvious and so comparatively inexpensive as to be almost certain to be used.

Since the number of Safeguard Phase I Sprints and Spartans is classified, we can make a table using various numbers of these missiles to reveal how simply the Soviets can neutralize Phase I. This table appears at the end of this paper.

It shows quite clearly that if Safeguard Phase I had 300 Sprints/Spartans, then the Soviets in 12 months could produce enough new SS-9s, each with 10 warheads, to neutralize Safeguard. If the SS-9's had 20 warheads, then it would take only 6 months. We should not forget that Safeguard Phase I is estimated to be completed in July, 1974—or 60 months from now.

This is the essential weakness of Safeguard. It shows quite clearly that Safeguard Phase I would add to our national security only if the Soviets chose to ignore it—an assumption only the most naive would make. In sum, Safeguard would not appear to be anything but false security and a waste of scarce Federal funds.

TABLE 1

Number of Sprints/Spartans	Number of SS-9's needed to saturate		Months needed to produce new SS-9's	
	10 warheads	20 warheads	10 warheads	20 warheads
100	10	5	4	2
300	30	15	12	6
600	60	30	24	12
1,000	100	50	40	20

NOTES

1. This table assumes that both our ABM and the Soviet ICBM's have 100 percent reliability. This is of course a false assumption; a 70-percent figure might be more realistic.

2. The SS-9 can easily be designed to carry 10 or 20 or perhaps even more MIRV'd warheads by 1974.

3. The Soviets now have 230 SS-9's; by 1975, they "are expected to have somewhere around 400" (Secretary Laird). This is a deployment rate of roughly 3 per month.

4. The Soviets do not need to use the SS-9 to saturate the ABM. They could instead use the smaller, less expensive SS-11 or SS-13, each of which have good accuracy and could carry multiple warheads.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

TERMINATION OF THE USE OF NATIONAL AIRPORT BY JET AIRCRAFT

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, yesterday my distinguished colleague from Colorado introduced a bill—S. 2570—that would direct the Secretary of Transportation to prepare and implement a program that would terminate the use of National Airport by pure jet aircraft. The legislation would also direct the Secretary to prepare and submit a plan to Congress for a high-speed surface transportation system that would connect Washington with Dulles and Friendship airports.

To my knowledge this is the first legislation introduced in the Senate that would bar jet aircraft from National.

The Senator, in introducing his bill, among other things, said, "I have understood that this bill will probably be sent to committee and be buried."

Unless the proposal contained in a bill lacks merit, it is not buried in the Commerce Committee, and so if this bill lacks merit it will be treated accordingly.

It seems to me it is a little unfair for the author to accuse a committee of burying his bill before it is even printed.

If it comes to the Aviation Subcommittee and we believe it is deserving of public hearing, it will get public hearing.

I should point out that the discontinuance of jets at National would result in a serious cost of manpower to the Nation. The shuttles alone carry approximately 20,000 persons per day, and 1 hour longer travel time for each per day would result in thousands of hours of loss in productivity to the Nation's economy.

The Commerce Committee has been extremely concerned about many of the problems which the Senator points to, and which affect especially Washington National Airport. The committee has taken the leadership in Congress in seeking to come to grips with the problem of noise and pollution created by jet airplanes. As a matter of fact, last year the committee held hearings, then reported a bill which ultimately became Public Law 90-411 which directs the FAA to prescribe certain minimum noise

abatement regulations relating to jet aircraft operation. At the present time, pursuant to this law, the FAA is promulgating regulations which when in effect will significantly reduce the noise level of commercial jet transports.

The Commerce Committee and particularly the Aviation Subcommittee far from seeking to, as the Senator puts it, "bury legislation designed to meet the problems of civil aviation," has on the contrary provided the leadership in many of these areas and the record on legislation from this committee speaks for itself. Together with the distinguished Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the chairman of the committee and former Senator Monroney, the distinguished previous chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee, we have moved forward and will move forward in the future to consider all legislation which has a bearing on making our aviation system both more safe and efficient.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR GOODELL TOMORROW

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL) be permitted to speak for 20 minutes following the time allotted to the distinguished Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH) tomorrow.

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

AWARD OF THE SPINGARN MEDAL TO CLARENCE M. MITCHELL, JR.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS) will make some remarks and lead the tributes to Clarence Mitchell for his having received the Spingarn Medal. I will take the opportunity simply to express my congratulations to Mr. Mitchell.

He is deserving and worthy of this high honor. Over the years since I entered the Senate, I have counseled with him many times, as have most Senators who seek to forward the goals and dreams of the civil rights movement. His judgment is superb and his wisdom unsurpassed. I am delighted that he has been chosen to receive this recognition.

I applaud the Senator from Maryland for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I rise at this point to pay tribute to an outstanding American. I should like to have delayed my remarks until such time as he might be able to hear them personally in the gallery, but he is presently testifying before an important committee on an extremely vital measure; namely, the extension of the Voting Rights Act of 1965; so he cannot be here at this moment to hear what I have to say.

However, knowing that this is the time set aside for me and others to speak on this subject, I shall go ahead as planned.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, each year the National Association for the

Advancement of Colored People selects a particular outstanding Negro American to receive the Spingarn Medal, an award instituted in 1914, to recognize distinguished merit or achievement during the year or years preceding.

Last week, at the NAACP Convention in Jackson, Miss., the 1969 medal was awarded to a Marylander, a distinguished son of the Free State, Clarence M. Mitchell, Jr.

The award message reads as follows:

For his selfless devotion to the task of ending racial bias;

For his uncompromising rejection of racism, white or black;

For his wisdom and tenacity in the pursuit of just laws;

For his abiding faith in the democratic process as a means of achieving freedom and equality for all; and

For the pivotal role he has played in enactment of civil rights legislation, particularly the Civil Rights Act of 1968, with its fair housing title.

Mr. President, I have this morning received a telegram from Andrew J. Biemiller, director of legislation for the AFL-CIO, which reads as follows:

JULY 10, 1969.

Hon. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
U.S. Senate
Washington, D.C.

The AFL-CIO is proud to join you in honoring Clarence Mitchell as recipient of the coveted Spingarn Medal. During our long relationship with Mr. Mitchell, he has earned our deepest respect and admiration for his courage and integrity.

Clarence Mitchell, by his words and his actions, has proved that civil rights victories can be won through the democratic system. As Director of the Washington Bureau of the NAACP, he has been a leader of the continuing battle for social justice.

The AFL-CIO has worked closely with Clarence Mitchell on Capitol Hill and through the executive agencies of the Federal government. We know full well the crucial role he has played in securing enactment of the major civil rights laws passed during the 1960s. We know, too, of his continuing efforts to see that the intent of these laws is upheld.

No one is more entitled to the Spingarn Medal. The AFL-CIO is pleased to join in saluting our good friend and respected ally, Clarence Mitchell.

ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
Director of Legislation,
AFL-CIO.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, it is a privilege to join in congratulating my good friend and fellow Marylander, Clarence M. Mitchell, who was recently honored by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People as the 54th recipient of the Spingarn Medal.

This award pays tribute to Clarence Mitchell for his service and his accomplishments not just during the past year, but throughout the more than two decades which he has devoted to the cause of equal rights and peaceful progress under law.

In these days of turmoil, shouting, and disruption, it is more important than ever to pay tribute to the men and women who have labored quietly, patiently and effectively within the democratic process and the legislative halls to secure in law and in fact those rights and liberties pledged to all Americans in the Constitution. Clarence Mitchell is one

such man. Impelled by deep conviction and sustained by remarkable energy and faith, he has been as instrumental as any single man in conceiving, shaping and gaining passage of some of the most important legislation of this century.

The Civil Rights Act of 1957, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the Civil Rights Act of 1968 are commonly called landmarks in our national drive toward social justice. None of these laws bears Clarence Mitchell's name, but all of them bear his mark. And it is a real tribute to the man that he has made this mark with dignity, with honesty, with the kind of personal integrity which is recognized even by those who may not always share his views.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. I should like to join in the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Maryland, and say that we are all very much pleased, and we are all honored, too, by the honor extended to Mr. Clarence Mitchell in the award of the very much coveted Spingarn Medal, which is not awarded lightly, and which carries with it the attributes of dedication, devotion to a cause, willingness and competence to follow through to the achievement of difficult ends, and recognition that there is no higher challenge to a human being than to strive continually to improve the estate of man and the dignity of humankind.

And in this our friend, Clarence Mitchell, has established himself not only as a man, but also as a standard around whom others, from conscience and conviction can share his views and his recognition of formidable challenges.

In recognizing him as a standard, we honor ourselves as well as the causes to which we commit ourselves. It is a great pleasure to be able to join in the tribute with the distinguished Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished minority whip, the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, today we pay long deserved tribute to a man who embodies all that is best in lobbying.

He lobbies not for special financial interests, but for the rights guaranteed in our Constitution.

He asks not for special favors, but for equal treatment.

On July 3 he received the coveted Spingarn Medal, presented annually since 1914 to recognize achievements of the American Negro.

I refer, of course, to Clarence Mitchell, director of the Washington Bureau of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Not only does Mr. Mitchell lobby for human causes, but he lobbies effectively.

In reporting on the effort to enact the civil rights bill of 1968, the Congressional Quarterly said:

Seldom has an individual lobbyist been accorded so much credit for the outcome of a bill as was Mitchell.

As floor manager for that bill I attest to the accuracy of that observation.

Mr. President, in seeking to pay tribute to men such as Clarence Mitchell one always gropes for the correct words. In this case however, the task is made easier, for Mr. Mitchell supplied the works himself in accepting the Spingarn Medal. He said:

I have spent most of my life hoping for and working for the right of all men to share in the blessing of our Constitution. I, too, am a law and order man. But I am a man who seeks just law. I am a man who seeks the kind of order that makes freedom grow instead of stifling it.

Indeed, Mr. Mitchell is a lobbyist for law and order in the highest use of those terms.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article about Mr. Mitchell from the Afro-American of July 12 be printed in the RECORD.

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

CLARENCE MITCHELL AWARDED NAACP'S SPINGARN MEDAL
(By Art Carter)

JACKSON, MISS.—Clarence M. Mitchell Jr., for nearly 20 years an effective lobbyist in Washington, Tuesday night was saluted by the NAACP as "the 101st United States Senator."

Head of the NAACP's Washington Bureau since 1950, the 57-year-old Mitchell, a resident of Baltimore who commutes daily to his office near the U.S. Capitol in Washington, was awarded the 54th Spingarn Medal amid a resounding crescendo of applause at the Jackson City Auditorium.

A long-time worker in the veteran civil rights organization, Mitchell was lauded as "one of our own." The citation accompanying the celebrated Spingarn Medal read:

"For his selfless devotion to the task of ending racial bias; for his uncompromising rejection of racism white or black; for his wisdom and tenacity in pursuit of just laws; for his abiding faith in the enactment of civil rights legislation, particularly the Civil Rights Act of 1968 with its fair housing title:

"The NAACP proudly presents this 54th Spingarn Medal to its own Clarence M. Mitchell Jr., "the 101st United States Senator."

The presentation was made by Mrs. Bruce B. Benson, president, League of Women Voters of the U.S.

Mrs. Benson paid tribute to Mitchell as "an unchallenged expert in the complex machinery of self-government."

She declared that since 1950, Mitchell has "maintained his special brand of steady, quiet, and consistently effective pressure on the national government." Mrs. Benson continued:

"For nearly two decades he has been the dean of lobbyists for civil rights. He has served this association and the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, but no organization can claim him as exclusively its own. He has kept the lines of communication open to all groups, to alert them on how to replace agony with justice.

"His vision, stubborn courage and mastery of his job have set a standard of thought and action to which working with them throughout the years that I have been a part of the NAACP."

Mitchell emphasized that he has "the good fortune to be a part of a winning team in the field of federal legislation" which is effective because "we are a cross section of America. We do not draw the color line in our relationship, nor do we ask about a man's religion or his national origin."

Mitchell publicly thanked "all members of the team who work in their home communities and states, everyone might well aspire."

In accepting the medal, Mr. Mitchell, in his customary modest manner, declared: "I have spent most of my life hoping for and working for the right of all men to share in the blessing of our Constitution, I, too, am a law and order man. But I am a man who seeks just law. I am a man who seeks the kind of order that makes freedom grow instead of stifling it."

Then Mitchell said "It is a solemn and greatly valued moment of my life to receive the Spingarn Medal. This is a tie that binds me ever more closely to some of the distinguished men and women who were given this honor in the past."

In this vein he cited the late Walter White and Roy Wilkins, NAACP executives; Justice Thurgood Marshall; the late Dr. Channing Tobias; the late crusading editor, Carl Murphy of the Afro-American; Mrs. Daisy Bates, the heroine of Little Rock; former Cabinet member, Dr. Robert C. Weaver, and two who gave their lives in the cause of freedom—Harry T. Moore of Florida and Mississippi's own valiant son, Medgar Evers.

He said he named them among the list of "other great citizens because I have had the privilege of * * * who give their time, who spend their money and who come to Washington when we need them," for "what you have done and will continue to do to make freedom and justice a living reality in America."

The famed Washington lobbyist declared "as I look at the history of the fight we have been making I feel a sense of inspiration because I am privileged to live in a time when we have gotten all three branches of our national government to work for civil rights."

He added that "We have reason to renew our faith in the government of free men when we ponder the great fact that President Lyndon B. Johnson from Texas, Chief Justice Earl Warren from California, and Vice President Hubert Humphrey from Minnesota all shared a common desire to establish first class citizenship under just laws."

But he warned his delegate friends that "having won the fight to get laws enacted, we must and we shall see that these statutes work and we must improve them whenever and however it is necessary to do so.

"We must be on guard against and repudiate those forces that would destroy us and our country by causing us to lose faith in the power of just law. Whether it comes from a Ku Klux Klan meeting in a cow pasture or a street corner meeting in Harlem, the voice that ridicules our Constitution, that demeans our Supreme Court and discounts our civil rights laws is the sound of man's ancient enemy—ignorance.

"The best proof of how much both black and white racists really rely on the courts for their own protection is the fact that whenever they get into trouble the first thing they look for is a lawyer and the second thing they seek is a way to get their case to the U.S. Supreme Court."

Mitchell urged an increase in "our political wisdom and our political participation," and paid tribute to some members of the "new team in Washington, like Secretary John Volpe of the Department of Transportation, and Secretary George Romney of the Department of Urban Affairs, who show promise in their approach to the civil rights duties of the federal government."

The determined lobbyist said, "We are challenged for what we have won and we accept the challenge. We shall win that fight. We do not intend to let any political party rob our children and our grandchildren of their birthright."

Also he told the delegates that "We must fight to save the Republican Party from its

new found allies like Senator Strom Thurmond."

"We do not object to putting the spirit of Abraham Lincoln into Mr. Thurmond, but we do object to putting the spirit of Mr. Thurmond into the party of Mr. Lincoln," he stressed.

"We must save the Republican Party by giving massive support to those Republicans in office who back civil rights, and we must save the soul of the party from the hell of equivocation and delusions about 'regional' legislation," he added.

Mitchell depicted America as a country of "many religions, many races, many points of view, but one people," and said that if we are really concerned about the slow pace of school desegregation and other social ills, "we must raise the money, do the work and fight the fight that will speed up and accomplish what we seek."

In conclusion, Mitchell had a word for "the wonderful, impulsive, handsome and idealistic young people who are rightly impatient with the evils of our times."

Speaking directly to the youths in the audience and around the country, Mitchell declared: "I say to you that we are the first to admit that we have not gotten rid of sickness, poverty, inequality and discrimination in our country and the world. But we have made a good start; we have laid a firm foundation and we in the NAACP are passing to you a better world than we inherited in 1909 when the NAACP was born. We have worked and continue to work to improve that world."

"We believe that we are giving you a way of life that is worth defending. We are asking you to share in the building of a democracy that is a shield for the humble and weak as well as a sword for the strong and the just."

"We ask you to keep your head among the stars that you might see better and brighter worlds for mankind. But we ask also that you keep your feet on the paths of common sense so that you do not destroy instead of build."

"We ask that you use your strength, your idealism and your intelligence to move the human race ever forward and ever higher."

Mr. Mitchell, a landmark in Washington legislative circles, assumed his position as director of the Washington NAACP bureau ten Congresses and five presidents ago. In 1957, after he had laid the groundwork for the crucial vote-counting, the Congress passed its first civil rights act in over 80 years.

In 1964, he promoted the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, and there is other vital legislation which bears the Mitchell imprint.

In her tribute, Mrs. Benson asserted, "Mr. Mitchell's vision, faith, and tenacity pushed the country to extend the body of civil rights law so that it now includes housing, education, employment and voting. His skill and his timing were right. I know that he will also use these qualities to see that the law is enforced."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

I am delighted to yield now to the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding.

I associate myself with the Senators who have already spoken in applauding and saluting Clarence Mitchell as the 54th Spingarn medalist.

No man—and I say this advisedly—has ever been more deserving of that honor. I have known Clarence Mitchell for a long time. I have known him since

I first came to Congress. That is a generation or more.

It has been a pleasure and a privilege to work with him over all of these years in the continuing struggle to secure for every man an equal opportunity to contribute to and to share in the workings of our society.

As the legislative director and as head of the Washington Bureau of the NAACP, Clarence Mitchell has represented that organization and all its causes superbly.

Always fair, always completely honest in discussion, in thought, and in action, he is deeply respected by everyone including those who may not be in agreement with him on a particular issue. Never flamboyant, nevertheless he has done more than any other individual whom I know to achieve the legislative milestones that have marked the last decades.

In many ways he epitomizes the cause to which he has dedicated most of his adult life. He gives each individual, regardless of race, religion, creed, or station in life, that respect for human rights and freedoms to which he believes all men are equally entitled.

It is quite right, Mr. President, that the citation which accompanies the award notes that, in addition to his legislative work, it is:

For his selfless devotion to the task of ending racial bias; for his uncompromising rejection of racism, white or black; for his wisdom and tenacity in pursuit of just laws; for his abiding faith in the democratic process as a means of achieving freedom and equality for all.

He is a great hearted man, Mr. President, whom I am proud to count as a dear friend.

I have special interest and I am especially touched by his being the recipient of this award. Seventeen years ago—I was chosen to present the Spingarn award at the national convention of the NAACP out west. Clarence Mitchell was the one who took me there. He was my host on that occasion. The recipient then was one of the martyrs of the struggle for civil rights, as Clarence Mitchell is one of its great heroes.

This long association with the awards and with him in connection with it makes this particular occasion even more gratifying and deeply satisfying to me.

I join my colleagues in the warmest of congratulations to the organization and to him.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I thank the wise and respected senior Senator from New Jersey for his very eloquent and moving remarks.

As director of the NAACP's Washington office since 1950, Clarence Mitchell is well known to all of us in the Senate. He is held in the highest esteem for his brilliant and tireless work to defend and, where necessary, to restore the unalienable rights of all Americans.

It is because Mr. Mitchell, his wife, distinguished son and family are all well known and respected residents of Maryland, that it is a particular pleasure for me to add my personal compliments to the virtually unanimous acclaim with which this award has been received throughout the Nation.

The words of the Spingarn Award are well chosen, as the distinguished Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE) has stated. It has been Mr. Mitchell's abiding faith in the democratic process, his tenacity, the strength of his remarkable character and intellect that have sustained him and all who have been associated with him through the discouragements of the fifties and the stresses, strains, and successes of the sixties.

There is no doubt that the experiences of the fifties, some of them bitter, laid the groundwork for the shift in public opinion that made possible the historic 1964 Civil Rights Act banning racial discrimination in places of public accommodations; the Voting Rights Act of 1965—now unfortunately imperiled by the present administration's willingness to let it expire—it will not expire because those of us in the Senate who fought the battle before will fight it again—and the landmark fair housing title of the 1968 Civil Rights Act.

Public opinion does not shift of its own accord. It is a lesson to political activists and idealists of today who are impatient for change and for progress that the Nation's conscience finally was aroused and laws that have proved effective were enacted because of the work of Clarence Mitchell and a few others—patient, dedicated, nonviolent work by men of the wisdom and leadership of Clarence Mitchell.

It was not my privilege to serve in the U.S. Senate during those early struggles; but in the few years that I have been privileged to represent Maryland in the U.S. Senate, I have come to count on Clarence Mitchell for invaluable support on a wide variety of matters vitally affecting the public interest and the interest of the citizens of Maryland—and, indeed, to count on the entire Mitchell family of Maryland for public spirit leadership of the highest caliber in community, State, and National affairs.

Clarence Mitchell's lifetime work is an inspiration not only to those of us who are his fellow Marylanders but also to everyone who has had the good fortune to be associated with him in the struggle to make this "a more perfect Union."

I might say to those of the generation to follow, the generation which will soon take over leadership, the generation which has all the wonderful impatience of youth, that the work, the struggles, and the success of this man should be a guide to those today who are impatient with our system and the ability of our institutions to change rapidly enough. The work of Clarence Mitchell shows the democratic system at its finest.

So, Mr. President, I take great honor in paying tribute to this 54th recipient of the Spingarn Award to a great American, Clarence Mitchell.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I would like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Clarence M. Mitchell, Jr., who was recently chosen by the NAACP as the 54th Spingarn medalist. He is truly deserving of this award which recognizes the outstanding contribution he has made in the enactment of civil rights

legislation and other just and equitable legislation.

As a Senator, I have admired and respected the manner in which Mr. Mitchell has advanced the cause of the disadvantaged citizen. His intelligent and consistent appeal for fairness and justice has had a tremendous impact on all Members of Congress. For his accomplishments, he has not only been awarded the Spingarn Medal, but has also been awarded the satisfaction of knowing that he has in fact advanced the civil rights of all citizens of this Nation.

Mr. BROOKE, Mr. President, last week the NAACP, meeting at its annual convention in Jackson, Miss., recognized one of its own for his outstanding service in the promotion of brotherhood and human understanding. This organization could have found no more fitting time or place to publicly cite the immense and unremitting efforts of Clarence Mitchell in the cause of civil rights.

For 23 years Clarence Mitchell has devoted himself to the service of the NAACP and the people of America. He has spent 19 of those 23 years as the organization's chief representative in Washington.

Since coming to Washington it has been my privilege to work with Clarence Mitchell on many projects. His efforts were instrumental in passing the open-housing legislation which Senator MONDALE and I proposed last year. This year his efforts have been focused largely on revealing and eliminating inequities in the Federal employment structure.

Clarence Mitchell works quietly, but the effects of his labors will be felt by millions of Americans for many years to come. It was the American authoress Willa Cather who once observed:

That is happiness; to be dissolved into something complete and great.

If that, indeed, is an accurate definition of happiness—and I have every reason to believe that it is—then Clarence Mitchell, with his lifelong dedication to a worthy cause—is a happy man indeed. I salute him proudly upon his receipt of the coveted and distinguished Spingarn Medal, which he so richly deserves.

Mr. PERCY, Mr. President, I would like to join my colleagues in commenting on the tremendously important contribution which Clarence M. Mitchell, Jr., has made to civil rights legislation and the advancement of all black Americans. The Washington Post recently hailed him as the 101st U.S. Senator. To this, I would say that few of us have been able to represent our constituency as well as has Mr. Mitchell in his untiring devotion and dedication to the principles of true equality and justice under the law. At a time when we must all realize that segregation is not the answer to a tradition of racism and prejudice, I believe that Mr. Mitchell's efforts in the enactment of the fair housing provision of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 take on a new meaning and importance. Mr. Mitchell has chosen not only the most peaceful but the most influential means of dissent by seeking legislatively to bring his 100 other colleagues to know the true extent

to which black people have been advantaged poor and opportunity poor in this otherwise prosperous Nation.

Mr. Mitchell not only richly deserves the 1969 Spingarn Medal from the NAACP but also the respect and cooperation from every Member of Congress and every citizen, black and white.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT OF AGREEMENTS UNDER THE AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of title I agreements under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON OVEROBLIGATION OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, reporting, pursuant to law on the overobligation of an appropriation by the Federal Aviation Administration (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

PROPOSED ADJUSTMENT OF SALARIES OF MEMBERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL

A letter from the Chairman, Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to adjust the salaries of the Chairman, the Vice Chairman, and other members of the District of Columbia Council (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION ACQUIRING PROPERTY ADJACENT TO FORD'S THEATER IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain property adjacent to the Ford's Theatre in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF A VOLUNTEERS IN THE PARK PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a Volunteers in the Park program (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON AWARD OF THE YOUNG AMERICAN MEDALS FOR BRAVERY AND SERVICE FOR 1967

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, reporting, pursuant to law, on the valor of American youth as demonstrated recently by the award of the Young American Medals for Bravery and Service for 1967, dated July 8, 1969; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED IMPROVEMENT IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE LEAVE SYSTEM FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Chairman, Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to improve the administration of the leave system for Federal employees by amending title 5, United States Code (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Americans for Patriotism, Inc., of Scarsdale, N.Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the size of the American Revolution—Bicentennial Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The PRESIDING OFFICER announced that on today, July 10, 1969, the Vice President signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 1647. An act to authorize the release of 100,000 short tons of lead from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; and

H.R. 3689. An act 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.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

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 (Rept. No. 91-297).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary without amendment:

S. 2462. A bill to amend the joint resolution establishing the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission (Rept. No. 91-299); and

S.J. Res. 85. A joint resolution to provide for the designation of the period from August 26, 1969, through September 1, 1969, as "National Archery Week" (Rept. No. 91-300).

By Mr. SCOTT, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 267. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Samuel J. Cole, U.S. Army (retired) (Rept. No. 91-298).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 571. A bill for the relief of Dr. Diego Aguilar Aranda (Rept. No. 91-301);

S. 1526. A bill for the relief of Dr. Zeliha Bilsel (Rept. No. 91-303);

S. 1527. A bill for the relief of Dr. Yilmaz Bilsel (Rept. No. 91-307);

S. 1645. A bill for the relief of Andrew Chu Yang (Rept. No. 91-305);

S. 1798. A bill for the relief of Dr. Yavuz Aykent (Rept. No. 91-306);

S. 1963. A bill for the relief of Wu Hip (Rept. No. 91-304);

S. 2019. A bill for the relief of Dug Foo Wong (Rept. No. 91-302);

H.R. 1828. An act to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon James F. Wegener (Rept. No. 91-303);

H.R. 1948. An act to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon Pfc. Joseph Anthony Smitko (Rept. No. 91-312);

H.R. 2224. An act for the relief of Franklin Jacinto Antonio (Rept. No. 91-311);

H.R. 2536. An act for the relief of Francesca Adriana Millonzi (Rept. No. 91-310);

H.R. 2890. An act for the relief of Rueben Rosen (Rept. No. 91-309);

H.R. 3166. An act for the relief of Aleksandar Zambell (Rept. No. 91-313);

H.R. 3167. An act for the relief of Ryszard Stanislaw Obacz (Rept. No. 91-314);

H.R. 3172. An act for the relief of Yolanda Fulgencio Hunter (Rept. No. 91-315);

H.R. 3376. An act for the relief of Maria da Conceicao Evaristo (Rept. No. 91-316); and H.R. 10060. An act for the relief of L. Cpl. Peter M. Nee (2465662) (Rept. No. 91-317).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 1110. A bill for the relief of Nickolas George Polizos (Rept. No. 91-318).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session, the following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. YARBOROUGH, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Hubert B. Heffner, of California, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Science and Technology;

William David McElroy, of Maryland, to be Director of the National Science Foundation; and

Dr. Roger O. Egeberg, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Gerald S. Levin, of California, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of California;

H. Emory Widener, Jr., of Virginia, to be U.S. district judge for the western district of Virginia;

Charles S. White-Spunner, Jr., of Mobile, Ala., to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Alabama;

R. Jackson B. Smith, Jr., of Georgia, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Georgia;

Charles H. Anderson, of Tennessee, to be U.S. attorney for the middle district of Tennessee;

Wade H. Ballard III, of West Virginia, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of West Virginia;

James M. Sullivan, Jr., of New York, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of New York;

Leigh B. Hanes, Jr., of Virginia, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Virginia;

Henry A. Schwarz, of Illinois, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Illinois; Evan LeRoy Hultman, of Iowa, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Iowa;

Robert J. Roth, of Kansas, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Kansas;

Donald E. Walter, of Louisiana, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Louisiana; James E. Williams, of South Carolina, to be U.S. marshal for the district of South Carolina;

Isaac George Hyltin, of Virginia, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Virginia;

Frank M. Dulan, of New York, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of New York;

George E. Tobin, of California, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of California;

Charles R. Wilcox, of Wyoming, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Wyoming;

Melvin A. Hove, of Iowa, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Iowa;

Robert G. Wagner, of Ohio, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Ohio;

William F. Howland, Jr., of Virginia, to be a member of the Board of Parole; and

William E. Amos, of Maryland, to be a member of the Board of Parole.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 2578. A bill to amend section 165(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which provides for treatment of losses on worthless securities; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 2579. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Education to make Vocational Education Opportunity Grants; 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. SPARKMAN (by request):

S. 2580. A bill to increase the authority of savings and loan associations to aid in providing housing in inner cities and elsewhere, to enable such associations to obtain additional working capital, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. CASE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DODD, Mr. GOODELL, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. PELL, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. SCHWEIKER, and Mr. TYDINGS):

S. 2581. A bill to authorize the reduction or elimination of the hazards of public rail-highway grade crossings along the high-speed rail line between Washington, District of Columbia, and Boston, Massachusetts; to the Committee on Commerce.

(The remarks of Mr. SCOTT when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. DOMINICK (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BELLMON, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DOLE, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. FONG, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HEUSKA, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MONTROYA, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TOWER, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. MOSS):

S. 2582. A bill to authorize the minting of clad silver dollars bearing the likeness of the late Dwight David Eisenhower; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(The remarks of Mr. DOMINICK when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. MCGEE:

S. 2583. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the county of Washakie, State of Wyoming, of certain real property of the United States; and

S. 2584. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to permit donations of surplus personal property and surplus real property to States and political subdivisions thereof for use in establishing and maintaining public museums; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 2585. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to permit certain additional individuals who become disabled prior to attaining age 31 to become entitled to disability insurance benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MUSKIE:

S. 2586. A bill for the relief of Gun Wa Mok;

S. 2587. A bill for the relief of Yu Chan;

S. 2588. A bill for the relief of Yuen Fung; and

S. 2589. A bill for the relief of Shui Choy Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 2590. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Marihuana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The remarks of Mr. MOSS when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 2591. A bill to amend section 203, Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to provide for the distribution of surplus personal property to State and local police organizations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(The remarks of Mr. GURNEY when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. MONTROYA:

S. 2592. A bill to provide financial assistance to States and nonprofit private organizations for the establishment of comprehensive drug abuse prevention and rehabilitation centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(The remarks of Mr. MONTROYA when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. GURNEY):

S.J. Res. 133. A joint resolution to redesignate the area in the State of Florida known as Cape Kennedy as Cape Canaveral; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs by unanimous consent.

(The remarks of Mr. HOLLAND when he introduced the joint resolution appear earlier in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. TYDINGS (for himself, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. DODD, Mr. GOODELL, Mr. GRAVEL, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. PELL, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. STEVENS, and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S.J. Res. 134. A joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week of September 28, 1969, through October 4, 1969, as "National Adult-Youth Communications Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The remarks of Mr. TYDINGS when he introduced the joint resolution appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

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

S.J. Res. 135. A joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim September 30, 1969, as "Bible Translation Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The remarks of Mr. HARRIS when he introduced the joint resolution appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

S. 2579—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL AUTHORIZING THE COMMISSION OF EDUCATION TO MAKE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION OPPORTUNITY GRANTS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am introducing today, the Vocational Education Opportunity Grant Act of 1969, or "New Start program." It is designed to provide job training for 100,000 youths from poverty areas each year.

It would provide grants up to \$2,500 per year for 2 years to persons 17 years of age or older for full-time training in accredited private vocational schools of their choice. The grants would be reserved for those who are academically, socially, economically, or culturally disadvantaged, and have not completed their secondary education or have not been able to obtain regular employment.

This bill would operate much like the GI bills which provide financial assistance to veterans for education and career training in fields of their choice. The experience gained during the past quarter-century under the GI bills, which helped many returning veterans make a new start, can be used to assist the underprivileged youth of America.

Since the first veterans' assistance program started operation, many highly qualified private technical schools have grown up across the country. I propose, with this bill, to enlist these institutions in the effort toward full employability of those able to learn a skill.

While many employers are searching for workers to fill vacant jobs, high school dropouts, and many graduates as well, find themselves without marketable skills. These are the hard-core unemployed. They want the training which would qualify them for these jobs, but they cannot afford the tuition of private technical schools, and the public vocational schools are often unable to accommodate their needs.

The public vocational system is not geared, in most cases, to accept older, more mature men and women who want to move ahead very quickly to acquire a skill which can be turned into earning power.

Dr. Herbert Striner of the Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, Washington, D.C., who has given me valuable assistance in preparing this legislation, said:

Separation from the school system by virtue of time and experience suggests that these former students can no longer be regarded as potentials for returning to the public system.

The private technical training schools are set up to handle the type of applicant who would be eligible for assistance under my bill. These schools provide a curriculum which reflects the current needs of industry and they also usually provide excellent counseling and placement services, which is an essential follow-up to the assistance I have in mind.

This new program, along with existing public vocational education programs, can offer a new start and new opportunities to those with the desire and the ambition to work and to become contributing members of their communities.

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

The bill (S. 2579) to authorize the Commissioner of Education to make Vocational Education Opportunity Grants, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 2581—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL RELATING TO THE HAZARDS OF GRADE CROSSINGS ALONG THE HIGH-SPEED RAIL LINE BETWEEN WASHINGTON, D.C., AND BOSTON, MASS.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, safety legislation to reduce or eliminate the hazards of public crossings on highways and roads along the routes of the new high-speed

passenger trains now serving the Northeast rail corridor. Both the parties of the Washington, D.C.-to-New York "Metroliner," and its New York-to-Boston turbine-powered counterpart, are included in my bill to insure that each has an opportunity to reach the full potential envisioned when these trains were launched as prototype demonstration projects under the High Speed Ground Transportation Act of 1965, legislation which I was privileged to cosponsor.

I welcome as cosponsors of my bill today Senators GORDON ALLOTT, Republican of Colorado; J. CALEB BOGGS, Republican of Delaware; CLIFFORD P. CASE, Republican of New Jersey; JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, Republican of Kentucky; THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat of Connecticut; CHARLES E. GOODELL, Republican of New York; JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican of New York; CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR., Republican of Maryland; ROBERT W. PACKWOOD, Republican of Oregon; CLAI-BORNE PELL, Democrat of Rhode Island; ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, Democrat of Connecticut; RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Republican of Pennsylvania, and JOSEPH D. TYDINGS, Democrat of Maryland.

Although none of the 43 public crossings are located in my Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, my interest in this proposal is in no way diminished. Pennsylvania has long been identified with an interest in high-speed ground transportation generally, and especially with the "Metroliner," the cars for which were built in my State in an effort which involved, directly or indirectly, the jobs of some 20,000 Pennsylvanians.

Of even more immediate importance is the fact that without crossings improvements, neither of these trains will ever be able to offer to the residents of my State, or to members of the traveling public from any other, the benefits of truly high-speed rail passenger service.

Mr. President, the introduction of this bill comes at a time when the Senate Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Surface Transportation, of which I am a member, has initiated hearings on the crucial subject of rail safety. Because of their spectacular nature, air crashes have tended more often to capture the focus of public attention and concern. But if there is one theme which has dominated our subcommittee hearings, it is that the Nation's railways, too, are confronted with a safety problem of growing magnitude. For trains designed to travel at speeds in excess of 100 miles per hour, the potential danger to life and property is particularly critical. Road crossings, and the hazards they pose to both rail and highway traffic, are an integral part of this problem.

Forty-three public crossings lie along the combined routes that compose the Washington, D.C.-to-Boston, high-speed Northeast rail corridor. These include, by State, 15 in Maryland, four in Delaware, seven in Connecticut, 16 in Rhode Island, one in Massachusetts. Certain of these crossings in Delaware and Maryland are already the object of agreements between those States, and the Department of Transportation, which will provide interim safety advances through

modernized warning systems and other improvements. Yet the introduction of high-speed service into a corridor already crowded with traffic demands that more permanent solutions, including in many instances the total separation of road and rail, be realized. This is the purpose of my bill.

In practice, this proposal would require that the Secretary of Transportation give first consideration, where practicable, to the total closing of a crossing as the ultimate means of safety. It is intended that the Secretary would promulgate appropriate criteria based on all relevant factors in order to avoid any indiscriminate application of the practicability standard. It is further intended that public hearings, where necessary, would be held in order to facilitate fairly such decisions.

Where it was determined, for public convenience or other reasons, that such a closing could not be "practically effected," the Secretary would then be specifically authorized to enter into project agreements on a shared-cost basis with the States or their political subdivisions, and the railroads. For the payment of Federal costs, my bill proposes a flexibility that would make available not only general revenues, but where appropriate and in keeping with the public interest, the use of Federal-aid highway funds, instead.

Because it is doubtful that Congress could authorize the expenditure of public funds from any source for the 36 private crossings that are also a part of the Northeast high-speed rail corridor, my bill does not attempt to accomplish this. I believe it can be hoped realistically, however, that the enactment of this legislation would provide the necessary incentive to encourage private arrangements to meet this problem as well.

Mr. President, similar proposals have already been the subject of hearings in the House of Representatives. I urge early and favorable Senate consideration of this vitally needed rail safety legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the full text of my bill printed at this point 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. 2581) to authorize the reduction or elimination of the hazards of public rail-highway grade crossings along the high-speed rail line between Washington, District of Columbia, and Boston, Mass., introduced by Mr. SCOTT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2581

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of Transportation shall pay to each State and the District of Columbia the cost of every project to reduce or eliminate the hazards of each public ground-level rail-highway crossing along the route of the high-speed ground transportation demonstration project between Washington, District of Columbia, and Boston, Massachu-

setts, being conducted under the authority of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research and development in high-speed ground transportation, and for other purposes", approved September 30, 1965 (49 U.S.C. 1631 et. seq.).

(b) Each project to eliminate the hazards of such a crossing shall be subject to section 130 of title 23, United States Code, in the same manner and to the same extent as any other project subject to the same section, except that if the highway involved is not on the Federal-aid highway primary or secondary system (including their extensions within urban areas) or on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, then the entire Federal cost of such project shall be paid out of sums appropriated to carry out this Act and not from amounts apportioned to the State under section 104 of title 23, United States Code.

SEC. 2. Before paying any part of the cost of a project under the first section of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(1) determine that the elimination of the hazard at such crossing cannot be practicably effected by the closing of such crossing, and

(2) determine that the State has entered into an agreement with its affected political subdivisions and the railroads involved in such project to provide all non-Federal costs of such project.

SEC. 3. There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act as it applies to projects not on the Federal-aid highway systems.

S. 2582—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL AUTHORIZING THE MINTING OF DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER CLAD SILVER DOLLARS

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I am introducing a bill today to provide for minting and issuing an Eisenhower silver dollar. I am joined in this proposal by 26 cosponsors.

This will be a prestige coin of which this country can be proud. It will very possibly be the last silver coin to be minted by the United States. It will honor Dwight David Eisenhower, a man who symbolizes the highest traditions of service to his country in both war and peace. To the very last day of his life he was a symbol of strength and honor for the people of the United States and the world.

I am a member of the Joint Commission on Coinage. That Commission together with Secretary of the Treasury, David M. Kennedy, announced on May 12, 1969, its decision to request authority to discontinue the minting of silver half-dollars and mint a silverless half-dollar and a new dollar coin with no silver content. I oppose that decision.

The decision has been made to sell our reserves of silver. We will retain only 165 million ounces in our strategic stockpiles under the Office of Emergency Preparedness and some minor reserves in other agencies.

The decision has been made to remove the U.S. Government from the silver market. Given these decisions I can see no better way to accomplish these goals, mark the end of an era in our country's history and pay a tribute to a truly great American.

This bill amends section 101(a) of the Coinage Act of 1965, 31 U.S.C. 391a. It simply adds the dollar coin containing

40 percent silver and an 800 fine cladding. It will be identical, in composition, to the Kennedy half dollar.

It provides that the coin shall bear the likeness of Dwight David Eisenhower.

It further provides that no less than 100 million coins annually shall be minted for 3 years from January 1, 1970. It is hoped that the number actually coined and issued will far exceed these figures. It does recognize the limitations of our present reserves and allows Congress the opportunity to review this matter after 3 years. These amounts are wholly realistic both in terms of remaining silver reserves and production capacity of the U.S. Mint.

The Treasury has approximately 150 million ounces left in reserves. We are auctioning one and one-half million ounces a week on the open market. The sales price on July 1, 1969, was \$1.59 an ounce. The decision has been made to divest ourselves of these silver stocks. The Government will be out of the silver business in less than 2 years providing the sales continue. The silver held by the Treasury in the form of bullion and coins is an asset of the U.S. Treasury. There are two ways to divest ourselves of this asset. We can continue sales as we are now and get \$1.59 an ounce, or whatever the market rate on the day of sale, or we can mint and issue a silver coin as we are doing with the Kennedy halves. The monetary value of silver received for a coin is \$3.16 an ounce. Simply stated there is approximately one-third of an ounce of silver in a dollar coin as set out in this bill. When this coin is issued through the Federal Reserve bank the U.S. Treasury receives a dollar in exchange. If a person wanted to melt down the coins and sell the silver he must melt 3.16 dollar coins to obtain 1 ounce of silver. In other words the U.S. Treasury gets \$3.16 an ounce for its silver. This holds true whether the coins are in circulation or not. The price of silver would have to reach \$3.16 an ounce before as much could be realized by direct sales.

It has been argued that the Government can make even more with base metal coins, such as our quarters, because the materials only cost a few cents. This is certainly true, but what do we do with our assets of silver stocks? The only question remaining is where we can get the best price. We get the greater monetary return by minting and issuing coins. At a market price of \$1.59 the increase in value is \$1.57, almost double the sales price.

It has been argued that these coins will not circulate and this is the only purpose of money, as a medium of exchange. Certainly many of these coins will not circulate. It obviously is, in part, a commemorative coin just as was the Kennedy half-dollar.

Some will be collected or just held. Some will be melted down and the silver sold when it can be done at a profit. Some will return to circulation. The principal point still is, however, at what price do we sell our remaining silver—\$1.59 an ounce or \$3.16 an ounce. If the Treasury is concerned only with circulation they can mint and issue base metal coins simultaneously.

There are other complex issues involved concerning silver use and production. The die has been cast, however, so far as any direct role the Government will play by disposing of our silver assets. The silver market is affected by many factors. The sale of silver by the U.S. Treasury at \$1.29 an ounce prior to 1967 artificially depressed the market. Sales at the market price since that time has seen a slight rise in the average price of silver. Wide fluctuations still occur. It has, however, been estimated that a reduction in sales to one-half million ounces a week from Treasury stocks would cause only a nominal rise in the price under current conditions. All of this only points out that this will give no special advantages nor cause any significant disadvantages to any silver interests.

We are divesting ourselves of our silver. The remaining reserves are adequate to mint an Eisenhower silver dollar and continue some sales at a lower level or decreasing level. We can receive a much higher value for our remaining silver assets by coining as opposed to outright sales.

More importantly, we will mint a coin of great prestige and value. We can honor Dwight David Eisenhower, a man who gave so much to our country. It is only fitting that we so honor our late President, as we did for the late John F. Kennedy, with a coin of real value. This great Nation should have a prestige coin. We cannot return to the old silver cartwheels just as we cannot return to the era of which they are a symbol. We can, however, mark the end of another era with a coin that reflects the greatness of this country and commemorates the man who devoted his life to service of that country. An Eisenhower silver dollar is a tribute not only to the man, but to the Nation and ideals he served.

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

The bill (S. 2582) to authorize the minting of clad silver dollars bearing the likeness of the late Dwight David Eisenhower, introduced by Mr. DOMINICK (for himself and other Senators) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I am pleased today to join my good friend and colleague, the distinguished Senator from Colorado, in introducing a bill to authorize the minting of clad silver dollars bearing the likeness of the late Dwight David Eisenhower.

It is appropriate that such a coin should commemorate a man held in esteem by so many millions of Americans and other millions all over the world, a man who in the true American tradition rose from a modest start in a small Kansas town to lead America and the allied forces to victory in Europe. He was President of all Americans, as proved by the overwhelming vote by which he was reelected to a second term, and by his sound counsel to those who sought it after his retirement from public life.

It is especially fitting that a silver dollar, the once proud symbol of American solidarity and fiscal soundness,

should be an Eisenhower dollar. It is fitting, too, that such a symbol should be available to all of the millions who remember General and President Eisenhower as one of their own, a leader but also an ordinary and humble man.

Silver dollars in Wyoming and other Western States—the “old cartwheels”—were not only a proud and solid symbol but were also the principal medium of exchange in retail establishments until they disappeared from the scene a few years back. None have been minted in recent years and the few million remaining in Treasury stocks went into collector's seclusion after quarters and dimes were reduced to their present lowly and brassy state. Only the Kennedy half dollar retains any actual intrinsic value with a 40-percent silver content and the Treasury even threatens to do the same to them as it did to the dimes and quarters.

But it seems to me that the least we could do for our two late great Presidents is to preserve their memory in something of real value but at the same time something within the reach of all as a keepsake and something that can also offer a little sense of security to the cash register's clink or the jingle in a cowboy's jeans.

There is enough silver set aside in a national strategic stockpile to take care of any emergency defense or space needs and to those who say the remaining Treasury stocks should go into teapots and silver service sets, I say it is just as important that this modest amount be used to mint a coin and symbol for the use of all—as a proper tribute to a great American.

S. 2590—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMMISSION ON MARIHUANA

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a Presidential Commission to study the legal, social, and medical questions arising out of the growing use of marihuana in our country.

Within 2 years after its establishment, the Commission would be required to submit to the President and the Congress a comprehensive report on its study and investigation, including recommendations for specific legislative proposals which should be considered, or the administrative action which should be taken.

The information available on marihuana is most confusing. We can make only an educated guess as to how many of our young people use marihuana, but we think it is at least 2 million. There is a great difference of opinion among authorities as to its effects on the psychological and physical functions of the human body. About the only thing on which everyone seems to agree is the individuality of the drug experience. Yet we have in effect Federal laws which make the possession, sale or use of marihuana a crime, subject to severe penalties. As my colleagues may remember, I have spoken a number of times on the Senate floor in the past few years on the

importance of knowing far more than we know now about marihuana and its effects before we can seek proper controls.

Some of the questions I have raised in the past are these:

“How dangerous is marihuana?”

“Does it, like alcohol, pose primarily a problem of use as opposed to abuse?”

“Or is it a drug the use of which should be discouraged at all costs—a drug which under certain conditions and dosages can lead to hallucinations, to a faulty sense of time, to a loss of judgment, to a lack of muscular coordination, and to many other undesirable, physical and mental manifestations?”

“Again, what are the long term effects of smoking marihuana? Could it induce lung cancer, as we know the smoking of cigarettes made of tobacco can, or would its continued use cause chromosomal changes, as we know can be the case in even the limited use of LSD?”

“To what extent may the use of marihuana lead to the use of other drugs, such as heroin or morphine or cocaine, whose serious effects we have established?”

In 1937 when the Marihuana Tax Act was signed into law, Congress was fully convinced of marihuana's “injurious effect upon the health and morals of the people of this country.” The act, which is enforced by the Bureau of Narcotics, requires registration and payment of a graduated occupational tax by all persons who import, manufacture, produce, compound, sell, deal in, dispense, prescribe, administer, or give away marihuana. Penalties for possession in violation of the law vary from a minimum of 2 years for a first offense to a maximum of 40 years for smuggling, selling or otherwise transferring marihuana, with the most severe penalties applying to the transfer of marihuana from an adult to a minor.

This law had been on the books for only a few years when Fiorella La Guardia, New York's unpredictable mayor, ordered a survey on the use of marihuana in New York, and its effects. The La Guardia Committee report challenged many of the conclusions on which the Federal law was based, and the La Guardia Committee conclusions were in turn attacked by the Journal of the American Medical Association. Other reports and more discussion followed, reaching new heights in 1963, when the Kennedy Commission recommendations came out, and again when the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice—the Crime Committee, as we call it—reported in 1967, and discussed marihuana among other things.

But nowhere—at any time—has an attempt been made to study and coordinate all of the available findings and statistics and observations, and distill from them any sort of integrated recommendations. This undoubtedly should be done.

Each time I have spoken in the Senate, I have pointed to a Federal research program now underway which I hope will give us clearer answers to some of our questions. It is the drug research program of the National Institute of Men-

tal Health, which encompasses several studies on marihuana. Each year I have made a particular point of supporting the NIMH budget request for drug research. It has been going gradually up, despite the fact that other programs have taken substantial cuts. In the fiscal year 1968, \$4 million was appropriated, in fiscal 1969, \$4.6 million, and the request for fiscal 1970 is for \$4.95 million. I trust it will be granted.

If we can continue the work which has been started, sound information should soon begin to emerge. The Institute was delayed in undertaking scheduled research on the behavioral effects of marihuana because adequate supplies were not available either of marihuana or of a synthetic used in testing it, called tetrahydrocannabinol. Now, I am told, these supplies are on hand, and good behavioral studies are underway which should give us some tentative answers at least on the fundamental mechanisms of perception, emotion and memory.

NIMH is also moving to get some firm information on the long-term effects of the use of marihuana. Observations on the natural histories of the lives of marihuana-using young people in this country obviously would be delayed for many years. So NIMH is negotiating for permission to make studies among the populations of several countries where large numbers of its citizens have traditionally used marihuana over a long period of time. The mental and physical health and habits of habitual users will be contrasted with that of non-users in the same area and with the same background and heritage.

Also, the Institute is making headway on several surveys on patterns of drug use among high school and college students, so we will have some acceptable national figures. Dr. Stanley Yolles, the Director of NIMH, reported progress on these studies when he appeared recently before the Labor and HEW Appropriations Subcommittee. He stated:

Several aspects are nearing completion on the patterns of drug use by high school and college age youth. A survey instrument is being developed for collaborative investigations into the prevalence and characteristics of drug use by these groups. Preliminary reports from the college surveys indicate that approximately 18 percent of college students have used marihuana one or more times, and that about 8 percent have used hallucinogenic drugs at least once. These data need to be followed up by more extensive survey information, utilizing the instruments developed in the pilot studies.

One of the surveys to which Dr. Yolles referred has been completed and its results reported in a recently published book, “Students and Drugs” by Richard H. Blum and associates. Although the survey was small in scope, and perhaps for this reason cannot be considered fully authoritative, it showed a substantial increase in the use of marihuana by college students.

First. In 1968, up to 57 percent had tried marihuana—plus or minus 12.75 that is, between 44 percent and 70 percent—as compared with 21 percent the previous year. Of these, almost all intend to continuing using—53 percent.

Second. In 1968, 14 percent used it

somewhat regularly as compared with 4 percent the previous year.

Third. A predicted 70 percent will have tried marihuana by spring 1969.

Fourth. Approximately 8 percent began use in high school.

The statistics reported by Mr. Blum are based on a sample from "School I"—300 students covered—which was a part of a survey of five west coast colleges conducted during the 1966-67 academic year, compared with a small followup survey—100 students covered—of randomly selected students in 1968 from the same school. Throughout the book he emphasizes the small scope of the survey and advises caution in use of the data reported.

Mr. President, there is already a large body of information on marihuana—enough for us to begin analyzing the problem, and to begin to formulate ideas on what should be done. During the next year or so, even more authoritative information will be available.

So I feel that the time has come when we should set up the machinery to evaluate what we already know about marihuana, and to analyze the new material about its effects and use as it comes to us.

We should also take a look at our present laws on marihuana. Are they realistic? Are they too severe, or not severe enough? Should the courts differentiate in the handling of the occasional user, the frequent user and the chronic user, and the person who shares his drug with another person and the dealer who sells for a profit?

The widespread use of marihuana, particularly among college students, has been accompanied by increasing support among some groups for legalization. Other critics of the law, while not supporting legalization, take the position that marihuana should be classed with the hallucinogens controlled by the Drug Abuse Act, which provides far less severe penalties for violations, and no penalty for possession. Who is right?

Mr. President, marihuana is evidently second only to alcohol in its use among our young people to escape reality. More and more of them are smoking "reefers" or "grass" or "weeds" or "pot" or whatever is the current name for marihuana in their locality.

If the continued use of marihuana even approaches causing the harm and heart-break which comes from the continued use of alcohol to an alcoholic, or if it induces physical ills even half as serious as lung cancer and emphysema and heart disorders which result from cigarette smoking, then we should be in a position to forewarn our young people.

I believe it would serve our national purpose to establish a Presidential Commission on Marihuana so we can stop generalizing about marihuana and start being specific about it and its use and effects.

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

The bill (S. 2590) to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Marihuana, introduced by Mr. Moss, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2591—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL PROVIDING FOR THE DISTRIBUTION OF SURPLUS PERSONAL PROPERTY TO STATE AND LOCAL POLICE ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I am introducing a bill today to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to allow State and local police agencies to participate in receiving U.S. Government surplus personal property.

At present this act only provides for the distribution of these surplus materials for use within the States for purposes of education, public health, or civil defense. Local law-enforcement agencies do not fall into any of these categories and so are not presently eligible to participate. This bill would include police organizations in the group of recipients of Federal surplus property.

Criminal violence is the most serious domestic crisis facing this country. The violent rate today is double the rate in 1950 and 65 percent over the 1960 rate. These statistics represent an epidemic of crime and violence which has affected virtually every segment of American society.

Law-enforcement agencies are desperately in need of these surplus materials in their battle to restore law and order. As we all know, the cities and large metropolitan areas are in trouble, and simply do not have sufficient funds to cope with local problems. The local tax dollar is not adequate to fill the needs of law-enforcement agencies. Inflation has forced metropolitan police departments to appropriate the major part of their budget for salaries, leaving little to buy, maintain, and operate needed equipment and supplies.

The list of equipment that the U.S. Government has for disposal is endless. Photographic, communications, and printing equipment, boats, automobiles, ambulances, station wagons, buses, could be used advantageously by police agencies everywhere.

Printing equipment, an item which I am sure that the Government declares surplus at various times, can be used to print training material for police officers, for community education and public relations materials. Only a few police departments can now afford helicopters, which have proven an effective deterrent against crime. Mapmaking equipment is needed to pinpoint districts of high crime incidence, and photographic equipment is needed for aerial photography. A large portion of this surplus equipment could also be used for rescue work, searches for lost children in outlying areas of the city, and rural areas adjoining the city.

The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act already has the machinery for the proper disposal of U.S. Government property through the States. This bill would simply add police organizations to the existing groups now eligible for such property. Under present law the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare determines the usefulness and necessity of surplus property for purposes of education and public health. The President makes the same determination for civil defense purposes. This

amendment would put police organizations in the same category as civil defense, and leave determination of usefulness and necessity up to the President.

Crime in all of its ramifications is the number one problem facing the country. This would be an effective first step toward the solution of that problem. I urge the Congress to act.

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

The bill (S. 2591) to amend section 203, Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to provide for the distribution of surplus personal property to State and local police organizations, introduced by Mr. GURNEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 2592—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL ESTABLISHING COMPREHENSIVE DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION AND REHABILITATION CENTERS

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, after thoroughly studying the drug abuse problem, I am persuaded that one of our current best hopes of preventing crime and delinquency resulting from drug addiction, and for controlling illegal drug traffic, is to provide funds for rapidly establishing comprehensive treatment centers to treat drug addicts and users. Additionally, I believe there must be an aggressive publicity and educational campaign aimed at vulnerable age and social groups in our population, and—as part of this educational approach—a requirement that Federal officials periodically brief State and local governments to make them aware of what is going on in the field of drug abuse, the means available for improving controls over both usage and illegal traffic, and a coordination of efforts to improve these controls nationally.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I am introducing legislation that would:

First, authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to States, municipalities, and non-profit institutions for establishing comprehensive prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation centers for drug addicts and abusers—on a voluntary basis, under civil commitment, and for addicts released pending criminal proceedings and on probation or parole;

Second, authorize the National Institute of Mental Health, in conjunction with its research on narcotics addiction and drug abuse, to carry on an intensive effort to publish educational and other materials on drug abuse. In coordination with State departments of health, the NIMH would be authorized to disseminate such materials and carry out demonstrations and other programs designed to acquaint the general public with respect to the dangers of drug addiction and abuse and encourage programs for their prevention;

Third, require the Justice Department's Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, in consultation with the organized crime and other components of the Department, to make State and local officials aware of what is going on in the

drug abuse and illegal drug traffic areas, as well as require them to cooperate and coordinate their efforts in order to improve controls on a nationwide basis.

Mr. President, the phenomenon and tragedy of drug addiction and experimentation is increasingly recognized as a dangerous health problem of international proportions. But its consequences are not limited to the shattered lives of the users themselves. There are, of course, medically sound reasons for using drugs in man's battle against pain and disease. And while there is no consistent public policy prohibiting things that are bad for us, nevertheless the law-abiding citizen is seriously affected by drug abuse—both in terms of the high frequency of crime which it spawns and the high cost of repeatedly enforcing laws against the use of mind-altering drugs when there is little hope of rehabilitation or cure for the user.

Despite advances in treatment of the past several years, a person addicted to heroin or barbiturates has less than a 10-percent chance of full recovery to social and psychological independence. As long as he is addicted, his life in the subterranean drug culture revolves around the next "fix," and home, job, and educational opportunities do not exist for him. A habit which can cost \$30 and more per day almost inevitably leads to criminal means to support it, and law-abiding citizens become victims of drug abuse as addicts rob, shoplift, and burglarize to pay for their habit.

Mr. President, it is generally recognized that it is no longer sufficient to rely on criminal preventive sanctions enacted at a time when little was known about the etiology of narcotics addiction or the elements of successful treatment. Just as the threat of long prison terms does not seem to deter the addict, neither does the reality of prison life cure him. After release, with no help in confronting his underlying addiction problem so as to prevent readdiction, it is not surprising that most addicts rejoin the illegal drug traffic and resume their prior habit.

It is necessary therefore to differentiate between addicts who are motivated to abandon drugs, and those who must be isolated as substantial threats to society. In short, the occasional marihuana smoker should not go to prison with the confirmed heroin user with criminal tendencies, nor should the same laws apply to the addict who buys as apply to the drug profiteer who sells.

The comprehensive rehabilitation programs which my bill envisions would complement other drug abuse legislation which has been introduced to permit more flexible treatment of youthful drug offenders, and those addicts prosecuted for selling drugs to support their own habit. It would, as I indicated earlier in my statement, be designed to treat drug addicts both on a voluntary basis and under civil commitment, as well as those addicts released pending criminal proceedings and on probation or parole.

Mr. President, in connection with this proposed measure, I must touch upon one point which my bill is also designed to help cure and which I acknowledge is particularly painful to me.

I am angry with a great anger at the atrocious deeds of those who deal in illicit drug traffic—particularly those whose sole motive is profit. In my opinion, the outrages which the dope peddlers in this Nation and other parts of the world have been and are continuing to perpetrate are an offense against all civilization.

None of us here can have observed and read about the disintegration and ruin of many fine young lives as the result of drug pushing activities without a profound feeling of outrage and horror. We are filled with sorrow as well that any society so penetrated with rationalism as is ours should be endangered and degraded by abominations of this sort.

Those who traffic in drugs are heaping crime upon crime in their terrible greed. They are one and all working to bring disaster on our country. Their motives and acts are heavily fraught with evil, and they have no share in the national honor.

The specter of the threat posed by drug pushers cannot be ignored, neither by private citizens nor State and local governments. Indeed, we must enlist the help of concerned Americans in fighting, step by step, this obstinate menace. While the police are doing the best they can, identification of drug pushers is complicated by the fact that in drug transactions both pusher and user attempt to avoid the police. Hence, there are usually no complainants in narcotics cases. As a result, the police often lack the "probable cause" necessary to make an arrest for possession of drugs.

In the belief that an educational program is the sine qua non of any effort to solve this social menace—and until more far-reaching programs of education which I have proposed in my bill can be instituted—I am preparing a pamphlet which I plan to distribute extensively within my State of New Mexico. It is designed to help concerned members of my constituency, local officials, and the vulnerable themselves, understand the truth about hazards and risks involved in drug abuse. I am hopeful that it will also encourage all New Mexicans to learn as much as they can about drugs and narcotics, and to consult with or report suspected drug abuse to local doctors and/or other appropriate officials. Only through working together—private citizen, local, State and Federal Governments alike—to identify those who are illicitly selling and buying drugs can we save a lot of fine young people from a life of hell, ruin, and slow, living death.

Given the difficulty in shackling man's unleashed curiosity—including that of experimenting with some of the newer mind-altering drugs—nevertheless we must win in spite of these sinister and ruthless forces that are debasing the lives of many of our citizens. I believe the legislation which I am proposing, together with the cooperation of every concerned American, is one mode for helping to expose and punish those trading on practices injurious to our civilization. Indeed, there must be stern execution of justice upon these evildoers, and I shall also strongly support all other legisla-

tion designed to prosecute them under the maximum penalties.

If, to paraphrase Franklin, men are to cease to be wolves to one another, we must quickly enact this legislation. In doing so, we shall be articulating the ideas to which we give allegiance, and helping to put an end to this affliction which is weighing so heavily upon us all.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2592) to provide financial assistance to States and nonprofit private organizations for the establishment of comprehensive drug abuse prevention and rehabilitation centers, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MONTOYA, 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. 2592

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Drug Abuse Control Act of 1969".

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this Act to provide financial assistance for centers for treatment and rehabilitation for drug addicts and for the prevention of drug abuse, and to strengthen drug abuse educational programs and the coordination of drug law enforcement activities, in order to contribute to the prevention and decline of crime and delinquency resulting from drug addiction.

TITLE I—GRANTS FOR TREATMENT AND REHABILITATION CENTERS FOR NARCOTIC DRUG ADDICTS AND FOR THE PREVENTION OF DRUG ABUSE

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 101. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$50 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; \$75 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; \$75 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; and \$75 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973 for the purpose of carrying out this title. Sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall remain available until expended.

ALLOTMENTS

SEC. 102. (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 101 for each fiscal year the Secretary shall allot not more than 5 per centum thereof among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands according to their specific needs. From the remainder of such sums the Secretary—

(1) shall allot to such State an amount which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum of such remainder as the number of persons who are determined to be drug addicts and drug abusers in such State bears to the number of such persons in all States, and

(2) shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum of such remainder as the population in such State bears to the population in all States. For the purposes of this subsection, the term "State" does not include Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

(b) The portion of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for a fiscal year which the Secretary determines will not be required, for the period such allotment is avail-

able, for carrying out the purposes of this title shall be available for reallocation from time to time, on such dates during such period as the Secretary may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsection (a) for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum which the Secretary estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such period for carrying out such portion of its State application approved under this title, and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallocated among the States whose proportionate amounts are not so reduced. Any amount reallocated to a State under this subsection during a year shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

(c) The number of persons determined to be drug addicts or drug abusers in a State and in all States shall be computed by the Secretary on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available to him.

STATE PLANS

SEC. 103. (a) Any State desiring to receive its allotment of Federal funds under this title shall submit a State plan consistent with such basic criteria as the Secretary may establish under section 104. Such plan shall—

(1) designate a single State agency for the administration of the plan;

(2) set forth a comprehensive statewide program for the construction, expansion, operation and modernization of centers for the treatment and rehabilitation of drug addicts and for the prevention of drug abuse in the State, under which at least 75 per centum of all Federal funds granted to the State agency under this title for any fiscal year will be available to local governmental bodies and nonprofit private organizations in such State for the construction, expansion, operation and modernization of such centers;

(3) provide, whenever practicable, satisfactory assurance that the control of funds and title to property derived therefrom shall be in a public agency for the use and purposes provided in this Act and that a public agency will administer such funds and property;

(4) provide for the designation of a State advisory council which shall include representatives of non-governmental organizations or groups and of public agencies, concerned with the operation, construction or modernization of centers for the treatment and rehabilitation of drug addicts or for the prevention of drug abuse;

(5) provide assurances that the State will pay from non-Federal sources the remaining costs of such program;

(6) provide minimum standards to be set at the discretion of the State, for the maintenance or operation of such centers;

(7) set forth policies and procedures designed to assure that Federal funds made available under this title will be so used as not to supplant State or local funds, but to supplement and, to the extent practicable, to increase the amounts of such funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for the purposes of this title;

(8) set forth procedures under which the State agency shall not finally disapprove an application for funds from an appropriate agency or nonprofit private organization within such State without first affording such agency or organization reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing;

(9) set forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State agency (including such funds paid by the State agency to any such agency or organization within such State) under this title; and

(10) provide for making such reasonable

reports in such form and containing such information as the Secretary may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this title and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Secretary may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

(b) The Secretary shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (a).

BASIC CRITERIA

SEC. 104. As soon as practicable after the enactment of this Act the Secretary shall after consultation with the director of the National Institute for Mental Health and the head of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs in the Department of Justice, by regulations prescribe basic criteria to be applied by the State agency under section 103. In addition to other matters such basic criteria shall provide—

(1) the general manner in which such State agency shall determine priority of projects based upon (A) the relative need of the area within such State for centers for the treatment and rehabilitation of drug addiction and for the prevention of drug abuse, (B) the relative ability of the public agency and of private resources in such area to support a program of construction, expansion, operation, or modernization of such centers, and (C) the extent to which the project contributes to carrying out the purposes of this Act;

(2) general standards of construction and equipment necessary for the treatment and rehabilitation of drug addicts.

PAYMENTS

SEC. 105. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), payment under this title shall be made to those State agencies which administer plans approved under section 103. Payments under this title from a State's allotment with respect to the cost of carrying out its State plan shall equal 75 per centum of such costs for any fiscal year. In determining the cost of carrying out a State's plan, there shall be excluded any cost with respect to which payments were received under any other Federal program.

(b) No payments shall be made to any State from its allotment for any fiscal year unless and until the Secretary finds that the State which will carry out the State plan for that year will have available during that year for expenditure from non-Federal sources for the purposes of treatment and rehabilitation of drug addicts and for the prevention of drug abuse not less than the total amount actually expended by such States for such purposes from such sources during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, plus an amount equal to not less than the non-Federal share of the costs with respect to which payment pursuant to subsection (a) is sought.

(c) Payments to a State under this title may be made in installments and in advance or by way of reimbursement with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments and they may be paid directly to the State or to one or more public agencies designated for this purpose by the State or to both.

ADMINISTRATION OF STATE PLANS

SEC. 106. (a) The Secretary shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this title, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State agency submitting the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(b) Whenever the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering a State plan approved under section 103, finds that—

(1) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of such section, or

(2) in the administration of the plan there

is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Secretary shall notify the State agency that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under this title until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 107. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Secretary's final action with respect to the approval of its plan submitted under section 103 or with his final action under section 106, such State may, within sixty days after notice of such action, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located a petition for review of that action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Secretary. The Secretary thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

(b) The findings of fact by the Secretary, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Secretary to take further evidence, and the Secretary may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

(c) Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Secretary or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

DIRECT FUNDING

SEC. 108. In any case in which a State fails to submit a State plan pursuant to this title within six months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary may make grants to the extent practicable in accordance with the provisions of this title to general public political subdivisions within such State and nonprofit private organizations within such State.

RECOVERY

SEC. 109. If any center with respect to which funds have been paid under this title shall, at any time within twenty years after the completion of construction or within twenty years after completion of expansion or modernization—

(1) be sold or transferred to any person, organization (A) which is not qualified to file an application under this title or (B) which is not approved as a transferring center by the said agency designated pursuant to section 103 or its successor; or

(2) ceases to be a center for the treatment or rehabilitation of drug addicts or the prevention of drug abuse, unless the Secretary determines in accordance with regulations that there is good cause for releasing the applicant or other owner from this obligation, the United States shall be entitled to recover from either the transferor or the transferee (or, in the case of a center which has ceased to be public or nonprofit, from the owners thereof) an amount bearing the same ratio to the then value (as determined by the agreement of the parties or by action brought in the district court of the United States for the district in which the center is situated) of so much of the center as constituted an approved project or projects, as the amount of the Federal participation bore to the cost of the construction, expansion or modernization under such project or projects. Such right of recovery shall not constitute a lien upon said facility prior to judgment.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION PROGRAM

SEC. 201. In order to educate the general public with respect to the dangers of drug addiction and encourage programs for the prevention of drug abuse, the Secretary—

(1) shall prepare and disseminate to appropriate State and local public agencies and other appropriate private nonprofit institutions and organizations such information resulting from the care, treatment and rehabilitation of drug addicts, and such information developed by any Federal agency on the prevention of drug abuse, as he deems appropriate;

(2) is authorized, upon request, to provide advice, counsel, technical assistance, and demonstrations to appropriate State and local public agencies and nonprofit private organizations and institutions undertaking or expanding prevention of drug abuse programs; and

(3) shall prepare and disseminate to appropriate State and local agencies and other appropriate nonprofit private institutions and organizations an annual report setting forth such developments in the field of prevention of drug abuse as he deems will contribute to carrying out the purposes of this Act.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$15,000,000 or the fiscal year June 30, 1970, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, to carry out the provisions of this section.

LAW ENFORCEMENT INFORMATION PROGRAM

SEC. 202. The Attorney General, through the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, after consultation with the head of the organized crime and racketeering section of the criminal division and the Administrator of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, shall develop and carry out a program to—

(1) collect and disseminate to State and local law enforcement agencies and to appropriate educational agencies and institutions relevant information with respect to drug abuse and narcotic drug traffic;

(2) provide effective procedures for the coordination of Federal, State and local drug abuse law enforcement activities.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated \$15 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years to carry out the provisions of this section.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 203. As used in this Act—

(1) "construction" includes the preparation of drawings and specifications for centers for the treatment and rehabilitation of drug addicts and the prevention of drug abuse; erecting, building, acquiring, altering, remodeling, improving, or extending such centers; and the inspection and supervision of the construction of such centers. Such term does not include interests in land or off-site improvements;

(2) "drug abuse" means the use by any person, on a periodic or continuous basis, for their psychotoxic effects alone and not as therapeutic media prescribed in the course of legitimate medical treatment, any drug or drugs capable of altering or affecting, to a substantive degree, the consciousness, mood, motivation, or critical judgment of an individual, or the psychomotor coordination or the perception of the auditory or visual sense of an individual. Such drugs shall include among others, the opiates, cocaine, marijuana, barbiturates, and amphetamines, but shall not include alcohol.

(3) "drug addict" means any individual who habitually uses any narcotic drug as defined by section 4731 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, so as to endanger the public morals, health, safety, or welfare, or who is or has been so far addicted to the use of such narcotic drugs as

to have lost the power of self-control with reference to his addiction.

(4) "modernization" means any program or project designed to enhance the prospect of successful treatment and rehabilitation of drug addicts or to improve the possibility of prevention of drug abuse in any State, including but not limited to the acquisition of equipment necessary for new techniques for such centers, innovative training projects to strengthen the number and quality of personnel serving such centers.

(5) "State" includes, in addition to the several States of the union, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

(6) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(7) "treatment" means confinement and treatment in a hospital and under supervised aftercare in the community and includes, but is not limited to, medical, educational, social, psychological, and vocational services, corrective and preventive guidance and training, and other rehabilitative services designed to protect the public and benefit the addict by correcting his antisocial tendencies and ending his dependence on addicting drugs and his susceptibility to addiction.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF A BILL

S. 2518

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. SAXBE), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. GRIFFIN), and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. JORDAN) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 2518) to amend title II of the Social Security Act, so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance thereunder.

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

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 134—INTRODUCTION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION PROCLAIMING NATIONAL ADULT-YOUTH COMMUNICATIONS WEEK

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which would authorize the President to proclaim the week of September 28, 1969, through October 4, 1969, as "National Adult-Youth Communications Week."

The inspiration for this bill comes, appropriately, from young people: ninth graders from Ridgely Junior High School in Maryland. The bill was conceived by the students in connection with a social studies project involving the study of the legislative process. Their purpose is twofold: First, to put their classroom learning into practice; and, second, to produce a bill to aid in decreasing the communications gap which exists between the generations. What is noteworthy about the students' initiative is their faith and interest in the legislative process, and their conviction that they, like other teenagers, can make meaningful contributions to our society. I would like to commend the ninth grade class

of Ridgely Junior High School for their initiative, for their energy, and for the constructive contribution they are making to our society by bringing this bill to the attention of Congress. Their faith in the democratic process should provide inspiration for all of us, young and old.

The times are the best witness to the appropriateness of this bill. Every day brings new evidence of misunderstandings between we parents and our children—campus unrest, anti-Vietnam demonstrations, draft resistance, and despair at the pace of progress on civil rights. We have adopted a catch phrase which is descriptive of the great divide between parents and their children: we call it the "generation gap." But like many such phrases, this is too simple a description of a complex problem. The root of our difficulties is a serious breakdown in communications between young and old, between parents and their children.

Communication is effective, of course, only if the dialog runs both ways—from old to young and from young to old. In my view, neither side of the generation gap can be very proud of its efforts to close the divide.

On the one hand, the flow of information from the young to adults has seemingly been reduced to a trickle, and what gets through is frequently distorted. Many adults are aware of only the manifestations of discontent and alienation—the picketing, sit-ins and campus unrest—and miss the sincere protestations lying behind them. For this breakdown in communications, both sides are responsible: youth for their intransigent propensity to "demand" rather than reason, and adults for their intransigent failure to listen.

On the other hand, the flow of communications from adults to youth has been substantially reduced. We adults have a world of experience to share, but we misread the abilities of our youth and their sincere dedication when we try to proselytize or to preach rather than to offer the lessons of our experience as would a friend or mentor. Our children rightfully challenge us, as well, to make the realities of our world match our rhetoric.

In short, upon both the young and the old rest twin obligations, both to speak and to listen. This bill provides a first step in establishing the context for bridging the generation gap. The bill would authorize the President: First, to call upon the Nation's TV networks to hold a series of programs to present the views of each generation to the other; second, to call upon secondary schools and colleges to promote similar discussions; and third, to call upon businesses to encourage family participation in recreational group activities during the week by setting special family rates. This bill, inspired by the constructive energy of representative young people, offers a significant beginning toward reestablishing unstructured dialog between the generations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 134) authorizing the President to proclaim the week of September 28, 1969, through October 4, 1969, as "National Adult-Youth

Communications Week," introduced by Mr. TYDINGS, for himself and other Senators, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 135—
INTRODUCTION OF A RESOLUTION
PROCLAIMING BIBLE TRANSLATION DAY**

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating September 30, 1969, as "Bible Translation Day."

I have been privileged to introduce this resolution on several occasions, and the support of the Senate has been received. This year we are confident that the other House will also act favorably, thereby authorizing the President to issue this proclamation.

I am particularly interested in the passage of this resolution because of my admiration and respect for the Summer Institute of Linguistics, which operates a linguistics institute, among other places, at the University of Oklahoma each summer. At such institutes, young men and women are trained to develop the means of reducing unwritten languages into a written form. Through their efforts, hundreds of groups now unable to communicate effectively with the outside world will be given the means of attaining the light of literature and science.

Last Saturday, an article by Mr. William Willoughby, appeared in the Washington Evening Star in which the work of the Summer Institute of Linguistics and other Bible translation groups is featured. I ask unanimous consent that this article, along with the joint resolution, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 135) to authorize the President to proclaim September 30, 1969, as Bible Translation Day, introduced by Mr. HARRIS, 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.J. Res. 135

Whereas there are over two thousand tribes living generally in out-of-the-way areas of the world in cultural isolation without books or even an alphabet and much less the Bible; and

Whereas the translation of the Bible into these tribal languages requires that an alphabet and a thorough grammatical analysis of the language be produced, and results in an expansion of literacy and an improvement of the cultural base of the language groups affected; and

Whereas this effort has cultural, economic, social, and political significance quite apart from its spiritual significance; and

Whereas a large group of linguistic scholars trained at the Universities of Oklahoma, North Dakota, Washington, Michigan, Indiana, California, Pennsylvania, Texas, and elsewhere are engaged in this task on a non-sectarian basis with the cooperation of foreign governments and institutions of higher

learning, and deserve our encouragement; and

Whereas the first translator of both the Old and New Testaments, Saint Jerome, died on the 30th of September: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the 30th day of September 1968 as "Bible Translation Day" and inviting the governments of States and communities and the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The article presented by Mr. HARRIS is as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 5, 1969]

**TRANSLATORS AND INSECTS—MAKING THE
WORLD LITERATE**

(By William Willoughby)

The young medical doctor, studying at the University of Oklahoma's Summer Institute of Linguistics to be a missionary, was traveling westward from the university to the annual Indian festival at Anadarko when he, his wife-to-be and another couple stopped to buy a watermelon. They sat along the roadside in the shade of trees eating it.

Inevitably the conversation of the four missionary candidates turned to eating native foods—one of the biggest fears and most unappetizing prospects each faces. The prospect of unfriendly arrows or of getting lost in the jungle takes a back seat to anticipating eating lizards, snakes, monkeys or insects.

"I wouldn't mind eating a locust," the teasing bride-to-be said to her doctor fiancé.

Immediately he picked up a hapless grasshopper, held it near his mouth and said, "Here, I'll go halves with you." He popped it into his mouth with due deliberation, biting it in two.

Next week, Oklahoma's Sen. Fred Harris and Nebraska's Sen. Carl Curtis will introduce a measure in the Senate which would honor the work of thousands of missionaries, not for eating grasshoppers, but for a profound work in reducing unwritten languages to writing. The resolution would officially recognize Sept. 30 as Translation Day.

Sept. 30 was picked for the observance because that is the birthday of St. Jerome, the first Christian translator of note.

The Summer Institute of Linguistics and Wycliffe Bible Translators, which are related organizations, Catholic and Lutheran translators, have been working for at least three years to have official recognition. They also are trying to get the day recognized on church calendars. Each year, in the House at least, the resolution gets locked into the Judiciary Committee.

Wycliffe, now the largest foreign missionary society in the world, with about 2,500 missionaries in the field, is the prime mover in the translation field. It is reducing 400 languages into writing now. Its aim is to reduce the 2,000 other unwritten languages before the turn of the century and get at least one of the Gospels translated into each of them.

Their motivation, of course, is religious, evangelistic. They feel it is necessary to spread the Gospel, and to do this, it is necessary that the language barrier be cracked. They're out in isolated valleys in New Guinea among Stone-Age cannibals to prove their conviction, or squatted around an Indian fire in South America or in a hut in the African bush country.

This fall they'll be in the Caucasus Mountains reducing languages for Russian officials in the tribes of Georgia and Azerbaijan. At least 60 unreduced languages were found there, and an agreement was reached only months ago for the linguists to come in.

The translators are popular with the gov-

ernments of developing nations, and in some cases are even sought out by them. The governments realize the economy of their nations cannot develop if the natives—out away from the cities—can't read. It's just this simple. They can't read if there's not even an alphabet in their own language.

The spirit behind the Wycliffites, and a man highly respected by Catholic and Lutheran translators, is Dr. Cameron Townsend. Fifty years ago he was a perplexed Bible salesman in Guatemala. Bibles sold well among the Spanish-speaking, but not among the Indians, who stuck to their own languages.

"If your God is so smart," the guide asked Townsend as the American was trying to convert him, "why doesn't He speak my language?" From that time on Townsend had a new ministry, seeing to it that God became more fluent. Since then, through the Summer Institute of Linguistics, more than 12,000 missionary linguistics serving more than 100 mission boards, have received this highly demanding training.

Making God fluent in the forgotten languages isn't easy. Some missionaries have met with strong resistance when they begin to write down the native sounds. "They're trying to steal our language," the tribesmen reason. Getting some of them to want to read is another thing. They think the white man is casting some sort of spell over them.

Let the educated American look askance at this primitive notion, he would do well to realize that the word "spell," as used in the writing of words, is strongly related to the meaning when we speak of "casting a spell on someone." The early Englishmen, not yet literate, often looked in fear at the person who could spell as having some kind of demonic influence—a person able to cast a spell on the person who couldn't read.

Dr. Kenneth L. Pike of the University of Michigan is the intellectual spark behind the translators. As president of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, each year his program trains 500 or more linguists.

The problem, forbidding to the outsider, is made "simple" by Pike. "There are only so many parts that wiggle in any person's speech mechanism in any part of the world," he reasoned. But how these parts wiggled in different languages is the problem. The possibilities run to over a million.

Pike reduced the possibilities to about 300 symbols, which the translators learn and use. Thus, out of the million possible sound combinations, the linguists are able to indicate them by symbols. Later, as in English or any other written language, this is refined to an alphabet of from 20 to 40 or so letters.

Oh—about our young medical missionary friend. That grasshopper stunt was all part of a well-calculated plan. His fiancée was a girl it would be hard for a man to get ahead of, having the competency a good missionary must possess.

As was anticipated, as soon as he had called her bluff by biting the insect in two, she bowed her head, put both hands over her eyes and cried, "Oh, no!"

He had won the day. While her hands were over her eyes, he quickly spat his half out, handing over her half. To this day, she is that far behind him—not as willing to catch up as she thought.

He, undoubtedly, is one of the few men ever to stay ahead of his woman. Try it some time.

But what if she bites?

**SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION
34—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION
RELATING TO NATIONAL INDIAN
POLICY**

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I submit for myself and for Senators ANDERSON, BURDICK, CHURCH, CRANSTON, FANNIN, GRAVEL, HARRIS, HATFIELD, KENNEDY,

MANSFIELD, McCARTHY, McGEE, METCALF, MONDALE, MONTOYA, MOSS, MUNDT, and NELSON a statement of national policy toward the American Indians and Alaskan Natives. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks and that a resolution adopted by the executive council of the National Congress of American Indians in January of this year also be printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, almost 3 years ago, I introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 114, defining the direction and policies which the United States should pursue in fulfilling its responsibility to the American Indian. This same resolution, as Senate Concurrent Resolution 11, passed the Senate in 1968, but was not acted on by the House of Representatives. Today, I am introducing the same resolution with the hope that it will command the prompt attention of both the Senate and the House of Representatives.

In the 3 years since I first introduced the resolution, some progress has been made in improving the social and economic conditions of Indian citizens.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs, or at least portions of it, is moving—painfully and reluctantly—away from a discredited philosophy of paternalism and guardianship, in administering Indian affairs to a role as adviser, partner, and resource in the free development of the Indian people. This transition has begun with some significant actions:

A National Indian Education Advisory Committee has been established by the Bureau of Indian Affairs with strong Indian representation;

The Bureau is experimenting with the use of contracts with Indian tribes to provide many of the services to Indian tribes and people presently carried out by the Bureau;

Administrative guidelines have recently been formulated by the Bureau to permit Indian tribes to elect school boards, to assume control of the schools operated by the BIA for Indian children;

No longer must Indian tribes depend solely upon the traditional agencies—the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Division of Indian Health—for the many services needed by Indians. Many Federal agencies, such as OEO, EDA, FHA, et cetera, now offer their services to Indian tribes directly;

The practice of seeking prior consultation with Indian tribes in matters affecting them is increasing among agencies providing services to Indian tribes.

In 1968, President Johnson created by Executive order a National Council on Indian Opportunity, chaired by the Vice President of the United States with Cabinet-level representation and with vigorous representation from Indian tribes and the Indian community. For the first time, at the highest level of Government, an agency has been created to coordinate the diverse Federal services available for Indians. For the first time, at the highest level of Government, an agency exists which can oversee all

of the policies and programs of the United States in its relations with Indian tribes.

There has been some progress and some limited successes. Let me take a moment to point out some of the progress being made by the Indians of my own State.

Housing programs sponsored by the Indian tribes of South Dakota are having a significant impact in improving living conditions on several reservations. The Rosebud Sioux Tribe pioneered a new approach in community housing by pooling the funds and cooperation of several Federal agencies to construct low-cost, low-income housing.

The BIA-operated schools on the Cheyenne River and Rosebud Sioux Reservations in South Dakota have been consolidated with the local public school system to provide an integrated, quality education for both Indian and non-Indian children in those communities.

Industrial development efforts on or near Indian reservations, aimed at providing jobs and a local purchasing base are moving ahead with some encouraging progress. Tribal enterprise itself is growing and showing considerable promise for future development of local resources. For example, the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe in South Dakota now owns and operates its own telephone system serving both the Indian and non-Indian population in two counties. It owns and operates a supermarket, livestock sales pavilion, and a cattle enterprise.

Finally, the tribal community action programs, funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity, have been outstandingly successful. They have illuminated the competence of the Indian people in directing and maintaining self-help programs which focus the energies of the target community on problems of collective concern.

Other reservations around the country are making similar progress. And in most instances, the successful program is undertaken and managed by the Indian people themselves.

These successes serve also to emphasize the great task remaining. They underscore the poverty, disease, illiteracy, and despair which is still the common inheritance of the Indian people.

When I introduced this resolution in 1966, I stressed the importance of basing our Indian programs on the principles of self-determination and self-help. It is essential also that programs be geared to the special geographic and ethnic factors which define local Indian problems, and that they be adequately funded on a dependable basis. While these guidelines are beginning to find currency in the administration of Indian affairs, a forthright congressional statement, as contained in this resolution, is still necessary—and overdue.

There is not yet a firm U.S. commitment, in terms of adequacy of funds and constituency of policy or programs, to free the Indians from the chains of poverty. There is not yet a firm resolve on the part of the United States to solve the problem where it exists—on the reservation.

This resolution is needed to release

the American Indian from the fear, real or imagined, of a hasty, ill-conceived termination of Federal supervision. Testifying before my subcommittee when I held hearings on Senate Concurrent Resolution 11 on March 5, 1968, the late Senator Robert Kennedy said of this policy:

This termination policy, as many have pointed out, has thoroughly "poisoned the well" of meaningful dialogue among government officials, legislators and the Indian people. After suffering a period of constant threat of termination and disenfranchisement, Indian tribes across the Nation have become deeply suspicious of any new program.

This resolution will refresh the well of dialog and erase the fears and suspicions of the Indian people.

With a new spirit of cooperation and a new sense of our mutual destiny, we can approach the seminal question—what role for the Indian in American society today? In many ways it is the American problem—uniquely our own, inextricably a part of our culture and a product of our history.

The anomalies of our Indian education policy defy logic and offend our sensibilities. Of approximately 150,000 Indian children in school today, one-third attend school in federally operated institutions. This is the only school system in America entirely operated and funded by the Federal Government. In this postspatnik era of great concern in the Congress and in the Executive for the quality of education in our Nation's schools—after the great debates here in the Congress on Federal aid to elementary and secondary education—after the enactment of landmark legislation for Federal aid for elementary and secondary education, we should surely expect that the only school system owned, operated, and funded solely by the Federal Government to be a model of excellence in quality education and an example to the public school system of our Nation. We should expect that it serve as a laboratory for innovative programs in quality education—in bilingual education—in education of minority children—in education of culturally deprived and disadvantaged children.

Yet, Mr. President, we find the record of Federal education of Indian children—both in federally operated schools and in public schools for which the United States provides special Indian-related financial assistance—showing:

A dropout or pushout rate of 50 percent before the 12th grade, twice the national average;

An overall education level of all Indians of 5 years, half the national average;

An achievement level for Indian children far below those of their white counterparts, with progressive failure the longer the child stays in school;

Statistics which indicate that 16,000 or more school-age Indian children are not in school.

The Coleman report, a report on equal educational opportunities in public schools, revealed in 1966:

Only 1% of Indian children in elementary school had Indian teachers or principals;

One-fourth of elementary and secondary

school teachers—by their own admission—would prefer not to teach Indian children;

Indian children, more than any other group, believe themselves to be "below average" in intelligence;

Indian children in the 12th grade have the weakest self-concept of all minority groups tested.

The only conclusion we can draw from such statistics is that we have failed, and failed badly, in our efforts to educate Indian children. The general public school system, hard pressed as it is for funds, facilities, and personnel, has—except in educating Indian children and other minorities—far outperformed the system which should be its model.

In the March 5, 1968, hearings on Senate Concurrent Resolution 11, the late Senator Kennedy again cut to the core of the question when he said:

I am convinced that the Federal Government has a moral and legal commitment to provide or subsidize not just an educational program, not just an average education program, but an educational program unsurpassed in its excellence and effectiveness for as many Indian children as can be properly considered within the Federal government's direct or indirect responsibility.

Mr. President, the United States does have a legal and moral obligation to educate Indian children. It is unthinkable that we should accept anything less than excellence in that effort.

I am hopeful that the Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, formerly chaired by Senator Robert Kennedy and now chaired by Senator EDWARD KENNEDY, will bring this problem more forcefully into focus for the Senate. I hope that the recommendations of that subcommittee will receive the most thoughtful consideration of this body.

HEALTH

The Federal assumption of responsibility for the health needs of the American Indian date back to the early 1800's, when Army physicians undertook to curb smallpox and other contagious diseases among Indian tribes living near military posts. Our present-day program for Indian health grows out of treaties subsequently negotiated, which include various provisions for medical services.

Yet, after a hundred and fifty years of Federal responsibility for Indian health, the statistics depicting the health conditions of the American Indian are closer to the health statistics of an underdeveloped nation of Africa or Asia than to the national averages for the United States. Let us take a moment to look at some of these statistics:

The average age of death for an American Indian is, today, 44 years, for all Americans, it is 65,

The infant mortality rate for Indians is 35 deaths per 1,000 births, 11 points higher than the national average and 20 points higher than for white middle class America;

Eighteen percent of the deaths among Indians occur in children under 1 year of age;

An incidence of tuberculosis among Indians and Alaska natives of about five times the national average;

The mortality from influenza and pneumonia is twice as high among the Indian population as in the United States

as a whole; among Alaska natives the figure is three times as high;

An incidence of streptococcal infections among Indians that is eight to 10 times that of the general population.

It is unacceptable that, in the greatest era of medical technology in the history of man, there exists a people living, medically, in the 18th century.

It is unacceptable that there exists in our midst a people suffering from diseases long eradicated in the United States and now found only in the most primitive of nations.

It is unacceptable that here is hunger and malnutrition and attendant diseases almost unknown in much of this Nation and found only among the most backward people.

We have made improvements in providing for the health of our Indian citizens. But, as the health standards of the Indians have risen, so have the health standards of the Nation as a whole and the gap is as great as ever. It is unconscionable for us to continue to tolerate this gap as a way of life for the Indian people. It must be closed.

HOUSING

Housing conditions for the inhabitants of our Indian reservations are, quite frankly, a national disgrace. Housing conditions on Indian reservations are among the worst in the Nation.

More than half of Indians and Alaska natives live in one- or two-bedroom houses. Or in shacks. Or in car bodies. Three-fourths of approximately 76,000 houses on reservations and trust land fall below minimum standards.

What does "below minimum standards" mean? It means: water for more than 50 percent of Indian families comes from open wells or ditches, and what there is of it comes by hand from potentially contaminated sources; wind, cockroaches, and rats come through the walls which in at least 80 percent of Indian homes are of tarpaper or mud; on the average, five to six people spend their nights in the same room, often in the same bed—parents right alongside of the children; more than 70 percent of Indian houses are too dilapidated to repair. It means that thousands of American Indians—our first citizens—fight a twilight struggle for bare minimum existence in the most affluent nation the world has known.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

The conditions I have described in Indian education, health, and housing derive in large part from the inadequate rate of economic development on Indian reservations and communities.

Indian tribes own, individually or as a tribe, approximately 2 percent of all the land in this Nation. If that 2 percent was consolidated, the resulting area would be more than the size of six New England States. But the image is misleading. When reservations were being formed, Indians were permitted to retain only those lands which were considered worthless for non-Indian economic use. Much of that land is still of only marginal economic benefit.

Yet, a number of tribes have found that the worthless lands they were allotted now have considerable value in

mineral, timber, water, and other natural resources. Some, such as the Agua Caliente Band of Mission Indians of the Palm Springs area, have found their lands to be strategically located in the expansion of urban and resort areas.

But all too often the pattern has been for outside, non-Indian interests to exploit and develop these resources. It is true that a few low-paying jobs for the Indians are generated by such development. But the real profit yield of the resource flows out of the reservation and its economy into the hands of outside concerns, while the tribe reaps only low-yield, short-term, rental payments. In many cases, the resources remain undeveloped—locked in the land—for lack of adequate capital and credit sources for the Indian community or for lack of appropriate incentive to outside interests to develop the resource.

The Indian people themselves are the greatest resource and potential asset of the reservation, eager and enterprising when presented with a challenge and the tools to meet it. Yet, they remain the victims of a vacillating and unresponsive national commitment. They must extract a living from a seasonal, wage-earning economy with a minimum or below-minimum income level. Many tribes depend wholly on a submarginal agriculture economy with a future of steadily diminishing return. The average unemployment rate for Indians is near 40 percent—10 times the national average. On some reservations, such as the Pine Ridge Sioux Reservation in my own State of South Dakota, the unemployment rate reaches, at times, an unbelievable 75 to 80 percent of the total available labor force.

Three-fourths of all Indian families exist on an income below the poverty level of \$3,000 a year—one-half or more earn less than \$2,000 a year.

The sociological costs of such decay and neglect are beyond reckoning. The culture and values of the Indians have survived a hundred and fifty years of concerted attempts to break them down; but they are most critically challenged by the poverty and despair which afflicts their community today.

The close-knit family structure of the Indian people is under a heavy strain. Broken homes and unwanted, untended orphans—foreign to traditional Indian practices—are increasing. Suicides among teenagers, traceable to cultural alienation and hopeless despair, are the highest in the Nation. Crime, for the most part minor felonies and misdemeanors, has become commonplace on Indian reservations.

In several States, one-third of the adult and juvenile inmates in State penal institutions are Indians—as in South Dakota, where Indians comprise only 5 percent of the total population.

Indians need, above all, to develop the community, social, and political skills required for long-term self-help. And it can be done.

Community action programs exist on over 100 Indian reservations, covering more than 80 percent of all service population Indians. The uniqueness of the CAP approach—funding tribal councils directly—has brought a new Indian

leadership to the forefront; and this largely explains the overwhelming Indian acceptance of the program. For the first time, Federal funds have been entrusted to the complete discretion of Indian tribal councils. Resources for maintaining paid professional staffs has resulted in the return of more natural Indian leaders to reservations for full-time paid work. If this kind of approach, recommended in my resolution, was embraced by all our Indian programs, Indian society would become more stable and productive.

It is a comprehensive approach, combining administrative reform, economic and educational initiatives and a new emphasis on self-determination to fashion a unified Federal program. It is not enough to criticize the dismal record of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Division of Indian Health—though such criticism is often warranted. They are, after all, only instruments of our will and our policies. While they may do less than is required of them, they can do no more than we authorize.

It is not enough to call for a reorganization or transfer of functions in Indian affairs—though this may be needed. A careful, well-conceived plan of reorganization or transfer without new direction and a firm commitment to action will only result in a continued inadequate performance. A hasty, ill-conceived plan could well mean disaster for the Indians on a monumental scale.

It is not enough to appropriate more money—though more money is required. Money without motive insures failure. More money without new direction, after consultation with the Indian people, will only bring about failure on a larger scale.

It is not enough to promise Indians self-determination and self-help—though that must be the cornerstone of our Indian policy. That raises the hopes and aspirations of the Indian people. A failure of commitment and the means to carry through on that commitment will only crush those hopes and aspirations more cruelly.

In short, our understanding of the problem must be thorough, our commitment to the solution of the problem must be unwavering, and our promises must be given genuine substance.

Enactment of this resolution is not an end in itself. It will not, of itself, solve the demanding problems of the Indian people. It will not, by itself, insure success in meeting age-old responsibilities and in solving longstanding problems.

But it will create an atmosphere for success.

Among the Indian people, it will create an atmosphere of confidence and trust in Federal programs and in the sincerity of our commitment to the common good. It will erase old fears and suspicions engendered by the termination policies of House Concurrent Resolution 108.

It will create an atmosphere in which dignity and self-respect can be reclaimed by the Indians, with the sure knowledge that they have a major role in determining their own destiny.

It will create an atmosphere in which administrators of Indian affairs can, in close cooperation and consultation with the Indian tribes and people, be flexible

and innovative in their approach to the problems.

INDIAN SUPPORT

The resolution has already given hope to the Indian people and encouragement to their aspirations. The hearings which I held on the resolution on March 5 of last year brought forth a unanimous expression of Indian support for the resolution. Domingo Montoya, president of the All-Pueblo Council representing the 19 Pueblo tribes, stated at that time:

When the day comes that this policy—rather than the manual under which it currently functions—becomes the "bible" of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, then I believe the crossroads will have been reached, and the turning point will be here in Indian affairs . . .

Mr. President, I am introducing this resolution and asking for the favorable consideration of the Congress so that we can reach that crossroad. I ask that it be appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 34), which reads as follows, was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. CON. RES. 34

Whereas it is recognized by Congress that American Indians and Alaska natives (Esquimos, Indians, and Aleuts) suffer from adverse economic, health, education, and social conditions which prevent them from sharing equally in the great social economic advancements achieved by our Nation; and

Whereas it is the understanding of Congress that periodic reversals in our Government's Indian policy throughout the years have ruled against full development of human and economic potential of Indian communities, thus prolonging the aforementioned deplorable conditions; and

Whereas improved and expanded services in Indian communities in recent years through direct Federal Indian service programs and a wide variety of other services have begun accomplishing encouraging breakthroughs; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the deplorable conditions of American Indians and Alaska natives can only be alleviated through a sustained, positive, and dynamic Indian policy with the necessary constructive programs and services directed to the governing bodies of these groups for application in their respective communities, offering self-determination and self-help features for the people involved; and that our Government's concern for its Indian citizens be formalized in a new national policy so that the beneficial effects may be continued until the day when the Nation's moral and legal obligations to its first citizens—the American Indian—are fulfilled.

(2) modern day needs of Indian people are no longer responsive to the programs and services of the two major Federal Indian service agencies alone (the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Division of Indian Health), but the complete solution of Indian problems will require new and innovative services for the full development of Indian and Alaska native people and their communities, and that the National Council on Indian Opportunity created by Executive Order numbered 11399, because of the representation on the Council of the Secretary of the several Departments concerned with the welfare of the Indian people and of the representation of the Indian leaders and because of the responsibility of the Council, under the chairmanship of the Vice President of the United States, for coordination of efforts of the Executive branch in Indian affairs, should be charged with the important responsibility

of coordinating the wide range of Federal, State, and local resources.

(3) Indian and Alaska native governing bodies should be recognized as having the full authority to determine the extent and manner of utilizing all available resources for their communities.

(4) American Indian and Alaska native property will be protected; that Indian culture and identity will be respected; that the necessary technical guidance and assistance will be given to insure future economic independence; that continued efforts will be directed to maximum development of natural resources; that inadequate and substandard housing and sanitation will be corrected; that a comprehensive health program incorporating and assuring curative and preventive physical and mental health will be further developed for Indian and Alaska natives; and that a long-term general, vocational, technical, and professional education program will be encouraged and developed for both old and young American Indians and Alaska natives so that they may share fully in our society;

(5) that the National Council on Indian Opportunity should periodically review all the activities of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and all other agencies of the Federal Government concerned with Indian welfare to assure Congress of maximum utilization of Federal, State, and local resources for Indian and Alaska native well-being; and that the National Council on Indian Opportunity should submit an annual report with necessary legislative recommendations to Congress to indicate the manner in which the intent of this resolution is being carried out; and

(6) American Indian and Alaska native communities should be given the freedom and encouragement to develop their maximum potential; and that Congress will support a policy of developing the necessary programs and services to bring Indians and Alaska natives to a desirable social and economic level of full participating citizens.

The resolution, presented by Mr. McGovern, is as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the current alleged policy of our government enunciated in House Concurrent Resolution 108 is a policy for the eventual termination of Indian tribes and reservations and serves as an obstacle to the development of our tribes and reservations; and

Whereas, Senate Concurrent Resolution 11 in the 90th Congress, if enacted, would encourage the development of tribal reservations and assist the various tribes in achieving greater parity with the rest of the people of the United States.

Whereas, this Resolution died in the last session of the 90th Congress and is due for re-introduction again.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the National Congress of American Indians in Convention assembled September 24-27, 1968, hereby strongly supports Senate Concurrent Resolution 11, and urges that it be enacted at the earliest possible time.

Now, therefore, be it further resolved, that the Executive Council of the National Congress of American Indians, assembled in Session at Washington, D.C., on January 21-23, 1969, support the said Senate Concurrent Resolution 11 and urges that it be enacted at the earliest possible time.

Adopted by the Executive Council of the National Congress of American Indians, assembled in Session at Washington, D.C., on January 21-23, 1969.

Rev. WENDELL CHINO,
President, National Congress of American Indians,

Mr. BENNY ATENCIO,
Chairman, Resolutions Committee, NCAI.

Attest:

Mr. BENNY ATENCIO,
Recording Secretary, National Congress of American Indians.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF A
CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

S. CON. RES. 24

Mr. MURPHY. 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 resolution (S. Con. Res. 24) to establish a gerontology center in California.

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

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 10, 1969, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1647) to authorize the release of 100,000 short tons of lead from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile.

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—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 69

Mr. McINTYRE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2546) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1970 for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, 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, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(The remarks of Mr. McINTYRE when he submitted the amendments appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON TRENDS IN LONG-TERM CARE

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Long-Term Care, Special Committee on Aging, I wish to announce that the subcommittee will begin hearings on July 30 dealing with the subject of Trends in Long-Term Care. Testimony will begin in room 3110, New Senate Office Building, at 10 a.m.

Our overall objective is to explore many subjects related to quality and availability of care in nursing homes and other long-term care facilities. The subcommittee will also seek information and opinions related to a new set of Department of Health, Education, and Welfare standards promulgated for skilled nursing homes under medicare.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point a recent statement I made to discuss the Health, Education,

and Welfare standards and other matters to be discussed at the hearing.

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

The basic fault in the regulations recently approved by Secretary Robert H. Finch for skilled nursing homes is that, in the vital area of nursing services, they fail to be responsive to the statute they purport to implement. The regulations on nursing service contain nothing that was not required by HEW policy before the new law was enacted.

A part of the Moss amendment to the Social Security Amendments of 1967 calls for "adequate and properly supervised nursing services . . . all hours of each day and all days of each week." The Department's obligation was to set out in regulations what constitutes "adequate nursing services" and what is required for them to be "properly supervised," and to do so in terms that State agencies could apply in surveying and approving nursing homes.

In fact, they put off for a full year the need to maintain standards which are in effect now.

The new regulations provide that, by July 1, 1970, licensed practical nurses in charge of nursing activities on all shifts must be qualified by graduation from a state-approved school of practical nursing or have background equivalent to such training.

But until then, nurses in charge on other than the day-shift may be licensed practical nurses "waivered" by a state licensing agency.

Recognizing the significance of this relaxation of standards for a year, HEW's announcement emphasizes that "any state that is not meeting this standard by December 31, 1969, must inform the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare of its plans for doing so."

The Department also notes that the newly published standards match those in the handbook of public assistance administration that regulated services until January 1 of this year, with the exception of the waiver granted for the employment of nurses who are not qualified by formal training.

We are left, therefore, with regulations that say, in effect, that a single, untrained practical nurse on duty in a home with 200 or 300 patients or more constitutes "properly supervised nursing services" on the afternoon and night shifts.

It is also questionable whether the provision for what HEW calls "background equivalent to such training," will in fact provide properly trained supervisory personnel. This language permits a state licensing authority to determine that an individual has "background considered to be equivalent" to graduation from a state-approved school of practical nursing. I fear this may mean serious state-to-state differences in supervisory quality.

Much is said about the necessity to hold down standards because of shortages of skilled nursing homes and of nurses. This is known as being "realistic." Granted there are areas in which there are no facilities meeting acceptable standards.

But the problem is not solved but only obscured by calling facilities skilled nursing homes when they are not.

We will be realistic when we stop labeling facilities as skilled nursing homes when we know they are not, stop paying public funds for services which are not being delivered but we tell ourselves they are, stop telling ourselves we are serving patients by placing them in institutions that may not be appropriate for their needs.

Until we begin to be "realistic" in these terms, patients will suffer and public money will be wasted. With more than \$1 billion every year of Federal tax collections being

spent on nursing homes, it is the duty of Congress and of HEW to see to it that the patients who must use nursing homes receive the quality of care being purchased.

Because of the importance of the issues raised by the regulations, I am going to begin hearings on July 30 on the subject of "Trends on Long-Term Care." I had expected to begin those hearings later in the year, but it has become obvious that the Subcommittee on Long-Term Care of the U.S. Senate Special Committee on Aging cannot very well ignore a current crisis while it considers future trends.

Accordingly, I will ask witnesses on July 30 to comment on the regulations. I believe their testimony will provide useful information that should be considered before the final decision is made on the regulations. I will be especially interested in comments from the American Nursing Home Association.

For the overall Subcommittee study—which will take several months to complete, I will also seek testimony on such matters as: new techniques to improve care and to emphasize rehabilitation, advanced building methods to reduce costs and provide more attractive and functional surroundings, the place of the long-term care institution in the development of comprehensive health care facilities for communities and regions, the need for trained professional and other staff, the effects of the development of "chain" facilities, methods of keeping costs to a minimum, and improvements in Federal programs related to nursing home construction or operation.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR TYDINGS BEFORE WASHINGTON COLLEGE ALUMNI BREAKFAST MEETING

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS) made an excellent speech on student unrest before the Washington College alumni breakfast meeting last May 31. The Senator showed deep insight and sensitivity in his discussion of the frustration which is leading many moderate young people into the camp of confrontation politics. Senator TYDINGS warns us that it will be our generation and not that of our children which will be to blame if students bent on reform have no alternative to violence. I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR TYDINGS

Student unrest is a subject which increasingly has bewildered and distressed the American people. Our brightest and best educated youth profoundly trouble us.

They express a disenchantment with the values and quality of American life; despair over the operation of many of our traditional institutions; futility about the prospects for change.

A few succumb to the blandishment to "turn on, tune in, and drop out," and disappear into the drug subcultures of San Francisco and New York.

However, a much larger number carry their grievances to the universities and colleges. Campuses across the country are astir with protest and demonstrations—demonstrations which in the past year have erupted into violent confrontations with civil authorities.

Many have responded simply by condemning and castigating these students. Few have taken the time to seek out the causes of their alienation and discontent, the reasons for their protest and dissent.

It is this latter course that I wish to explore with you this morning. For I am convinced that unless we—as the parents of these students and as the present custodians of this society—acquire the understanding to bridge the generation gap, our future and that of our children is imperiled.

Our efforts to understand the current restiveness on our campuses must begin with a fundamental distinction: We must not confuse the small minority who would employ anti-democratic means to achieve societal change with the great majority of students who seek reform within a democratic framework.

For the former labor under the dangerous misconception that totalitarian means can successfully hasten the realization of democratic objectives. They fail to recognize the bitterly learned lesson of the twentieth century: That democracy is a process. Violate it as a means and you lose it—whatever your objectives.

Therefore, those who denounce freedom of speech, the will of the majority, and non-violent negotiation as outmoded obstacles to change must be stopped. On this there can be no question: those who hold themselves above the law must be dealt with firmly and fairly under the law.

Violence and coercion cannot be tolerated. The survival of democracy permits no alternatives.

However, there remains the other group—the overwhelming majority of students who accept the democratic process but reject much of what they see in America. More often than not the best informed and most committed of our youth, these students are issuing a critical challenge to this Nation to live up to its ideals; to realize its promise.

They can be neither ignored nor suppressed.

Much of their disaffection is with matters that should be equally disturbing to us: a pointless war in Southeast Asia which drags on and on while thousands of American and Vietnamese die; a military draft that favors a few and disrupts the lives of all; a distorted set of national priorities which permits the Federal Government to spend far more on the instrumentalities of death than on the necessities of life; a nation with a GNP about to top the trillion dollar mark in which millions still struggle for survival ill-clothed, ill-housed, ill-fed; a society dedicated to the proposition that "all men are created equal" while forcing Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans and Indians to endure second-class citizenship; a people who preach the primacy of matters of the spirit while preoccupied with the materialistic pursuit of split-level homes and chrome-covered cars.

Our young people are frustrated and embittered by the reluctance of major institutions to correct these national shortcomings; their seeming inability to promote needed change.

Too often, student cries for reform appear to fall on the deaf ears of parents, educators, politicians and bureaucrats who are inflexibly wedded to the status quo.

Too often, our entreaties that demands for change must be handled through the "proper channels" are perceived by students as hypocritical rhetoric designed to sidetrack their concerns.

Too often, in short, our young people have come to believe that their views do not matter, that no one is listening.

Thus, we begin to understand as one statesman put it, "Why so many of our young people have turned from engagement to disengagement, from politics to passivity, from hope to nihilism . . ."

Clearly, this is not a state of affairs we can accept if we hope to survive as a free, prosperous nation. Something must be done. But what?

We must begin by reexamining our own performance in recent years as the generation

in power. Too often, we have been guilty of reinforcing the wrong modes of behavior in our young people.

For example, legitimate student requests forwarded through the "proper channels" have been ignored in many universities, only to be granted at a later date in response to violence and "non-negotiable demand." In student eyes the lesson is clear: The university only responds to coercion. Those who counsel against violence and disorder lose their credibility.

Some students have begun to advocate the "politics of confrontation" as the best hope for positive change. I do not agree. Confronting each other across "gulfs of hostility and mistrust" will only produce disaster.

However, unless institutions start to demonstrate greater flexibility and willingness to adjust to changing conditions, the number of young people willing to use violence and destruction to achieve reform will surely grow. And the responsibility for this tragedy will rest with us—the men and women who direct these institutions.

In a period of disagreement and discontent such as ours, a democracy's only hope is the mutual consent of all citizens to abide by certain basic ground rules. All must agree to respect the fundamental individual rights of others, regardless of the degree of dissatisfaction and antipathy involved.

For if these ground rules only can be implemented through the repeated use of State coercion, democracy will perish. Once compulsion replaces consent, a different form of government exists.

By showing that we are sincerely interested in what students are saying, by judging their proposals on the basis of merit rather than age, and by promptly translating their legitimate grievances into remedial action, we will generate the good will and mutual trust that are the prerequisites of democratic consent.

By demonstrating that the democratic ground rules of our society apply equally to young and old, we will build respect for those rules.

The challenge of youth to this Nation is direct: That America's deeds match her rhetoric; that the substance of our lives reflect the principles of our heritage. If we fail to meet this challenge, we will not only have failed our children, we will have failed ourselves as well.

In our quest to span the gap between the generations, we would do well to heed the advice offered by Robert Kennedy in his last book, "To Seek a Newer World."

"We may find some of their ideas impractical, some of their views overdrawn. Still, there is no question of their energy, of their ability, above all of their honest commitment to a better and more decent world for all of us. It is for us now to make the effort, to take their causes as our causes, and to enlist them in our own, to lend to their vision and daring the insight and wisdom of our experience."

CHARACTER, MORALITY, AND COURAGE

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, we have heard a great deal recently about the poverty of millions of our citizens today.

And of course it is a problem. In my opinion, however, we have not heard enough about what one distinguished Georgian recently called "the poverty of character, morality and courage." Speaking at the graduation exercises of Georgia College, Mr. William R. Bowdoin, vice chairman of the Trust Co. of Georgia, urged students to construct their future by relying not on the group but on the individual.

He castigated those extremists who would change "individual" to "mob," and "opportunity" to "demands." And he castigated all Americans who apathetically rely on the Government to provide them with things they could obtain themselves. Mr. Bowdoin described the American free enterprise system as the greatest antipoverty program the world has ever known, citing as proof the 10 million new jobs created in the last 6 years alone.

Mr. President, the message of this distinguished citizen is one from which we can all profit. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

SPEECH TO GEORGIA COLLEGE GRADUATION, MILLEDGEVILLE, GA.

(By Wm. R. Bowdoin, vice-chairman, Trust Co. of Georgia, Atlanta, Ga., June 6, 1969)

Dr. Bunting, Members of the Graduating Class, Trustees, Staff, Faculty, Parents and Friends of Georgia College.

On the pages of this fine institution's illustrious history are recorded the names of many renowned individuals who have visited here and have been honored by an invitation to speak to the student body. I am privileged to stand where they have stood, but I cannot lay claim to their great accomplishments. It is regrettable I do not possess the eloquence of diction to properly express my deep appreciation for the honor you have accorded me, so I will just resort to two of the nicest words in the English language and say—thank you.

The ceremony today signifies satisfactory completion of the first major endeavor of the members of this class. I shall remember with unbounded pride the opportunity to share the occasion with you. The gray clouds of sadness a time of parting at graduation often brings will soon be rolled back by the sunshine of opportunity and challenge that awaits each of you in a changing world.

Whatever course you may chart for your career, the greatest opportunity for proper influence and leadership in mending a torn society is yours to a higher degree than at any time in our history.

I could attempt to speak in platitudes with emphasis for this occasion on the goodness of all your surroundings. That would be an imposition on your tolerance and an insult to your intelligence. That unfortunately is not the kind of society and world into which you now move.

Therefore, I will speak briefly about your new environs and responsibilities you have toward the preservation and expansion of a decent society.

My remarks will be addressed primarily to members of the graduating class, but I hope parents and friends will listen because you, too, have a continuing responsibility to these wonderful young ladies and gentlemen.

Some of you no doubt will disagree with my comments. That is still your privilege and I pray that you never lose it.

When you receive your diploma this morning, you cross the threshold into full citizenship. As one of a generation over thirty, I welcome you. We want and need your help because we respect and trust you.

The relatively few years since the members of your class first saw the light of day have brought many changes in the philosophy and activities of our people. Some have been for the better, others leave a big question. Some have been necessary; some have been an imposition.

Lest you draw any erroneous conclusions about my attitude, I want to make it crystal

clear that I do not share a feeling of hopelessness for our country's future expressed by the faint hearted. I do, however, have a strong feeling of concern about the growing disease of apathy infecting too many of our people. I am concerned that we are using tolerance as an excuse instead of the virtue it is. I am concerned that we permit the extreme minorities to reflect adversely upon the vast majority of decent people of all ages.

I am concerned that today as never before in our history we are prepared to be the masters of our own destiny, yet never have we been so confused about where the destiny lies.

We seem to have forgotten that what is now the United States was a great land when it was discovered, but it took men and women of character, courage, vision, ability, faith and understanding to make it a great nation. Only the dominance of these qualities can keep it great. These qualities cannot be determined by the color of a man's skin, but only by the dedication and loyalty within his heart.

Proof of this is the great work of Booker T. Washington, George Washington Carver, and the late Dr. Rufus Clement, for thirty years president of Atlanta University. The strong character and gentle but firm and able hand of these dedicated men have made a contribution to the educational and cultural well-being of our area and nation that will benefit people of all races for generations to come, if their teachings are heeded.

I do not subscribe to the philosophy that this nation was built by the common people as often suggested. It was built by uncommon people. Uncommon in the sense of possessing a desire to work, a willingness to sacrifice if need be, to study, to build upon a firm foundation of loyalty and understanding among all people. Undergirded by this philosophy, the uncommon people have pointed the way to a better life for all who follow their example and leadership.

One of the former heroes of France, Marshal Petain, after France's fall in World War II, said, "Our spirit of enjoyment was stronger than our spirit of sacrifice. We wanted to have more than we wanted to give. We spared effort and met disaster."

There is mounting evidence everywhere today that more and more basically good people are doing nothing to correct an apathetic attitude toward the preservation and proper expansion of those basic fundamental principles upon which this nation was founded—reverence for God, loyalty to country, respect for the law, and the proper discharge of individual responsibility.

These are the principles that through the years have inspired young men and women to dream dreams and older men and women to work for a future they will probably never live to see—principles for which men have fought and given their lifeblood to preserve from Valley Forge to Vietnam.

These are the principles that for generations have been the rallying point to build courage when courage seemed to fail—to regain faith when there seemed little cause for faith, and to create hope when hope becomes forlorn.

Today this great bulwark of inspiration and strength is being pressured by every available means that can be dreamed up by those who would like to see it crumble and fall—those who would have us believe the pattern of their action was set by our forebearers in 1776. Nothing could be more incorrect.

Those gallant men and women of 1776 were teachers, doctors, preachers, farmers, merchants, bankers, lawyers, hunters and fishermen. They owned *their* businesses, *their* land, practiced their professions and, under God, had hopes of growing in affluence and influence as the result of *their* abilities and *hard* work. They were not ordinary people

voicing ordinary complaints. The men who fought under Washington were not a nameless impoverished people. Little men and big men, they placed in jeopardy *their* lands, *their* businesses, *their* loved ones, and *their* lives. They were England's finest Englishmen and were never so truly English as in the hour of revolution. But this was no revolution of little men filled with big hates, but a revolution of big men who hated little-ness in government and were resolved to put an end to it.

Edmund Burke said, "For evil to triumph, good men have but to do nothing."

Many years ago, Mr. John D. Rockefeller said, "Every right implies a responsibility; every possession an obligation, and every opportunity a duty."

This sound philosophy hurls a challenge to you and me and we cannot sidestep it in the hope someone else will pick it up.

Those who roam the countryside shouting about freedom, flailing others who refuse to do their bidding, should be reminded that a reckless abuse of freedom so prevalent in their actions turns freedom into a terrible mockery.

Those who preach non-violence but encourage violation of the law have in fact created more violence, strife and turmoil than has been known in our nation's history. The right to protest, to air grievances has been a privilege enjoyed since our country's beginning, but it has never included the right of the protesters to deny others by any available means the right they claim.

Those who subscribe to this concept should be reminded that fair debate and honest opposition are the foundation stones of our democracy, but must never be supplanted with vilification and bigotry.

The privileges we enjoy as free people do not necessarily in time become our inalienable rights.

A democracy is not a self-perpetuating form of government, but depends upon the character and abilities and contribution of each generation for its survival and expansion.

All sound-thinking individuals realize that regardless of our personal preference or opinion, we must live within the law with the same dignity and pride that has marked our people from the beginning of our nation. If this is to be accomplished, we cannot sit in silence and surrender to unwarranted demands of the howling, screeching mobs who mock the law by acts of violence and spit on those who wear the uniform of authority.

What inspires the action of these misguided creatures? I have no positive proof, but I am concerned about a recent statement by Gus Hall, head of the Communist Party USA, when he said, "Fronts are a thing of the past. We don't need them. We've got Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee and Students for a Democratic Society going for us."

How much longer will responsible citizens tolerate the actions of such groups while the cream of American manhood is fighting and dying in Vietnam and on other foreign shores? How much longer, in good conscience and in good faith toward our fighting forces and our nation can we tolerate it?

We have been represented in South Vietnam since 1950 when the first advisory team was sent there. We have been locked four years in mortal combat, *on the defensive*, and what have we accomplished? The loss of more than 36,000 American boys killed, more than 150,000 wounded, many disabled for life, the expenditure of nearly \$100 billion dollars of American taxpayers' money, exclusive of \$23 billion more wasted on ill-designed aircraft and other armament. During this period there has been established in South Vietnam, if reports are true, one of the most corrupt governments the world has known since the days of the Roman

Empire. Is this a just reason for pride? Certainly not.

I readily admit my intolerance of those who make a joke of patriotism because I happen to be one who still stands with pride and a little misty-eyed when the "Star Spangled Banner" is played or the flag passes in review. I happen to be one who believes with all my heart this is still the greatest nation on earth, but within it live some very disreputable individuals who enjoy the privileges afforded by dedicated and conscientious efforts of decent people. I also happen to be one who long since has grown tired of American boys being sacrificed for aimless political missions the world over. But whether we approve the cause or not, I also happen to be one who believes that every able-bodied man should be ready to answer "present" when his name is called for service in the armed forces of our nation. Both moral and military strength must be maintained.

Mrs. Bowdoin and I are proud and fortunate parents who every day turn to God in gratitude that our older son has returned safely after 1300 hours of combat flying as a helicopter gunship pilot in Vietnam. Our younger son is preparing to follow in his brother's footsteps.

We live in a time of strange concepts.

We boast of our greatest era of prosperity and hear more about poverty than at any time in the history of America. Honest poverty deserves the concerted and prayerful attention of all who are blessed with a better life.

Professional poverty, encouraged by Federal hand-outs now reaching into the third generation, is repulsive to all concept of decency and ambition.

Yet we hear all too little about the real poverty that confronts us—the poverty of character, morality and courage. Instead of affluence being a blessing, we are allowing it to become a terrible agony.

The American private enterprise system, although under constant attack, has proven through the years to be the greatest anti-poverty program the world has ever known. Within the last six years alone, more than ten million new jobs have been created—new jobs affording a living wage and an atmosphere of dignity that generates ambition.

In a time of greatest necessity for higher education, we are experiencing throughout the nation unbelievable destruction of physical facilities and moral fibre in our colleges and universities. Impossible demands are being made upon administrators of colleges and universities by students aided by outside agitators and some faculty members who are traitors to their commitment.

It was my privilege recently to spend an evening of round table discussion with a group of college students. It was a very enjoyable occasion. There is no doubt in my mind the vast majority of our young men and women are better educated and more responsible than ever before. Students in institutions of higher learning have some legitimate complaints. They are entitled to be heard, and their recommendations considered and adopted when appropriate to the betterment of the college or university, but students cannot be given control of our educational institutions. A student's primary mission is the pursuit of education and not to manage the affairs of the college in accordance with personal desires. There are many examples of the results the latter development produces.

A great philosopher once said, "Those who do not remember the past are condemned to repeat it."

There is an old Turkish saying, "Read new books but old proverbs." New books stimulate a vision of the future and old proverbs contain the convictions from experience that men must live by. We must retain from the past all that is sound and good and just, and

use it today in building for the future. In our building we must be willing to change when change is required.

The members of your generation and mine must make every effort to blend the experience of the past and abilities of the present to provide a future richer in advantages and opportunities and freedom than have been ours to receive. This means individual dedication and cooperation.

As Clarence Manion has said, "It must be remembered that 95% of the peace, order and welfare existing in human society is always produced by the conscientious practice of man-to-man justice and person-to-person charity."

I believe we can correct many of our social and political deficiencies by placing less emphasis on minorities and majorities, and giving more stress to the *individual*. This is the American way. America is based upon the concept of the *individual* whose personality is inviolate because he is created in the image of God. Our rights come from the Creator, not from some organization to which we may belong. This sacred truth is proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence and guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, although some in high places would have us believe otherwise.

These documents intend that all citizens should be recognized regardless of race, creed or color, for their *individual* worth, and must always have opportunities to improve themselves and their lot in life, but must always discharge properly the concept of individual responsibilities for good citizenship placed upon them by our founding fathers.

The key words in the whole American system are "individual" and "opportunity." These words can never be translated to mean *mobs* and *demands*. Individual opportunity can never be truthfully transposed to read *group guarantees*.

That is why it disturbs me to see many of our young people who, instead of attracting attention by dignity and worthwhile achievement, resort to some weird personal appearance or boisterous acts of sound and fury signifying nothing but trouble. Where are the parents of these wayward individuals?

Any individual who damns the land of his birth, desecrates our flag, and mocks Him who died on Calvary's cross is a disgrace to the concept of a nation created under God.

One of the greatest justices ever to sit on the United States Supreme Court in the days when that court was honored and revered throughout the world, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, said, "As life is action and passion, it is required of us that we should share in the action and passion of our times at the peril of being judged not to have lived."

My young friends, your contribution to strong and constructive leadership can mean much to a troubled nation. Our adversaries within this country are small in number but loud in voice. Our cooperative efforts can diminish their influence rather than allow it to spread.

Too many of our people today are saying, "Well, I am just one person and there is very little I can do." Our very poor voting record bears out this tragic attitude. A one-man cheering section in a 50,000 seat capacity stadium is muted by the vastness of the structure, but add that one voice to 50,000 others and you have your answer. Our destiny in the final analysis rests with the acts of individual citizens because the unit of our society is the individual.

That is why I urge you to develop strong and meaningful convictions. Be enthusiastic and energetic about your convictions and stand for something worthwhile. Don't just sit idly by while the flames of misunderstanding and strife and discord envelop you.

Make it your business to be informed, to know what is going on in your community, your state and your nation. Get the facts.

Communicate your opinion to those in whom you entrust the management of your government and community affairs. You ask the impossible of these representatives when you don't give them the benefit of your opinion and let them know what you stand for. When you are too otherwise occupied to go to the polls and cast an intelligent ballot for the candidate of your choice, you forfeit your right to criticize the results. If you feel your representatives are right, support them. If you think they are wrong, tell them why you think they are wrong. They are entitled to that consideration.

That great American, General Dwight Eisenhower, said, "There is nothing wrong with America that faith, love of freedom, intelligence and energy of her citizens cannot cure." I believe that and pledge to each of you my full support and active cooperation in a joint effort to insure continued sound growth and development of this wonderful land of ours.

I shall always remember with pride the honor of participating in your program today. To all of you ladies and gentlemen of this graduating class, I extend my heartiest congratulations.

I have great faith and confidence in your ability and, as your march toward even greater achievements in the years ahead, I hope your thoughts and actions will be guided by a simple philosophy—have courage tempered with humility; ambition tempered with moderation; sound judgment tempered with understanding, and above all, "do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with thy God."

COMMUNITY ANTENNA TELEVISION

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, one of the most complex issues confronting Congress is the consideration of legislation providing for the orderly development and regulation of the cable television industry.

The National Observer for the week of July 7 contains an informative article on this subject written by William J. Lanouette. In addition to reviewing the major policy issues presented by the CATV controversy, the article focuses on the television programming available in Texarkana on the Texas-Arkansas border. The programs currently distributed to the citizens of the Texarkana area of Arkansas come from three stations in Shreveport, La. Such stations obviously do not meet the community needs of southwestern Arkansas. Mr. Lanouette describes how the citizens of the Texarkana area are being denied the opportunity to receive the television programs they desire because of the regulations adopted by a majority of the Federal Communications Commission.

The National Observer article concludes by stating that "it may take an act of Congress" to assure adequate television service to the people of my State. For some time, I have been urging the various parties involved in the CATV issue to exert every effort to reach agreement on a joint recommendation to Congress. I regret that little progress has been made so far. If the parties cannot reach some accommodation, then Congress will have to proceed actively with the preparation and consideration of appropriate legislation.

Because of the widespread public interest in the CATV question, 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 National Observer, July 7, 1969]
TECHNOLOGY TANGLES WITH BUREAUCRACY IN CATV TIFF—IN TEXARKANA, TELEVISION VIEWERS ASK: WHO WANTS TO SEE CLYDE FANT EAT CHICKEN?

(By William J. Lanouette)

TEXARKANA.—Texarkana, split by the Texas-Arkansas state line, is a city in search of its own identity. With separate municipal governments, separate police and fire departments, and traditionally strong loyalties to their respective state capitals in Austin and Little Rock, the 60,000 citizens of this city face one further divisive complication. All television programs in town come from three stations in Shreveport, La.

Blame for the inconvenience of the boundary rests with the cities' founding fathers, and most citizens have made a virtue of its existence. Residents here however, blame the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) for the television confusion, making this independent regulatory agency one of the cities' few common enemies.

By almost universal agreement the townspeople see a way out of their communications gulch. Their answer is community antenna television (CATV), or "cable TV," a technique that can pick up distant television signals from the air or by microwave relay and deliver them by coaxial cable from a central source to subscribers' homes for about \$5 a month. It is used in many towns around Texarkana and others across the country.

The citizens of Texarkana have been waiting for CATV since their two city governments awarded franchises to a cable company in August 1965. But because the FCC has placed them in the Shreveport television market area—one of the nation's top 100—and also ruled that CATV cannot bring distant signals into these areas, plans have been stalled ever since in the red tape and politics of Washington.

TECHNOLOGY VERSUS BUREAUCRACY

Texarkana, and dozens of cities like it, are at once enticed by the promise of CATV and stymied by the present state of regulations that surround it. "It's a fight of technology against bureaucracy," one Federal agency spokesman said, "and it's going to get a lot grimmer."

But the regulations reflect deeper conflicts:

Cable television has created a technological revolution that now challenges not only the television industry, but all forms of electronic communication.

CATV has become a multimillion-dollar industry by serving the remote areas of the United States. Its next step, movement into and saturation of big cities, could turn the communications industry upside down, and has been fought bitterly by established broadcast, network, and utilities companies.

Reluctance by the FCC to regulate this struggle has drawn the Supreme Court, Congress, and the Justice Department into the disputes.

The battlefield at the moment is Washington, D.C., and the battle is just beginning. Its resolution may change the nation's concepts of education, home entertainment, police protection, retail sales, and neighborhood politics. Even the contestants in this struggle aren't sure of CATV's full potential or its ultimate problems.

GROWTH IS INEVITABLE

"There is no doubt that CATV will grow," an industry spokesman said; "it's just inevitable. The only question is 'how fast?' and that's up to the FCC."

Even with restrictions, the CATV industry has made impressive gains. It has grown in

20 years from small one- and three-signal systems that brought distant signals to coal-mining towns in the mountains of Pennsylvania or to remote ranchers in the West into a multimillion-dollar, 2,300-system industry that now brings up to 20 signals into 3,600,000 homes in 49 states.

"When I said a few years ago that in 10 years 85 per cent of American homes would be receiving television by cable, most of my colleagues thought I was crazy," says Irving B. Kahn, president of TelePrompTer Corp., a CATV company with 24 systems from New York state to Hawaii, and one of the two franchises in Manhattan. "Today many people in the industry consider that estimate conservative."

But where CATV goes from here depends on three factors: continued development of technology, continued subscribed and investment support, and the effect of continued Government regulations.

THE STRONGEST ASSET IS TECHNOLOGY

Technology has always been CATV's strongest asset, and the more forward-looking members of the industry anticipate that CATV will revolutionize not only television, but all of electronic communications.

Today, even in the large cities, most conventional over-the-air television sets can receive only three or four signals well, and the advent of color has made reception of a clear signal even more critical. CATV subscribers, on the other hand, are able to receive all stations clearly, both very high frequency (VHF) and ultra high frequency (UHF). In the large cities CATV subscribers often have channels available only to themselves that feature neighborhood public-service programs, educational programs, news, weather, and stock-market reports. And CATV spokesmen are talking of cable-television hook-ups for hospitals, police surveillance, direct-order marketing, and data transmission.

CATV subscriber and investor support also is encouraging. Subscriptions increase at a rate of about 25 per cent each year. Estimated annual revenues now exceed \$300,000,000; plant investment is more than \$500,000,000. The average size of a CATV system is still about 1,850 subscribers, but with the gradual entrance into major metropolitan markets, CATV systems of 100,000 or more will become common. Big-city potential is seen in the fact that 15 companies have applied for New York City's three franchises when they come up for renewal. Of the dozen largest CATV companies that have gone public, eight have shown gains this spring.

Yet, despite professional optimism, the CATV industry is not the runaway enterprise that many of its promoters think it could be, for a variety of reasons.

For one, conventional, over-the-air broadcasters have opposed CATV, fearful of its potential. And when the cable stations begin originating local programs as they have done in New York and talk of interconnecting with other CATV systems in network-like fashion, the broadcasters howl.

KILL CABLE TELEVISION

The motion-picture industry also is running scared. Until CATV, movie houses had exclusive rights to show first-run films and closed-circuit sports events. CATV could, potentially, buy the rights to films and local sports events. It might even charge its subscribers an added fee for particular games, such as the World Series or a prize fight. To meet the challenge of such a possibility, theaters along Broadway in upper Manhattan, where Mr. Kahn's cable franchise is in its third year of operation, have joined in and confused the issue by raising the specter of "pay TV." Some theater owners have trimmed their marquee with such warnings as "Stop Pay TV" and "Kill Cable Television." Pay TV, however, employs another concept: A "scrambled" television signal is

transmitted over the air and can only be "unscrambled" by a converter attached to the subscriber's set.

As CATV expands it will unavoidably disrupt existing advertising and broadcast patterns, and the large networks sense this. As a way of hedging its bets, CBS has recently been investing in CATV stocks, though NBC and ABC fought the CATV trend through the influential National Association of Broadcasters (NAB), which represents the major networks and larger television stations. "Let's face it," a CATV executive admitted. "If I had millions tied up in a profitable station, I wouldn't take this lying down either."

In an attempt to maintain orderly development of the television industry, and allow for the expansion of CATV without undue disruption of existing operations all within "the public interest," the FCC has tried to set regulations that will reconcile opposing viewpoints. None of the contestants is satisfied with the results. CATV spokesmen think the FCC is repressive, the broadcast industry finds the FCC irresponsible, the telephone companies believe the FCC is unnecessarily upsetting the status quo, and holders of television copyrights think the FCC has given their property away.

For years the FCC contended that it had no need to assert its jurisdiction over CATV systems, but in 1962 it entered the field indirectly by prohibiting a microwave company, over which it does have jurisdiction, from transmitting television signals to a CATV system. By 1965 the FCC had finally applied its authority to those CATV systems fed by microwave transmission, and the following year it set up a CATV task force and claimed jurisdiction over all cable systems.

Then in 1966, the FCC made a major decision that limited CATV's expansion. It prohibited CATV from importing distant signals into the top 100 television markets. The commission did allow CATV to carry strictly local signals to those markets, but this has very little commercial appeal outside the larger cities.

Two Supreme Court decisions in 1968 reinforced the FCC's responsibility for CATV. One upheld the Commission's authority in the field, and another found that CATV broadcasts are not "performances," and thus not subject for payment of copyright fees.

"There's a parental and protective instinct in all independent regulatory agencies," says John Cole, Jr., a Washington lawyer whose firm specializes in representing CATV systems before the FCC. "They like to protect and promote their own. Over the years the broadcasters have been the FCC's favored children, while CATV people were seen as disruptive neighborhood brats. But, lately, there has been a decided softening of this attitude. It may even grow into a real affection, but that will take time."

Of its rules that have restricted CATV growth, one insider says: "The FCC is sooner or later going to have to admit that CATV won't go away."

In the industry's attempt to reach a compromise with the broadcast and copyright interests, an interstaff agreement was drawn up in May by the NAB and the National Community Television Association (NCTA), which among other things, abandoned the CATV's plans to interconnect in network fashion in exchange for expanded operations in the major metropolitan markets. But, though the NCTA officials accepted the agreement, NAB turned it down, and the two sides are now back on the firing line. At their annual convention in San Francisco last month, the NCTA members talked of future technology, but admitted their present frustrations. "We've just about given up on the FCC," an association spokesman said. "Our only salvation now lies with Congress."

Behind this struggle lies much more than the orderly division of existing television

markets. Concerned outsiders have been drawn into the fray. Congress is still uncertain about CATV's copyright responsibilities, and, in an attempt to reconcile the cable and broadcast interests with those of the artists and copyright owners, Sen. John McClellan, Arkansas Democrat and chairman of the Judiciary subcommittee on patents, trademarks, and copyrights, has called for suggestions to amend the 1909 copyright law. Last week he also urged the broadcast, cable, and copyright officials to bring a compromise to Congress by the end of August.

Too, Senate and House commerce subcommittees are considering proposals to define the FCC's role in regulating CATV. But, as Rep. Torbert Macdonald, Massachusetts Democrat and chairman of the House communications subcommittee, told NCTA members recently: "Please remember it would be much easier for Congress to take no action. The appearance of indecision or division [by the industry] is an invitation to do just that. Don't make that happen."

The states, too, are becoming interested in the regulation of CATV, mainly as a possible source of revenue. In all states but two, franchises are awarded to CATV companies by each locality, usually in return for 5 per cent of the station's gross annual revenues. In Nevada a state law has incorporated the franchises previously awarded, and now allows future franchises to be made by the state's Public Utilities Commission. In Connecticut, the Public Utilities Commission awarded franchises two years ago, but the awards have been bound up in contesting litigation since.

WHO WOULD CONTROL PROGRAMMING?

Another question behind the current struggle is the role that CATV might play if it is declared a "common carrier," like the telephone companies. Some observers of CATV's growth have warned that the decision about what will be televised should not be left entirely to the system owners. Others contend that since the CATV system is a private arrangement between the company and its subscribers, only they need determine program content. Usually the municipality awarding the franchise stipulates that a certain number of channels be set aside for community or educational use, though this number varies from one city to another.

Also, the telephone companies, which control poles and right of way in most cities, would like to share in this potential growth by providing CATV cables rather than simply leasing the pole space as is now common.

The American Civil Liberties Union has filed an opinion with the FCC requesting that CATV be regulated as a common carrier, "and make a fixed proportion of their channel capacity available . . . to any and all persons and organizations desiring to communicate to the public."

"The common-carrier concept is really the big fight of the future," said Paul Laskin, staff director of a New York City CATV study. "This is the only solution that ensures access and regulates the tremendous concentration of channels in one hand."

The guarantee of community channels is eagerly anticipated in Texarkana, where its Model Cities director, Tom McRae, notes: "This community suffers from a tragic unawareness of itself, and cable TV could do something to help."

Richard Arnold, a resident of Texarkana, Ark., and attorney for the media group that owns the city's two daily papers, one television station that serves the market, and one of the city's four radio stations, admitted: "Local news coverage is not as good as it should be. CATV would allow the community to participate in such things as the setting of water rates or the Model Cities hearings."

"We really get itchy for CATV during foot-

ball season," another city resident says. And Ben Mizell, city manager of Texarkana, Texas, explains: "The reason we're so loyal to the statehouses and the sports teams is because we're at the tail end of our two states. We're back-to-back here, and just can't forget it."

Other citizens would like more air time devoted to the activities of local civic clubs, to high-school football, or to outdoor programs. And some are just tired of hearing about Shreveport. Said one: "I'm sick of watching Clyde Fant [mayor of Shreveport] cut ribbons and eat chicken dinners. I would like to find out what [Arkansas Gov.] Winthrop Rockefeller did last night." For that to happen, however, it may take an act of Congress.

McGEE SENATE INTERNSHIP CONTEST

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, each year it is my pleasure to conduct for high-school students in my State of Wyoming the McGee Senate Internship contest, which brings back to Washington one boy and one girl for a week of observing democracy in action—here in the Senate and in Washington. The contest is designed to stir up interest among high-school students in national and international questions.

As a part of the contest each student was required to complete an essay on "Our President: How Should We Choose Him?" Frankly, it was a study of our electoral college system. This year, as I am each year, I was impressed with the depth of understanding and the dedication to our democratic principles displayed by these young people in their essays. This topic is one of vital interest today, and the essays reflect sound reasoning which should be of interest to us all.

Of course, it would be impossible for everyone to read all these essays, but I think some of the most outstanding ones selected by an impartial panel of three judges should receive wider circulation, and I ask unanimous consent that two of these essays, written by David L. Shaul, of Cheyenne, Wyo., and Joyce Swanson, of Saratoga, Wyo., which received honorable mention in the McGee Senate Internship contest, be printed in the RECORD.

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

OUR PRESIDENT: HOW SHOULD WE CHOOSE HIM?

(By David L. Shaul, East High School, Cheyenne, Wyo.)

The late Dwight David Eisenhower once remarked in an article in *Reader's Digest* that our national nominating conventions were a "disgrace" and pondered how the television transmissions of these "capitalistic" spectacles influenced the opinions which foreign audiences might form of America. Although we know ourselves that the conventions are merely overtones of life in these United States, the starving people of India or the citizenry of one of the virgin African nations must, upon seeing telecasts or tapes of these proceedings, wonder what America is really like. The conventions of this summer past, notably the Democratic Convention in Chicago, dramatically emphasize the crying need for modifications of our nominating process.

How, then, can we choose the candidates for the Presidency in some intelligent way,

instead of by partying? It would be a mistake to eliminate the two party system, since both parties have adequately represented the will of the people throughout our history. American law and politics, though comparatively young in the terms of international statecraft, are based on certain traditions, without which we would be at a loss. Just as our courts uphold precedents based on centuries of English jurist tradition, our other divisions of government embrace customs which have almost always been adhered to, since they were established by Washington, Adams and Jefferson to fill a basic need which was often left out by the Constitution. This unwritten Constitution has become an integral part of our working government. It would therefore be impractical to abandon these practices, since they make our political system workable and do not distort the desires of the people to any alarming extent.

As mentioned earlier, the conventions, two-thirds of whose members are chosen by party machinery, have gotten out of hand. In this age of electronic wizardry, it would no longer be impractical to have a national primary, the details of which could be worked out. This would be more "democratic" in the strictest sense of the word. When the Progressive movement swept the land as the Grangers and Populists did earlier, the idea of "The cure for democracy is more democracy!" was advanced. It has been said that today too many Americans don't really care. People who have no faith in humanity at all look up, expecting a bomb at any moment. Our nation's youth are condemned and yet it is said that a "busy boy" is not synonymous with "bad boy." The "good boy" is good because he is "busy"—he is involved. Isn't it about time that we got involved in our nation's fate? What better way can we begin with than in the choosing of the two people who will vie for the People's Office?

Candidates, rather their respective parties, now have a wide spectrum of mass media to broadcast their appeals to the people with. The ideal campaign is somewhere between reason and emotion; however, it should be honest and realistic. Such is the case in our newest state. Despite her composite racial and cultural forces, Hawaii conducts the kind of campaign that is fair, yet effective, much like what President Wilson was noted for: intelligent reason with the touch of human sentiment. The words of Kamehameha III, which became the motto of the Kingdom and later the State, express this sentiment exactly. "Ua mau ke ea 'o ka 'aina i ka pono." "The life of the land is preserved in righteousness."

The electoral college was framed by men who created something well adapted to their times. Fewer people were educated and schooled in those times than are now, and by having an educated and elect man vote for an illiterate Revolutionary War veteran, it kept the reins of government in the hands of those wise people who had money (freeing them from having to earn a living) as well as an education. In addition to this "rich man's plot," which actually yielded the best results for its day, it was claimed that the country's sparse population made a plebiscite impractical. However, today, in many respects, a high school student has a better education than what was offered in some graduate colleges up until the 1870's or the 1880's. The maze of communications we now possess are quite sufficient to handle a direct vote.

Some steps have been taken in this direction. The Lodge-Gossett Amendment of 1950 offered a compromise between the old system and the new ideas. Some have suggested reviving the district method, and of course, some advocate giving the franchise to the people. A plebiscite would interest more people and attract more voters, although pledged electoral voting is the general prac-

tice and about half of the states have the general-ticket system, since we are, unlike a country like Germany, a political nation. It would be advantageous to eliminate an outmoded system which, even with the help of the Twelfth Amendment, has ignored the will of the people at times, and, although it has elected only four minority Presidents, it has produced, at times, several serious disagreements. Some practices that are associated with the electoral system, like the convention balloons, are a gross waste of money.

In these troubled times when we don't know what is after Armageddon, we shouldn't be pessimists, but we should be careful. We should choose our President carefully, and we should choose him (or her) by ourselves. The electoral college is on the way out, the plebiscite is on the way in, and the people are on the way up. Dag Hammarskjöld once quietly said, "Unless the world has a spiritual rebirth in the next few years, civilization is doomed." But a little bird once aroused someone by saying: "Where there's a will, there's a way!"

OUR PRESIDENT: HOW SHOULD WE CHOOSE HIM?

(By Joyce Swanson, Platte Valley High School, Saratoga, Wyo.)

"I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and will, to the best of my Ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States."

An awesome responsibility is presented to one man every four years. This single man must swear that his decisions will be as right as can be humanly made. Few people in America will not be affected by those decisions, and heads of government in every nation of the world will hear them. His reach is great and his wisdom must match it.

Men of astounding foresight made up a document that has become the precious instrument that regulates the functioning of democracy in America. The signers of the Constitution, after much thought, provided for the selection of the chief executive in the fairest and the most logical manner possible for their time. Thus, the electoral college came into being.

From the time of our Independence to the early twentieth century, the citizens of the United States were, for the most part, rural, isolated, uneducated, and unaware of the world-wide implications of presidential policies. They had come from foreign soil. Peasants came from China. Starving laborers came from Ireland. Dissatisfied or fortune-seeking Englishmen abandoned their native land for this one. Italians, Slavs, Frenchmen, Spanish, and Scandinavians sailed to a new shore.

From this conglomeration of races, customs, traditions, and beliefs, one solitary man had to be chosen to take the responsibility to lead and guide this mass of humanity.

Two hundred years ago the population was too new, too foreign to the principles of Democracy, too steeped in the European and Asian customs, to intelligently single out a satisfactory leader for America. The very men who wrote the documents we live by were raised in a class-system world. They believed that only the higher classes should have a voice in the selection of a leader. At that time perhaps there was some wisdom in the exclusion of those poorer, more scantily educated people from the government leadership. The "lower" class may have lacked the real understanding of the problems at hand and they were not given the opportunity that we have today to study the problems from an intellectual point of view. That was the purpose of the Electoral College—to remove the heaviest burden of responsibility from the shoulders of the general public.

In removing this burden, this system also

removed a right—the right of the people to select their leader.

It is absolutely essential that our population be led by the best available man. This man necessarily has to be a man of the nation, not of one state or of one group. He must know the people of the country, their occupations, their cultural needs, the commodities they produce, the markets they need, as well as their social problems. He has to know what potentials geography and nature have provided in any particular area. He has to be an expert in economics, finance, psychology, and political science. He should be at least brilliant in military strategy, recreation, education, and conservation, not to mention foreign affairs. His public speaking ability has to be almost perfect, his personality pleasing, his mind clear, and his foreign image untarnished. He is both inventive and selective at the same time. He must consider all suggestions and choose the most preferable for the majority of the public. In short, he must be a genius and a popular one.

Could a public made up largely of uneducated, uninformed, provincial people choose such a man out of the entire population? Probably not, and most certainly not in 1800. The Party system was developed to aid in the first selection. The parties narrow the choice considerably and make the voter's job much easier.

Political parties have a knowledge of all those capable and qualified to serve. The sorting and selection of the most competent candidates is their duty. Although this method of nomination has come under fire from concerned Americans, none have yet proposed a more adequate and plausible method. If the mechanics of this system are imperfect, it is the obligation of the parties themselves to study and institute a satisfactory substitute for the convention. No matter what changes are made in technical details, the parties still must narrow the choice to the few most competent men.

We, the people of the United States, also have a responsibility. We are to choose the president of this, the greatest nation of all time. But how can we properly execute this responsibility, how can we forge a future for our children if the ultimate choice is taken from us?

The population has reached a level of intelligence and awareness never dreamed of when the ink of the Constitution was still fresh. Education has been made available to every citizen. Communication has made isolation become a thing of the past. Fifty states have grown a network of interchange of information that enables them to become one nation with similar problems and opportunities.

Through contemporary news media—newspapers, radio, television, and periodicals, the citizenry of the United States not only knows what the candidate says, but is informed of the factors which motivate the statement.

National attention is focused on national issues. The voter understands these issues from the larger perspective of a national rather than a strictly local point of view. The child watches the ball game from the restricted vision offered by a knothole in the fence. The adult sees the entire playing field from his stadium seat. America has grown up. Americans are adults. They see issues on a three-dimensional scale where there are two sides and a depth to every problem, and Americans are learning to consider all angles.

Equalities have become the most recent concern of the public. Our constitution promises rights to all. How can these rights be exercised if we do not back up the "one-man, one-vote" principle? The importance of the individual is a cause for great pride among patriotic Americans. The individual of today is qualified to elect a president.

There was a time when the general population could not be expected to make so

great a decision as choosing a leader, but that old era is gone. Time has changed us. Our new, higher standard of living has made us more perceptive. Uncertainty of early immigrants has been replaced with surety that comes from educational opportunities and realization of the position of the United States in the scheme of world events from better, faster news coverage. There is an alertness and world-mindedness about Americans that could not be found fifty years ago.

Loyalties are no longer divided. Americans seldom remember fidelity to the European or Asian countries of their family origins. The only country these second, third, or more generation Americans feel allegiance to is the United States.

Americans know the duties of the President and they understand what type of man must fill that office. The public realizes the extent of responsibility their leader must take and how important his decisions will be. Through expanded communications the populous is informed of each candidate's ideas, policies, and, quite accurately, his capabilities.

America, as a nation, has changed. Methods of government have also been changed to accommodate the advancing nation. That which does not change to adapt to environment does not survive in nature. Democracy is a living, breathing thing through its government. Restriction to outdated tradition is slowly strangling the life away. We citizens do not wish to be held responsible for the death of our free society. Our voice should no longer be muffled by translation through the electoral college.

Where this country goes and how it moves is of more than slight concern to the entire population. It is of particular concern to the threshold generation. It is a matter of our liberty, of enjoying our rights, of standing tall and proud, and of gasping in awe at the beauty of the flag of the United States of America against a free blue sky. So give us the privilege of direct balloting for the leader whose decisions will impel our nation toward continuing greatness.

PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE PROGRAM

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the June issue of the National League Journal, the official publication of the National League of Insured Savings Associations, contains an excellent article on the Partners of the Alliance program, written by the programs director, Mr. James H. Boren.

My State of Alabama, in partnership with Guatemala, has participated in the program, and I know that much progress in the areas of mutual understanding and trade has been made. Among the persons from the private sector mentioned in the article is Mr. Arthur Tonsmeire of Mobile, Ala. Mr. Tonsmeire has been in the forefront of the efforts made in Alabama under the Partners of the Alliance program, and I was pleased to see this recognition of the good work that he has done.

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:

THE ALLIANCE HAS MANY PARTNERS

On May 14, 1969, in Salt Lake City, 350 delegates from 17 hemispheric nations rose to their feet and cheered as they unanimously adopted a special resolution requesting air transport assistance for the movement of program volunteers and donated

equipment in grassroots projects of the Partners of the Alliance program.

Their action was not the result of convention platitudes and resolution-passing, but of a demonstrated need.

In 1968, funds provided through the National Association of the Partners of the Alliance by A.I.D. enabled 350 program volunteers to work on Partners projects. During the same period, private donations in the United States enabled 1200 project volunteers to travel to Latin America, and funding from Latin America enabled 560 Latin American volunteers to work on activities in the United States.

Last year, more than 660 tons of new and carefully screened used equipment were shipped to Latin American Partners through privately arranged means.

The tragedy, however, is that the Partners committees in the United States could have made available several hundred more professional and technical volunteers to literally thousands of tons of hospital equipment for rural hospitals; tractors and other implements for agricultural schools or cooperatives; educational equipment and supplies; steel cable for suspension bridges to bring isolated villages into national life; generators; engines; new books for libraries; rice hullers for Amazonian settlements; and countless other types of commodities for people-oriented projects.

The problem was transportation.

This was the setting in Salt Lake City when the private sector leaders from throughout the hemisphere sprang to their feet and cheered in support of the resolution which called for the assignment of one airplane to the Partners of the Alliance . . . one airplane to be devoted to bringing together the citizens of the Americas in an action program dedicated to the cause of understanding and peace.

The airplane—and the program itself—can be justified by the cost-benefit ratio in terms of dollars, but the real value of the Partners of the Alliance and the contribution which could be made by the assignment of the air transport is to be found in the intangibles which come from people working together with people in a spirit of partnership.

After the resolution was passed, a petition was presented to the Assistant Secretary of State for Interamerican Affairs, Charles Meyer, by action of the delegates to the IV Interamerican Conference of the Partners of the Alliance.

But what is the Partners of the Alliance? Who are the people who met in Salt Lake City, and what are they trying to do?

The Partners are people . . . people doing something about hemispheric understanding by working together in an action program. They are men and women of many fields of interest bound together by a common determination to help make the hemisphere a better place in which to live.

They are such men as Rex Baker of Houston and Arthur Tonsmeire of Mobile; Royden Derrick of Salt Lake City and Hickman Price of Washington, D.C.; Will Pirkey of Denver and Edgar Ribas of Curitiba, Brazil. They and thousands of their private sector colleagues from throughout the hemisphere are working in the cause of orderly development and hemispheric peace.

In its early days, the Alliance for Progress was little understood by people throughout the hemisphere, and while its goals were nobly expressed in the Charter of Punta del Este, its translation in terms of citizen participation was lost in the organizational drive of government-to-government programs.

To the rural campesino or to the citizen living in the barrio of an urban area, there was little understanding and little visibility in the early stages of building a savings and loan system even though such a system would help meet the basic need of housing

and ultimately have high visibility. The expansion of institutions of higher education, the development of distant ports, the improvement of communications, and the effect of agricultural research were lost in the maze of day-to-day problems of the campesino or barrio dweller.

To them, the Alliance for Progress had meaning to the degree to which there was response to their own self-help efforts . . . a roof for a school which they had constructed of adobe; a pump for the well they had dug; hand tools with which to convert a trail into a farm-to-market road; or a loan to a cooperative for the purchase of a truck to haul products to market.

These high-impact but economically low-priority activities could not fit into the nation's economic development plan. The citizen level initiative, however, reflected the spirit of the Alliance for Progress at its best.

While a need existed to respond to local level self-help activities in Latin America, many citizens and private organizations in the United States were ready and willing to help. In the early days of the Alliance, those who were working in the government-to-government programs were asked by highly skilled and motivated individuals. "What can I do? Is there a constructive way in which I or my organization may give of time or means to the Alliance?"

The answer could have been, "Write your congressman and ask him to support the foreign aid bill." This, however would have been neither effective nor appropriate.

While support of the AID appropriations was vital, the people wanted to be involved directly. No means existed, however, to articulate that interest in the form of an operational program of private citizens.

In bringing about involvement of people at the grassroots level, another factor had to be considered, the factor of human dignity. The people of Latin America, just as the people of the United States, strongly resent and properly reject any program which is put forward in a patronizing way. While real and recognized needs in the economic and social areas were receiving attention, very little thought was being given to the contribution which Latin America could make to the United States.

A need existed to bring the people of Latin America into the role of participants, rather than recipients. Combining this principle with the fact that the people of other American Republics have much to contribute to the United States, we had the elements of "partnership" activities which give full recognition to importance of "dignity." Private sector groups in the United States can respond to local self-help efforts in Latin America, but they can also receive contributions from their Partners in the form of touring art collections, visiting teachers in language, music, art, history, and other fields.

Thus, the Partners of the Alliance was born of a set of opportunities, as well as needs.

First conceived on a cold and bouncy train ride from Puno to Arequipa on the high plains of the Peruvian Andes, the Partners of the Alliance now involves citizens in 37 states and 37 areas in 16 Latin American nations. The goal: to bring people into the action orbit of the Alliance for Progress, and by so doing establish friendships that transcend not only official national borders, but national differences in terms of official policies on trade or aid.

The Partners of the Alliance office in AID was established to serve as the initial catalyst to bring together private citizen groups in the United States and Latin America. Partners of the Alliance committees are formed on a state-wide basis by interested leaders in the fields of education, business, health, labor, agriculture, and finance. Civic clubs, student groups, trade associations, and individual citizens can participate through the instrument of the Partners committees.

Following the formation of the counterpart committees and after basic information has been exchanged, funds provided by the Agency for International Development are made available for the transportation and per diem expenses of a "program development team" representing the U.S. Partners committee to meet with the Latin American Partners organization.

For approximately two weeks, the U.S. team visits schools, hospitals, agriculture projects, rural medical posts and hospitals. They eat the dust and wade in the backwash of the rivers. The final two days of the team visit are given to discussions from which evolve mutually identified projects of a self-help nature which the Partners will implement from private resources.

Most Partners projects fall into the categories of: (1) education, (2) public health and medicine, (3) agriculture and rural development, (4) business and industry, and (5) cultural exchanges.

By March of 1969, the U.S. Partners had been responsible for a flow of more than \$13,000,000 in hard contributions to their Latin American partners. This figure does not include another \$2,000,000-plus from Partners-inspired foundation assistance.

Nor does it include very significant contributions in the form of packing, shipping to port, transporting donated equipment by sea or air, room and board for students on scholarships or for volunteer participants from Latin America, or local administrative costs and a significant amount of local and international travel.

As the resolution says, one airplane—designed for purposes of war to be converted to serve the cause of peace and understanding in the hemisphere—is wanted by the Alliance for Progress Partners of the Alliance.

EXTENDING THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT—THE CASE AGAINST COMPROMISE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, democracy, as has so often been said, is a process. Deny or distort any of the basic elements of this process and democracy dies. Therefore, no compromise can be countenanced in this matter. For "partial democracy" is nothing but tyranny by another name.

Thus, the tragedy of the administration's current indecisiveness regarding the extension of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

This act was adopted by the Congress to make good on a constitutional promise made more than a century ago and then abandoned as part of a political deal at the end of Reconstruction in 1876. For 90 years, Negroes in much of the South were forced to exist in a political limbo closer to slavery than citizenship. In Mississippi, as late as 1964, less than 7 percent of the black populace over 21 years of age was registered to vote.

In short, to black Americans in much of the South "democracy" was a hollow shibboleth—a bitter joke—rather than an operational reality. Owing to discriminatory voting laws and procedures, while the 14th and 15th amendments declared them free men and full citizens, in fact many Negroes remained in a state of political servitude.

It was the transparent hypocrisy of a Nation calling itself a democracy while denying certain citizens the right to vote because of their color that finally created the civil rights movement of the past decade. Stirred by the nonviolent determination of Martin Luther King and

his courageous followers, the senseless brutality of Selma, and the murder of freedom marcher Rev. James Reeb, in early 1965, the conscience of the Nation demanded that Congress act.

The result was the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, in which I was privileged to play a role as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

In brief, the act automatically suspended literacy tests and other discriminatory devices used as prerequisites for registering or voting in any State or political subdivision which maintained them and also had a voting-age population of which less than 50 percent was registered or actually voted in the 1964 Presidential election. In addition, the act provided for the assignment of Federal examiners to register eligible voters and observe polling places in the States and counties covered, and prohibited these States and counties from changing their voting qualifications without either the approval of the U.S. Attorney General or the District Court of the District of Columbia.

To obtain a release from these provisions, a State must file a suit in the district court for the District of Columbia showing that it has not employed any test or device to deny the right to vote because of race or color during the 5 years preceding the filing of the suit. Since the six States initially covered by the act in 1965 have been forbidden by the act to employ any discriminatory tests or devices, these States will automatically be exempted from the act's provisions in 1970 unless the Congress votes to extend coverage beyond the present 5-year limit.

As I see it, there are three grounds on which an extension of the act might logically be opposed.

First, an extension might be opposed if it were concluded that the act was not effective. But the statistics show this has clearly not been the case.

In 1964, just prior to the passage of the Voting Rights Act, the percentage of the nonwhite voting age population registered to vote in Mississippi was 6.7 percent; now it is 59.8 percent. In Alabama, the percentage has risen from 19.3 percent to 51.6 percent; in Georgia, from 27.4 percent to 52.6 percent; in Louisiana, from 31.6 percent to 58.9 percent; in South Carolina, from 37.3 percent to 51.2 percent; and in Virginia, from 38.3 percent to 55.6 percent. For the first time, more than 50 percent of the black voting age population is registered in every Southern State in the Union.

How much of this impressive gain can be attributed directly or indirectly to the Voting Rights Act?

Records of the Civil Service Commission show that as of December 31, 1967, Federal examiners had been dispatched to 58 counties in the South and had registered 158,094 persons to vote. In addition, it is estimated that nearly 500,000 Negroes have been registered by local officials since the passage of the act.

In short, as a result of the Voting Rights Act, black Americans are active participants in Southern politics for the first time since Reconstruction.

And this participation is not limited strictly to voting. When the Voting

Rights Act was passed 4 years ago there were almost no black elected officials in the six Southern States fully covered by the act. Today there are 267.

Therefore, claims that the Voting Rights Act of 1965 has failed to markedly reduce obstacles to Negro political participation in the States covered are not substantiated by the facts.

Second, extension of the act's coverage might logically be opposed on the grounds that the act was no longer needed because the legislation's objectives were fully achieved. But again, this is clearly not the case.

While Negro registration and voting figures in the States covered by the act reflect dramatic improvements, much remains to be done. There are still 185 counties in these States in which less than 50 percent of the Negroes of voting age are registered. In five of these six States, the percentage of whites of voting age registered to vote exceeds that of blacks by 30 percent or more. As a recent Civil Rights Commission report stated, with regard to Negro voting in the South "full equality is far from a reality."

Furthermore, the six States wholly covered by the act have failed to repeal any of the tests and devices for registering and voting—including the literacy tests—suspended by the Voting Rights Act. If the act's coverage is allowed to expire next year, these requirements will automatically be revived returning us to the discriminatory situation of 4 years ago.

In addition, any of these States could then pass legislation requiring all voters to reregister. This means thousands of black voters who had been denied the ballot because of discriminatory laws and who registered for the first time under the Voting Rights Act could again be without the franchise.

Whether the States in question would carry matters to this extreme or not, failure to extend the act's coverage would surely constitute an abandonment of Negroes in the South before they have developed sufficient political strength to repeal any attempts to reimpose discriminatory voting practices.

Therefore, to argue that the act need not be extended because its objectives have been fully accomplished is to blindly disregard the facts.

Finally, extension might be opposed on the grounds that a more effective substitute proposal exists that could be shepherded through Congress before the current act expires. This is, in effect, what Attorney General Mitchell purported to offer in his testimony of June 26 before the House Judiciary Committee.

In my own view, the Attorney General's case is suspect on two levels. To begin with, it is terribly unlikely that any major piece of civil rights legislation could be enacted by the Congress in the 12 months before the coverage of the current Voting Rights Act expires. Under far more propitious conditions, with the public clamoring for action after witnessing peaceful demonstrators put upon by dogs and fire hoses in Selma, the Congress required 6 months to pass the 1965 act.

But more important than the time

factor, the proposals contained in the Attorney General's testimony do not comprise a satisfactory legislative alternative to extended coverage of the Voting Rights Act.

The administration is proposing the following: A nationwide ban on literacy tests until January 1, 1974; a nationwide ban on residency tests for Presidential elections; additional authority for the Attorney General to dispatch voting examiners and observers on a nationwide basis; nationwide authority for the Attorney General to initiate voting rights law suits and to ask for a freeze on discriminatory voting laws; and the appointment of a national voting commission to study voting discrimination and other corrupt practices.

There is nothing wrong with most of these proposals, though I suspect some of them are directed at the straw man of nonsouthern voting discrimination. However, they must be viewed by Congress as possible supplements to the Voting Rights Act to be considered after the act's coverage is extended—not as possible substitutes for extension.

For acceptance of the administration's proposals as a substitute for extension carries a number of deleterious consequences.

First, section 5 of the act would be eliminated. This is the section that prohibits States covered by the act from implementing new voting qualifications or procedures without first obtaining the approval of the Attorney General or a declaratory judgment from the District Court of the District of Columbia stating that the new qualification or procedure "does not and will not have the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color."

This section constitutes an important enforcement device in the act. For the States and subdivisions covered have attempted many subterfuges to escape the act's intent and purpose. Over the past 4 years, they have switched to at-large elections and consolidated counties to nullify local black majorities, extended the terms of white incumbent officials, substituted appointment for election, increased filing fees, added requirements for getting on the ballot, and imposed barriers to the assumption of office. Such actions argue strongly for the retention of section 5.

Second, substituting the administration's proposals for extension of the present act would force a return to the case-by-case, county-by-county approach through the courts which proved so inadequate in the years before the Voting Rights Act of 1965. In fact, it was the obvious inability of this approach to meet the dimensions of the problems of racial discrimination in voting that prompted the 1965 legislation. Sacrificing the automatic coverage of the present act would be turning the clock back 4 years.

Third, the ban on discriminatory tests and devices other than the literacy test would be dropped.

Fourth, and finally, substituting the administration's "nationwide strategy" for extension of the present act's coverage would lead to a serious dilution of the Federal effort in the South—the one area

where serious voter discrimination against nonwhites still exists.

In short, adopting the administration's proposals in place of extending the coverage of the current act would critically undermine the real progress in voting rights that has been realized over the past 4 years.

The case for extending the Voting Rights Act of 1965 is an overwhelming one. For the consequences of not extending it are dangerous and anti-democratic.

How can we urge aggrieved minorities to take their grievances to the ballot box while barring the door to the polls without creating explosive frustrations? And how can we claim to ourselves and to the world that America is a democracy when we draw back from action needed to simply guarantee every man the right to vote?

IL PENSEROSO JUNIOR STUDY CLUB OF LOCKNEY, TEX., URGES ESTABLISHMENT OF 100,000-ACRE BIG THICKET NATIONAL PARK

Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. President, support for the establishment of a 100,000-acre Big Thicket National Park in southeast Texas continues to grow. The Il Penseroso Junior Study Club of Lockney, Tex., has passed a resolution urging the preservation of at least 100,000 acres of this beautiful and unique area.

In addition to the rich and diverse plantlife and birdlife which are found throughout this wilderness, the Big Thicket provides a home for a profusion of small game—including beaver, mink, otter, nutria, muskrat, wildcat, fox, wolf, red and gray squirrels, flying squirrels, raccoon, opossum, and many others. The seriously threatened American alligator can still be found in the sluggish bayous. The endangered Texas red wolf has taken refuge here and has managed to survive.

Highways, pipelines, oil wells, timber operations, real estate developments, and other encroachments have already reduced the Big Thicket from its original size of 3.5 million acres to about 300,000 acres. It is continuing to disappear at a rate of 50 acres per day. We must act now if we are to save even a small part of this great area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution passed by the Il Penseroso Junior Study Club, including the name of its signer, be printed in the RECORD.

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

Whereas, the Big Thicket of Texas is a meeting place for eastern, western and northern ecological elements; and

Whereas, this is the last stand in Texas of the nearly extinct Ivory-billed Woodpecker; and

Whereas, this beautiful and unique area is rapidly being destroyed by bulldozer and chain saw; therefore

Be it resolved that The Il Penseroso Junior Study Club of Lockney, Texas, urges the preservation of at least 100,000 acres containing the most unique areas of the Big Thicket, these areas to be connected by environmental corridors; and

Be it further resolved that the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the Sen-

ate of the United States be requested to set immediate hearings on S4 which would create a Big Thicket National Area.

Mrs. DON DUVALL,
President, *Il Penseroso Jr. Study Club.*

BIRTHPLACE OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY OF KANSAS

Mr. DOLE, Mr. President, the birth of the Republican Party of Kansas 110 years ago is colorfully described in an article written by a Kansas freelance writer, Mrs. Dorothy C. Bishop, of Osawatomie, Kans. Dorothy Bishop has been active in the civic, church, and social affairs of the community since 1939 and returned to a business career in 1954. Her article was published in the *Osawatomie Graphic-News* of May 15, 1969.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD:

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

KANSAS REPUBLICAN PARTY WAS FORMED IN OSAWATOMIE 110 YEARS AGO SUNDAY

(By Dorothy C. Bishop)

It was 110 years ago this coming Sunday, May 18, that the Republican Party of Kansas was born in Osawatomie, then a village of at most 150 houses.

Lincoln was invited to attend the convention which was called to organize the Republican Party in Kansas but was too busy to do so. Another great American, Horace Greeley, a champion of freedom whose pen and voice supported Free Kansas, purposely was not invited to attend but came and received an enthusiastic welcome. As founder and editor of the *New York Tribune*, Greeley was influential in bringing about the nomination of Lincoln. Later, in 1872, the famous journalist accepted the nomination for president but was defeated by the incumbent president, Ulysses S. Grant.

Greeley made an able and effective speech that day in Osawatomie, but, contrary to popular belief, not to the convention. He spoke from an extemporized platform outside and just north of the Osage Valley House where the convention occupied the second story which had been fitted up for the occasion (The American State Bank, Sixth and Main Sts., is now located on the site.) The preliminary work of the convention was done in an upstairs front room in the Jilison House which stood north of the present Presbyterian Church on Main St.

The convention was a memorable incident in the political history of Kansas, and, not unlike the present-day political convocations, had its factions and conflicts of opinion. One of the major issues was on the question of the Negro in Kansas. It was because of the diversities of views that Greeley was not invited to participate in the convention and that Osawatomie was selected as the site of the convention in preference to some more prominent and convenient location where the local influence might have given predominance to one or the other factors.

Speaking in Osawatomie on May 18, 1898, 39 years later, the president of that first convention, Oscar E. Leonard of Coffey County, told how it was to the Republican Editorial Association of the Second Congressional District.

"Perhaps the fact of my selection as president of the convention also was an outgrowth of the diversity of views," said Leonard. "I had been somewhat active in rallying one of the elements to attend the convention, Hon. W. A. Phillips being put forward for the position on the other side, the radical wing. (Later Phillips became a congressman, a colonel who established the

town of Salina, and author of "The Conquest of Kansas.") Not that I entertained extreme views on the issue, but rather that I did not, but believed that these differences, somewhat personal, might be harmonized, as they fortunately were.

"There were radical abolitionists among us, able men, and true to their convictions; there were also (and it was numerically the strongest) a conservative element, not a few of whom were called 'black-law men' because they favored the entire exclusion of the Negro. This hardly seems possible, in the light of the persistent and unyielding opposition to slavery that characterize the early struggles of Kansas. A majority of free-state men of Kansas had no purpose or wish to interfere with the institution of slavery where it existed, nor did they covet the presence of the colored element, slave or free."

The Osawatomie meeting requested the constitutional convention of July 5, 1859 at Wyandotte to incorporate an article in the constitution prohibiting slavery, and this received an overwhelming mandate of 48 to one; but, on the other hand, an amendment to prohibit admission of Negroes to schools came perilously close to passing. An effort to strike the word "white" from the definition of qualified voters was voted down. The suffrage question was also introduced—and rejected.

The differences of opinion over the place of Negroes in Kansas explains why Greeley did not address, and was not invited to address the convention.

"There was a feeling," said Leonard, "that Mr. Greeley, with his very pronounced views, and his lack of understanding of the peculiar status of our affairs, might serve to aggravate, rather than to placate the prevailing differences; and while entertaining all due respect and admiration for that gentleman, it was not by the majority deemed advisable to invite him to participate in the business of the convention."

Invited or not, Greeley's appearance at the convention caused controversy in Kansas. Those who opposed the organization of the Republican Party thought that meddling in local politics by an outsider like Horace Greeley could not be condoned.

On April 28, 1859, Greeley had announced in the *New York Tribune* that he proposed taking a trip Westward to California "returning across the continent or by the Isthmus." On the way west he planned to look in "on the first distinctively Republican Convention of the Freemen of Kansas, which meets at Osawatomie on the 18th of May . . ." Greeley also asked T. D. Thatcher, editor of the *Lawrence Republican*, "to state in such manner as you think fit that I propose to attend your Territorial Republican Convention at Osawatomie . . . I have written and talked about Kansas some, until I want to see it . . . hope to see some old friends whom I may more easily find at Osawatomie than by traveling over your broad prairies."

Greeley had been prodding the government to build a transcontinental railroad, and this, no doubt, more than anything else, prompted his journey across the continent. He made notes along the way of the physical characteristics which would affect construction of a railroad and his letters to the *New York Tribune* describing the difficulties of the trip pointed up the need to connect the two coasts.

Martha B. Caldwell, writing about Horace Greeley's overland trip for the May 1940 *Kansas Historical Quarterly*, states that a "rumor spread that Frank P. Blair of Missouri and Gov. S. P. Chase of Ohio, as well as Greeley, were expected to be present at the convention to give the Republicans some wholesome advice . . . the Democrats especially made political capital of the story.

"The Leavenworth Herald wrote, 'We find the so-called Republicans of Kansas sending all the way to New York for the great Aga-

memnon of Black Republicanism—Horace Greeley—to aid in the organization of their party in this territory. He comes with a platform in his breeches pocket . . .

"So much was made of these reports that Greeley authorized the editor of the *Lawrence Republican* to say in the columns of his paper that the story was without a shadow of foundation; that no one, either in or out of Kansas, solicited his presence at the convention; that the moment he determined to visit Kansas he wrote the articles which appeared in the *Tribune* and *Lawrence Republican*."

On Monday, May 9, Greeley left New York for his journey west which he made by train, steamer, stage, and wagon. He arrived at Atchison Sunday morning, May 16. Greeley's paper, the *New York Tribune*, was widely read in Kansas and it is doubtful that the arrival of any other man in Kansas at that time would have created more of a sensation.

In 1859 Kansas was still isolated—no railroads or telegraphs in Kansas, unless possibly at Ft. Leavenworth, and the telephone would not be invented for nearly 20 years.

To get to Osawatomie at that particular time was a test of man's pluck and endurance. It was during the rainy season, the roads well-nigh impassable and the streams swollen to overflowing and filled with driftwood. When Greeley reached Osawatomie about 9 o'clock in the morning of May 18 he was amazed at the crowd of nearly 1000 who had gathered for the occasion.

During his overland journey, Greeley wrote 34 letters to the *Tribune* which were later republished in book form, "The Overland Journey to California."

The famous editor left Atchison early May 16 in a two-horse wagon. At 11 a.m. May 16 the party reached Leavenworth where they were joined by Leavenworth delegates who had given up the idea of reaching Osawatomie, certain that the convention would be postponed because of the high water. Putting their horses and wagon on board the steamer, D. A. January, they descended the Missouri River about 50 miles to "Wyandot" where they spent the night . . . the next morning at 6 o'clock they set out for Osawatomie, about 50 miles distant, hoping to get there before night . . . a heavy rain had fallen the day before and the Kansas River bottom was covered with water and the road was all but impassable . . . they passed the Prairie Village of Shawnee, a town of 20 or 30 houses with a large hotel, then directly south which brought them in sight of the Santa Fe Trail with its "white-topped emigrant wagons, and three great contract trains." Crossing the trail at right angles they left "the small village of Olathe a mile or so to the west and struck off over the prairie almost due south.

At Spring Hill, a hamlet of four or six dwellings "including a store but no tavern," the party stopped to give their horses food and rest. Unable to secure horse feed in the town they again set out after lunching on crackers and herring and a "homeopathic dose" purchased for a quarter from a passing wagoner . . .

Their direct route led due south through Paola but being assured by persons they met that Bull Creek was impassable on this road, they turned to the west through Marysville and crossed the creek at Rock Ford, three miles beyond. Greeley confessed that this "wide, impetuous stream, so impenetrable to the eye, and so far above its average level, wore a vicious look" when they plunged into it . . .

Twelve miles more brought them to Stanton where they stayed the night. Stanton was a little town of 20 or 30 houses, including two stores and a tavern. At the tavern they found five or six persons bound for Osawatomie "one of whom had swam three streams since morning." Later in the evening 15 or 20 more arrived, among them the Lawrence and Douglas County delegations.

After supper, a meeting was held in the schoolhouse where Greeley and others spoke to a well-filled house.

The delegation got an early start the next morning, May 18, and were soon at the Marais des Cygnes River, a mile from Stanton. The river, ordinarily fordable, was 15 or 20 feet in depth. The rope to Josiah Bund's ferry was buried in the water and the tree to which it was attached standing in the middle of the stream. After a long wait, a new rope was secured and the party was ferried across finally reaching Osawatomie about 9 o'clock in the morning.

Greeley described Osawatomie as a village of some 150 houses, situated in the forks of the Marais des Cygnes and Pottawatomie, a somewhat smaller creek, which comes in from the southwest. He wrote:

"The location is pleasant and favorable but not a commanding one; the surrounding country is more considerably cultivated than any I had passed south of the Kaw. The two creeks supply abundant and good timber; (Ed. note: Easterners still refer to Kansas rivers as creeks, even at flood stage) an excellent stream sawmill has taken the place of that which the border ruffians burned; a flouring mill, tannery, brewery, and a large hotel, are being erected or completed. I presume there is a larger town somewhere in what is known as Southern Kansas, though I do not know which it is."

Greeley was introduced by O. C. Brown, a founder of Osawatomie. The editor talked for an hour and a half. He reviewed the old political parties, the steady growth of the slave power and then dwelt on the origin, history, principles and objects of the Republican Party. "It was a labor of love so to speak," wrote Greeley of the occasion. The Lawrence Republican printed the speech in full, May 26, and posted up the proof-sheets with corrections in Greeley's own handwriting. Later the entire speech was published in the May 31, 1859 edition of the New York Tribune.

In the course of his speech, Greeley said: "The able and gallant Lincoln, of Illinois, whom we had hoped to meet and hear today, has happily illustrated the squatter sovereignty principle thus: 'If A. wants to make B. a slave, C. must not interfere to prevent him.'"

Forty-six years after the convention, Leonard told how they "sat down on" Greeley. "He came out to Kansas," Leonard asserted, "with a number of theories and intended to dictate to us." But right there was where Mr. Greeley miscalculated. We treated him with the courtesy due the great editor that he was but we merely pushed him aside and held the convention in our own way.

Although Greeley didn't participate in the business of the convention it is not known how much influence he exerted among the committees. He was accused of writing the platform but this was denied vigorously by John A. Martin, editor of the Atchison Champion, a member of the platform committee, who declared that Greeley had never seen the platform until a copy was handed to him in Lawrence.

That long-ago May when Greeley attended the birth of the Republican Party in Kansas must have been much like this May, green and luxuriant after the spring rains, for Greeley was much impressed with the beauty of this region, declaring:

"If the Garden of Eden exceeded this land in beauty or fertility I pity Adam for having to leave it."

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS ENDORSES PRESIDENT NIXON'S AIR FORCE ACADEMY SPEECH

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, President Nixon's June 5 address before the Air Force Academy served both as a tocsin

and a source of inspiration. In a comment which I gave over the radio on the following day, I expressed the belief that it reflected the views of the great majority of the American people. I have received a number of evidences that this is so. One of the most eloquent items of evidence was a resolution adopted by the Polish American Congress, District of Connecticut, at its quarterly meeting in Hartford, Conn., on June 8, 1969.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

The Polish American Congress, District of Connecticut, assembled at the Quarterly Meeting held in Hartford on June 8, 1969, do hereby unanimously resolve:

1. We warmly welcome and fully endorse President Nixon's clear, resolute and profoundly wise statements on the defense policy of the United States, as expressed in his address at the Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs on June 5, 1969.

2. We believe that all new isolationists, defeatists, naive pacifists and advocates of weakness and unilateral disarmament, clamoring for peace at any price, instead of helping to preserve or bring about peace, are actually prolonging or even promoting wars, by indirectly inviting aggressors to easy conquests, as history had proven it over and over again.

3. We are deeply convinced that only by being strong and determined, America can preserve peace, protect and defend her own security and also freedom in the world.

4. We hold it as a self-evident fact, that this great country of ours was chosen by the grace of God and historical destiny to bear the lofty burden of world wide responsibilities as the champion and defender of freedom in the world, threatened by communist tyranny.

5. We also strongly feel and insist that the United States Government take all necessary steps and exert all efforts to strive for, and ultimately bring about the liberation of Poland, Czechoslovakia and other Captive Nations in Eastern and Central Europe, which, as a result of the infamous Yalta agreement were left in the Russian sphere of influence and are now suffering under the imposed communist regimes and neo-colonial Russian oppression and exploitation.

6. We believe that peace at home, with law and order and with justice and equal opportunities for all should be and must be the ultimate goal of Federal, State and local governments as well as of all the citizens, to make America a shining example for the whole world as a champion and defender of freedom, democracy and justice to all.

HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS ARE AN IMPORTANT ELEMENT IN A PEACEFUL WORLD ORDER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President; I rise today to speak once again of the three human rights conventions that have languished in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for over 20 years.

Critics of these conventions have found it difficult to attack them frontally. Few are willing to assert that such things as the equal rights of women, immunity from forced labor or the prohibition of genocide are undesirable.

But these critics have found numerous ways to attack the conventions obliquely, to prevent their ratification by undermining their foundations.

One such criticism would have us believe that, however worthy the conventions, they are nothing more than words on paper and thus powerless to affect real events. Political theorists, the argument runs, have long affirmed that in the end it is relationships of political power and not highminded statements of ideals that determine political action. Thus conventions like the ones I speak for today can be little more than sops to moralizers or facades behind which political business proceeds as usual.

I take issue with this argument, Mr. President. It misrepresents the nature of political relations and completely misses the value of statements of political intent.

It is indisputable that relationships of power are a major determinant of political action. But they are just that—a major determinant, and not the whole story. The successful operation of any political grouping depends not simply on coercive force, but on a measure of consent as well. Were it not for this mutual acquiescence to the privileges, obligations and sanctions of the system, no political entity could long survive, no matter how much force was employed in the attempt to hold it together.

What applies to the city, the State and the Nation applies equally, and perhaps more, to the system of nations. If there is truly to come about a peaceful world order based on mutual respect for the rights of others, there must first come a profound and uncoerced agreement on the nature and value of these rights. There must be among nations that same kind of consensus that is so vital to the cohesion of the most successful and long-lasting of nations.

How then, Mr. President, if these thoughts are true, can it be asserted that conventions like the ones before us are ineffectual and meaningless? For these conventions, if commonly held, represent nothing less than the first important step toward establishment of the consensus upon which a genuinely peaceful world order must be constructed.

Admittedly the conventions are only the first step in a long and difficult process. But this process we must attempt, and it has little chance of success if we fail at the very beginning, as we must surely do if we continue to ignore these conventions. If these principles are not mutually held, they do indeed become meaningless and ineffectual—mere words on paper.

It is for this reason, Mr. President, that I once again urge the Senate to act promptly to add our name to the long list of nations that have already affirmed their agreement to these important conventions.

TOM MBOYA

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, we have again been shaken by the reality of assassination, this time of a young and dynamic, very promising leader in Africa—Minister of Planning and Economic Development Tom Mboya, of Kenya. His death is a severe loss, for Tom Mboya was young—only 38—yet had years of experience, having been leader of the Kenya Federation of Labor and of

the African National Union, as well as a high official in the Government headed by his friend Jomo Kenyatta.

Having had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Mboya, I can say from firsthand that he was a man sparked by the desire to uplift his people, and all the people of Africa, regardless of tribal loyalties and other transitory evidences of divisiveness. He was a builder who was, as Anthony Astrachan wrote in the Washington Post recently, busy building institutions in the state that would outlast any individual or generation—that would provide at least the chance of viability for countries that need every chance they can get.

Mr. President, Kenya and all of Africa needed Tom Mboya. But he has been taken away by an act of senseless violence, not unlike those we ourselves have experienced. His example, however, cannot be taken away. He will be remembered with great favor here, as I am sure he will be in his native country, whose people I join in mourning his loss and in extending condolences to his widow and family.

POLICY ON CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, in March of 1968 an accident occurred at Dugway Proving Grounds in which 6,000 sheep were killed. This was the first blemish on an admirable safety record for the testing ground. In light of this I began to investigate the entire operation at Dugway and our national policy concerning chemical and biological warfare.

Since that time in 1968, I have attempted to keep abreast of new developments in this field. Recently the Army announced it would shortly dispose of 20,000 tons of lethal GB nerve gas. The initial plan called for the rail movement of this gas from the Rocky Mountain Arsenal—RMA—located outside Denver, Colo., to Earle, N.J., for disposal in the sea through Operation Chase—cut holes and sink 'em.

When news of this plan was made public a number of serious objections were raised. The main focus of complaint was the danger involved in the rail shipment of such lethal gas through large urban areas.

In response to the public outcry raised against this plan, the Army requested the National Academy of Sciences to study alternative methods of disposing of the obsolete nerve gas.

In a report released on June 25, 1969, the NAS recommended that the gases not be moved and that the processes of demilitarization and detoxification begin immediately at the RMA.

As a less desirable and far more dangerous alternative the NAS tentatively recommended that the gases be transported by rail to the Tooele Army Depot in Utah for demilitarization and detoxification.

The reason for this alternative plan was, in my opinion, the political pressure that was being brought to bear on the Army by various public figures to get the gas out of Colorado.

I then, and still do, object to this needless exposing of citizens in Colorado and Utah to this lethal gas that could be

released in transit by the slightest accident.

The reasons why I consider this alternative proposal both needless and dangerous are two:

First. The NAS recognized the inherent danger of transporting live nerve gas bombs by rail. The increasing rate of railroad accidents, as witnessed by the recent railroad car explosion at Wells, Nev., and the unnecessary exposure of U.S. citizens to this danger, seem overwhelmingly persuasive to keep the gas at RMA.

Second. With the monetary restraint that Congress is experiencing this year, it seems an unnecessary waste of the taxpayers' money to spend approximately \$14 million to construct a new demilitarization and detoxification plant at Tooele, when one already exists at the RMA.

In examining the entire nerve gas problem I do see a danger with the present RMA facilities, that could be easily corrected.

When the Army planned to ship the nerve gas bombs to Earle, N.J., for disposal, they were removed from their protected storage area and placed in unprotected boxcars, where they remain today. These railroad cars are easily seen from the air either approaching or taking off from Stapleton airport.

Presently the airspace above the arsenal is not restricted. Jet aircraft and other airplanes fly directly over these boxcars. The only limitation is that all aircraft must be above 2,500 feet.

In light of this I am asking first, that the Army remove the M-34 bombs from the railroad cars and place them in the protected storage areas within the confines of the arsenal. Second, I am asking the FAA to restrict the air space above the RMA to all aircraft at all levels below 40,000 feet. These two modifications would correct this needless danger to the public.

In discussing this proposal with the FAA they have commented that this could be accomplished with no significant handicap to the Stapleton International Airport, which is located a short distance from the RMA. Stapleton presently has 300 to 350 flight operations daily. Stapleton Air Field was first opened October 17, 1929. Planes have been flying over RMA ever since the arsenal was constructed, which includes World War II.

If Colorado State officials are really concerned about the formulation of creative solutions to difficult problems, they should support corrections of this obvious danger to the public.

ADMIRAL RICKOVER'S REASSIGNMENT

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I am very gratified that on the strong recommendations of Admiral Moorer, Chief of Naval Operations, Secretary of the Navy Chaffee has announced the retention of Vice Admiral Rickover on active duty in the Navy as the head of our naval nuclear propulsion program.

Admiral Rickover has ably filled this post for over 20 years, during which time his genius, determination, and personal

courage have been the decisive factors in placing the United States into world leadership in nuclear-powered warships.

Today, our Polaris submarines stand out clearly as our most formidable deterrent against nuclear war. These submarines would not exist except for the contributions made by Admiral Rickover's program. We owe a great deal to Admiral Rickover, and I am particularly pleased that Secretary Laird has had the wisdom and foresight to insure that the Nation will retain his invaluable services for another 2 years.

I also note that Admiral Rickover will, during this extension, have the same duties, responsibilities, and authority he has had to date. This is imperative if the present high standards set by Admiral Rickover in all phases of the naval nuclear propulsion program are to be maintained.

THE MAGNIFICENT MATCHBOX FLEET

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, many of my colleagues will remember Representative Gordon Canfield, of New Jersey, who served with great distinction for 20 years in the House. His deep interest and work in behalf of the Coast Guard earned for him the title of "Father of the Coast Guard Reserve." Mr. Canfield has called my attention to a story which appeared in the May-June issue of the Review, a publication of the Defense Supply Association.

I ask unanimous consent to enter in the RECORD "The Magnificent Matchbox Fleet," H. R. Kaplan's vivid account of the role played by 50 U.S. Coast Guard cutters on D-day, June 6, 1944. It is eloquent testimony to the Coast Guard's continued efforts today to maintain its reputation as the smallest military component in constant readiness for peace or war time service.

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

D-DAY REVISITED: THE MAGNIFICENT MATCHBOX FLEET

(By H. R. Kaplan)

Reporters named it the "matchbox fleet." Actually, it was a flotilla of fifty modest wooden 83-foot U.S. Coast Guard cutters, hastily organized to carry out rescue services during the most gigantic amphibious landing operation ever carried out in the long and tragic history of war—the Allied invasion of Europe in June, 1944. Before that fateful June 6 was over, the men of Coast Guard Rescue Flotilla No. 1 would see the white sands of the French beaches stained red with blood, and the sight of dead bodies would become commonplace. In the next couple of days, young men would be reshaped in the fiery crucible of war into seasoned veterans.

The idea of a rescue flotilla emanated from no less a personage than the Commander-in-Chief himself, President Franklin D. Roosevelt. A yachtsman and a former Assistant Secretary of the Navy, he had developed a healthy respect for the small-boat expertise of the Coast Guard. He reasoned that in the probably crowded and chaotic conditions of the Channel during the landings, only small vessels, expertly handled, could operate with any degree of success. Their job would be simple but dangerous. They were to accompany the initial invasion waves to within less than one mile of the

beaches. At that point they were to heave to, waiting for the first casualties to come in. They would be sitting ducks for the heavy German gun emplacements of the "Atlantic Westwall," one of the most heavily fortified lines in the world.

All along the French coast the Germans had mounted fortifications manned by battle-hardened veterans. Against this awesome array of firepower, the Allies were about to attempt one of the most difficult tasks in the science of war—assault of a strongly fortified sector from the water. However, what the Americans and their allies did have going for them were enormous resources in men and materials and the element of surprise. Nevertheless, the problem was to put those men and supplies on the beaches and to keep them there long enough to develop a foothold for penetration to the interior. All of this would have to be done in the face of murderous, ranking German fire.

The cutters of the Flotilla, commanded by LCDR. Alexander V. Stewart, were to take on board as many wounded men as possible, even to the danger point. Then they were to dash to larger vessels, transfer their survivors, and return to search for more. Their crews were American and English, and the skippers were mostly young lieutenants, junior grade. For a long time they had trained for this moment. Everything they had learned would at last be put to the test. The very fortunes of the Free World depended on the outcome of this day. As the great Sir Winston Churchill had put it, "The New World in all its power and majesty" was "coming to the rescue of the Old." If they survived this day, they would have something to tell their children many years later. If they survived.

For the young skippers and their crews, the night of June 5, 1944, would be one of the longest of their lives. As the hours slipped by till morning, a strange quiet descended on the cutters. Each man wondered: Would he make it back? Would he, when the test came, have the guts to meet it? Others withdrew into some private place within themselves, thinking of a girl left behind, a farm, or a special place where they had been happy in a world left irrevocably behind. This was no training exercise, but the long-awaited invasion itself.

Typical of the mood on the cutters was that of Rescue Cutter No. 62, commanded by Lieutenant, junior grade, Raymond M. Rosenbloom, Jr. On the night before the invasion, he had called all hands together in the tiny galley. In his early twenties, Rosenbloom was grim and unsmiling as he prepared to give his men their final briefing. A combat correspondent on board recorded his words.

"Well, girls," he said, "Sometime tomorrow more ships than the world has ever seen will sail from England to put our troops in France." No one said anything.

"We probably won't reach the beach ourselves," he continued, "and you ought to thank God." Some of the men looked a little uncomfortable about that, but they remained silent.

"We will be with the first convoy," said Rosenbloom, "and as you know, our job will be to pick up survivors from the torpedoed ships. We may have a lot to do, but we hope we won't."

Rosenbloom then outlined the plan, reminding his men that the Navy's job was to put the Army on the beach and that the particular task of Coast Guard Cutter 62 was to pick up Army men from the Channel and put them on the nearest large craft going to France.

"When you pull these men out of the water, the lieutenant said, "they will have rifles strapped on their backs. Their first instinct, past experience has shown, will be to get rid of the rifle since even after they are pulled aboard the horror will remain that the rifle is pulling them down. You will

not let them throw overboard either rifles or ammunition. The first thing you will let these men know is that the war is not over for them but that they are going to be put aboard another invasion craft."

There was absolute silence, as if the men were hypnotized by Rosenbloom's words. This was no 24-year-old speaking, but a tough veteran. Speaking slowly in a matter of fact voice, Rosenbloom continued. "We're going to have to be callous. That's going to be the hardest part of our job. When we get a load we're going to have to back away, no matter how many men are in the water. Don't feel sorry for a boy, even if he has a broken leg and is screaming to be pulled aboard. Like in a department store, our value is in a quick turnover and a quick return. As soon as we've unloaded one batch of boys on a larger ship, we'll go back for another. If the boys in the water won't get out of the way we'll have to back right through them and they'll have to take a chance of being hit by the propellers."

"If a man is dead," Rosenbloom paused briefly. "The pharmacist's mate told you how to tell if a man is dead, didn't he?" The men nodded.

"All right, if a man is dead, and the ship is loaded and you're rushed for time, you're not to waste any sentimentality on him because it may mean other lives. You'll cut off one of his dog tags, put your foot under him and hoist him over the rail. And keep hauling in live men as fast as you can. Even with the nets and ropes, they'll have trouble getting aboard. If we lose a big ship there'll be a lot of them in the water and there's going to be no time to lose."

Some of the crew had turned white as the lieutenant spoke. Rosenbloom gave them a few seconds to absorb the impact of what he had said. Relentlessly, he continued: "The wounded will be a problem. The damage and first-aid crew under Chief Dickey will handle them as best they can. The worst wounded will be given a shot of morphine, the others quick first aid. Chief, as far as possible, if a man is wounded, let his own buddies take care of him."

"Men who are able to walk, you will herd below as fast as you can. Stuff them in the fo'c'sle and stuff them in the wardroom. If the ship gets too full, stuff them in the lazarette."

"The first men pulled aboard, if they are healthy, put to work helping you pull in the others. You will find them as meek as lambs, experience has shown. They'll do everything you say. They'll be so damned glad to be out of the water, especially at night."

Once again the lieutenant waited before going on. "Remember this. Anyone who goes below to light a cigarette must put on a pair of red goggles." This instruction was intended to prevent night blindness.

"The only lights below will be covered with a red shield or an orange shield", Rosenbloom said. "Also to take care of night blindness. These shields will not be removed under any circumstances."

"We will not fire on any aircraft unless we are directly attacked. The flashes will give away our position. In case, through confusion, one of our own ships fires on us, we will not give away our position by firing the recognition rocket unless a real salvo lands in our neighborhood. Every time we pass a ship Signalman Fernandes (Tony Fernandes of Westfield, Mass.) will keep his blinker gun trained on the bridge, ready to give the signal."

"If we are sunk ourselves and washed ashore on the German side, don't touch anything. It may be boobytrapped. Just find yourself a soft place and lie there until you see some of our troops."

"We will be on the port side of the convoy and will be vulnerable to E-Boat attack. You know the E-boats. We will not fire unless we are directly attacked. If we are attacked, do

the best we can with the pea-shooters. Remember, we're specialists, and our specialty is not shooting but rescuing men. Now have you read your gas instructions?"

The men nodded.

"All right. I don't need to tell you that if you use your gas equipment correctly you will be safe. If you don't use your equipment properly—well, you've all seen gas victims of the last war walking about." The briefing was over. For the first time, these young men had had a look at the frightening face of war.

Only a few hours later, the mighty invasion force was on its way. Soon the skies were dark with clouds of fighters and bombers streaking towards the French coast to soften up German defenses. The roar of their motors was deafening. On they sped through the late English twilight. As dawn emerged out of the grey mists of the Channel, the Coast Guard rescue flotilla groped its way with the rest of the invasion fleet through miles of mine fields. Lighting their path were intermittent flashes of flares and gunfire. By now all hell had begun to break loose as the German defenders reacted feverishly to the seemingly endless flow of men and ships.

By six a.m. of June 6 the first waves of troops had hit the beaches where they were immediately pinned down by deadly German fire. Bomb blasts sent rivers of fire along the beach. This was the big show all right, and it wasn't long before the first wounded started coming in. The time had arrived for the Rescue Flotilla to show its mettle. From that time until well into the invasion, every man on board the cutters worked without stopping as long as he could stand on his feet. Rest was out of the question when all those men were tossing around on the dark water. With the superhuman energy which comes to men at such times, they pulled every man possible out of the water.

The wounded were transferred from the small boats, bobbing like empty bottles in the rough seas and banging sharply against the larger vessels. But the transfers were managed somehow with skill and gentleness. As weary soldiers leaned on railings and stared down, the casualties were brought on board. Litter cases were swathed in blankets soaked with spray, waterdrops beading the exhausted faces and closed eyes. Straps were slipped under the ends of the stretchers which were quickly hoisted, while guide ropes held the small craft safely off the side of the transports. Wounded men able to walk came up ladders assisted from below, grabbed by strong hands from above. As each came aboard, two soldiers took his arms around their shoulders and led him inside to the dressing stations.

In preparation for this grim time, the larger vessels had been equipped with bunks for hundreds of wounded, operating rooms, plasma, sulfas, penicillin, and the latest medical stores. Most of the litter cases were taken directly to the operating room, while the less seriously wounded were looked after in the wardroom, converted into a first-aid station. Every available space was lined with waiting litters as the wounded began coming aboard fast. In corridors, minor casualties sat on chairs, or lay on the floor. And over everything hung the sickening stench of blood, sweat and wet filth. Every man who could help was pressed into service. They removed temporary bandages, now wet and dirty, cleaned wounds with disinfectants, picked out stuck bits of clothing, sand, grass, and often metal. For two days and nights the doctors and their assistants worked with no sleep. There were amputations, chest and abdominal-cavity perforations. Yet none of the wounded died before the ships reached England.

Sometimes the wounded were in such a desperate state that medical and surgical treatment had to be administered immediately on the rescue cutters.

While the Coast Guard cutter was circling a British transport, a German shore battery opened up. Three large shells struck the water about 35 feet away. The explosions from the large-caliber guns flung hot water into the men's faces. A British destroyer immediately struck out for shore, hurling shells at the enemy emplacements, finally silencing them.

Altogether, Coast Guard Rescue Flotilla No. 1 made 1,438 rescues from the English Channel during the invasion of France. Even months after the operation had been completed, they were still on the job picking men out of the cold, angry water.

All of this was a quarter of a century ago, and nothing remains of the gallant cutters of the "matchbox fleet" in the Coast Guard. Nothing that is, except affection in the hearts of men grown elderly who bless every inch of their wooden hulls. And who is to say that is not the greatest monument of all?

NAVIGABILITY OF CONGAREE RIVER OR WATEREE RIVER, S.C.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, in July 1969, a concurrent resolution was adopted by the South Carolina General Assembly, whereby it was requested that the Cooper-Santee River Basin Development Association, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and all other State and Federal agencies not take any action toward making the Congaree River or the Wateree River navigable until the State of South Carolina, acting through its appropriate State agencies or the general assembly, determines that such navigability would not interfere with the propagation of striped bass.

Since the proposal to make the Congaree or Wateree navigable is an important and significant transportation proposal, both to the State of South Carolina and the Nation, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Requesting the Cooper-Santee River Basin Development Association, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and all other State and Federal agencies not to take any action toward making the Congaree or Wateree Rivers navigable until the State of South Carolina, acting through its appropriate State agencies or the general assembly, determines that such navigability would not interfere with the propagation of striped bass

Whereas, it has been suggested and planned by certain groups and individuals that action be taken toward making the Congaree or Wateree Rivers navigable; and

Whereas, it has not yet been determined to be feasible or practicable to develop these rivers for these purposes; and

Whereas, such development could result in inestimable damage to fish, wildlife and wildlife breeding areas adjacent to said rivers and may also cause damage to landowners adjacent to the rivers as a result of flooding. Now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring:

That the Cooper-Santee River Basin Development Association, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and all other state and federal agencies are requested not to take any action toward making the Congaree or Wateree Rivers navigable, other than to conduct studies thereof if deemed advisable, until the

State of South Carolina, acting through the General Assembly, determines that such navigability will not interfere with the propagation of striped bass.

Be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the United States Corps of Engineers, to each United States Senator from South Carolina, and to each member of Congress from South Carolina.

State of South Carolina, in the House of Representatives, Columbia, South Carolina, July 2, 1969.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a Resolution passed in the House of Representatives and concurred in by the Senate.

INEZ WATSON,
Clerk of the House.

FURTHER ACTION ON PESTICIDE CONTROL URGED OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Department of Agriculture announced yesterday the suspension of the use of DDT and eight other pesticides in its departmental programs.

As reported by today's Evening Star, the New York Times, and the Washington Post, the Department's action resulted from the recent recommendations of a National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council pesticide study.

DDT is now registered by the Department of Agriculture for about 240 agricultural uses, and also is authorized for other uses such as for control of Dutch elm disease and for mosquito control. DDT production in the United States is at more than 100 million pounds a year.

I understand that a special Department of Agriculture committee is recommending to Secretary Clifford Hardin that aerial dusting of DDT and the use of the pesticide in aquatic areas be stopped. Such action would be a step forward, but it alone would not be enough to prevent further damage to the environment, to fish and wildlife, and possibly to man, from this persistent pesticide.

In a letter to Secretary Hardin, I have urged instead that the Department ban DDT immediately canceling the registration for all its uses except those that may be absolutely necessary for the protection of human health, or by setting a specific timetable for doing this.

DDT has proved to be not only hazardous, but expendable. The question is not whether to eliminate its use, but when. And I believe we must accomplish it on a timetable not of years but of months.

Six years ago, the President's Science Advisory Committee concluded that the goal must be the elimination of the use of persistent, toxic pesticides. With each passing year, this matter becomes more urgent, and yet, progress toward this end at the Federal level has been disappointingly slow.

In this country, DDT has been banned in Arizona and Michigan, and, overseas, in Sweden. It would be unfortunate if the Federal Government were cast in the role of following, rather than leading, in this critical national concern. At best, any limitation or banning of some DDT uses could be considered only an initial step. Action must be taken not only with

regard to DDT, but for other pesticides as well. While the use of DDT has decreased substantially in the recent years, use of the even more toxic insecticides aldrin and dieldrin has actually increased. And predictably, dangerously high concentrations of these compounds are also being found in the environment.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles from the Evening Star, the New York Times, and the Washington Post be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 10, 1969]

REPORT CRITICAL OF DDT SHELVED, NELSON SAYS

(By Mark Brown)

Sen. Gaylord A. Nelson has charged the Department of Agriculture with sitting on a report condemning the general use of DDT.

Agriculture officials denied any such report exists, but did announce yesterday the department had ordered a temporary halt in the use of nine persistent or long-lasting pesticides—including DDT—in government pest control programs.

The Wisconsin Democrat called on Secretary of Agriculture Clifford M. Hardin to ban use of the toxic pesticide altogether.

Nelson said the department has kept the report quiet because "they haven't done anything about it."

But Dr. G. W. Irving Jr., administrator of the USDA's agricultural research service, and Harry W. Hays, director of the pesticide regulation division, said no such recommendations have been made to Hardin.

"If there had been a report I would have known about it," Irving said.

Nelson acknowledged the report may not yet have reached Hardin's desk. But he added, "There is no doubt in my mind the report exists."

He contended the department's temporary halt to use of DDT in its own programs was a "ridiculous palliative" designed to assuage public opinion.

"The Department of Agriculture is America's worst offender," Nelson asserted. "It is locked in with the agricultural interests that use DDT."

Nelson said Hardin set up a special intra-departmental committee to study the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council Report on Persistent Pesticides.

The USDA committee recommended a ban on aerial dusting with DDT and use of the pesticide in "aquatic areas"—near lakes, rivers and streams, he said.

Nelson has contended DDT is contaminating America's waters—especially in the Great Lakes area—and poisoning the environment for fish, wildlife and even man.

The committee's recommendations don't go far enough, he said, even though they are "a step forward."

The temporary suspension—good until completion of a 90-day review—affects USDA pest control operations on military and civilian airports, joint federal-state projects and national forests.

In addition to DDT, pesticides involved are Dieldrin, Endrin, Aldrin, Chlordane, Toxaphene, Lindane, Heptachlor, and BHC. All are "persistent" long-lasting pesticides.

Undersecretary of Agriculture J. Phil Campbell, who announced the suspension, said it was ordered because of "the present concern over protection of our environment from contamination."

Only a minor percentage of the persistent pesticides used in the United States are used in the programs affected by the temporary ban, Irving said.

[From the New York Times, July 9, 1969]
FEDERAL USE OF DDT RESTRICTED PENDING
RESULT OF 30-DAY STUDY

(By Gladwin Hill)

LOS ANGELES, July 9.—Under pressures from many quarters about the harmful side effects of "hard" pesticides, the Department of Agriculture announced today that it was suspending the use of DDT and eight other similar compounds in its programs pending a 30-day "review."

The action was in line with recent recommendations of a National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council pesticide study requested by the department.

The most controversial of the current programs is the application of dieldrin, which is more toxic than DDT, to airports to avert any insect infestation from airplanes from overseas.

The projected treatment of Kelly Air Force Base in San Antonio, Tex., which was disclosed last week, brought protests from conservationists that accidental runoff might poison the waters of the Gulf of Mexico.

More than 250,000 pounds of dieldrin has been applied in the program to 56 military and civilian airports across the country over the last 15 years, including the principal airports around New York and Washington.

Besides DDT and dieldrin, the suspension covers endrin aldrin, chlordane, toxaphene, lindane, heptachlor and benzene hexachloride. The action was announced in Washington by J. Phil Campbell, acting Secretary of Agriculture in the absence of Secretary Clifford M. Hardin, who is traveling in the West.

Senator Gaylord Nelson, Wisconsin Democrat who has been campaigning against DDT, urged Secretary Hardin, in a communication released today, to impose a national ban on the application of DDT by aerial "dusting" and by any method in areas close to bodies of water, as constructive steps toward eventual elimination of the compound.

These restrictions were said to have been recommended by an unpublicized intradepartmental committee that was recently set up by Secretary Hardin to assess the Academy of Science-Research Council report.

All the pesticides involved in the suspension belong to the man-made chemical family of chlorinated hydrocarbons, which are distinctive for their toxicity and longevity. They do not dissolve readily in water and tend to remain concentrated. They accumulate particularly in the organs of fish and birds, and apparently disrupt reproduction.

DIELDRIN KNOWLEDGE SCANT

Most humans now have DDT in their bodies although the body tends to eliminate it before it reaches a toxic level. On dieldrin and the other compounds, knowledge is less specific.

The Agriculture Department has been using what it called "the persistent pesticides" to counter such insects as the Japanese beetle, the white-fringed beetle, pine bark beetles, the European chafer and the Tussock moth, in the airport program, in national forests and in various Federal-state projects.

The department announcement said that the review "will consider possible alternative control methods, including other chemicals."

"Although the programs are carefully planned, to insure maximum safety to man, animals and our natural resources," Mr. Campbell said, "the present concern over protection of our environment from contamination warrants a further review of our control operations."

The review will be conducted by department personnel, but its conclusions will be subject to review in turn by the intradepartmental Federal Committee on Pest Control, which oversees Federal control programs.

The Academy of Science-Research Council report had recommended that "further and more effective steps be taken to reduce the

needless or inadvertent release of persistent pesticides into the environment."

AT LEAST 23 BABIES TREATED

Regarding the dieldrin program, the director of the Agriculture Department's plant pest control division, Donald R. Shepherd, said in a telephone interview that at least 23 military bases and 33 civilian airports had been treated and, in a number of cases, re-treated since 1954, with the idea of making the soil lethal to any insect coming off an airplane.

About 75,000 acres of land were involved. The standard application is 30 pounds of a 10 percent granular dieldrin-and-clay compound per acre, representing three pounds of pure dieldrin.

Dieldrin was used, Mr. Shepherd said, because one pound of it was equal to about eight pounds of DDT in insecticidal effects calculated to last from five to seven years, minimizing reapplications.

Some scientists say the use of such a powerful chemical is unnecessary and that this widespread application of it may well account for some of the dieldrin that is regularly showing up, along with DDT, in fish and birds.

"There's enough of it around now to kill eagles and peregrine falcons, and we're finding it regularly in West Coast pelicans," Dr. Robert Risebrough, a biochemist of the University of California at Berkeley, said in a telephone interview.

HIGH RATE OF TOXICITY

"In the Lake Michigan Coho Salmon," said Dr. Charles Wurster, a biologist at the State University of New York at Stony Brook who has been prominent in the national anti-DDT campaign, "where there will be 7 parts per million of DDT, you may find one-quarter of a part per million of dieldrin. There's less of it, but it's much worse than DDT in terms of toxicity."

"This use of dieldrin on airports is foolish. All the insects have to do is get off the plane and fly. The solution is to treat the airplane, not poison the environment around it."

Mr. Shepherd said that attention had been given in each case to local ecological factors—that treatment of Travis Air Force Base in California was deferred pending a study of its colony of burrowing owls, which might be poisoned.

But he acknowledged that a runoff of the chemical had resulted in "a few fish kills" during the program. He said that at Norfolk, Va., where there had been intensive applications, state agencies found dieldrin in oysters and shrimps, but that "it wasn't considered hazardous."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
July 9, 1969]

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT SUSPENDS USE OF DDT

The Agriculture Department yesterday ordered a halt to use of nine long-lasting pesticides, including DDT and Dieldrin, in its pest control programs.

The order followed urgent requests by Sen. Gaylord Nelson (D-Wis.), that all use of DDT be banned, and by Rep. Bertram L. Podell (D-N.Y.), that DDT not even be produced.

Undersecretary of Agriculture J. Phil Campbell said the departmental suspension was ordered pending a review of the pest control programs, to be completed in 30 days.

Campbell's order affected programs conducted by the Agricultural Research Service and the U.S. Forest Service which involve applications of DDT, Dieldrin, Endrin, Aldrin, Chlordane, Toxaphene, Heptachlor and BHC.

Departmental pest control operations on military and civilian airports will be halted along with cooperative Federal-state projects and application of pesticides in national forests, Campbell said.

KANSAS EDITOR WRITES PERCEPTIVELY ON FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I recently had the opportunity to read two excellent editorials published in the Salina, Kans., Journal. And at a time when we are very much concerned with foreign policy and defense matters, I wish to call these editorials to the attention of Senators.

The editor, Mr. Whitley Austin, observes with great perception that many of our policies have been based on myths and exaggerated notions of our power to control world events. As he puts it:

We have fondly believed we can whip anyone, out-produce anyone, out-bank anyone, out-boss anyone.

But we are "getting our come-uppance." We must now make a realistic assessment of "what we can actually do and get away with and then proceed to do it."

One of the things we must strive for is more effective communication with the great powers—Russia, China, Japan, and West Germany. Mr. Austin states it well:

We don't have to get in bed with them but we can talk and trade with them on a basis of mutual advantage. Stress the "mutual"—it is the only way to make a successful bargain.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorials entitled "Fairy Tales, the Basis of Our Foreign Policy," of June 27, and "Where Do We Begin Our National Defense?" of July 2, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Salina (Kans.) Journal, June 27, 1969]

FAIRY TALES THE BASIS OF OUR FOREIGN POLICY

How long can the United States operate its foreign policy on the basis of fairy tales?

In essence, this was the question Alf Landon asked in his lecture at Kansas State University earlier this week.

Because Washington has placed its faith in characters that might have come out of the Wizard of Oz, we are in a bushel of trouble, from Vietnam to the Holy Land, from the city ghettos to the market places of Europe and Asia, and in the long stretch of South America.

We have fondly believed we can whip anyone, out-produce anyone, out-bank anyone, out-boss anyone—and we are getting our come-uppance.

At the same time that we seem scared to death of the Russian Dragon breathing the fires of Communism, we act as if China didn't exist.

We burn incense to the Good Fairy Democracy while we cultivate the Dictator Witches.

But ours isn't a Never-Never Land; it's a hard, real world; and Alf Landon thinks we should shape up to it.

First, we should burn our illusions. Our strength is not as the strength of ten, neither is our heart pure.

Having discovered what we actually can do and get away with, we should proceed to do it. This is not isolationism, new or old. It is practical common sense, including acceptance of our limitations.

Landon certainly is not an isolationist. In sum, he believes that, while warily keeping our vitals clutched, we should deal hard-headedly with both China and Russia to restore trade and peace to the world.

And although these three, the United States, Russia and China, are the great powers, they also have their limitations. Even collectively, they are not Imperial Wizards. So we should use our heads and deal with the rest, not as a Good Fairy distributing gold dust and diamond promises, but as a merchant cultivating customers, particularly important ones such as Japan and West Germany.

Perhaps in the dank cellars of the White House or the rooftop cocktail lounge of the State Department a foreign policy of this kind is being shaped. Perhaps. There are few signs of it. The gnomes and fairies are still busy on Capitol Hill and in the Pentagon. Mr. Nixon seems content to apply kisses to the scratches, emporizing, waiting, game playing.

Alf Landon has shown the way out of the picture book department. But articulation of a new foreign policy must come from those with the power to apply it. Until that policy is spelled, proof-read and published, we may expect more nightmares.

[From the Salina (Kans.) Journal, July 2, 1969]

WHERE DO WE BEGIN OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE?

"If we pull out of Vietnam, where do we stop?", a friend asked the other evening.

A better question is: "Where do we begin?"

If the issue is national defense, it involves more than protection of U.S. geography or salvation of disastrous pride.

Because no great nation can live in isolation, we need a world enough at peace so we can trade and communicate with most of it.

We have tried several ways but they have not worked.

Except in some of its humanitarian aspects, the United Nations has been a disappointment. We are far from ready to discard it but we cannot rely upon it.

Collective security treaties as elaborated by the late Foster Dulles have become close to worthless. What nation, including those in the area and directly concerned, has given us more than nominal help in Vietnam? If NATO were put to the test, what would or could it do? The web of treaties seem mostly to entangle, not shield us.

We have discovered to our sorrow that we are not effective world policemen, even upon a selective basis. We saved all of China and are left wet-nursing Formosa. Korea remains a potential bomb; South Korea prospers only because of a constant infusion of our money and troops.

Our tragic Vietnam effort has not deterred the spread of Communism but invited it in Southeast Asia; rather than establish liberty we have created a colonial dictatorship; we may end up having to fight the South Vietnamese as well as the North.

So when do we begin a plan that works?

Not, let me write at once, by razing the Pentagon. Aside from protecting our continental and island possessions, we need to ride shotgun on our lines of communication. A look at the globe tells us this means sea power and air power, not a land expeditionary force.

It is even more important to have something to communicate and parties on the other end of the lines. Whether you like them or not, the other important powers today are chiefly Russia, China, Japan, and West Germany. We don't have to get in bed with them but we can talk and trade with them on a basis of mutual advantage. Stress the "mutual"; it is the only way to make a successful bargain.

This may seem more an expression of greed than of ideals. Perhaps but not necessarily. And it is free from the paranoid fears that have crippled and misled us. What is evil about diminishing poverty and hunger?

This also is a vast over-simplification of the problems. But it is a good premise on

which to begin. To stop the old mistakes is to clear the way for a start.

THE PESTICIDE PERIL—XXIII

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, further evidence of a possible link between cancer and the widespread use of certain persistent pesticides was presented at hearings of a New York State legislative subcommittee yesterday on a proposal to ban DDT, as reported by this morning's New York Times.

Dr. James T. Grace, director of Roswell Park Memorial Institute, told the Environmental Health Subcommittee of the New York State Legislature—just one of the many State legislatures considering proposals to ban DDT and other persistent pesticides—that research done by the institute "indicates certain chlorinated hydrocarbons clearly produced tumors in mice." He warned that if these chemicals create problems in lower forms, then we must be careful on how we gamble on their use in our environment.

The New York State Pesticide Control Board has urged immediate controls of the chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides and a ban on sales of DDT by 1971. The board's action adds to the growing concern in our country and throughout the world for the potential threat to our environment and human health of the continued use of toxic, persistent pesticides.

I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times article, and a second Times article regarding the annual report of Dr. M. G. Candau, Director General of the World Health Organization, in which he cited the continued use of DDT as a disease eradicator and stressed the need to develop substitutes to take the place of chlorinated hydrocarbons in the safeguarding of human health, be placed in the Record at this point.

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

[From the New York Times, July 10, 1969]

SOME PESTICIDES ARE LINKED TO CANCER

(By Bill Kovach)

BUFFALO, July 9.—A possible link between cancer and the widespread use of certain pesticides was added to the growing concern over the use of such chemicals at hearings of a state legislative subcommittee here today.

Dr. James T. Grace, director of Roswell Park Memorial Institute, told the Environmental Health Subcommittee of the State Legislature of soon-to-be published research done by the institute that indicates certain chlorinated hydrocarbons (a class of chemicals included in DDT and a number of other pesticides) "clearly" produced tumors in mice.

"If we find these chemicals create problems in lower forms," Dr. Grace told the legislators, "then we must be extremely careful on how we gamble on their use in our environment."

Though Dr. Grace was careful to draw no direct connection between his research and cancer in humans, he said the lack of detailed knowledge of cause and effect itself was reason for caution in the use of "potent compounds with potent effects which are persistent and whose build-up becomes concentrated."

The testimony came as the subcommittee joined by two other legislative committees concerned with agriculture and conserva-

tion, opened the first of a series of hearings to consider the need for state legislation on pesticide controls.

CONFLICTING VIEWS ON SAFETY

Representatives of government and the chemical industry presented two conflicting pictures of the dangers posed to human welfare by a group of pesticides in wide use, including DDT, Chlordane and Rhothane.

The State Pesticide Control Board recently urged the commissioner of health, agriculture and markets, and conservation to begin immediate controls of this group of pesticides. The board has also called for a ban on sales—except in emergencies—of DDT by 1971 and legislation to require the licensing of all who use such pesticides.

Dr. J. Henry Wills, secretary of the Pesticide Control Board, said the board took the action because it was "disturbed by the possibility of adverse effects of halogenated (or chlorinated) hydrocarbon pesticides on human health." He cited evidence that their "uncontrolled use" could result in a number of diseases in humans.

Later a representative of the Shell Oil Company, which manufactures some pesticides but not DDT, charged that much of the testimony heard by the committee, was "unsubstantiated as far as we're concerned." T. R. Fitzsimmons said his company's pesticide workers who had been exposed to the chemicals for up to 15 years "are among the healthiest employes of our company."

He joined representatives of the New York State Farm Bureau in urging the legislators to "go slow" in the area of controlling or planning pesticide use.

The subcommittee Chairman, Assemblyman Chester R. Hardt, Republican of Williamsville, said the committee would continue the study at meetings to be announced later.

DDT CURB QUESTIONED

(By John H. Fenton)

BOSTON, July 9.—The Director General of the World Health Organization counseled today against restrictions of the pesticide DDT in countries where the eradication of insect-borne diseases was of prime importance.

In his annual report to the 22d assembly of the association, Dr. M. G. Candau, the Director General, said, "We must not forget the enormous benefits insecticides have brought to humanity." Sessions of the assembly opened yesterday at the War Memorial Auditorium and will continue through July 25.

Dr. Candau, a Brazilian, whose country includes jungle territory, told the delegates of more than 100 nations that the concept of malaria eradication rested "completely" on the continued use of DDT.

"The record of the safety of DDT to man has been outstanding in the last 20 years," said Dr. Candau, "and its low cost makes it irreplaceable in public health at the present time."

NEW COMPOUNDS SOUGHT

Limitations in the use of DDT, he went on "would give rise to grave health problems in the majority of the developing countries."

At the same time, Dr. Candau said, the World Health Organization was seeking compounds that might take the place of chlorinated hydrocarbons in public health. He said there was every possibility that effective nonpersistent and economically feasible substitutes might be found.

DDT is a chlorinated hydrocarbon. Its scientific name is dichloro-diphenyl-trichloro-ethane.

Dr. Candau asserted: "I hope that restrictions applied to the use of DDT because of its effects on wild life in some parts of the world where insect-borne diseases are rare will not lead to similar and unjustifiable measures in countries where these diseases are of paramount importance."

In covering a broad field of concern to the organization, Dr. Candau also said that in the effort to improve world health, priority must be given to the manpower situation. The lack of trained personnel, he said, affected both developed and developing countries.

ON NEED FOR DOCTORS

"Physicians in all countries," he went on, "could be used to better advantage if they were relieved of functions that could be carried out by other members of the [health] team."

Dr. William H. Stewart, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, who was elected president of the World Health Organization yesterday, addressed the delegates earlier.

Dr. Stewart said that a minimal goal of the organization was that "no man or population group should be compelled to expose themselves to preventable risk of disease or disability as a condition of employment or as a condition of urban or rural living."

THE GOOD PEOPLE OF BREA, CALIF.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I rise today to express my appreciation for the efforts being made by the good people of Brea, Calif., on behalf of our young Marines at Camp Pendleton 75 miles away. These are the Marines who have fought so heroically in Vietnam, a land half the size of this State in which they were trained. Brea, Mr. President, is a small community of about 16,000 people. But size is no requisite for achievement or compassion. Brea has a big and very warm heart. Brea knows humility, but its story deserves to be told. It deserves to be heard, for I believe all of us can learn even a little from it. Critics and supporters of that far off war will agree, I believe, that there is a significant moral in the story of Brea.

Almost 18 months ago, the people of Brea opened their doors and hearts to Marines who were being sent to Vietnam. They call it the Brea Marine Weekends, and until now more than 3,500 Marines have spent such holidays in 340 homes of Brea. The project has the full support of Brea's city council, its mayor and other members of the city government. It is sponsored by the Brea Congregational Church, whose minister, Charles E. Harlow, says briefly:

This program has been uniquely successful. Lives have been changed—those of the Marines and of the weekend "parents."

Mr. President, one out of every 35 Marines in Vietnam has spent a weekend with a Brea family. And three out of every four of them write to these families from the battlefield. If this is not eloquent testimony to such friendship and compassion then I do not know what is.

Several weeks ago I asked the U.S. Marine Corps headquarters for its comments on the Brea program. Since then I have been informed by the Commandant of the Marine Corps that he has forwarded a certificate of appreciation to the community of Brea for this "outstanding example of unselfish community and public service." The Marine Corps tells:

The program has indeed been of exceptional benefit to the morale of those Marines fortunate enough to participate.

During their 13-month hitches in Vietnam, as I have mentioned, many of these Marines write to their Brea "families." They write: "You mean you really care?" or "Why do you do this?" or "May God bless you." And they write that their weekend visits have led many of them to stop and ponder their future.

Mr. Harlow has expressed concern that he has been unable to find any similar community programs for our servicemen throughout the country. He believes that too often this neglect can make these men feel like second-class citizens when, in fact, we all realize they represent our defensive first line. I join him in the hope that other cities across the country might find merit in the Brea experience which has resulted in such binding ties between our military of whom we ask so much and the civilians they serve so well.

Finally, Mr. President, when these men return home from the war, many of them set aside a few days of their precious leave time to pay return visits to their Brea "family." I hope my distinguished colleagues will join me in saluting these deserving people of Brea.

FORMATION OF THE GEO-TRANSPORT FOUNDATION OF NEW ENGLAND

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues a significant development in the field of high-speed ground transportation.

Announcement is being made today of the formation of the Geo-Transport Foundation of New England, Inc., a private nonprofit group organized to facilitate development of effective high-speed ground transportation services between Boston, my own State of Rhode Island, central Connecticut, and New York City.

I would like to say at the outset, Mr. President, that I have been in close touch with the founders of the Geo-Transport Foundation since the group first met informally more than a year ago as the New England air road study group—NEAR. During the past year I have attended several meetings of the NEAR group. I have encouraged their interest and their efforts toward development of high-speed ground transportation.

I have in the past several Congresses introduced legislation to provide for regional rail passenger service authorities; and as a result of my participation in the NEAR group discussions, I have modified my bill in this Congress to reflect the comments and suggestions offered by members of the group.

It has been for me a most stimulating and encouraging experience, because the NEAR group and the Geo-Transport Foundation represent an awakening on the part of the business community to the prospects and potential of high-speed ground transportation.

Mr. President, the Congress, in 1965, recognized the need for improved public ground transportation by adopting the High Speed Ground Transportation Act. That legislation, in which I am proud to claim a paternal interest, provided for a relatively modest program of research, development, and demonstrations in high-speed ground transportation.

It has been clear from the outset, however, that the Government's role in development of high-speed ground transportation would be a limited one. Indeed, the 1965 act provided what was essentially seed money for research and development in this passenger transportation field in which there had been no significant research and development efforts for the past 50 years.

The program, in short, is designed to provide leadership and stimulation to private enterprise. But if there is to be any significant implementation of high speed ground transportation systems, private industry must play the major role.

I am therefore delighted that this group of responsible and prominent business leaders in the New England area has demonstrated such a deep interest in high-speed ground transportation systems to serve the region.

I would emphasize that this group is composed of experienced business leaders with a vision of the future. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to insert in the RECORD at this point a list of the current members of the Geo-Transport Foundation.

The function of the Geo-Transport Foundation, Mr. President, is viewed as a transitional one. Essentially, the foundation will attempt to devise and lay the groundwork for a new organization or agency that can provide the required coordination and cooperation between public and private sectors.

The ultimate goals of this new agency, as outlined by the Geo-Transport Foundation, are ambitious and far reaching. The new organization would seek: First, to take over and operate intercity railroad passengers services; second, to design, build, and operate a new-technology high-speed ground passenger transport system; third, to effectively blend public and private capital in the conduct of these operations; and, fourth, to be eligible to receive grants from local, State, and Federal transportation assistance programs.

As one who has had a deep and continuing interest in improved rail passenger and high-speed ground transportation services for the people of this country, I am heartened by the formation of the Geo-Transport Foundation. I believe the foundation's program and objectives deserve the most serious and sympathetic consideration by all government and private groups concerned with providing balanced transportation services to meet the transportation needs of the future.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a statement of the background and goals of the Geo-Transport Foundation of New England, Inc., prepared by the foundation.

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

GEO-TRANSPORT FOUNDATION MEMBERS

The members of NEAR and the Geo-Transport Foundation are:

Paul Baran, Treasurer, Institute For The Future, Middletown, Connecticut.

Richard M. Bissell, Jr., Director of Economic Planning, United Aircraft Corp., East Hartford, Connecticut.

Frank P. Davidson, President, Institute For The Future, New York City.

Georges F. Doriot, President, American Research & Development Corp., Boston, Massachusetts.

Byron K. Elliott, Retired Chairman of the Board, John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co., Boston, Massachusetts.

George P. Gardner, Jr., Partner, Paine, Webber, Jackson & Curtis, Boston, Massachusetts.

Charles Jackson, Jr., Attorney, Gaston, Snow, Motley & Holt, Boston, Massachusetts.

Charles L. Miller, Professor of Engineering, M.I.T., Cambridge, Massachusetts.

G. William Miller, President and Chief Executive Officer, Textron, Inc., Providence, Rhode Island.

Ernest B. Tracy, Partner, Dillon, Read & Co., Inc., New York City.

William C. Whittemore, Senior Vice President and Treasurer, John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co., Boston, Massachusetts.

The members have counseled with—
Hon. Claiborne Pell, United States Senate, Washington, D.C.

Walter A. Barry, Jr., Vice President, DeLeuw, Cather & Co., Chicago, Illinois.

T. G. Fellows, Managing Director, Tracked Hovercraft Limited, London, SW 1, England.

John S. Gallagher, Jr., Director of Transportation Research, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, Ohio.

L. M. Horner, Division Vice President, Surface Transportation Systems, Sikorsky Aircraft, Stratford, Connecticut, and various management representatives of the Penn Central Transportation Company.

GEO-TRANSPORT FOUNDATION OF NEW ENGLAND BACKGROUND

The Geo-Transport Foundation started late in 1967 when a group of distinguished New Englanders initiated a series of informal meetings concerning the dilemma posed by the decline of public passenger transportation in New England. Growing highway congestion, the delays and shifting patterns of air service, and the rapid decline of railroad passenger service were visible to everyone, and having an adverse effect upon the economic health of New England. This group, which called itself the New England Air Road (NEAR) Study group, determined to see what could be done to reverse this passenger transport service deterioration.

Initial attention was given to corridor routes linking southern New England with New York. A group of informal studies were undertaken which pulled together previous similar efforts and sought to determine whether it is technically and economically feasible to provide good quality, medium distance intercity ground passenger transportation which could assist in relieving the overburden on local air and highway transport facilities. Whether such a service might assist in the future growth and development of New England was also investigated.

The NEAR Study Group Reached Six Principal Conclusions:

1. The provision of high speed intercity ground transportation services in the corridors between Boston, Providence, Rhode Island-central Connecticut and New York, is an object of established public policy.
2. The United States Department of Transportation's East Coast Corridor Program is conceptually and technically sound, but has been seriously hampered north and east of New York by the lack of an adequate mechanism for implementation.
3. The exigencies of the present situation call for an evolutionary approach, starting with an improvement of existing rail intercity passenger services and progressing through several stages of development to the design, construction and operation of an entirely new high speed ground service utilizing the best of the new technologies.

4. The implementation of such plan requires the active support and cooperation of local, state and federal governments and of private industry. However, no mechanism exists for establishing this essential cooperation and implementing the resulting service.

5. An excellent opportunity exists to construct an international SST jet port in eastern Connecticut-western Rhode Island which could effectively serve Boston and New York, in addition to all of southern New England, if good high speed ground transport service could be available to and from the airport site.

6. There exists a demand for high speed service over shorter route segments (such as Hartford to New York, and Providence to New York) where highways are congested and good air service is expensive to support and difficult to provide. Further, The Boston-New York market is growing so fast there is need right now for a good high speed ground transport system to relieve air and highway congestion, both areas where future major increases in capacity will be difficult and costly to achieve.

The study group reviewed the reports and studies of the U.S. Northeast Corridor Project, the New England Regional Commission, United Aircraft, and others. It also had DeLeuw, Cather & Co., Dillon Read & Co., and Battelle Memorial Institute correlate and review presently available data concerning several service alternatives to get a sense of their probable economic feasibility. These studies indicate that with modest local, state, and federal assistance it would be possible to create and maintain an attractive useful intercity ground passenger transport service on a self-supporting basis in the Boston-New York corridors, both for an interim railroad service and for an ultimate new-technology high speed service.

Informational briefings have been held with several New England governors and senators, and with representatives of the Penn Central Transportation Company. The response has been encouraging.

FORMATION OF GEO-TRANSPORT FOUNDATION

The NEAR study group decided that it could best be of assistance in getting active high speed ground transport development and implementations under way in southern New England by creating an organization which could bring about the necessary coordination and cooperation between the concerned public and private sectors, and by providing a mechanism for implementing resulting plans.

Accordingly, the Geo-Transport Foundation of New England was formed with the specific task of setting up a new agency which can (1) take over and operate intercity railroad passenger services; (2) Design, build and operate a new-technology high speed ground passenger transport system; (3) Effectively blend public and private capital in the conduct of these tasks; (4) Be eligible to receive grants from local, state and federal transportation assistance programs.

The Geo-Transport Foundation of New England is incorporated under the laws of Massachusetts as a not-for-profit organization concerned with the evolutionary development and implementation of high speed intercity ground transport in New England. It is intended to be a regional organization in nature and supported by New England industry and government, and therefore responsive to local interests and concerns.

The GTF is intended as a transitional organization which will bridge the gap between an informal study group and the creation of a new, permanent agency which can actually finance, acquire, build and operate interstate high speed ground passenger transport systems. GTF has as its principal task the creation of this new agency and getting it set up and in business. Blending the interest of the public and private sec-

tors of the economy to provide a mechanism for implementing joint regional federal high speed ground transport programs is a prime goal of GTF.

CURRENT GTF ORGANIZATION AND FUNDING

Initially the Foundation is being supported by principal New England industries. It is desired to have the governments of the New England states represented in and supporting the organization. Application is being made to the New England Regional Commission for funds to support a study of alternative organizational forms for the ultimate agency which will enable it to finance, launch and manage a high speed ground transport service in New England. Funds will be needed from other sources, including state governments, to finance the development of the first two stages of evolutionary service (improved intercity service over existing Penn Central lines, and the institution of modernized railroad passenger service over two routes between Boston and New York) and the correlation of these with regional, state and local transportation plans.

Planning for the new technology high speed route will be initiated after plans are under way for a take-over of existing railroad intercity passenger services.

SHORT RANGE PLANNING

Within the next year the Foundation intends to complete detailed plans for the creation of an organization which can implement the plans being drafted. Hopefully, the resulting organization will combine the interest of local and state governments, and of local industry in designing and operating a service which will be eligible for support by the United States Department of Transportation under plans which have been jointly developed by everyone concerned.

The Foundation also intends to draft work plans for the initial tasks to be undertaken by the new organization, and to initiate discussions with the Penn Central so the new organization can start up with a minimum of lost time and effort.

ILLINOIS DEMONSTRATES STATE RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I am proud to share with my colleagues in the Congress important actions taken by our Illinois State Legislature that are of general interest.

In 1969 in Illinois at least one positive answer has been given to the question of whether State governments will move to shoulder their share of the domestic problems confronting this Nation. In 6 short months, Gov. Richard Ogilvie, with bipartisan support in the general assembly, has coaxed, pushed, and pulled the government of the State of Illinois into a position of leadership.

An effective State government must attack the domestic problems of today. The State must be willing to take on the responsibility of exercising the taxing powers available to it to insure adequate revenues from an equitable tax system. The State must take a positive and aggressive role in those program areas that appropriately are run at the State level. The State must not play simply a caretaker role, on the one hand, nor abdicate its responsibilities by turning continually to the Federal Government for program development and initiative, on the other hand. And perhaps most important, the effective State must use its powers to help local communities in their tasks of providing services and attacking the critical

problems that have become so apparent in recent years.

This is the course that has been laid out for the State of Illinois. While Gov. Richard Ogilvie would be the first to admit that this is only a beginning, the steps made thus far are impressive.

INCOME TAX

Within the restrictive provisions of an archaic State Constitution and in a setting of widespread and longstanding emotional opposition to an income tax, the Ogilvie administration constructed, proposed and steered through the Legislature, working closely with the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, the most significant reform in the State tax structure in the history of Illinois.

The needs of the State and local governments have been met in the past by near-total reliance on regressive sales and property taxes with their attendant hardships on low and fixed income families. The yields from these taxes do not grow in succeeding years commensurate with the increased needs for schools, welfare, and other vital services. Frequent increases in the rates of these taxes over the years has only accentuated the inequities.

The State was fiscally seriously sick and the band-aid palliatives and politically expedient fiscal gimmicks of the past several years were simply not adequate. A bold prescription of unpleasant tasting strong medicine was needed. Governor Ogilvie met that test and brought the State of Illinois into the front-rank of States meeting their responsibilities and meeting the challenge of progressive action.

A 2½-percent flat rate tax on gross income of individuals without any loopholes was enacted. A 4-percent rate was applied to corporations. A liberal \$1,000 exemption for the taxpayer and each dependent is the only deduction provided from adjusted gross income—line 9 of the Federal tax form—in addition, capital gains, dividends, and State and local bond interest are taxed fully as ordinary income. This tax was accepted by the legislature with virtually no alterations to its structure.

REVENUE SHARING

The establishment of a new broadly based source of revenue for the State was accompanied by a specific State-local fiscal partnership by the provision that one-twelfth of the revenues from the tax would be shared by direct per capita distribution to city and county governments. This principle, which many of us have supported and worked for on the Federal level for a Federal-State partnership has become a reality in my home State. This breakthrough is eloquent testimony to the commitment the States are willing to make to the cities in the form of unrestricted block-grants over and above the continuation, and in fact increase, in various existing State-local categorical aid programs.

Illinois also adjusted the sharing of sales tax revenues with the cities by increasing the city share by one-third and decreasing the State portion an equal amount. This greatly adds to the cities'

ability to cope with their own diverse problems as they best see fit under the principles of homerule, and still prevented the onerous sales tax from being raised above its existing 5-cent total.

We in the Federal Government would be well advised to recognize this type of commitment to the levels of government closest to the people and move now in our deliberations on tax reform to include major tax-sharing with the States as an integral part. I am pleased to co-sponsor such legislation and will work with many of my colleagues for its enactment.

MEETING THE NEEDS

Education was rightfully singled out as the first priority of the Ogilvie administration and Illinois this year took a giant step forward in having the State bear a greater proportion of the increasing costs of our schools. State support for schools was increased by over 75 percent and special weighting provisions were added to give additional help to some urban school districts.

Higher education made great advances when the State support for our 2-year community college system was more than doubled and two complete senior universities were established, the first new institutions since 1896.

The most ambitious highway and road-building program in the history of Illinois was authorized by the creation of a Trust Authority empowered to issue \$2 billion in bonds along with increases in various user and license fees.

The necessity to match Federal highway funds has required four-fifths of available revenue sources in Illinois—leaving a small amount for all other State and local roads. This has meant a steady deterioration of that system with over 6,000 miles of roads and over 1,000 bridges below minimum design and safety standards. In addition, a supplemental freeway system of 2,000 miles of new roads is vital to future economic growth and development, especially in the underdeveloped areas of southern and western Illinois where jobs are needed now.

The needs for highway safety will come first in this highway program and something will be done about the carnage on Illinois roads which last year involved 350,000 motor vehicle accidents with 155,000 injuries and 2,500 deaths.

EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT

Upon taking office in January 1969, Governor Ogilvie made a commitment to provide strong central leadership to a State government which in the past has been little more than a collection of autonomous agencies. To carry out this commitment, a bureau of the budget within the executive office of the Governor was established and patterned after our Federal Bureau of the Budget. By agreement with the legislative leadership, the Governor converted the State from a biennial to an annual budget for fiscal year 1970 in order to make the heretofore ritualistic budget process a strong planning and management tool in Illinois.

The Governor's office of human resources was established by executive order to focus top-level attention on the needs of minorities and to expand the

opportunities for all of our citizens. This office constitutes a major commitment by the State to coordinate and implement both OEO and model cities programs and to develop innovative answers with the State to our urban crisis.

Many other steps were taken, both large and small. A full department of law enforcement was established with an IBI modeled after the FBI to wage the war on organized crime in the State. A department of local government affairs was created to consolidate several separate agencies so that municipalities might get one-stop service in dealing with the State and a more efficient partnership developed.

CONCLUSION

The most important message that comes from a review of what has happened in Illinois in the last 6 months is precisely that—a great deal has happened. Gov. Richard B. Ogilvie has led Illinois in a demonstration that State government can be a major positive force in our federal system. He and a majority of legislators in both the State senate and house have shown that a State can face up to its responsibilities—They have had the rugged courage to follow what in their view was the responsible course, politically risky though it may have been.

Strong legislative leadership provided by Representative Ralph T. Smith, speaker of the house, and Senator W. Russell Arrington, president pro tempore and majority leader of the senate, meant that all the creative energies of the State government were harnessed together in common cause. I am very proud of the political courage and high sense of public responsibility which these leaders have shown in Illinois.

The Illinois story is concrete proof of the new and exciting chapters which will be written in the next 4 years in the revitalized partnership of our Federal system.

Illinois has not previously been in the forefront in facing up to its responsibilities. But great progress has been made in this past 6 months that forecasts a better tomorrow for all our citizens and a stronger, more constructive role for the State and its municipalities.

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 (Mr. HUGHES in the chair). The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The ASSISTANT 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 proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the previous order, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to suggest the absence of a quorum, without losing my right to the floor.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The assignment legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, Senator STENNIS on February 28, 1969, appointed me chairman of a special ad hoc Subcommittee on Tactical Air Power of the Armed Services Committee.

Other Members appointed to serve on this subcommittee were Senator SYMINGTON, YOUNG, THURMOND, TOWER, and GOLDWATER.

Senator STENNIS requested that we conduct as searching an inquiry as possible into the request of the military for billions of dollars pertaining to the tactical aircraft of all three services. Specifically, Senator STENNIS requested that we examine the new fighter programs—namely, the Air Force F-15 and the Navy F-14. In addition, he requested that we examine the F-111 program and the many types of tactical air-to-ground missiles that are an important part of our tactical aircraft.

I was pleased and honored to serve as chairman of the Tactical Air Power Subcommittee. We spent many days in receiving extensive briefings from the military. The purpose of these briefings, of course, was to become thoroughly familiar with the intended operational mission of the weapons systems involved; their performance characteristics; whether they are on schedule; the magnitude of the costs involved; and other related matters. In particular, it was our purpose to determine the justification for initiating or continuing the many programs that fall within the sphere of tactical aviation.

I want to say at the outset that tactical aircraft and the related missiles associated with such aircraft is a very broad area and encompasses many types of individual aircraft and missiles.

I believe it would be well to dwell briefly on an explanation of what is meant by tactical aircraft so that the Senators may have an appreciation of the type of military equipment that I am talking about.

The primary objective of tactical air forces is to assist our ground forces in fighting nonnuclear wars. They achieve this objective by performing three essential missions:

First. Air superiority: The most important mission for tactical air forces is to defend our land forces from attack by enemy air forces. This is done by pos-

sessing a superior air-to-air capability over any enemy air force. It is often-times referred to as a "dogfight" capability.

Second. Close air support: Tactical aircraft provide firepower in support of our land forces by inflicting casualties and damage on enemy troops and equipment immediately adjacent to our ground forces.

Third. Interdiction missions: Tactical aircraft are used to restrict and impede the enemy's movement of men and materiel. This is done by striking road and rail networks behind the lines, transportation points, supply depots, air bases, and so forth.

It is important to be aware of the fact that the design requirement for an air superiority aircraft are largely dissimilar from aircraft performing the latter two missions, which are air-to-ground missions. The requirement for air-to-air combat dictates that the aircraft be light, fast, highly maneuverable, and so forth. The requirement for carrying a large number of bombs over long distances on air-to-ground missions generally dictates that these aircraft are heavier, slower, and less maneuverable. As a consequence, these aircraft cannot compete in successful air-to-air combat with enemy dogfighters. To survive, they must operate in what is known as a "permissive air environment."

I will discuss later in my speech the vital need for a new fighter. Before doing so, I would like to mention the specific weapons systems that the Tactical Air Power Subcommittee reviewed; some of the pertinent facts concerning these weapons systems; the recommendations that we made to the full Armed Services Committee; and the final action taken by the Armed Services Committee in respect to our recommendations.

The programs reviewed by the Tactical Air Power subcommittee were: The RF-111, a reconnaissance version of the F-111 aircraft; the light intratheater transport—LIT; the AGM X-3 air-to-ground missile; the Cheyenne helicopter; the F-111 aircraft programs; the AX tactical aircraft; the A-7 tactical aircraft; the A-37 tactical aircraft; the Harrier, a new V/STOL aircraft; the Tow antitank missile; the Condor air-to-ground tactical missile; the Maverick air-to-ground tactical missile; the F-15 new Air Force fighter; the F-14 new Navy fighter; and the A-6 tactical aircraft.

I would now like to discuss very briefly each of these programs for which the services requested very substantial funds in the fiscal year 1970 authorization bill, and the actions taken by the Tactical Air Power Subcommittee.

First. The RF-111: The RF-111 is a reconnaissance version of the F-111 currently being produced for the Air Force. The Air Force requested \$15 million to initiate R. & D. However, our investigation revealed that the total cost for the program would amount to \$821 million. The purpose of the RF-111 was to perform the reconnaissance role for tactical Air Force.

We determined that the Air Force already has purchased 481 RF-4C's; a substantial quantity of RF-101's; the very

effective SR-71's, and also has available other reconnaissance equipment. Therefore, it was our recommendation that the justification for this program lacked sufficient merit in that the value to be realized for this large expenditure was not justified.

It was the feeling of the Tactical Air Power Subcommittee, Mr. President, that this was one of the better illustrations of the proper role that the Congress can play with reference to military programs. Although the request for this year was relatively small, namely, \$15 million, and therefore not nearly as substantial as many other on-going programs, we felt that one of the vital roles we could play was to "nip in the bud" programs of questionable justification before our investment became large. After programs have been underway for several years and the investment in Government funds is high, it is extremely difficult to cancel them. After all, to do so would result in the almost complete loss of our previous investment, with no visible return to our defense establishment through increased readiness. This type of decision is all the more difficult where the remaining funds needed to complete are relatively small when compared with large prior expenditures. That is why the Tactical Air Power Subcommittee concentrated particularly hard on those programs that the military desired to initiate this year but whose ultimate expenditure over future years would amount to billions of dollars.

The full Armed Services Committee agreed with our recommendation to delete the \$15 million requested to initiate R. & D. for the F-111. Denying the initiation of this program will result in a total savings to the Government of at least \$821 million.

Second. LIT—Light intratheater transport—was a proposal by the Air Force to develop a new tactical airlift aircraft to replace the C-123 and the C-130 aircraft in the mid 1970's. It was to be a tilt-wing, turbo-prop aircraft. The request by the Air Force was small, namely only \$1 million for R. & D.

The Tactical Air Power Subcommittee recommended that funds for this aircraft be denied, and the full committee agreed with our recommendation. The reason for our action was twofold:

First, the C-130 has done an excellent job in meeting this mission requirement in Vietnam and the Department of Defense indicated that, if necessary, it could continue to rely on this aircraft in the 1970's.

Second, the tilt-wing concept of aircraft appeared to our committee to be questionable technologically. Well over \$100 million was spent to build five XC-142 tilt-wing aircraft. Four of the five crashed. Further, Air Force testimony indicated that the fate of nearly every V/STOL aircraft we have built has been the same—they have crashed. Therefore, although the funds request was small, we denied the request. It is extremely important to note that the total cost of this program would have been \$437 million as a minimum for R. & D. alone. No production costs were available, but it is thoroughly reasonable to conclude that the total cost for this pro-

gram would have exceeded \$1 billion once production costs were included.

Third. The AGM X-3 is a new tactical air-to-ground, standoff missile. The Air Force requested \$3 million to initiate R. & D. The committee denied the request for \$3 million, and the full Armed Services Committee supported our recommendation.

The primary reason for our denial of the fund request was the fact that all three services currently have a large family of air-to-ground missiles either in being or in R. & D., including the Tow, Walleye, Bullpup, Maverick, Condor, Shrike, Standard Arm, and so forth.

The Tactical Air Power Subcommittee felt that before any new additional air-to-ground missile development work should be undertaken, that the Department of Defense should study thoroughly the entire family of air-to-ground tactical missiles for all three services. In addition, we felt that the Department of Defense should analyze all existing programs to determine if the requirements for each type is still valid and to insure the elimination of any duplication of military effort.

We did recognize that the AGMX-3 had some proposed performance characteristics that were different from our existing family of weapons. However, we were not persuaded that these few characteristics were sufficient to justify starting out on a program that would cost at least \$200 million for R. & D. alone. The Air Force had no cost information on how much it would cost to produce these missiles. The ultimate cost of this program unquestionably would exceed \$500 million, and therefore we felt that the ramifications of cancelling a \$3 million request for this item in fiscal year 1970 was significant indeed.

Fourth. The Cheyenne: The Cheyenne is a rigid rotor helicopter being developed by the Army for the close air support of its ground forces. They intended to buy 375 Cheyennes. As a matter of fact, 10 test aircraft have been produced, and one of them recently crashed. The program encountered serious technical difficulties. As a result, the Army recently decided to cancel the production contract with the Lockheed Aircraft Corp.

The Tactical Air Power Subcommittee took note of the Army's decision to cancel the contract, and subsequently the full Armed Services Committee eliminated the entire \$429 million contained in the Army's request for the Cheyenne program.

The Army desires to continue R. & D. on the Cheyenne aircraft. However, its request to continue R. & D. came after the Tactical Air Power Subcommittee had completed its deliberations. Therefore, all funds with respect to this aircraft had been eliminated.

I think it would be fair to say, however, that the Tactical Air Power Subcommittee would favor continuing the R. & D. at some reasonable level, because this aircraft represents a quantum jump in the state of the art. Also, it would not seem reasonable to merely junk the nine existing aircraft which we already have paid for. However, as I stated, the Army's revised request for

funds was received too late to take action thereon, and all money for the Cheyenne was removed from the bill.

Fifth. The F-111: The F-111 aircraft is the Air Force version of the TFX. The original design mission for this aircraft was the low level delivery of nuclear bombs. In 1964 it was given an additional interdiction mission to deliver general purpose bombs. It is the only Air Force tactical aircraft fully capable of operating at night and in all weather conditions. The present program calls for the purchase of 550 operational aircraft. These aircraft will cost \$6.667 billion—\$1.569 billion for R. & D. and \$5.089 billion for production. The average unit cost is \$12.5 million each, including R. & D., compared with the original estimated cost of \$3.4 million each, made in November 1963.

The subcommittee of course examined in some detail the reasons for the substantial increase in costs. They are as follows: A reduction in the overall program from 1,388 to 550 aircraft; a reduced production rate; many configuration changes to the aircraft; the purchase of different models; drastic inflation during the past 4 years; and contractual underestimation of cost.

The subcommittee deliberated at considerable length relative to this program. It concluded that the request of the Air Force for \$800.2 million, including \$73 million for R. & D., \$71.4 million for overruns, and \$655.8 million for 68 aircraft, was justified. We were persuaded by the fact that it is the only aircraft that can perform tactical missions at night and in all weather, and has the longest range of any other tactical aircraft. This is an extremely important role for tactical aircraft to perform.

Quite obviously we cannot dictate visual or good weather during periods of conflict with an enemy. We must have an aircraft that can perform at night and in bad weather. No one regrets the cost increases more than I do.

There is one special area relative to the F-111 that the subcommittee also analyzed in detail. That is the rather well publicized Mark II avionics for the F-111D model. The F-111A is equipped with the Mark I avionics, costing about \$400,000 each.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield at that point?

Mr. CANNON. I would prefer, if the Senator would not mind, to go through my entire statement and then I will submit to questions on all parts of it.

Mr. GORE. I do not quite understand the term "avionics." I wonder would the Senator explain that to me?

Mr. CANNON. Avionics consist of the sophisticated electronic gear in the aircraft which permits it to carry out its navigational mission, its bombing mission, and so forth. It makes it possible to go to a preselected point and to get there with pinpoint accuracy in the performance of the mission and to return. That is generally referred to in the term of "avionics."

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, it was decided by the Department of Defense to purchase a new Mark II avionics for the F-111D in order to give it the ac-

curacy required to drop conventional bombs. It was estimated to cost \$750,000 per aircraft. The present cost is about \$2 million per aircraft. We registered our vital concern relative to the cost of the Mark II system with the Air Force. Subsequently, the Air Force stated that it intended only to buy those Mark II's which already are under contract and for which funds already have been previously appropriated. Therefore, it was our feeling that approximately \$85 million could be removed from the fiscal year 1970 authorization request for this aircraft, or that additional F-111's could be purchased with this money. The Air Force felt that only about \$60 million could be saved by not purchasing new additional Mark II avionics sets.

The final action taken by the Armed Services Committee was to direct the Air Force to not purchase any additional Mark II sets with fiscal year 1970 funds and to take this money and purchase additional F-111 aircraft therewith.

The Air Force presently is determining the amount of money that can be applied to additional F-111 aircraft procurement and also what type of modified avionics system will subsequently be installed on the remaining F-111D aircraft.

I would like to add that the cost figures that I have mentioned previously refer only to the F-111 A/E/D. We did not analyze the FB-111 program, which is a strategic bomber version of the F-111 and which involves an additional \$1 billion.

I also should point out that the spare parts cost for the F-111 tactical fighter aircraft is now estimated at \$532.7 million. The total estimated cost of the 550 F-111 tactical fighter, including spare parts, will be \$7.2 billion.

Sixth. AX: The AX is a new tactical aircraft proposed by the Air Force to supply close air support for Army ground forces. The Air Force requests \$12 million to initiate research and development this year. The Tactical Air Power Subcommittee recommended, and the Armed Services Committee approved, this request.

During our briefings it was apparent that the Cheyenne helicopter and the AX aircraft were clearly competitive for the same mission. It was clear to the members that we definitely would not support both of these programs because we felt that both of them were not justified. However, when the Army canceled the Cheyenne helicopter program and after independently reviewing the proposed AX program, we recommended that funds for it be authorized.

It is quite clear that today and in the near future there is a distinct requirement for aircraft specifically designed for the close air support mission. Today in Vietnam we are using multipurpose aircraft such as the A-6, A-7, A-37, F-100, and even the F-4 to perform this role in addition to Army helicopter gun ships. The Air Force states that it will use existing technology and anticipates that the aircraft can be developed quickly and without substantial difficulty. The total research and development costs are estimated at \$137 million which appears high. The total estimated production costs, including spare

parts and support equipment, will be \$1.33 billion. Therefore, the total program cost estimate is \$1.467 billion. This is a substantial sum as the members know and, if the program is pursued to completion, will buy slightly less than 1,000 aircraft.

The Air Force estimates that this aircraft can be purchased for approximately \$1.2 to \$1.3 million each.

We have today no specialized aircraft to perform this role. It was the opinion of the subcommittee that we should have such an aircraft for the 1970's. We felt that during the past few years we have concentrated too much on the "multipurpose" aircraft which has degraded our aircraft in the performance of their primary mission. It is just not possible to build one aircraft to perform several missions. Too many compromises are built into the aircraft and, furthermore, numerous additional costs are involved.

Seventh. A-7: The A-7 is a single-seat, single-engine tactical aircraft developed by the Navy for both close air support and interdiction missions. Both the Navy and the Air Force are purchasing this aircraft. The Air Force requested \$348.2 million to purchase 128 aircraft, and \$26.5 million for long-lead items. The Navy requested 27 aircraft to cost \$99.6 million, and \$4.4 million for long-lead items.

It was clear from Air Force testimony that they are not enthusiastic about the A-7 aircraft. It was clear, further, that former civilian officials in the Department of Defense had been very enthusiastic about this aircraft because it was supposed to be economical. Originally, it was to cost slightly over \$1.2 million. Its present cost approximates \$3 million which is comparable to the present cost of the F-4 fighter aircraft. It is clear that the F-4 is our only air superiority-type aircraft. The Chief of Staff of the Air Force testified that the F-4 could perform the close air support and interdiction missions almost as well, if not as well, as the A-7. Therefore, in view of the Air Force's complete lack of enthusiasm for this aircraft, the subcommittee removed all A-7 funds from the Air Force fiscal year 1970 request, amounting to \$374.7 million. We authorized the Air Force to buy 120 F-4 aircraft for the \$348.2 million and to use the \$26.5 million for long-lead items for the F-4.

The Air Force has already received funds for 74 A-7 aircraft. However, very few of them have been delivered. Most of them are in the very early stages of production. As a result, we denied the Navy's request for 27 aircraft, costing \$99.6 million and the \$4.4 million for long-lead items. We requested the Department of Defense to make the necessary budgetary and other arrangements to permit the Navy to receive out of the previously funded Air Force money the equivalent number of A-7's which would have been procured under the Navy's request in this bill.

The committee, of course, had nothing against the A-7 aircraft. However, its prime mission is to deliver heavy bomb loads over long distances. It does require a permissive air environment in which to operate because it cannot conduct an effective air battle with an enemy fighter.

We therefore agreed with the Air Force position that our national defense would be better served by purchasing the F-4 rather than the A-7. Also most importantly we believe that additional costs incurred, if any, would be nominal indeed.

Subsequent to the testimony by the Chief of Staff of the Air Force the committee eliminated all A-7 procurement and recommended purchase of F-4 aircraft instead. I should add that the Chief of Staff of the Air Force called on me yesterday to furnish information recently developed by the Air Force.

The information indicates that after a new reappraisal, for various reasons, including financial, the Air Force prefers to continue purchasing A-7's. I have not had time to completely evaluate this most recent Air Force information nor to discuss it with other members of the subcommittee and am not prepared to make any other recommendation. I firmly support the committee's position.

Eight. A-37: The A-37 is a tactical aircraft being purchased by the Air Force for the close air support role. It is a modified T-37-B which is a twin jet trainer aircraft. The Congress has already authorized funds for several squadrons which are to be turned over to the Vietnamese Air Force. The \$38.5 million that the Air Force requested in fiscal year 1970 for 96 A-37-B's were for active Air Force units. However, deliveries of these aircraft would not commence until late 1970. More important, their use in the active Air Force is planned to be confined to Southeast Asia because of their relatively limited capabilities. Upon termination of the war in South Vietnam they are to be turned over to the Air National Guard. The Tactical Air Power Subcommittee, with the subsequent concurrence of the full Armed Services Committee, reduced the request of the Air Force from 96 to 36 A-37's. We felt that introducing large numbers of these limited capable aircraft into the inventory was not justified. Therefore, the Air Force request was reduced by \$22.5 million from \$38.5 million to \$16 million.

Ninth. Harrier: The Harrier is a V/STOL aircraft developed by Hawker-Siddeley in England which the Marine Corps desires to purchase. It requested \$57.6 million for 12 aircraft. The Tactical Air Power Subcommittee reviewed this program in considerable detail. One of the very attractive features of this program is the fact that it will require no research and development funds. The aircraft has already been developed. The Marine Corps will conduct extensive operational tests with the 12 aircraft. They persuaded us of the merit of this program because of the aircraft's ability to operate from small helicopter-type landing pads whether these pads are on land or on board ship.

Another persuasive factor relative to this request is that the Marine Corps gave up the purchase of 17 F-4's for a comparable amount of money. Therefore, additional Government funds were not involved.

The Tactical Air Power Subcommittee felt that, inasmuch as the military has never had any V/STOL operational air-

craft, this program should be pursued to determine once and for all the military advantages of this type of aircraft. All previous V/STOL aircraft were R. & D. prototypes.

We were concerned about the balance-of-payments aspects. The Marine Corps assured us that it had studied this aspect thoroughly and made the necessary arrangements so the balance-of-payments impact would be negligible, if any.

Tenth. Tow: The Tow is a wire-guided antitank missile. It also has capability against hard targets. The Army requested \$2.1 million for research and development and \$156 million for procurement. The subcommittee was impressed with the capabilities of this missile, which can be used on the ground and was also planned to be installed on the ill-fated Cheyenne helicopter.

The subcommittee did feel that the Army was building up too rapidly the quantities of these missiles to be purchased. Therefore, we recommended, and the Armed Services Committee concurred, a reduction of \$14 million from the procurement request; namely, from \$156 to \$142 million.

This is another in the large family of tactical missiles launched both from the air and from the ground which we felt the military might well be buying excessive types and quantities. Therefore, I am herewith requesting that the military completely review this family of weapons.

Eleventh. Condor: The Condor is an air-to-ground tactical missile being developed by the Navy. The Navy requested \$12.9 million to continue research and development. This program is over 1 year behind schedule because of technical difficulties. We were extremely concerned about this schedule slippage and whether or not this missile will be a successful addition to our military arsenal. We did not feel it wise to deny the \$12.9 million which would in effect cancel the program, inasmuch as we have already invested over \$100 million. The current estimate is that total research and development will cost \$15 million.

If significant progress is not made this year on this program then I would certainly recommend a searching reappraisal next year, and specifically before we authorize any production funds for this missile.

Twelfth. Maverick: The Maverick is the new air-to-ground tactical missile being developed by the Air Force to kill enemy tanks and small fixed targets. The Air Force requested \$39.6 million to continue research and development in fiscal year 1970. The Tactical Air Power Subcommittee and the full Armed Services Committee approved continuation of this program. Three primary reasons for the Maverick are that, first, it can attack at lower altitudes and has a better range-speed capability; second, being a smaller weapon, more missiles per aircraft can be carried, and third, being a smaller weapon, it is less expensive.

The total research and development program is estimated at \$142.8 million, of which \$70 million has been authorized in prior years. The total production cost is estimated at \$306 million. Our concern is not with the Maverick but the

principle that the services purchase fewer types of air-to-ground missiles. This is an additional missile in the family of air-to-ground missiles. I am herewith requesting the Department of Defense to analyze it thoroughly to see if there is any duplication with other programs. This program is on schedule and therefore we authorized funds for it to continue in research and development.

Thirteenth. A-6: The A-6 is a tactical aircraft developed for the Navy. It is the Navy's only night, all-weather capable aircraft. They requested \$62.5 million for 12 aircraft. It has proven itself in many combat sorties over North Vietnam. The Navy requested 12 aircraft for attrition; namely, to replace forecasted losses. We were impressed with its combat performance and authorized the aircraft.

Mr. President, because of their importance, I left the following programs until last: The Air Force's F-15 and the Navy's F-14. The F-15 is a new air-to-air superiority fighter to be developed for the Air Force. It is to be operational by 1975 and will replace the F-4. The Air Force's request was for \$175 million to initiate research and development in fiscal year 1970. The total program will cost an estimated \$5.14 billion, including \$1.080 billion for research and development and \$4.060 billion for production, spares, and ground support equipment. The estimated unit cost is \$10 million per aircraft.

The F-14 is a new air superiority fighter being developed for the Navy. It also must perform the Fleet Air Defense mission that was intended to be performed by the F-111B. The F-14A will use the P-12 engine and the Phoenix missile developed for the F-111B. The F-14B will incorporate a new advanced technology engine which will also be the same basic engine to be used on the Air Force F-15. The F-14C will have new avionics. It is to be a variable sweep-wing aircraft with a two-man crew. The Navy requested \$464 million; namely, \$225 million for research and development, and \$239 million for procurement, including six aircraft. The total estimated cost for the F-14 program including all three models will be \$6.4 billion, including \$1.3 billion for research and development and \$5.1 billion for production cost to purchase 463 aircraft. The cost per aircraft including research and development is estimated at \$15 million.

Mr. President, I would now like to discuss why, in my opinion, it is so critical that the United States pursue the development of these two aircraft and why we need to commence these programs this year when economic considerations are so important. To be able to fight a successful conventional war it is essential that we have an air superiority aircraft that can dominate the battlefield. This requires an aircraft that can meet and defeat any enemy aircraft in air-to-air battle. This in turn permits our other tactical aircraft to support our ground forces by bombing enemy troops, supply lines, etc. Without an air superiority fighter capable of protecting all of our other tactical aircraft which require a

"permissive" air environment we would be faced with a very dangerous situation.

The only aircraft in our inventory today with an acceptable air-to-air combat capability is the F-4. This aircraft has proven to be an excellent weapon system. However, it is critically important to recognize that its technology dates back to 1955. In an age of rapidly advancing technological achievements, it is not only questionable but doubtful that it could cope successfully with potential adversary aircraft in the mid-1970's.

The most likely enemy air superiority aircraft threat today is the MIG-21. Extensive testimony by the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee last year established that the F-4 was at least equal in performance to the MIG-21 at normal fighting altitudes. Our best military experts state that today, therefore, there is relative equality between the F-4 and the MIG-21.

We are then faced with several important issues: What has the Soviet Union done recently and what will it do in the future with respect to fighter aircraft development? Most importantly, what air-to-air fighter capability will the Soviets possess by the mid-1970's? Can the United States continue to rely upon the F-4 in the mid-1970's? The answer provided by all recognized experts is that the F-4 will be technologically outmoded by the mid-1970's and, therefore, we cannot rely upon the F-4 to achieve or maintain supremacy in air-to-air combat with a potential enemy.

The informed experts agree that an aircraft designed on a technology of the 1955 time frame will be totally inadequate to cope with the highly sophisticated aircraft of potential enemies in the mid-1970's. As the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee's report unanimously concluded in October 1968:

We have grave concern over the ability of the United States to establish and maintain control of the air during the 1970's.

It is well recognized that if the air space is controlled, then the battle area and surrounding terrain is controlled. If the airspace is not controlled, especially against a first-class airpower, then tactical aircraft designed for air-to-ground roles will be relatively ineffective in the performance of their missions. Even modern aircraft designed for air-to-ground roles require a "permissive" air environment, that is, no heavy enemy fighter opposition, if they are to carry out their mission with success.

The committee is compelled to point out that for the last few years the United States has concentrated on the development of "multipurpose" missions, including air-to-air combat and air-to-ground missions. The requirements for an aircraft to be capable of performing "multipurpose" missions unquestionably compromises an aircraft in the performance of its primary mission, irrespective of the nature of its primary mission. It is the committee's judgment that we now concentrate on the development of the fighter aircraft specially configured and confined to the "air superiority" role. We have long neglected undertaking a new

program in this area, relying exclusively on the capability of the F-4.

Now let us examine in unclassified form the development by the Soviet Union to improve on the Mig-21 which we already stated is equal in fighting performance to our F-4.

The Soviets since 1955 have flown 18 new models of modern-type aircraft. Obviously, not all of these different models will go into production or become operational. However, it does afford the Soviets with a wide selection of high performance flying prototypes from which it can select the very best for production.

Seven of the 18 new models were seen for the first time by the free world at the July 1967 Moscow airshow. It was at this show that we first saw the Foxbat, the present holder of the world's speed record. Intelligence sources estimated that at least three of the new fighters seen for the first time at that airshow are currently in or will go to production.

It is a well-established fact that during the past decade the Soviet Union has introduced at least one new type operational fighter every 2 years. A total of six, with 11 models; namely, five models of the Mig-21 Fishbed; two models of the Fishpot, one model each of the Fitter, Firebar, Fiddler, and the Flagon.

It is also well established that the Soviet Union has concentrated its development and production efforts on tactical aircraft specifically oriented for the air superiority role. In general, this means it concentrates on aircraft that are light, fast, and highly maneuverable.

In contrast, with Soviet emphasis on producing many types of aircraft devoted to control of the air, the United States has developed and is relying completely on only one air superiority weapon system—the F-4.

It is fundamental to conclude that the new Soviet aircraft flown in 1967 by the Soviets are and will be superior to the Mig-21. Further, when they become operational they will be superior to the F-4. After all, a nation with its eyes on the future and on what potential adversaries may do will not develop new weapon systems that are inferior to existing models.

It is important to note that all seven types of tactical aircraft flown by the Soviet Union at its July 1967 airshow were designed before 1964. It is extremely reasonable to assume that the Soviets since the airshow have continued its design efforts to improve upon the impressive aircraft flown at the 1967 airshow. It is also reasonable to assume that new and improved types are now being flown or are in advanced stages of development. The U.S.S.R. does not make frequent announcements of its progress in aircraft or other military fields of endeavor.

I earnestly believe that the high level of effort being undertaken by the Soviets during the past few years and a conservative assessment of its future activities dictates that the United States must, of necessity, seriously concern itself today with the development of new air superiority fighter aircraft.

A modern fighter takes several years to develop and produce. This is an inevitable and inescapable fact. Therefore,

even though it is decided to approve and fund a new fighter today, it will be 1975 before it is operational. There is one exception to this rule: The F-14A will be operational at a substantially earlier date because it will use the existing engine and avionics technology developed for the F-111B program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief question at that point?

Mr. CANNON. I would prefer not to yield until I have completed my statement. Then I shall be happy to yield for questions on anything I have pointed out.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Very well. I did not know which the Senator preferred.

Mr. CANNON. It is important to point out that the United States and its free world allies have approximate numerical parity in tactical aircraft with the Soviet Union and other Communist aligned nations.

People also will ask the logical question: Why do we need both the F-14 and the F-15?

I would like to state that the F-15 will be developed by the Air Force for the sole mission of achieving a maximum air-to-air capability. As such it will be light, fast, and highly maneuverable. Most importantly, it would not be able to operate from an aircraft carrier. If it were given this assignment, it would of necessity have to be structurally substantially heavier and it would be compromised in other respects in order to have the necessary operating characteristics required by the Navy. The F-15 will also have only a single pilot and will have the minimum avionics necessary to perform its mission.

The F-14 Navy fighter of necessity must be designed structurally to operate from a carrier. Anyone who has witnessed carrier landings and catapult launchings will recognize the structural integrity requirements for such an aircraft. Also, most importantly, the operating environment of carrier task forces requires that the F-14 must perform the fleet air defense mission. This requires that it be able to fly long distances and to loiter for substantial periods to protect the carrier against incoming enemy bombers, fighter aircraft, missiles, and so forth. It also requires a more sophisticated avionics system to detect incoming enemy aircraft.

The F-14 will fill the role of the canceled F-111B in performing the fleet air defense mission and the F-14B will replace the F-4 fighter aircraft in the air superiority role in the mid-1970's. The Navy has limited space aboard its carriers. Therefore, it must design its fighter aircraft to perform multiple missions. The threat it faces includes not only attacks from bombers and missiles but from highly maneuverable fighters as well. The Navy must defend against this multiple threat with limited numbers of fighters. Therefore, this forces their design to accommodate the multiple capabilities required. As a result, the Navy F-14 will be a larger aircraft with two crewmembers. It is unnecessary and would be very unwise to install these various requirements into the Air Force's F-15.

An important factor in developing both aircraft is that we will have two air superiority aircraft in case either program should run into unforeseen difficulties during research and development. Perhaps the most important factor is that each service will have an aircraft optimized for its own operational environment without compromise to the other. The F-111 is a classic example of compromise—neither the Navy nor the Air Force realized the performance goals which were originally envisioned for that aircraft.

It is also significant that the advanced technology engine presently under competitive development will be basically the same for both the F-14B and the F-15. A common engine makes sense but a common airframe does not.

In conclusion, Mr. President, with respect to the actions of the Tactical Airpower Subcommittee and the Armed Services Committee, I feel it is imperative to point out to the Members precisely what our national policy is. It is that our military forces are charged with the responsibility of being able to fight a war of indefinite duration in Asia—as we are currently doing in South Vietnam—and at the same time have the capability to wage a large-scale conventional NATO war for a stipulated period of time. The exact duration is classified. The responsibility of the Military Establishment is to insure that we have on hand sufficient military forces and hardware at all times to successfully carry out this very important responsibility. If we do not provide our military leaders with sufficient forces to meet our stated national policy objectives then I feel it essential that, first, our stated national policy objectives should be changed or, second, we should recognize that national policy objectives may exist which the military is incapable of carrying out. I feel, Mr. President, this is a most important principle which must be understood by all the Members of Congress. Reducing the Military Establishment in funds is a desirable objective but we must know what risk we will run when we do so. I am not stating that the funds requested by the military are sacrosanct or justified, but I do feel they should be scrutinized most carefully before reductions are made. It was with this guiding principle in mind that the Tactical Airpower Subcommittee acted under the mandate from Senator STENNIS and did its very best to conduct a conscientious review of the military programs presented to it.

In summary, Mr. President, we reviewed 15 major programs in detail. We reduced the authorization request in the tactical area by \$588.5 million. I would like to emphasize that three of the programs that we refused the military permission to initiate R. & D.; namely, the RF-111, the Light Intratheater Transport, and the AGM X-3, that although only \$18 million was requested and denied for these three programs in fiscal year 1970, that the total cost of these three programs if they had been permitted to proceed to completion would have cost the Government over \$2.3 billion.

STATEMENT ON ADVANCED MANNED STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT

Mr. President, at this point I would like to make a short statement relative to the action taken by the Armed Services Committee on the AMSA—Advanced Manned Strategic Aircraft.

The budget, as revised by Secretary Laird and as approved by the committee, contains \$95.2 million in research and development funds for AMSA. If this is approved by the Congress, the fiscal year 1970 AMSA program will be \$100.2 million since an additional \$5 million is available from fiscal year 1969 funds.

The AMSA development which Secretary Laird approved in March 1969 would lead to an operational capability in the latter half of the 1970 decade. AMSA, in the opinion of the committee, will be badly needed at that time as a replacement for the aging B-52 G and H modles.

I should want to emphasize, however, that the approval of fiscal year 1970 budget request does not commit the United States either to full-scale development or to production and deployment of AMSA. It does accelerate the engineering and development process. It does not provide funds for a full-scale development contract.

I assure the Senate that the planned AMSA program includes a number of milestones at which the progress of the program can be assessed and decisions made as to whether the program should continue as planned. The Defense Department plans to use these reviews to take advantage of all technological advances up to that point and to reconsider our approach in the light of the updated information on the likely threat.

The basic reason for commencing the AMSA program is to maintain a flexible overall strategic force, taking account of any possible vulnerability of any part of our missile force, and thereby complicate Soviet defense plans by our progress toward a new bomber with improved penetration capability.

AMSA will contribute to the attainment of U.S. military and political objectives by the controlled application of offensive airpower over the complete range of possible conflict situations, either conventional or nuclear.

Studies have shown that the most cost-effective approach to maintaining our general war assured destruction and damage-limiting capabilities in the face of Soviet advanced defenses is a mixed force of bombers and missiles. A mixed force insures against unexpected Soviet developments or tactics that might reduce the deterrent or war-fighting value of either bombers or missiles alone. A mixed force minimizes any relative Soviet advantage in a protracted but limited nuclear exchange.

In addition, a requirement for selective response and precision delivery may exist in either a nuclear or a nonnuclear conflict where constraints preclude the commitment of U.S. missile forces. Studies, including our experience in Vietnam, have demonstrated that large, high performance bombers can provide cost-effective augmentation of our general purpose forces in nonnuclear conflicts.

Since AMSA is a completely new de-

sign, its physical characteristics can be tailored to assist in penetration. It is difficult now to determine just what will be done in this area, and how the actions will contribute to penetrability. However, the problem will be thoroughly investigated before the final design of AMSA is frozen for the purpose of insuring that the best trade-offs of survivability and penetration are made.

The committee has recommended that the entire amount in fiscal year 1970 for AMSA be approved and we hope that this will be sustained by the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I commend not only the distinguished Senator from Nevada, but also the full committee for the splendid work he and the members of the committee have done since they started on the mission in about the middle of February. The Senator from Nevada has taken the lead in it, but every other committee member has made a very substantial contribution.

We have in this analysis of the work of the Senator one of the fine presentations of the year in the military field, a fine analysis, a fine summary, and, I think, sufficiently sound conclusions.

I wish there had been time—but the Senator did not have time—to have copies of the speech available in advance so that it could have been studied and followed by Senators as it was delivered. I will point out quite briefly a few of the items the Senator did go into.

First, on page 6 of the copy I have, the Senator analyzes the problem that goes with AGM X-3. The Senator makes recommendations in connection with that. Even though only \$3 million is involved now, it was a very fine piece of work the Senator did.

I refer now to page 25 of my copy, near the end of the speech, where the Senator points out that the actual operations of the committee on the bill reduced it by \$588 million. The potential costs of the programs would have been \$2.3 billion.

As a Member of the U.S. Senate, that is my idea of the way to get at a number of these expensive programs and nip them in the bud if they are not needed, if they are duplicative, or if they do not show prospect.

I want to have our feelings about the entire bill reflected here and show what has been done by all the committee members who have worked on the matter.

I note what the Senator said about the AMSA, and I know he made a contribution there, even though that was not a subject that the subcommittee had a chance to get into fully.

The Senator is, of course, eminently qualified to speak on that item, but the funds in the bill do not commit Congress to that bomber program beyond the research and development.

That is what the Senator has spelled out here as I understand it. Am I correct?

Mr. CANNON. The Senator is correct. Previously a letter from Secretary Foster to the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIER) was printed in the CONGRES-

SIONAL RECORD. That letter made the situation absolutely clear that this was no production program, that this did not authorize production and did not authorize contract definition.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator again and point out that the ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND), who served on the subcommittee, is going to seek the floor shortly.

Mr. President, the printed record released today of hearings on Intelligence and the ABM before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has been cited by the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as evidence there is disagreement between Secretary of Defense Laird and Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Mr. Helms, in their assessment of the strategic threat which makes the ABM necessary.

The distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee maintains that the testimony now of record tends to establish a disagreement between the intelligence estimates of the Department of Defense and the CIA. I have not seen the testimony and therefore do not comment on it. However, after several press reports on the alleged disagreements appeared at the time I was preparing, as chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, for debate of the Defense authorization bill, it became clear to me that the Members of the Senate should have available for their consideration the assessment of the strategic threat and that we should know the extent of agreement or disagreement on the threat between the Department of Defense and the CIA.

For that reason, I wrote to Secretary Laird, asking him to state his definition of the threat and whether his definition and evaluation is concurred in by the CIA, particularly Mr. Helms. At the same time, I wrote to Director Helms, asking him to respond appropriately indicating his agreement or disagreement with Mr. Laird's response.

Both Secretary Laird and Mr. Helms have replied and both have made it clear there is no disagreement between them as to the strategic threat.

This makes it very clear to me and I hope to other Senators that there is no disagreement on this intelligence issue. I ask unanimous consent that my letters to Secretary Laird and Mr. Helms and their replies to me be placed in the RECORD at this point.

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

JULY 3, 1969.

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Secretary of Defense, The Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In preparation for Senate debate on the Defense Department Authorization bill which will include authorization of funds for the Anti-Ballistic Missile System, it is important that I know the assessment of the Intercontinental Ballistic missile threat and the degree of agreement, or disagreement within the intelligence community.

Therefore, I would appreciate your immediately providing me with the following:

(a) Your definition and evaluation of the ICBM threat facing the United States from any and all nations.

(b) Whether your definition and evaluation is concurred in by the Central Intelligence Agency, particularly Mr. Richard Helms, Director, and if there is disagreement, to what extent and in what regard.

With best wishes, I am.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN STENNIS,
Chairman, Senate Armed Services Committee.

JULY 3, 1969.

Mr. RICHARD HELMS,
Director,
Central Intelligence Agency,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HELMS: The enclosed letter to Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird is self-explanatory.

I emphasize the necessity of having for the debate on the Defense Authorization bill the assessment of the Intercontinental Ballistic Missile threat and whether or not there is disagreement within the intelligence community, particularly, as between the Department of Defense and the C.I.A.

Therefore, I would greatly appreciate if you would respond appropriately after consultation with Secretary Laird indicating your agreement or disagreement with any aspects of his response.

With every good wish, I am

Sincerely yours,

JOHN STENNIS,
Chairman,
Senate Armed Services Committee.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., July 8, 1969.

HON. JOHN C. STENNIS,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Service, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am pleased to have this opportunity to respond to your letters of July 2nd and July 3rd. In your letter of the 2nd, you refer to certain newspaper accounts quoting members of the Foreign Relations Committee to the effect that I had changed my position concerning a potential first strike threat from the Soviet Union during the period of the mid-1970s. Let me first state categorically that my position on this matter has not changed. As a matter of fact my concern about the Soviet threat to our deterrent has been stated and restated before your Committee and every Committee of the Congress before which I have addressed this issue since assuming office on January 20th. In a letter to the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee dated July 1, I addressed this question and restated once again the essentials of my position concerning this matter. I enclose a copy of my letter to the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee for your information.

In your letter of July 3rd, you asked for my definition and evaluation of the Intercontinental Ballistic Missile Threat facing the United States from any and all nations.

Since January 1969, there have been several new developments in the Soviet Strategic Forces, all tending to confirm the statements I made in my first appearance before your Committee concerning the threat to the national security of the U.S. in the mid-1970s. In summary, these developments are: continued deployment of the SS-9, SS-11 and SS-13; testing of the SS-9 with multiple re-entry vehicles; continued deployment of the Polaris-type submarine; continued efforts to improve anti-submarine warfare capabilities; and continued testing of the improved ABM.

During 1969, the deployment of the SS-9 has continued at about the same rate as in 1967 and 1968. If this rate of deployment is continued, the USSR could have about 400 SS-9 operational launchers deployed by the mid-1970s.

The Soviets now have well over 1200 ICBM launchers completed or under construction. This includes the older SS-7s and SS-8s as

well as the SS-13s, SS-11s, and SS-9s. All of these will be operational before mid-1971.

Three tests of the SS-9 with multiple re-entry vehicles have taken place since March. These three tests were to the mid-Pacific covering a distance of 5,100 nautical miles. There is some difference of opinion in the intelligence community concerning the precise nature of these tests but all are agreed that the USSR has the capability to deploy hard target multiple independently-targeted re-entry vehicles by the mid-1970s.

At least eight or nine new Y-class Polaris-type 16 tube ballistic missile submarines have already been launched and several are believed to be operational. Continued deployment at the current rate will allow the USSR to match the U.S. Polaris fleet by the mid-1970s.

Testing of the improved Soviet ABM interceptor continues.

In short, we believe the USSR has the capability of acquiring, by the mid-1970s; some 400 SS-9 ICBMs, multiple independently-targeted re-entry vehicles, SLBMs matching the U.S. Polaris fleet, ICBM re-targeting capability.

This capability would constitute a very grave threat to our Minuteman forces and our bomber forces in the mid-1970s. As a consequence, the deterrent to nuclear warfare would be eroded seriously.

Although the potential Chinese ICBM threat has slipped somewhat, it is estimated that a first generation ICBM could reach Initial Operational Capability by 1972. By 1975 operational ICBM launchers might fall somewhere between 10 and 25. During the 1970s, China could develop a significant production program in thermonuclear weapons and associated delivery systems and, consequently, would represent a considerable threat to U.S. bases and allies in Asia, and a growing threat to the continental United States.

If I may, Mr. Chairman, I would like to sum up for you my position with regard to the Soviet threat as it relates to the urgent need for approval of the Safeguard ABM proposal.

As a Defense planner, as well as a Cabinet officer and a member of the National Security Council, I have a special role in the use of intelligence provided by the intelligence community. It is my responsibility to propose policies and plans which will fulfill the mission assigned to the Department of Defense, one aspect of which is to deter the Soviet Union from starting a nuclear war.

As a part of this responsibility, I must apply my own best judgment to the available intelligence to ensure that the President's policies and the mission of the Department of Defense are fulfilled. Consequently, I must consider not only what are the probabilities of future development and the state of current activities as expressed in the assessments of the intelligence community, but also the possibilities of future developments based on available current information.

That is why in my testimony before the Congress and in my public comments I have stressed the possible capabilities of the Soviet Union for the future in terms of relative strategic power. My discussion of Soviet capabilities has been derived by projecting to future years their demonstrated capabilities for production and deployment of strategic weapons and by making allowances for the rate of technological achievement.

It is my carefully considered judgment, in which all of my principal military and civilian advisors agree, that the Soviet Union could achieve, or reach a position where they believe they have achieved, a capability to gravely weaken our deterrent by the mid-1970s—if we do nothing now to offset it. This judgment is based upon the following conclusions:

1. The Soviet Union could acquire a capa-

bility to destroy virtually all of our Minuteman missiles. To be able to do so, in the present context they would need: (a) at least 420 SS-9s with three independently-targeted re-entry vehicles which have a capability of separating from one another by some relatively small number of miles; (b) each of these re-entry vehicles would have to have a warhead of approximately 5 megatons and a reasonably good accuracy; (c) the SS-9s would have to be re-targetable; and (d) the range would have to be sufficient to reach all of the Minuteman silos.

2. The Soviet Union could acquire a capability to threaten severely the survival of our alert bombers. To do so in the present context they would need: (a) a force of about 15 Y-class (Polaris-type) submarines on station off our shores; and (b) the ability to launch the missiles on a depressed trajectory.

3. Although we confidently expect our Polaris/Poseidon submarines to remain highly survivable through the early to mid-1970s, we cannot preclude the possibility that the Soviet Union in the next few years may devise some weapon, techniques or tactic which could critically increase the vulnerability of those submarines. Nor can we preclude the possibility that the Soviet Union might deploy a more extensive and effective ABM defense which could intercept a significant portion of the residual warheads. In any event, I believe it would be far too risky to rely upon only one of the three major elements of our strategic retaliatory forces for our deterrent.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, it is entirely possible that the Soviet Union could achieve by the mid-1970s a capability to reduce, in a surprise attack, our surviving strategic offensive forces below the minimum level required for "Assured Destruction," and thus gravely weaken our deterrent. In my judgment, the overall strategic balance between the United States and the Soviet Union is much too close to run that risk. Therefore, something more must be done now to ensure a favorable strategic balance in the mid-1970s and beyond.

Short of achieving a workable agreement with the Soviet Union on the limitation of strategic armaments, which will take some time, we are convinced that the approval of Phase I of Safeguard would be the most prudent and economical course we could pursue at this particular juncture. This action would place us in a position to move forward promptly not only with the defense of our Minuteman and bomber forces should the Soviet threat develop as I have described, but also with the defense of our population against the Chinese ICBM threat should that emerge during the next few years.

In your letter of July 3rd, you also asked whether the Director of Central Intelligence, Richard Helms, concurs in my formulation of the threat. I have furnished a copy of this letter to Director Helms and he assures me that he has no disagreement with the statements concerning the potential Soviet and Chinese Communist strategic capabilities, as seen from the intelligence point of view.

Sincerely,

MEL LAIRD.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., July 8, 1969.

HON. JOHN STENNIS,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In your letter of 3 July 1969 to Mr. Helms, you requested that he consult with Secretary Laird on Secretary Laird's response to your inquiry concerning the strategic threat to the United States.

Although Mr. Helms is presently out of town, he has read the text of Secretary Laird's reply. Mr. Helms wishes to assure you that he has no disagreement with the statements

in Secretary Laird's letter to you of 8 July concerning the potential Soviet and Chinese Communist strategic capabilities, as seen from the intelligence point of view.

Sincerely,

R. E. CUSHMAN, Jr.,
Lieutenant General, USMC, Acting
Director.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee previously asked me to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding.

The Senator has made a very excellent speech. I congratulate him for it. I should like to ask him one or two questions for my own information.

What the Senator had to say about the long leadtime being necessary reminded me of an article which was published in the newspaper about a recent air show in Paris. It noted that the Swedes had a fighter called the "Begar." I think in English it means a thunderbolt.

It surprised me that this small country of 7½ million people had produced this particular aircraft which was perhaps the most modern, best, and newest model fighter in the air show. Did the Senator know about that?

Mr. CANNON. I did not happen to attend the air show this past year.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The article was in the newspaper.

Mr. CANNON. However, I must say that the last time I did attend the air show, the Swedes exhibited what appeared to be a fine model. So I am satisfied that they are doing some work along that line.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was surprised that such a small country would be able to do this. These are rather expensive programs.

Mr. CANNON. They are. The Senator recalls that in my talk I covered the Harrier aircraft, which is produced by the British. The Marines are trying to get that aircraft.

I saw the aircraft perform in Washington a while ago. It was quite impressive. The Marines are anxious to purchase 12 of those aircraft so that they can experiment and find out if there is a use for that plane.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would think that would be an efficient way to do it, if I might offer a layman's point of view.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is it not true that the United States has some money in the development of the Harrier?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; the United States has. I will supply the exact figures a little later. It is either \$50 or \$100 million in the development of the Harrier, in the predecessor to the Harrier.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is a sort of joint venture.

Mr. CANNON. It was a model different from the Harrier itself, and it went prin-

cipally into the engines. It was in a 1127 model. I will supply the details in a moment.

It was \$50 million. That was in the predecessor to the Harrier, which was being developed by the British. It was called the B-1127. Most of the \$50 million in this joint effort went into the research and development for engines that could be used for this type of program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Near the end of his speech, the Senator referred to something which interested me very much. I know that I do not know as much about it as I should. The first time it was called to my attention, it was part of the so-called posture statement of the former Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara.

If I understood the Senator correctly, he referred to what I supposed would be called the "mission" or the responsibility of the Military Establishment to fight a war, a full-fledged war, in Asia, and to be prepared to fight one in Europe and, if I recall correctly, to be prepared also to fight at least a smaller war or to take care of an uprising or insurgency in Latin America.

What I wish to ask the Senator is this: Does the Committee on Armed Services participate in making that kind of estimate of what our posture should be, or is that done strictly by the Secretary of Defense?

Mr. CANNON. That is a matter of national policy.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Who determines it?

Mr. CANNON. Our committee does not participate in the determination of that national policy. It is presented to us as being a matter of national policy, and, therefore we try to implement the services requirements so that they can carry out their mission.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I can understand that, if that is the policy and it is presented to the committee. Of course, I think the Senator is quite right. What I was inquiring about was the origin of the policy. It seems to me that this is quite an ambitious policy to take upon our shoulders alone—this extensive commitment.

I am reminded of the refrain that the Senator from Missouri has made rather prominent in talking about over-commitment, with which I completely agree.

It strikes me that if this is the policy of the Government, it may be that we have commitments beyond a reasonable expectation of our capacity in view of our needs at home. I do not say this in any critical way, because I do not know who produces this policy, who starts this, whether it starts with the Secretary of Defense, whether it is a product of the National Security Agency, or just who formulates these contingencies we are expected to meet.

The way it was described to me—and I tried to understand it as best I could from this posture statement—is that, having adopted this policy, then we must assume, in order to plan, the worst possible contingency that could arise out of these three areas. That seems to present an almost unlimited demand.

Mr. CANNON. That is why I said we have either to change our national policy objectives, if we are not going to try

to support them, or to proceed on the assumption that national policy objectives may exist which the military is incapable of carrying out.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator completely on what he has said. I raised this matter because he mentioned it, not because I am prepared to go into it too far. I raise the question to ask if this is perhaps one of the sources of the difficulty that confronts some of us. This national policy is very closely related to foreign policy. I understand that a discussion occurred in the Chamber yesterday, of which I was not aware until I read the RECORD, about the proper lines between foreign policy and armed services policy. This is an example, it seems to me, of how difficult it is to disentangle them.

If it is going to be our policy to defend the whole world or to be prepared to fight all over the world, or the three major areas, we are taking on a tremendous responsibility which I question whether we are quite capable of fulfilling. I would not want to put a requirement up to the military that is beyond its reasonable capacity to fulfill. When I say "reasonable," I mean in view of all the needs of the country at home.

I congratulate the Senator for bringing up that point. I think it is a very important point—it has never been expressed sufficiently in the past—as to what is the objective or what is the policy of the Government with regard to our military requirements.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, first, I should like to express satisfaction and gratitude to the chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Mississippi, for his leadership in promoting subcommittee consideration and responsibility.

We have heard now two major efforts, informative speeches, as a result. Today I have listened intently to a very able and distinguished Senator speak on the aircraft program. I am impressed with the inadequacy of my knowledge, but I must acknowledge that I know far more than I did before the Senator from Nevada began, and I thank him. It was an able, informative address, of great service to the Senate and to many, many people who will read the RECORD.

Now, if the Senator will yield further, there are two matters of quandary on my part. I am sure he can be of assistance. I have heard with some concern the length of time during which our country has not developed a fighter plane. The Senator has referred to the F-4 as being equal to the Mig, but I seemed to detect some apprehension on his part when he said that its technology dated to 1955. Did I correctly understand the Senator?

Mr. CANNON. The Senator's understanding is correct.

Mr. GORE. The Senator did not state when the F-4 was first operational. Would he have that in mind?

Mr. CANNON. I think it was really 1959 when it first became operational.

Mr. GORE. So it has been 10 years in operation.

Mr. CANNON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GORE. Do I correctly understand the Senator now to say that even 10 years later, we do not yet have on the drawing board what he would regard as a competent, competitive, air-to-air fighter?

Mr. CANNON. The Senator's understanding is correct. As an air superiority fighter, we have nothing on the drawing board insofar as, let us say, a contract definition or anything of this sort. We do have a number of contractors who, of course, are thinking along these lines, and some who perhaps have proposals ready to present. But we have not a real fighter on the drawing board and ready to go into production at this time.

Mr. GORE. I congratulate the Senator upon recommending that we undertake such an achievement.

As chairman of the subcommittee that is generally referred to as the Disarmament Subcommittee, I would like to suggest that disarmament, as such, seems to be a very distant goal. The goal, which may be within the grasp of Americans today and people of the world today, is a limitation of armaments. Even a limitation must flow, it seems to me, from a relative standoff position, a balanced position of strength—not necessarily a superiority of strength. I believe President Nixon expressed it differently later as a sufficiency of strength.

So with the long leadtime necessary, with the very unusual extended period in which we have not attempted to develop a superior air-to-air fighter, I am led to the conclusion to support wholeheartedly the conclusion of the committee. With that—

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, if the Senator would permit me, I may have made one statement which would have misled him. When I said "air superiority fighters," I was talking about the Air Force. With respect to the F-14, the Navy version I mentioned, there is some procurement money in here for six models they want to go ahead.

The reason this airplane can come at an earlier date is for the reason that they would use on the first model of the F-14 the engines developed for the F-111B program, and the Phoenix missile which was developed for the F-111B.

The F-14A would come in at an earlier time than if it was starting from scratch now, but the F-14B later would incorporate a new engine to be developed and new avionics to give it capability.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator for that addendum and I appreciate it.

Now, the question I wish to propose is not one relating particularly to this matter, but the one that I ask out of curiosity, searching for knowledge. I ask a question which has been asked of me many times by the people I have the honor in part to represent. I ask it of the Senator because I recognize him as one of the students and authorities on aviation in the Senate and in the country.

The question is: With all the tonnage which is reported to have been dropped by the Air Force on Vietnam, how can we explain the seemingly inadequate, if not minimal, results achieved? I do not wish to promote any argument about the war. I ask the question for information.

Mr. CANNON. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks.

I would like to summarize briefly and say that when a service is shackled in trying to perform a job, and restrictions are placed on them, one can add bombs to bombs ad infinitum, and it will not get the job done unless they are permitted to do the job assigned to them.

That is an oversimplification, but, Mr. President, you can continue dropping bombs all over North Vietnam and South Vietnam from here to kingdom come, and it never will solve the problem if you are not going to permit them to attack the root of the problem.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. CANNON. The Senator from Arizona had asked me to yield to him.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee for having done an excellent job in presenting a subject not too well known by too many Members of this body.

Because the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations is in the Chamber and because he raised what I think is a question that is very much at the nub of this entire argument developing on the floor of the Senate—the argument about the ABM, MIRV, and the cost of military equipment—I would like, if I can, to have some answers or even proposed thoughts that might be of help to all of us.

When we talk about national policy I think I am correct in saying that our obligations around the world have some bearing. When we talk about the views of the military, I think these treaties and arrangements also have a bearing. Looking over a list of commitments we have under collective defense agreements I see we have the North Atlantic Treaty Organization with 15 different countries, the Rio Treaty with 22 countries, the CENTO Treaty, the SEATO Treaty with eight countries, the treaty with the Republic of Korea involving two countries, a treaty with the Republic of China involving two countries, the Philippine Treaty involving two countries, and the Japanese Treaty involving two countries.

The language in some of these treaties or agreements seems to me to be rather specific about our use of arms in going to the fulfillment of the arrangement or treaty. Others are rather ambiguous and limit us to a constitutional interpretation of what the need might be. I do not know whether this can be done or not but if it could be, I think it would be of great help to this body, the administration, and certainly the American people, in understanding just what we are talking about when we talk about our global commitments. I can recognize the policy we are operating under as an international policeman role, but we must remember we have some rather specific treaties which I interpret as calling upon us to do what we are doing in South Vietnam, even though that was not by treaty.

I am asking if it would be possible for the Committee on Foreign Relations to possibly reopen hearings—not hearings, but perhaps a study on these treaties, so that we might have some idea from the Committee on Foreign Relations on how

far they think we have to go. I think if we could ever get that determination of how permanently we are committed to use arms, let us say, in country "X," then go through all of them, I think it would be a lot easier for us to stand on the floor of the Senate to argue.

Does the Senator from Arkansas have anything to report along that line?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, who has the floor?

Mr. CANNON. I have the floor. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. One of the first things we did in the beginning of this session was to review, along the line of the comment of the Senator from Arizona, all of our commitments. We have had some discussion of that. The Senator read the list of treaties and agreements accurately. There are varying degrees of responsibility under those treaties. I would rank NATO No. 1 in the sense that it is a flat declaration that an attack on one nation is regarded as an attack on all. That is not common. We go all the way down to some that are statements of good will which state in effect, "If you get into difficulty, we will consider it."

I do not wish to argue what SEATO means. It is ambiguous in that it has two classifications, one involves overt aggression and the other subversion. That is another matter that comes up in another way.

But the Senator is quite correct. That is one reason I raised the question with the Senator from Nevada. This gets to the nub of the matter of our responsibilities. It is the responsibility of the Committee on Foreign Relations to review these commitments.

The Senator from Missouri is the chairman of a special subcommittee which will go into a study of some of the physical aspects of these commitments. His committee dealt with these Spanish bases which was a kind of extracurricular obligation, in my view, and I believe, of the Senator from Missouri's. We think there is a similar one in another country, which we will be studying. Our purpose is to do what the Senator from Arizona suggests—that we review all of our commitments, consider them, understand them, and at least try to make recommendations as to what limits might be applicable to them, because this open-ended approach we have had grew out of the war. I do not disavow my own responsibility for not having done it earlier. The Senate should have, including myself. But in any case better late than never for us to try to do that. I think that after we have had sufficient time to consider the report of the Senator from Missouri's subcommittee, the committee as a whole will consider and make recommendations along that line.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to hear the chairman say that. As I have studied this more and more, I am convinced that the size of our military outlays depends and will depend on just what we interpret our commitments to be. In other words, if we are called upon tomorrow to go to Europe to defend a country with whom we have a clear obligation to defend, it means one thing. If we have a way of

renegotiating a treaty so that we can get other language, that would be something different. Then we can really go to work on this military budget. But until we have a really clearly defined, fenced-in idea of what our responsibilities are, I cannot see much hope of reducing military expenditures outside the end of the Vietnamese war.

I congratulate the Senator for having started these studies and hope that they can be finished and in readable form in the near future. It is something that the American people should know about.

I have found, in the years since I came here and traveled around the country, that when I mentioned mutual security agreements, the ears of my audience popped up because they had not heard of them, probably because we did not give them much publicity in the years that we were passing them. It will be good for the American people to know what our specific obligations are, and just what we as a body, and eventually the administration, feel about these commitments.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, before I yield to the distinguished Senator from Missouri, the Senator from Tennessee asked me when the F-4 became operational. I said that I thought it became operational in 1959. It actually flew first in 1958 and then became operational, with the Navy, in 1961.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If I may interject there, I remember when the Senator from Nevada and I went to Langley Field to fly the F-4 in 1959.

Mr. CANNON. The Senator is correct. Now, Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, as the ranking majority member of the distinguished Senator from Nevada's Subcommittee on Tactical Air Power, it has been my privilege to work with and for him on this report.

In the years since I came to the Senate I have never seen a more thorough and constructive job done in analyzing these various programs.

I am sure the people of his State are as proud of him as are those of us who worked with him during the long and careful hours of the subcommittee's preparation, work, and actual hearings that he has engaged in.

I do not agree with every conclusion, but especially because of the outstanding accomplishment, it is my privilege to support the report.

It is always a pleasure to congratulate one on a job well done. I did my best to be a regular attendant, and believe the information presented to the Senate on this subject today is the best analysis of tactical air power we have had to date.

I am impressed with the method and manner in which the able Senator developed the importance or unimportance of various proposed models, and was impressed also with the question asked by the Senator from Tennessee, in which he wondered why so much had been done in the way of airpower effort with so relatively little results.

Many know why that is. Shortly after we got into this war a great number of rules were laid down, and weapons systems were used in a manner for which they had never been designed.

I might make a contribution to this discussion by pointing out that, on good authority, it would appear, during the past 4 years, to the Vietnam theater, we have shipped more tonnage of materials than we did to Europe during the entire World War II, even though we have one-eighth of the number of troops in Vietnam that we had in Europe during that war.

Accordingly, I would hope that no one would judge the efficacy, or lack of efficacy, of airpower on the basis of the way air power has been handled under directions from higher authority to the Air Force and Navy.

I was also impressed with the questions asked by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas with respect to the Swedish plane. It is ironic that an American manufacturer now loses some planes in this recommended budget, because we have no V/STOL airplane, no STOL plane, and no VTOL plane.

It is a fact, as the Senator from Arizona commented—and he is one of the true authorities in this body on air power—that the Soviets have three types of V/STOL airplanes, all above mach 2; that the French have a STOL airplane; that the British have a V/STOL airplane, that the Swedish have a V/STOL airplane; and that despite the fact we have spent many billions of dollars a year, all we have to show for that money are discussions and arguments. We get the arguments. These other countries, including Soviet Russia, get the hardware.

Commercially, we have arranged to that the British have a V/STOL airport, so that we can accommodate foreign planes which come to this country, or foreign airplanes purchased by the military and civilians in this country for use in this country.

I am glad this point has been brought out.

In closing, let me again congratulate the Senator from Nevada. He has made a real contribution from the standpoint of how to spend, and how not to spend our defense appropriations.

Mr. CANNON, Mr. President, I want to thank the distinguished Senator from Missouri for his very complimentary remarks. Let me say again that all on the committee did a great job in working on this project and its problems. I appreciate it very much. We had a very able staff that did a tremendous amount of work and were responsible to a great extent for the very fine report we are able to present to the Senate. I want to thank them for their support.

Mr. STENNIS, Mr. President, if the Senator from Nevada will yield briefly—

Mr. CANNON, I yield.

Mr. STENNIS, I should like to comment on the matter of commitments. The question was raised here about what are our commitments and what is the Armed Services Committee trying to meet.

Certainly that is a timely question, a question well expressed by the Senator from Arizona. But that is an old subject. Whatever our policy, or whatever our commitments are, they were not orig-

inated in the Armed Services Committee. Since I came to the Senate, various treaties and commitments have come before us but they came out of the Committee on Foreign Relations. That is where they should be sent. We have been concerned about this in the Armed Services Committee, as many Senators know, for several years.

We started into this matter of commitment and our ability to meet them—I think it was 2 years ago—but the war in Vietnam got worse, shortages there existed; so we turned to the problems of the war.

On pages 2200 and 2201 of the hearings is found a letter to me in response to my letter, with a list of all the nations with which we have defense treaties and other defense arrangements. I ask unanimous consent that those two pages be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, for the information of the Senate.

There being no objection, the letter

was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HON. JOHN STENNIS,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to your letter of April 14 requesting a simplified compilation of treaty commitments and other defense arrangements of the United States, the two enclosures to this letter have been prepared for your use.

The first enclosure is a tabular listing of the countries with whom the United States has entered into defense commitments pursuant to multilateral or bilateral treaties. The table also indicates, in addition, those countries with whom the United States has entered into Executive agreements or a general treaty containing defense assurances.

The second enclosure extracts the pertinent provisions of the treaties and Executive agreements relating to consultation and action in the event of armed attack.

Sincerely,

L. NIEDERLEHNER,
Acting General Counsel.

PARTIES TO DEFENSE TREATIES AND OTHER DEFENSE ARRANGEMENTS

Parties	Multilateral treaties				Bilateral treaties	Bilateral executive agreement or general treaty
	Rio	NATO	SEATO	Anzus		
Argentina.....	X					
Australia.....			X	X		
Belgium.....		X				
Bolivia.....	X					
Brazil.....	X					
Canada.....		X				X
Chile.....	X					
China.....					X	
Colombia.....	X					
Costa Rica.....	X					
Cuba ¹	X					
Denmark.....		X				X
Dominican Republic.....	X					
Ecuador.....	X					
El Salvador.....	X					
France.....		X	X			
Germany Federal Republic of.....		X				
Greece.....		X				
Guatemala.....	X					
Haiti.....	X					
Honduras.....	X					
Iceland.....		X				X
Iran.....						X
Italy.....		X				
Japan.....					X	
Korea.....					X	
Liberia.....						X
Luxembourg.....		X				
Mexico.....	X					
Netherlands, the.....		X				
New Zealand.....			X	X		
Nicaragua.....	X					
Norway.....		X				
Pakistan.....			X			X
Panama.....	X					X
Paraguay.....	X					
Peru.....	X					
Philippines, the.....			X		X	
Portugal.....		X				
Spain.....						X
Thailand.....			X			
Trinidad and Tobago.....	X					
Turkey.....		X				X
United Kingdom.....		X	X			
Uruguay.....	X	X				
Venezuela.....	X					

¹ Cuba was excluded from participation in the Inter-American System by Resolution VII, 8th meeting of Foreign Ministers, Punta del Este, 1962.

Mr. STENNIS, Mr. President, I raised the point in my opening remarks on the bill, saying we had some kind of commitments, or defense agreements, with 46 nations, and so long as we had those we had to make some kind of attempt to be prepared to directly defend ourselves and to live up to our commitments. I said, further, as one Senator, that I would be perfectly willing to open the issue of our national commitments and debate it; I further said I would favor a review and a renegotiation of these

commitments, if we could. I think we have learned a lot since the commitments were made. And I sincerely hope we have.

I know the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) will do a good job in whatever he undertakes, but a great deal of the talk—not from him, but a great deal of the talk—is that there should be an investigation of our military. I am glad to get clear that we should really investigate the commitments, and try to bring that out, so that not just our com-

mittee or the Senate, but the whole Nation, will learn of it. The Senator from Missouri and I are in pretty much accord as to our being overcommitted as I see it.

I pointed out the other day that we have to do something, as I see it, when the shooting stops in Vietnam, with reference to the size of our military personnel. Personnel cost run into real money.

Up to now, we have been trying to prepare for two conventional wars. We already have one going on. Everybody knows where that is. The other war we are thinking about primarily would be in Western Europe. It seems to me we also have a policy to go where there is trouble in a little country wherever it may be. In view of all this, the committee has tried to arrive at a sound, effective minimum military program. This is the purpose of the items in the bill.

I do not want to frighten anyone as a result of what I said about preparing for two conventional wars, but that is what we are doing. It would take a higher power to know the possibilities of a nuclear war but that is, of course, a possibility.

I thank the Senator for yielding.
Mr. CANNON. I yield now to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the Senator. I know the Senator has been on his feet for a long time. I want to commend the Senator for the fine presentation he has made to the Senate and note that, in my opinion, it is the most thoroughgoing analysis of our tactical air power needs that I have heard in this body. I thank the Senator for making such a full presentation. I think it is extremely fortunate that the subcommittee was chaired by a man who has had long experience in the Air Force.

I have spent a great deal of time with combat pilots over the last few years. I spent time with them in Southeast Asia. I think they will be grateful to the Senator for recognizing what their problems are and what machines and weapons they need to do the job required of them.

I think the Senator has very accurately and completely reflected the mood and desire of the men who have to fight with those machines. That, I think, alone deserves a commendation.

The Senator from Tennessee made the point about our bombing not being very effective. I think it should be pointed out that we have had to operate under severe restrictions there. To begin with, we developed the system of bombing one section at a time, so the enemy knew what we were going to bomb next, and brought in the most sophisticated air defense equipment known.

The port of Haiphong was not interdicted. Ordinarily you hit the enemy where the biggest amount of his supplies are being brought, through whatever bottleneck there is. As a matter of fact, before the bombing moratorium, we were bombing the railroad from Kwangsi Province, China, into Hanoi, which brings in about 18,000 metric tons a month. You have to keep pounding something like that to keep it out of operation, because it is fairly easy to repair.

But at the same time, Haiphong, where 150 or 160 metric tons a month were coming in, was off limits. So is it any wonder that we have not been as effective in the role of interdiction, as we could have been if these restrictions had not been put into effect? I think the Senator has done a good job of bringing that matter up. I think it should be re-emphasized.

When we talk about tactical aircraft, we are talking about five or six different kinds of aircraft. I think we made a mistake in supporting the concept of commonality in trying to develop the TFX, now the F-111. It was wrong. It could not be done. So now we are alert to the damage that was done. The Russians are ahead of us in terms of air-to-air interceptors. We tried to put into the TFX an airplane that would be able to serve as close support for ground troops, one that would be an attack bomber, an air-to-air interceptor, one that could operate in two different roles off carrier decks. It just has not been done.

The Senator from Arkansas noted that the Swedes have developed a better interceptor than we have. What we have to understand is that the Swedes devote their entire resources to the development of defensive weapons.

They do not devote any of their resources to the development of strategic weapons. They can think purely in terms of defense of the homeland.

When you put all your eggs in one basket, you can do anything. If we decided to channel all of our research and development efforts into one area, we could develop the best of any one thing we wanted in the world. We have the engineering and technological know-how, in this country, for doing everything from developing a better detergent to developing a better strategic weapon. Now is the time that we have to think in terms of priorities. I think the distinguished Senator from Nevada has underscored what the priorities in terms of tactical air support are, and I offer him my thanks.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I happen to have been the ranking member of the Cannon subcommittee on tactical air power, and I should like to join with other Senators in commending the distinguished Senator on the leadership he gave the subcommittee.

I feel that the report of this subcommittee will be of great value in years to come, and I feel that our Nation will benefit because the study was made.

Mr. CANNON. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the previous order, the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from Maine, without it being counted against my time.

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

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Nevada and his subcommittee members for the out-

standing work they have performed. I commend them most highly.

I would also like to make a short statement on a matter related to this bill.

Mr. President, in connection with the debate on the military authorization bill now before us, I want to read into the RECORD an appeal delivered to my office yesterday indicating some of the activity of interns with a group that calls itself "PEACE."

Of particular interest in the appeal is the statement:

Weekly meetings to coordinate research and recruit intern help will also serve to foster those bourgeois needs of love, affection, human warmth and contact.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire paper be placed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

PEOPLE ENGAGED IN AUGMENTING CONSTRUCTIVE EFFORTS
(1135 Bellview Road, McLean, Va., Telephone 759-2811)

Attention: INTERNS: United States cities burn. Vietnamese cities burn. Appalachian children die of malnutrition, and India is threatened with mass starvation. The U.S. national purpose appears confused: its human and material resources being wasted. Men and women of conscience ask, "Is there not an alternative?"

The DOD appropriation commits much national energy, skill and resources. It is therefore good sense that this expenditure be scrutinized and evaluated. Interns are invited, with the permission of their member, to learn about and contribute to the several inquiries into defense spending presently in progress. PEACE is intended to be voluntary and done on the intern's own time, unless the intern's member approves of the activity full time. Weekly meetings to coordinate research and recruit intern help will also serve to foster those bourgeois needs of love, affection, and human warmth and contact.

The first meeting will be Friday, July 11, 1969. Beer will be served. Dress informally. (Coed volleyball and softball will begin at 7:30). After the games, about 9:30, speakers will give short talks concerning the different areas which need more attention.

As an introduction to the project the following articles are suggested and people are encouraged to have read them by Friday:

(1) "The Economics of Military Procurement," *Report of the Subcommittee on Economy in Government of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress*, May 1969, (printing Number 29-493 O).

(2) Galbraith, John Kenneth, "How to control the Military" Harper's, June 1969. Reprint in Cong. Rec. May 23, 1969, pp. 13560-13567.

(3) Benson, Robert S., "How the Pentagon Can Save \$9 Billion," *Washington Monthly*, March 1969. Reprint Cong. Rec. May 12, 1969, pp. 12002-12006. (Ed. no: long and boring, but documents inefficiency outside of new weapons systems).

(4) Shoup, General, "The New American Militarism," Atlantic, reprint Cong. Rec., March 26, 1969, pp. 7775-7777.

(5) Newman, Barbara, "Can Budget Bureau Put Lid on Pentagon Spending," *Washingtonian*, July 1969.

Directions to 1135 Bellview Road, McLean, Va.:

1. Memorial Bridge to George Washington Pkwy.

2. to Rt. 495 (G. Wash. Parkway splits, take left fork towards S. Va. and Dulles Airport)

3. Take Exit 13 off of Rt. 495, to Rt. 193, Great Falls 1st Exit

4. Turn right at stop sign at end of exit ramp onto 193 (also called Georgetown Pike).

5. Go 2.3 miles to sign "Greenway", turn left onto Bellview.

6. Go to 1st intersection (Old Dominion Dr. and Bellview) continue on Bellview for exactly 1 mile, turn left onto drive (mailbox has name "White" on it, before left turn there is old dilapidated barn on the right).

Don't panic—traveling time from Washington: a mere 20 minutes.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it is long past time for dedicated Americans to speak up for our military. I know of no better time than now to challenge the critics who have been carrying on continuous and unjustified condemnation of our military. Passage of the authorization bill as it has been submitted would reassure our military that our Nation stands behind them.

Mr. President, this bill has received a penetrating review by the Senate Armed Services Committee, under the outstanding leadership of our distinguished Committee Chairman, Senator STENNIS. The Committee has been fully cognizant of the costs for defense and the other needs of our country. We have already made substantial cuts in the bill. In fact some cuts, especially in research and development, were too severe, and I question the soundness of some reductions. Any further cuts in the authorization bill would be an unacceptable risk to our security.

Mr. President, the procurement of these major items and the maintenance of our reserve components represent the minimum essential for our Armed Forces. I speak in favor of this bill, and for our Defense Establishment. In my support, I think the time is propitious for answering the critics of our military who would slash the deterrence that has prevented nuclear war.

Our Armed Forces must have the united support of our Nation. Critics in Congress, the press and other elements of our society have been generally unjust in their charges. Condemnation of our so-called military-industrial complex will not solve our problems. Objective dialog, constructive criticism and peaceful dissent are healthy for our country. But continuous condemnation not founded on facts is a disservice to our military and harmful to our country.

Many critics blame our Defense Establishment for our social ills, a prolonged war, the Soviet buildup, and the conflicts throughout the world. It is time the critics recognize that the Communists, and not our military, are responsible for the confrontation we live in today. Even the liberal-minded Washington Post recently concluded a series of articles showing the present Soviet leadership was reaffirming the Stalinist line.

Many among the antimilitary and the militant left ignore the Communists' longstanding design for world domination. Lest they forget, this is what caused the United States to rearm after practically disbanding the world's most powerful military force in 1946.

If the military and industry did not have team unity, including competent personnel with military experience in

industry, then we could well be in World War III already. Those who would weaken this power of deterrence and undermine our military widen the unity gap.

Mr. President, in the face of the growing Soviet threat and their continuous provocative actions throughout the world, it is inconceivable that our Nation will not respond with the unity which has always marked our history in time of peril. Our national security depends on unity more than ever before. Those leaders and others who attack our Armed Forces and second-guess our commanders in the field are doing as much damage to the morale and discipline of our forces as the radical groups who are mounting deliberate assaults on our military services.

No wonder our military commanders are beset by cases of mutiny, disobedience, racial strife, and desertion. Even a Federal judge ruled that an individual as a matter of "honest belief" can determine for himself when a limited war is "unjust" and refuse to serve. Such irrational judgment by a member of the Judiciary makes it difficult to define sedition.

The recent decision of the Supreme Court to have civilian courts instead of military courts prosecute servicemen for crimes not service-connected is questionable. It will jeopardize the control of discipline and downgrade military authority which is essential for our Armed Forces. Justice William O. Douglas' vicious attack on our military lawyers is not warranted. He characterized military courts as "singularly inept in dealing with nice subtleties of constitutional law in spirit and in practice." Military lawyers are well trained, and more familiar with the military implications than civilian lawyers.

This is another example of Justice Douglas undermining the military. His recent article entitled, "The Public Be Damned," in which he made a blistering attack on the Army Corps of Engineers, demonstrated his lack of propriety. After reading his article, one can make his own assessment as to whether or not Justice Douglas would be objective in any case before the Supreme Court involving the Corps of Engineers. These outside activities downgrade the dignity of the Supreme Court and demonstrate his susceptibility to prejudiced views and conflicts of interest.

Mr. President, the antiwar emotionalism is causing many people to lose their perspective. This continued onslaught on the military, which is fed fuel by many leaders, could seriously jeopardize discipline in our Armed Forces.

President Nixon responded to those who attack our Military Establishment. I support the views expressed in his recent commencement address at the Air Force Academy. His credo of nine points for the defenders of our Nation placed our Defense Establishment in the proper perspective.

I would like to quote the essence of President Nixon's nine points in his military creed. He said:

1. I believe that we must balance our need for survival as a nation with our need for survival as a people.

2. I believe that our defense establishment will remain the servant of our national policy of bringing about peace in this world, and that those in any way connected with the military must scrupulously avoid even the appearance of becoming the master of that policy.

3. I believe that every man in uniform is a citizen first and a serviceman second, and that we must resist any attempt to isolate or separate the defenders from the defended.

4. I believe that the basis for decisions on defense spending must be "what we need for our security" and not "what will this mean for business and employment."

5. I believe that moderation has a moral significance only in those who have another choice.

6. I believe that defense decisions must be made on the hard realities of the offensive capabilities of our adversaries and not on our fervent hopes about their intentions.

7. I believe we must take risks for peace—but calculated risks, not foolish risks.

8. I believe that America is not about to become a Garrison State, or a Welfare State, or a Police State—

9. And I believe this above all: That this Nation shall continue to be a source of world leadership and a source of freedom's strength, in creating a just world order that will bring an end to war.

I was also glad to note that President Nixon clarified what President Eisenhower really said about the military-industrial complex. President Eisenhower has been quoted out of context. When one reads the Eisenhower farewell address, I suggest that he gave a balanced assessment appropriate to the time, that placed the emphasis on the need for this complex in the face of the Soviet threat. I believe President Nixon's citation of General Eisenhower pointed out this balance when he said:

Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction.

Mr. President, it appears to be a popular pastime today to quote great Americans out of context in order to frighten the public or make political gain. Some critics rejoice in such exercises.

Some have already used President Nixon's Air Force Academy address out of context in a game of semantics. It has been alleged that President Nixon is trying to ignore the Senate in making a judgment on defense appropriations. This accusation is based on the President's statement that "the President of the United States is the man charged with making that judgment." His next sentence stated that "after a complete review of our foreign and defense policies, I have submitted requests to the Congress for military appropriations." His critics refused to note the latter sentence. It is this kind of political footwork that creates distrust and agitation in the American people.

Mr. President, while the Communists seek to move closer and closer to their objective of the annihilation of the capitalist system, many of our misguided and the New Left promote neo-isolationism, unilateral disarmament and dissolution of collective security alliances. If we had failed to stand firm in Berlin, Korea, Vietnam, and other areas, the Communists would have engulfed the rest of the world by now. America's presence overseas must be maintained in the face of the Soviet threat. However, I do

agree that our scale of assistance to our allies should be reappraised and there should be more contribution from them. History refutes the view that weakness and unilateral disarmament is the road to peace.

Our Nation suffers because of those who have lost their patience and spirit. Some are willing to reduce our strength and would negotiate from fear in disregard of the catastrophes of history under such an appeasement approach. Now is not the time to grow weary and retreat in the face of minority dissension. It is time to reassert our firmness and national interests.

Mr. President, deeds, not words, are the only indicators of Soviet intentions. I am not aware of any peaceful deeds of the Communists. On the contrary, they have never before been stronger, nor committed more aggressive acts than they have in the last 10 years. Yet, the stronger the United States has become, the more restraint and weakness we demonstrate to show our good faith. The Communists do not respect weakness. Nevertheless, we again have demonstrated our good faith and desire for peace by taking calculated risks in the bombing halt and troop withdrawal.

Mr. President, the antagonists of our Military Establishment in our country allege that our Nation is addicted to military intervention and chronic warfare. One only has to review the conflicts in the world to show the shallowness of this allegation. We have not been the world's policeman in the troubled areas of the Middle East, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Africa, Malaysia, Indonesia, India, Pakistan, Laos, Algeria, and other areas. Yet, the Communists have been busy interventionists or aggressors in these areas. Critics rarely condemn the enormous amount of money, weapons, and military supplies that the Soviet Union and Red China pour into North Vietnam.

If we show weakness now, the Communists will certainly continue their aggression in Asia and Europe. This is not the time to renege on our military commitment overseas. Some politicians would have one believe that military strength or an arms race breeds war.

Mr. President, our military are accused of being too influential in foreign policy. They are accused of being responsible for stationing our forces in many foreign countries. They are accused of formulating national policy. These criticisms are totally unfounded and an injustice to our men and women in uniform.

The military have never been under greater civilian control than in recent years. Civilians formulate foreign policy, not the military.

Civilians, with congressional approval—not the military—determine our force structures, personnel strengths and procurement of weapons systems. Unfortunately, civilians have exercised too much control of the selection of weapons systems which were both wasteful and injurious to our security. The military do not choose the commitments around the world, but they execute the policies at the direction of the President. They execute them with courage, sacrifice, and at great risk and hardship.

Civilian mismanagement of the military has prolonged the war in Vietnam. Gradualism violates all military principles for victory. A no-win policy is disastrous and unknown in American history. I am confident we could have won the Vietnam war a long time ago if our effort had not been throttled by civilians. It is ridiculous that this war has been allowed to go on for over 7 years. In the early stages, it could have been resolved by our airpower and seapower within 60 days.

Mr. President, the role of the Armed Forces is service to our people and for their security. It is true that this security is costly, but the Kremlin has not been willing to accept any alternative. They have yet to accept serious arms control proposals with on-site inspection which we have been earnestly and sincerely pursuing for many years. Consequently, the American people have recognized the growing Communist threat and demanded continued security. I hope that recent overtures for arms talks are in good faith.

I also agree with President Nixon that "the American Defense Establishment should never be a sacred cow, nor should the American military be anybody's scapegoat." Inefficiency and waste cannot be tolerated. I am confident also that there were some areas of the defense budget that could have been reduced, and this has been done.

Our Armed Services and Appropriations Committees have given the defense budget a comprehensive study with a view toward the elimination of low priority and nonessential weapons. There are always ways to improve efficiency, especially when managing the vast resources the size of the Defense Department with 4.8 million people and a \$77 billion budget. Excessive overcosts and contractual procedures are receiving a thorough examination. Our distinguished chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee recently implemented new controls and procedures to insure that weapons and contracts receive continuous penetrating review.

It appears that there is an attempt to make Americans believe that the military are deliberately making short estimates and causing overruns for weapons systems. They are being unjustly blamed for inflation.

As Dean Acheson said:

I can't imagine anyone taking seriously the thought that military officers could be engaged in a conspiracy to waste funds of the United States.

General Wheeler said, he "has yet to meet his fellow conspirators."

Mr. President, the avalanche of criticism of our military today ignores the fact that this administration inherited some ineffective procedures and policies. The inefficiency, cost overruns, and waste that are being exposed by this administration can be credited to the previous administration and civilians in defense systems analysis who have been tagged as "computerized whiz kids." The Defense Department is already taking steps to eliminate waste and the procurement of unsatisfactory or low-priority weapons, such as the Cheyenne helicopter,

the Manned Orbiting Laboratory, and phasing out of the FB-111 program.

In the past, weapons were put into production before they were fully developed. The Secretary of Defense is taking measures to eliminate such waste. I suspect, also, that a lot of the waste of the previous administration was the result of the civilian leadership being a "captive of a scientific-technological elite" which President Eisenhower also warned against. Billions of dollars worth of weapons and sophisticated electronic gadgetry have been produced in the past 10 years, but we have not produced a single supersonic air superiority tactical fighter aircraft to counter those already being produced by the Soviets.

Mr. President, the threat to this country is in the Kremlin—not the Pentagon. The overwhelming assault on the military, the generals, the weapons systems, the Pentagon, the military-industrial complex, the draft, the conduct of the war, and the ROTC is primarily emotional hysteria. Distress over the tragic Vietnam war should not disillusion thoughtful Americans.

The verbal assault is aimed at our total military capability. Here is our security. Yet, many supposedly loyal American leaders place themselves in the same category with the violent demonstrators on the campus and elsewhere who protest these same security assets. It has been said by some philosophers that haters ultimately hate themselves and that protestors of violence ultimately become violent. I hope that this trend reverses in the face of the Soviet threat.

The free world has faced and must continue to face the hard reality of our times—that is, the growing economic and military power of the Soviets and that we shall continue to face it until the U.S.S.R. is convinced that the only recourse to prevent their own destruction is arms control and eventual disarmament.

The Kremlin is making an exhaustive effort to surpass America's strength.

The Soviets are seeking to dominate the oceans with expanding global sea power. They now have 375 submarines to our 142, and all their subs have been built since World War II, while 50 percent of ours are of World War II vintage.

Their capacity to produce nuclear subs of high speed and to produce subs of the U.S. *Polaris* type has been greatly increased. In fact, they have one submarine yard capable of building more submarines than all of the U.S. submarine yards put together.

The Soviets have also surpassed the United States in ICBM's. They have over 1,200 compared with our 1,054. The Russians have also developed a huge missile called the SS-9 capable of carrying heavy megatonnage, while the United States has no missiles of this type. Added to this picture is the fact the Soviets have around 700 intermediate range ballistic missiles to none for the United States. This entire situation becomes even more foreboding when we consider that they are continuing to build ICBM's and we have stopped our production.

In deliverable megatonnage the Soviets have a decided advantage over the United States, and here again our plans

call for a decline in this area, while intelligence shows the Russians are increasing in this capability.

On comparative bomber strength, the Russians have 900, including some 200 heavy bombers, while the U.S. strength is only 549. Furthermore, they have developed and are flying a supersonic transport capable of bomber conversion, while we have none.

In the tactical air power area, the Soviets have flown 18 new air superiority aircraft since 1955, while we developed the F-4, which remains today as our only air-to-air plane. We are clearly behind in this critical area of maintaining control of the skies over our fighting men. While they were developing the Foxbait and Floger, we were struggling with the F-111, which is not a true air superiority fighter.

The Soviets are also testing a fractional orbital bombardment system and antispace weapons, while we have taken no action in these critical areas. Further, they deployed their ABM in 1962, 7 years ago.

We can be assured that they will bleed us as long as they can in Vietnam, and they will propose arms control talks so long as they might gain an advantage.

The Soviets are experts in the art of planned misinformation. While engaged in disarmament talks in 1957, the Kremlin announced the successful firing of an ICBM. So, why should we be trapped as some would have us do, by delaying the ABM and stopping our tests of MIRV? Military technology must not be stifled on the basis of hopeful diplomacy.

Mr. President, costs for security and waste on some weapons are one thing, but the other allegations tagged on for "overkill" of our military are something else again. This is unfair to the men and women in uniform. Such unjust accusations shatter esprit de corps and incentive. It disillusiones the military. How can we expect loyalty and dedication when we fellow Americans ridicule our military?

We should never lose sight of the fact that the Soviets' increasing threat to the free world is the real cause. The Communists rejoice at our attacks on our military. It encourages their goal of world domination.

Some of our people seem to be seized by a fear psychosis. Assaults on the military now remind me of the early sixties in reverse. Then, rather than face the facts of life—the real threat—it was commonplace, beginning in 1961, to muzzle and censor the military. Now, as the facts of the real threat of Soviet military and economic power are spread before us, there are those who want to tuck tail and run.

It reminds me of what Rudyard Kipling said:

This is the time to fear . . . When he shows as seeking quarter, with paws like hands in prayer, that is the time of peril—the time of the Truce of the Bear.

As President Kennedy indicated:

We must never be lulled into believing that the Communist powers have yielded their ambition for world domination.

There are too many indulging in wishful thinking. When faced with realities

or danger, too many are filled with nostalgia. Their answer is conciliatory accommodation. If we are that scared of the Soviets, then there is not much to stop them taking over the rest of the free world by the piecemeal method.

Mr. President, what has happened to dedication, determination, spirit, unity, duty, and country? This is the code by which the military lives. It would be good for our country if the irresponsible critics and violent protestors would take heed of this code. Ill-informed condemnation by the politically ambitious and others is not a substitute for intelligent and constructive criticism. It does serious damage to the foundations of our great institutions, organizations, and our security.

The military leaders have long since been denied the spirit for any decisive action. If the demoralization continues, the spirit for victory may not be there when it is needed most for our survival.

Mr. President, so long as diplomacy continues to fail, our military is our only security. To continue to shatter the morale and spirit of our Armed Forces, especially when diplomacy fails, will guarantee that the free world will not survive.

Mr. President, in closing, I urge the Senate to pass this authorization bill without further reductions in order to protect the security of our country and our people.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRANSTON in the chair). Does the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I wish to express my personal appreciation for the defense of the military made by the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina. He has rendered a great service by setting the RECORD straight.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I wish to thank the able and distinguished Senator from Maine, who is the ranking member on the minority side and who has done such a magnificent job in this position.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, in my brief remarks yesterday at the conclusion of the very able speech by the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH), I expressed my gratitude, as a new member of that committee, for the remarkable openness and impartiality shown by the chairman and the other senior members of the committee. I wish to reiterate my appreciation at this point, and to express at the same time my very special gratitude to the able Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. McINTYRE), chairman of the Subcommittee on Research and Development, on which I was privileged to serve. As a friend and fellow New Englander, Senator McINTYRE has shown the greatest kindness and fullest cooperation to me and to my staff. For his aid and consideration I will always be thankful. Let me also say it was a great privilege for me to work with my other colleagues on that subcommittee—Senators YOUNG of Ohio, BYRD of Virginia, and MURPHY.

Ours was a most demanding and chal-

lenging task, Mr. President. None of us on the subcommittee are scientists, yet we had the responsibility for examining the proposed research, development, test and evaluation budget of more than \$8 billion. We heard testimony and attended briefings involving 20 major weapons systems, many of which are still little more than visions in the eyes of their creators. We spent many hours, in and out of committee, examining detailed reports, hypotheses, and predictions. We knew, as we proceeded with our difficult task, that our determinations could have a decisive effect upon our country's security and technological capability for many years to come.

Obviously a subcommittee which was formed on February 28 and submitted its report to the full committee only 4 months later could not investigate in great detail all the hundreds of items which the military is presently developing. We had to draw a line, and draw it early. Consequently, as the chairman has observed, we looked for "soft spots"; or, more specifically, for duplication, overlap, or excessive cost overruns in the research and development stage. We also considered priorities, asking the basic questions: What kind of wars are we likely to be fighting 5 or 10 years from now when these weapons are actually operational? And what type of weapon is the enemy likely to rely on at that particular stage in our development?

Projections of this nature can never be perfect, but I believe the subcommittee was on solid ground in its efforts to delete overlapping systems development and to insist that the services not only work together in the research and development stage but plan for systems which will also work in conjunction once they are actually deployed.

Mr. President, I have no intention of going over again the ground covered by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee in his statement delivered yesterday. The reductions in the various systems, the deletions which were made, the recommendations which accompany our report—all speak clearly for themselves. After the most careful deliberation we have concluded, and the full committee has upheld our view, that a total of \$1,042,000, or 12.7 percent, can reasonably be cut from the research and development budget without endangering—in the least—our national security or our progress on the technological advances necessary to sustain our defense. The savings in future years, resulting from consolidation of system research and reordering of our priorities, will run to many billions of dollars more.

I shall comment briefly, however, on a few of the major systems considered by the subcommittee.

Major reductions were made by the subcommittee in continental air defense. This is essentially an antibomber defense, and intelligence estimates played a heavy role in our deliberations. For one thing, the chances of a bomber attack upon the United States are remote, and become more so as we and our adversaries proceed with increasingly complex and reliable missile development. Second, it is significant that the Soviet Union has four times fewer bombers

than the United States, and is not now building more.

For these reasons, it was decided that continental air defense would have low priority in terms of procurement in the years ahead, and, therefore, maximum consolidation and savings could be instituted at this stage. Thus, funds for the Navy E2A/C aircraft, a sea-based duplicate of the Air Force AWACS system, were deleted from the budget. Reductions were also made in the CONUS air defense interceptor, and funds for the Army's Sam-D missile were deleted in full from the budget.

In other areas, the subcommittee has recommended a deletion of \$8 million for chemical and biological weapons research, thus supporting an overall committee reduction of \$16 million for this extremely controversial program. The subcommittee, recognizing the problems which have occurred and the heavy cost overrun which has been encountered in the development of the main battle tank, has reduced research and development funds for that program by \$14.9 million, and has ordered a reorientation of the program as well.

The subcommittee also recommended that funds for the Army heavy-lift helicopter be deleted from the budget. This is an example of the application of our judgment that there was no need for both the Army and the Navy to be working on the same type of aircraft. Since the Navy is likely to have more use for such a vehicle in the future, it was decided that a considerable amount could be saved if the Navy alone were assigned responsibility for this program.

Deletion of funds for the Manned Orbiting Laboratory represents another considerable saving, both in the present budget and in years to come. Testimony collected by the subcommittee led us to the conclusion that most, if not all, of the functions planned for the MOL could be performed as effectively, and certainly at far less cost, by an unmanned satellite.

Finally, I should like to mention a number of recommendations made by the subcommittee with regard to research by the Department of Defense in the social and behavioral sciences. I believe that the military has a clear and definite reason for authorizing studies of the physical and psychological capabilities of the men in the military, their training needs, and the optimum designs for weapons systems so that they may be operated with a minimum of stress.

But I have long believed that such areas as foreign environments and policy planning studies should fall more within the purview of other branches of our Government. It caused me great distress, for example, to learn that the Department of State has an annual budget of only \$100,000 for contingency policy planning, while the budget for comparable work in the Department of Defense totals \$36 million. For this reason, I was pleased to see the subcommittee impose a 12-percent reduction in funds for research in these areas and recommend in its report that more of these efforts be turned over to the Department of State, the Arms Control and Disarmament

Agency, and the National Science Foundation. I commend this step, and urge Senators who have responsibility for the budgets of these other agencies to take note of this recommendation.

I conclude, Mr. President, by pointing out that the work of the Research and Development Subcommittee does not stop with the passage of this authorization of individual proposed weapons must broaden and deepen our investigation of individual proposed weapons systems, and remain as current as humanly possible on technological problems and advances. We must work to insure that the recommendations contained in this report are carried out, that "comparability" in weapons development is enforced wherever possible, that clear priorities are established and carefully observed.

Again, let me say that it has been a great privilege and a great learning experience for me to be able to work with the members of the Committee on Armed Services and its informed and competent staff. I thank my colleagues, especially the chairman, and look forward to many more years of this association.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR TOWER TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the period for the transaction of routine morning business tomorrow, the distinguished Senator from Texas (Mr. Tower) be recognized.

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 Senate resumed the consideration of 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 69

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to S. 2546

which would insert a new title dealing with the Safeguard-ABM system and ask that it be printed.

Mr. President, in order that this amendment will be readily available to Senators, I also ask unanimous consent that it be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 69) is as follows:
AMENDMENT No. 69

On page 5, at the end of line 6 insert the following new title:

"TITLE IV—SAFEGUARD ANTIBALLISTIC MISSILE SYSTEM

"Sec. 401. (a) In the case of funds authorized under this Act for the Safeguard Antiballistic Missile System, such funds may be used only for—

"(1) Research, development, testing, and evaluation of the System's radars, computers, and related electronic equipment.

"(2) Pre-production expenses of the Sprint and Spartan missiles and the production of such missiles for research, development, evaluation, and testing.

"(b) The equipment described in clause (1) of subsection (a) may not be installed at any proposed ABM site, except at or near Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, and Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana.

"(c) None of the funds appropriated pursuant to this or any other Act may be expended for the acquisition of land, not now owned by the United States, or the use of land owned by the United States, for the construction or installation of any ABM facilities at any proposed ABM site, except at or near Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, and Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana.

"(d) None of the funds appropriated pursuant to this or any other Act may be expended for the procurement, installation, or deployment of any operational missile as a part of any antiballistic missile system, nor for the construction of any silos or other launch facilities for any operational missile as a part of any antiballistic missile system."

On page 5, line 7, strike out "Title IV" and insert in lieu thereof "Title V."

On page 5, line 8, strike out "Sec. 401" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 501."

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my supplemental views appearing on pages 66 and 67 of the report of the Committee on Armed Services be printed in the RECORD.

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

SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS OF Mr. McINTYRE

I did not vote in the committee when it considered Safeguard-ABM. I do not believe that a "yea" or "nay" answer for or against Safeguard-ABM is adequate. I believe that an alternative to Safeguard-ABM is the proper answer.

I had the chance to discuss my alternative during the committee action on Safeguard-ABM but I did not call for formal consideration and a vote at that time. Rather, I prefer that this proposal be considered on the floor of the Senate when the authorization bill is being voted upon.

The alternative proposal which I am offering to Safeguard-ABM would—

(1) Authorize a concentrated developmental testing program of the radar, computer, and related electronic components of the Safeguard system at the North Dakota and

Montana locations suggested by the President.

(2) Authorize production engineering and continued developmental testing of the system's missiles.

(3) Preclude the deployment or production of operational Sprints or Spartans, the construction of missile launch facilities, and the acquisition of land at other than the two locations.

(4) Require full congressional review and approval before any such deployment or production of weapons, silo construction, or further land acquisition.

A concentrated developmental testing program with a clear expression of congressional desire to withhold the deployment of more nuclear weapons would lose nothing and gain much.

This alternative will retain the option to deploy substantially on the President's schedule if Congress decides next year to authorize full deployment.

There would be a delay of only 4 to 5 months in the completion of the Grand Forks site, none at Malmstrom site, and only 1½ months in the testing of the integration of the two systems.

There would be a gain of another year's intelligence information to try to clarify the current projections about the possible threat of a Soviet first strike.

The current disagreement between the CIA and DOD underlines how difficult it is to make long-range intelligence projections with confidence and precision.

As Secretary Laird has pointed out:

"Our intelligence projections over the next 2 or 3 years are reasonably firm. But when we project 5 or 6 years ahead we are getting into an area of considerable uncertainty. * * * Our national intelligence projections for the mid-1970's involve a large measure of judgment rather than hard evidence."

The alternative I am proposing would give us another year's "hard evidence" to inform our final decision about full deployment. If the Soviets are not trying to develop a first strike, their buildup should begin to level off. If they are, it will persist, perhaps even accelerate.

If future intelligence information clearly demonstrates the Soviet intention and ability to develop a first strike capability, the concentrated testing program I am proposing would have retained our option of meeting a threat to our Minuteman with Safeguard. If the Soviet threat of a first strike does not materialize, we can decide with confidence and a sense of security not to deploy Safeguard.

By withholding the decision to deploy more nuclear weapons, and by meeting the long leadtime problem of Safeguard, a concentrated testing program, neither gives the Soviets reason to increase their arms nor lets our own guard down.

The alternative I am proposing would concentrate on the most difficult technical problems in the system. Dr. John Foster, head of DOD Research and Development, as well as most informed and responsible critics, have emphasized the difficulty in developing a reliable computer program, integrating this complex system of radars and computers, and relying on uniformed personnel. This testing program would enable us to concentrate on these problems, work out the bugs, make any necessary improvements, and raise our confidence in the system.

The alternative I am proposing would also help strategic arms limitations talks.

A decision now to deploy more nuclear weapons—even if defensive—would complicate strategic arms limitation talks. If there is a beginning of the construction of missile silos, as requested in the Safeguard proposal, the Soviets could misinterpret this activity as the beginning of a dramatic expansion of offensive weapons. Even if they accept state-

ments that the silos would be filled with purely defensive missiles, they could use the intent to deploy more nuclear weapons as an excuse to deploy more of theirs.

On the other hand a concentrated developmental testing program which retains the option to deploy Safeguard substantially on schedule gives the Soviets a realistic incentive to enter into effective SALT talks. The knowledge on their part that to overcome Safeguard, if deployed, would require an expensive addition to their strategic arms, should help to dissuade them from trying to develop a first strike capability and should motivate them to proceed with SALT talks. It was this kind of realism that enabled us to negotiate a nuclear nonproliferation treaty and a test ban agreement.

Finally, the alternative I am proposing would symbolize our Nation's desire to turn the corner on the arms race and to affirm a fresh set of national priorities. In fiscal year 1970 there would be a saving of at least \$15 million in construction funds for missile silos alone. But the long-range savings due to improvements in the system or an eventual decision not to deploy could well be dramatic.

In sum, the alternative I am proposing would not intensify the arms race; it would help us secure an effective arms limitation agreement; it would seek to answer the hardest questions about the system's workability; it would symbolize our turning the corner on defense spending; and it would preserve the ability to meet in time any clear Soviet threat to the strategic balance in the 1970's.

And above all it strikes a balance in the consideration of the twin problems of achieving national safety and a secure peace.

THOMAS J. MCINTYRE.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE) for offering his amendment to the legislation which is now pending.

I also wish to commend the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) for proposing their amendment yesterday.

While these two amendments differ in some degree, they represent a determination on the part of their sponsors for a workable modification of the ABM proposal.

It has been obvious for sometime that authority for the Defense Department to proceed with the development of an unlimited ABM system could not be approved by this Senate.

In fact, without modification I would have had to vote "No" on this proposal.

It is, however, imperative that in the world as it is today the security of the United States be firmly maintained and that our defenses, including our deterrent and retaliatory powers, be kept up to date.

The issue before us is not whether we should agree with those who contend that the United States should set an example to the world through unilateral disarmament or those who apparently hold that the solution to international differences can best be solved by the dropping of bombs.

While the Polaris submarine has undoubtedly been our greatest deterrent to a widespread war, yet we should not regard the matter before us as an issue between the Polaris and other branches of our Defense Department.

Above all else, the situation with which we are confronted calls for the

exercise of common sense, fairness, and clarity.

As I have indicated, we should not grant authority for the deployment or permanent installation of ABM missiles at this session of Congress, but neither should we retard the research which would be essential to the ultimate installation of ABM missiles should circumstances prove such a course to be advisable.

I am particularly interested in research as it pertains to the improvement of our presently inadequate radar systems—and, I might add, our sonar systems as well.

A special reason for perfecting our radar system is the fact that within the next decade or so, supersonic air transportation between the continents will become an accomplished fact and the same radar which would be used to detect oncoming enemy missiles would also be used for the civilian economic requirements of the future.

The moon flight shot scheduled for July 16 is another reason for the need to develop more sophisticated tracking devices which can be used for civilian purposes as well as military, not that our present tracking system to the moon is not excellent but it must be perfect before outerspace travel can be extended to greater distances.

It is rather ironic that much of the civilian economic progress of mankind has come about as a result of war or preparation for possible war.

We have paid an exceptionally high and unnecessary price for this progress, but until mankind learns to govern itself and keep its passions under control, it is unlikely that we will be able to digress from this course which has persisted over the centuries.

Therefore, it is essential that the legislation now before us be modified to prohibit the permanent installation or deployment of ABM missiles but not to such an extent that it impairs the security of the Nation or impedes the economic progress upon which our future depends.

It has been said repeatedly that legislation authorizing an ABM program is needed to strengthen the hands of the President at the upcoming meeting with Russia.

May I point out, however, that if the United States enters into a conference with Russia looking to control of armament and aimed at developing a less tense relationship between the two countries, that even though the legislation as written could be approved by as many as 51 or 52 votes in the Senate, which I doubt, we would be in an extremely weak bargaining position.

I believe it is absolutely necessary for President Nixon to have a much larger number of votes of the Senate supporting him when we enter into such a conference.

The pending legislation relating to the ABM must be modified to the extent that strong approval of the Senate will be obtained.

Again I wish to commend the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Kentucky for recognizing this sit-

uation, and I express the hope and belief that before this debate is ended, a mutual and satisfactory common ground will be reached.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont, the ranking Republican in this body, for the thoughtful speech which he has just made.

As I stated to the distinguished Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH) yesterday, those of our colleagues who come from New England do not waste words. They get to the point quickly. The Senator has indicated that the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, as well as the amendment offered yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) are steps in the right direction, if not necessarily the right answer.

The Senator also has indicated that authority for the Defense Department to proceed with the development of an unlimited ABM system could not be approved by the Senate.

This is an indication of the closeness of the vote, under present circumstances, which may well accrue if the matter is faced up to without a sizable change in the proposal.

The Senator indicates:

In fact, without modification I would have had to vote no on the proposal.

That, in relation to his approval, in a sense, of the offer of the two amendments referred to, indicates that the Senator has an open mind and is not prepared, even as yet, to commit himself. As a matter of fact, it might well be that the determination of this issue could be decided by the distinguished Senator from Vermont, who now has the floor.

As the Senator has said:

It is, however, imperative that in the world as it is today the security of the United States be firmly maintained and that our defenses, including our deterrent and retaliatory powers, be kept up to date.

With that statement, I agree.

Then the Senator goes on to say:

The issue before us is not whether we should agree with those who contend that the United States should set an example to the world through unilateral disarmament or those who apparently hold that the solution to international differences can best be solved by the dropping of bombs.

I agree wholeheartedly because both of these positions, in my opinion, represent not logic and reason, but, rather, emotion farfetched.

That is the only part of this debate which has disturbed me, when those of us who have raised questions about the ABM—some of us, at least—have been charged with advocating unilateral disarmament.

Fortunately, I know of no Senator who has advocated that this matter of international differences can be solved by the dropping of bombs.

The Senator from Vermont also said:

Above all else, the situation with which we are confronted calls for the exercise of common sense, fairness, and clarity.

That is absolutely correct. That is what the Senator from Vermont is trying to inject into this debate. He said further:

As I have indicated, we should not grant authority for the deployment or permanent installation of ABM missiles at this session of Congress, but neither should we retard the research which would be essential to the ultimate installation of ABM missiles should circumstances prove such a course to be advisable.

That is correct. Then the Senator said:

I am particularly interested in research as it pertains to the improvement of our presently inadequate radar systems.

I am, too. But there is a grave question about the softness or vulnerability of the radar system which is proposed to be installed at missile sites, especially in Montana and North Dakota. I should think, as a suggestion, that perhaps it would be possible to achieve the same results if testing were to be carried on at such missile sites as Kwajalein, which has been in operation for some time, if my information is correct, and at Eniwetok, which I understand, is 500 or 600 miles from Kwajalein—in other words, approximately the same distance as between Grand Forks, N. Dak., and Malmstrom, Mont.

Furthermore, there would be no indication that something was being attempted which might prove to be a steppingstone, a nose under the tent, or a foot in the door to the building of a complete ABM system, not only at those two sites, and not only as to computerized Sprints and Spartans, but the same being applied to the other 10 missile sites that are underway.

What the Senator from Vermont has said indicates, of course, that he has given this subject a great deal of thought. Different views may exist among us, but I do not question the integrity or the patriotism of any Member of this body, whether he be for or against the system. Whether or not one is against it is, of course, a matter of judgment, which all of us must face up to. The President has faced up to his responsibility and has rendered a judgment. We have to face up to our responsibility and render a judgment, as well.

The Senator from Vermont also said—and I am getting close to the end of this interpolation:

It has been said repeatedly that legislation authorizing an ABM program is needed to strengthen the hands of the President at the upcoming meeting with Russia.

That is a doubtful thesis. No one can read the minds of the Russians. No one really knows what the effect will be of a system of this kind being built. It might be beneficial; it might be harmful. It is a doubtful thesis.

The Senator from Vermont also said:

May I point out, however, that if the United States enters into a conference with Russia looking to the control of armament and aimed at developing a less tense relationship between the two countries, even though the legislation as written could be approved by as many as 51 or 52 votes in the Senate, which I doubt, we would be in an extremely weak bargaining position.

The Senator is correct. I join him in his remarks because the situation is one

which cannot be avoided now. It must be faced up to in some manner or in some form.

When the Senator, in his last paragraph, after commending the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Kentucky, expresses "the hope and belief that before this debate has ended, a mutual and satisfactory common ground will be reached," I join him, but I emphasize the importance of achieving an objective of this sort.

As has happened so often in my years in the Senate, the distinguished Senator from Vermont has rendered a service to all of us, regardless of our position. I hope that in the light of his remarks, we will do a little reevaluating and rethinking. I congratulate him for a fine speech.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me thank the Senator from Montana for his analysis of the remarks which I have just made. I am willing to confess that the remarks pertaining to the radar installations were put in there for the purpose of pointing out what is possibly the only issue which will require a better understanding among Members of the Senate. This is one thing which will have to be worked out and reconciled before we can get a large vote for the bill, or for the ABM part of the Defense authorization bill, in the Senate.

I believe it is essential, not perhaps so much for the purpose of trading the ABM with the Russians, but indicating to the Russians that the Congress, or at least the Senate, is behind the President in his efforts to achieve a limitation of armaments as well as better relations between the two countries. I think the size of the vote on the amendment which will finally be produced—and I do not think any of the sponsors or introducers of the two amendments already before the Senate can claim perfection—will carry great weight in the disarmament conferences when they take place, which we understand will probably be sometime next month.

I yield now to the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. McINTYRE). I commend the Senator again for presenting the amendment he has submitted.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding to me. I also want to thank him for the kind and judicious remarks he had made about the amendment I have just offered. It is rewarding indeed to one who has participated in the Armed Services Committee hearings and who has studied this subject, as I am sure every Member of this body has, to have those remarks from the distinguished and great Senator from New England—if I may put him in that category right now. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I want to join the Senator from Montana in commending the Senator from Vermont for his statement. I think he has analyzed the question extremely well. I think it is very beneficial to this debate and will put it in a perspective which makes it much more understandable to the public at large. I congratulate the Senator for rendering a real service to this debate.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The able senior Senator from Vermont has today, as on many other occasions, rendered a notable service. The spirit of accommodation which he says is needed in the national interest, prevails, in my view, in the Senate.

Perhaps I can be permitted to say that, as chairman of the Disarmament Subcommittee which held extensive hearings on the subject of the ABM, hearing witnesses both pro and con, some 6 weeks ago I called an unpublicized executive session of the subcommittee. So far as I know, there has been no publicity about it. For 3 hours members of the committee, in an absolutely nonpartisan, bipartisan spirit, discussed the responsibility of Senators in this context.

We came to the conclusion, rightly or wrongly, that deployment of the antiballistic missile system could be every detrimental—might be even disastrous—to the coming conference. In any event, whether we were right or wrong, we reached the conclusion that we could not compromise on deployment; but with the coming of the conference, at which time, we had been assured then, the administration was nearing the end of its negotiating position and would soon indicate a readiness to go to conference, we considered, as I said, the responsibility of Senators in this regard.

Around the table, a spirit of accommodation was unanimously expressed. So with the approval of the group then present—again unanimously—I designated two members to convey to President Nixon the attitude of the members of the subcommittee.

I think that spirit of accommodation still prevails. I think it prevailed when, late last Monday afternoon, the pending bill was made the business of the Senate and debate began. But, because this spirit of accommodation had not met with reciprocation, it became necessary to join issue for a showdown battle, if necessary.

I say, in all sincerity, I doubt if that a showdown battle on this issue would be in the President's interest, would be in the national interest, or that it would be in the interest of the Senate. But, as the Senator from Montana has said, reciprocity, accommodation, and compromise is a two-way street. The able senior Senator from Vermont has now stepped right into the middle of the street and is beckoning in both directions.

I join the Senator from Montana in again expressing appreciation to him and in expressing a willingness to cooperate with him to the extent of full research and development.

Mr. AIKEN. I hope the Senator from Tennessee realizes there is an island in the middle of that street.

Mr. GORE. If we need to build some traffic protection for the Senator, I am willing to do that, too.

Mr. AIKEN. Otherwise, it might be a precarious position.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it has been my privilege to know the distinguished Senator from Vermont for a

good many years, and I have served with him on two committees over a period of years.

The more you know the Senator, the more you respect him. It would not be possible not to like him. This afternoon, once again he has shown that he is a great Senator, a wise and able statesman.

Because of the nature of this debate, and its import with respect to the future of these United States, I hope with all my heart that Senators on both sides of the aisle will give full respect to the thoughts this wise man has presented us today.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I would not be human if I did not appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Missouri. But let me say, finally, that my fondest hope is that the Members of the Senate will agree upon a modification of the ABM for research and development work as well as enable us to get a very large percentage of the Members of the Senate to vote in favor of it, because the President must have that backing for the upcoming arms talks.

I would not interpret our vote this year to be in support of an ABM deployment next year, the year after, or the year after that, or whenever it might come about, as much as I would an indication that we are behind the President in his efforts to secure better relationships with other countries of the world. I am particularly thinking of Russia with whom continuous competition and arms rivalry is turning out to be a very expensive affair for all of us.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I have reviewed the speech, or the "release when given" comments of the Senator from Vermont. I am sorry I was not here when he presented them. I should like to make just a few comments on those, and then comment upon the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. McINTYRE), which I think is particularly important.

The Senator from Vermont, for whom I have great admiration and respect, has said, on his opening page:

It has been obvious for some time that authority for the Defense Department to proceed with the development of an unlimited ABM system could not be approved by this Senate.

Then he goes on to say:

In fact, without modification I would have had to vote no on the proposal.

Mr. President, it is not my understanding that either the committee or the President has advocated the development of an unlimited ABM system. As a matter of fact, it is quite limited, and the President, in his speech endorsing this proposal, very carefully stated that he was reserving the option, during the process of negotiations, to be able to halt whatever was going on at any time that he felt so inclined, and that by going forward now with procurement of certain items, we still retained our option to stop deployment while at the same time we were perfecting the ability of all the components to work together, in the event that they were needed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I simply wanted to observe that I would interpret any authorization for deployment of the missiles to be the ultimate objective, so far as unlimited development went, because once we started deploying them, there would be no end to the procedure. Some of the witnesses have testified that the ABM proposal as written into the bill was a good start, indicating that they expected to go on from there, and on and on, until nobody knows what the end would be.

It might be limited, but from the witnesses I heard, it sounded very much as if they viewed it as a start toward an unlimited program.

Mr. DOMINICK. With all due respect to the Senator from Vermont, I think he is probably reading more into this than the committee is, at least more than they intended to authorize, and certainly more, I believe, than the President indicated in his speech in support of the proposal.

I shall leave the matter there, because I believe Senators can read the report of the committee on this matter, and read the President's statement, and see that this is a very careful limitation, in order to preserve our option to put an ABM, eventually, in 1974, in two places, and be able to observe the credibility of our deterrent force.

I was certainly happy to see the statement of the distinguished Senator from Vermont that:

Our defenses including our deterrent and retaliatory powers (should) be kept up to date.

I think this is part of the process of doing it, and on that process perhaps we disagree to a certain extent.

Mr. President, I also wish to comment on the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. McINTYRE), for whom also I have high regard.

As I said the other day, I think the Senator from New Hampshire and the other members of the Subcommittee on R.D.T. & E. did a very fine job of analysis of the proposed budget. By virtue of the work which he and other members of the committee did, we were able to cut off almost \$1 billion from the proposed budget. Undoubtedly, as we continue in this effort, we can do some more.

I know his reservations about the ABM, and have now reviewed his proposed amendment, and would like to indicate some of the problems that I see in this if—and I say "if" because I hope there will not be any withdrawal from the position we are in—but if we have to take anything at all, there are problems with this amendment which are inherent in the total program of research and development, and on deployment as well.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. I should like to request information as to how other Senators could obtain copies of the amendment, so we could more closely follow the colloquy. Have they been printed?

Mr. DOMINICK. I happen to have a copy here, which I assume comes from Senator McINTYRE's office. I will be happy

to let the Senator look at it and return it.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the Senator very much. I now have one here.

Mr. DOMINICK. The problem with the amendment is that it casts a cloud of doubt over the entire Safeguard developmental effort, as I see it, because the body of the authorization bill, as it came from the committee, authorizes certain expenditures for the Safeguard system in general terms; the proposed amendment purports to redefine and limit this authority by an enumeration of activities for which funds may be used. By implication, at least, expenditure for anything that does not appear on the list of enumerated activities is unauthorized. The list contained and the language used in the amendment appear, on examination, to be so incomplete and ambiguous as to raise serious difficulties with implementation if it were put into effect, and to cast doubt on the authority to conduct certain necessary developmental and preproduction activities.

The following are examples of some of the practical problems of interpretation and ambiguity that would arise under the amendment:

First, S. 2546 in its title states that the authorization of test facilities at Kwajalein is a specific purpose of the bill and this is implemented by section 203. Yet the absence of language in subsection (a) of the amendment specifically authorizing funds to be spent for such facilities and R.D.T. & E. effort on radar and missiles at Kwajalein, coupled with the further limitation in subsection (b) forbidding the installation of "equipment described" in subsection (a) (1)—that is, radars, computers, and related electronic equipment—at "any proposed anti-ballistic-missile site" other than Grand Forks and Malmstrom, could lead to the conclusion that construction and installation of facilities at Kwajalein is unauthorized. These additional facilities at Kwajalein are required for essential system tests with radars and missiles.

Second, likewise, the provision in subsection (b) limiting the installation of "equipment described" to two specified sites may preclude the establishment of essential modifications to training facilities; it may also prohibit the modification of existing command and control facilities and the production and installation of the tactical software control site at Whippany, N.J., which is essential to the developmental testing program.

Third, subsection (a) (2) raises even more serious ambiguities. This is the only portion of the amendment dealing with what is permitted in the way of preproduction and production type activity. It permits "preproduction expenses"—an ambiguous term—but only for missiles. Considering that subsection (a) (1) permits funds to be used only for research, development, testing and evaluation of system components such as radars, computers, and related electronic equipment, but not for production of these items, it is unclear how funds—particularly PEMA funds—can be used to procure these items for the Grand Forks and Malmstrom tactical sites. The amendment is silent with respect to production engineering and preparation for manu-

facture of nonmissile items such as radars and computers. Absence of such authority would have a serious impact on timely future deployability of the system.

Fourth, there is no specific authorization for funds to be used for development or procurement of necessary and ancillary supporting facilities that are not "related electronic equipment."

Fifth, this amendment could be interpreted as preventing the accomplishment in fiscal year 1970 of survey, advanced engineering, and site selection for phase 2 sites. If this site selection activity is not carried out in fiscal year 1970 on several of the phase 2 sites, there will be several months of delay in proceeding with these sites if their later deployment is approved.

So the problem, as I see it in general—and I am not trying to be critical of it because as I say it is trying to accomplish some kind of compromise—if we go forward with this type of amendment, we have ambiguities in what we can or cannot do that will no doubt cause a very great delay in future deployment in the event we need it next year. That is the main problem with the Cooper amendment and with the McIntyre amendment.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, I have listened to the critique of the language of my amendment.

I have had numerous sources of advice as to how to draw this—from legislative counsel, from members of our own staff, members of the Committee on Armed Services.

I assure the Senator that his critical comments made here will be looked at carefully. In the event we find some merit in them, we will try to make the appropriate modifications in the amendment now at the desk.

There should be no doubt concerning my amendment, as it is very clearly spelled out in the supplemental views in the committee report. However, I appreciate—and I am sure the Senator does—how difficult it sometimes is to put down in exact, legal language in an amendment to a bill the very thoughts that we expressly have in mind.

There is always the question of some ambiguity creeping in.

We will take recognition of the Senator's remarks.

Mr. DOMINICK. I fully understand that. That is the reason why I spoke up. I thought that if the Senator wanted to perfect his amendment, it would give him a chance to do so. Second, in all fairness, regardless of the amendment, the Senator is trying to prevent the deployment in fiscal year 1970 of deployable items. I must in all conscience oppose the amendment, since it will do that.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator if he has discussed this matter with the White House?

Mr. DOMINICK. I have not been in touch with the White House. However, I have been in touch with other representatives, and I am sure they agree with that.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President. There is no need to add to the tributes that have

been paid to the senior Senator from Vermont. He was asked by us to approach the question before the Senate with commonsense, fairness, and clarity. These are qualities which have always marked the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

I hope that we will follow his suggestion.

I know there was no intention on the part of any of us who opposed last year the deployment of ABM, to confront the then President of the United States—and now with a new President and one of my party, there is no desire or pleasure on our part for a confrontation.

We have offered an amendment which would provide to the administration all the money it has asked, but to be used for research, development, testing and evaluation of all the components of the system so there would be no timelag if in the future—next year, before, or even later—it should become evident that the threat which the Secretary of Defense has projected had become a reality.

As the distinguished Senator from Colorado has called attention to the amendment which the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) and I offered for ourselves and on behalf of many others who hold the same position, I point out that the amendment is not ambiguous.

Its sponsors decided as a group to provide to the administration all of the money it asked so that it would be enabled in fiscal year 1970 to proceed with research, development, testing, and evaluation and do so in ways that it thought best, but with the option of developing a more effective system than the Safeguard, if one became needed.

We provide, incident to research and development, that the administration could make such procurement as it believed necessary for such testing. As the Secretary of Defense himself stated in his testimony before the House Subcommittee on Appropriations that no part of the system could be deployed as an integrated unit until 1974, or as separate component parts during the coming year, we have not deprived the administration of anything if the amendment should be agreed to, except the political decision of actual deployment at this time.

Our reasoning is, as many have stated, that, approaching the arms talk, it would be better for the administration to go to the talks without commencing the deployment of the weapons, offensive and defensive, which the very negotiations seek to control. It is to determine if the nuclear arms race can be brought under control.

Our amendment is clear. It will be elaborated in view of the statement of my friend, the Senator from Colorado, I again make this explanation of the purpose of our amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a few moments ago, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, made a brief statement. The first paragraph reads as follows:

The printed record released today of the hearings on Intelligence and the ABM before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has

been cited by the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as evidence of the disagreement between Secretary of Defense Laird and Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Mr. Helms in their assessment of the strategic threat which makes the ABM necessary.

Then later, in the next to the last sentence, it states:

Both Secretary Laird and Mr. Helms have replied and made it clear that there is no disagreement between them as to the strategic threat.

I thought it was necessary to clear up the record, because the transcript of the hearing held with Mr. Helms and Secretary Laird, which was released today, does not allege that there was any difference with regard to the strategic threat. I want to read the paragraph. There are differences, but not of that character, because I do not think the CIA has made an assessment of that particular matter. I read from page 6 of the hearings which were released today. This is in a letter which I addressed to Mr. Laird based upon his letter and the hearings:

In fact, as the record now stands it leaves the impression that there have been no disagreements within the intelligence community as far as certain recent developments in Soviet weaponry are concerned. I felt that I had no choice but to agree to the deletions requested by the executive branch on the grounds of national security. But the fact of the matter is that there have been disagreements within the intelligence community on such recent developments, although all the testimony given at our June 23 meeting indicating such disagreements has been deleted from the public record.

Now, those disagreements did not relate to the strategic threat. I wish to make it clear that they do relate, however, to other aspects of the matter which were deleted. They were deleted because all of the testimony of Mr. Helms was deleted on the usual grounds of national security. But I have the hearings before me. I would be very pleased to show them to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, to illustrate what I mean. There were distinctly differences of view as to certain weapons systems and their characteristics, and this is what was referred to in my letter to Mr. Laird.

I only wanted to make this statement in order to clarify the record. To say that there were no differences on the strategic threat is, in a sense—I am not sure what the right characterization is, whether it is a red herring or not. In any case, that is not what was at issue at all. I assure the Senator that I hold in my hand the document which clearly shows there were differences between the two agencies—that is, between the intelligence community and the Secretary of Defense—with regard to certain weapons systems and things of that nature in arriving at a judgment as to what the intentions are and also what the necessity of the ABM is at this time—such differences, I may say, relating to the ABM and the Russians, and so on. These are differences with which the Senator is familiar. Those are the differences I was discussing.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I should

like to respond to the Senator's comment, if he will yield to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. In the first place, the opening sentence of the statement I made uses the term "which makes the ABM necessary." It was not my purpose to imply that Mr. Helms testified that the ABM was necessary. The words should have been "which gives rise to the question of whether or not the ABM is necessary." That is a refinement of language that makes clear what I said—which gave rise to the question of whether or not the ABM is necessary. I was talking about the strategic threat.

Mr. President, it is hardly possible to describe how many things have been said and written about this conflict in the testimony given by Mr. Laird and Mr. Helms. It has been mentioned to me on the Senate floor by Senators who are interested from one point of view and the other.

Finally, in the rush of all these other matters, I made some effort to look at the testimony of both men. It was not convenient to get it, although I was not denied access to it. It was not convenient for me to see it. But the release of the testimony of Mr. Laird and Mr. Helms, with the deletions, gives rise to the question again: Well, what is the conflict between these men?

I anticipated that the best I could by writing each of them a letter and pointing out that the alleged conflicts had been called to my attention many times and that in preparation for this debate I wanted to know the facts. They are responsible men, in responsible positions.

I attached to my brief statement a copy of the letter to Mr. Helms. I will not burden the Senate by reading both of them, except to read the last paragraph:

I would greatly appreciate if you would respond appropriately after consultation with Secretary Laird indicating your agreement or disagreement with any aspects of his response.

I said to Mr. Laird that I wanted to be provided with a statement and—

Whether your definition and evaluation is concurred in by the Central Intelligence Agency, particularly Mr. Richard Helms, Director, and if there is disagreement, to what extent and in what regard.

Those are very pointed questions.

An answer was received from Mr. Laird. Mr. Helms happened to be out of the country, but this matter was communicated to him. It was read to him, and he has sent a reply through General Cushman, and I will put that in the RECORD. General Cushman was Acting Director in the absence of Mr. Helms from the city. He said:

Although Mr. Helms is presently out of town, he has read the text of Secretary Laird's reply. Mr. Helms wishes to assure you that he has no disagreement with the statements in Secretary Laird's letter to you of 8 July concerning the potential Soviet and Chinese Communist strategic capabili-

ties, as seen from the intelligence point of view.

I should like to dwell on that for a moment—strategic capability. That is the capacity and the possibility of what appears to be the course of events and evaluation of what indications arise as to what the plans are for the future; that is, the capability of our adversary as to the strategic threat. That is as far as Mr. Helms' duties go, as the Senator knows. Mr. Helms does not advise whether we need an ABM—never; nor whether we need an F-14 or F-15 or any other weapons. He works, as the Senator well knows, upon the intelligence, the capabilities.

Mr. Helms is not going any further than that in his duty; and they certify here that there is no disagreement on these matters so far as Mr. Helms' duty goes; and I think that clarifies the situation a great deal.

Now, we can go back and pick up fragments here, there, and yonder about what Mr. Helms thinks about the indications from—we cannot discuss these things too much—but fragments of matters he may know about, or what Mr. Laird thinks about that. I do not think that is so relevant. But Mr. Laird has the duty of enunciating a policy the best he can.

He and the President and others passed on this intelligence. There is where the matter about the ABM comes in.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to make one comment, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Missouri unless he wishes me to yield to him right now.

Mr. SYMINGTON. No, but I would appreciate it if the Senator would yield to me later.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. First, I wish to emphasize what is said in that last letter in case those who do not read it carefully should miss it. I refer to the letter to Senator STENNIS from General Cushing. I reiterate that the letter says:

Mr. Helms wishes to assure you that he has no disagreement with the statements in Secretary Laird's letter to you of 8 July concerning the potential Soviet and Chinese Communist strategic capabilities.

And I wish to emphasize, "as seen from the intelligence point of view."

Now, coming to the letter of Mr. Laird, he said:

In short, we believe the USSR has the capability of acquiring, by the mid-1970's: some 400 SS-9 ICBMs, multiple independently-targeted re-entry vehicles, SLBMs matching the U.S. POLARIS fleet, ICBM retargeting capability.

This illustrates a point that has been very slippery in this entire matter. I wish to show to the Senator from Mississippi that the committee of which I am a member did not seek this controversy. We were not trying to nitpick. The whole matter of difference arose out of the statement made by the Secretary of Defense in open session before the subcommittee headed by the Senator from Ten-

nessee to the effect that the Soviet Union was going for a first strike capability. Then, he added, for emphasis:

There is no question about that.

This is a very significant statement. This is where the matter started. This did not start with any little meeting in secret between our committee and the Secretary of Defense or the CIA. We were trying to clarify a statement which was extremely provocative, a statement that, if true, and based upon a finding of the intelligence community, should be taken most seriously.

That statement was generally interpreted to mean that the Soviet Union was preparing for a first strike, which means utter destruction of the United States beyond the possibility for retaliation. I will read his statement. This is from that hearing. This is the Secretary of Defense speaking:

The Chairman has quoted your statement before the committee which was carried on television. But for the sake of my question I would like to repeat it:

"With the large tonnage the Soviets have, they are going for our missiles and they are going for a first strike capability. There is no question about that."

Secretary Laird did it for emphasis. This is what started the whole matter. This raises extremely serious questions about our whole relations with the Soviet Union. If that statement by the Secretary could be taken literally and fully, my goodness, an ABM would be mighty small potatoes compared to that kind of threat. This is what we have been trying to clarify. And that is why we had this meeting; in order to determine what the Secretary meant.

Immediately after Secretary Laird said what I quoted about a first strike, I inquired of the intelligence division of the State Department, and later of the CIA and the Chairman of the U.S. Intelligence Board to this effect. I asked if that Board ever found that the U.S.S.R. was going for a first strike capability. In other words, were they producing weapons or doing anything else which led the intelligence community to make such a finding? They make that annual finding in the fall and then they meet once a week to update whatever their newest intelligence may bring to their attention.

I was assured they had never made such a finding. In other words, this statement of the Secretary of Defense had been made on his own authority without being based on findings of the intelligence community. That is what started this matter. I think it is important that it be clarified.

I believe that in this last hearing, the Senator should read carefully the committee hearing, and especially the questioning of the Senator from Tennessee who pursued this matter at great length. He was chairman of the subcommittee in which this statement was made. I believe the Senator from Mississippi will find there quite a qualification by the Secretary of Defense himself as to what he intended. I do not believe he intended to give the impression that he did give by that statement. I think he has drawn back from that.

That is the only point I wanted to

make with respect to the strategic threat or capability. I am not saying and I do not think anybody is saying that given an all-out effort the Russians could not make lots of weapons and we could not make lots of weapons. This proposition is centered around the thought that by having a meeting with them, and the President has committed himself to having a meeting with them, we can control or stop at least this vast acceleration of the arms race. I think we can, and if we understand the situation better and if each side is convinced that the other side is not going to destroy the deterrents, then I think a negotiated settlement is possible.

I yield to the Senator from Missouri, who wishes to respond.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if I may, I would like to make a few remarks in response.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the Senator's statement. I am sure he appreciates what I was doing with these letters. I do not know if we have a qualified statement, but I wanted to get something by both of them to put side by side in this debate.

Now, we know, as far as these letters go, there is no difference between them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not accept the statement that there is no difference between them. There is no difference on that point. I would not want to let it pass that there is no difference.

Let me say to the Senator that I did not wish to have Mr. Helms come and be confronted by the Secretary of Defense. The Secretary of Defense is a powerful political figure on his own. For a long time, he was an influential Member of the House of Representatives. This puts him with a man who can be dismissed tomorrow morning by the President if he does not suit him. I did not want to have the two men together. It was not done at the insistence of the Director of the CIA. I do not like to ask him, "Do you disagree with the Secretary of Defense?" That puts him in the intolerable position of standing up and disagreeing with a man who, in our political system, is far more secure. I did not want to do that in the first place. I think the letter in which he replied is couched very carefully. I certainly hope beyond all things that as a result of these exchanges, the Director of the CIA is not dismissed. I have been afraid of that, or even to mention him in public after I saw what happened to Mr. Fitzgerald and others in the bureaucracy when they disagreed. I have been concerned about that and I did not want to expose Mr. Helms to anything of that kind unnecessarily because he should not be.

Mr. STENNIS. On the question of the first strike capability, that rests more in the minds of our adversaries than anywhere else, I think we can talk about it a long time and no one could put his hand on the answer.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator inspired me to make a comment.

I asked a great psychiatrist, 2 weeks ago, about the principle of projection, that it is entirely in the mind. What occurred to me was that when one makes a

public statement to the effect that someone else is about to do something, it is a common psychological phenomenon that one really is speaking what is in his own mind. Is the Senator familiar with that principle? [Laughter.]

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is far beyond me in many things, including psychiatry.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That was Dr. Carl Menninger who said that, not I.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, perhaps it is unfortunate that I am the only Senator who listens to the testimony of the Secretary of Defense and the Director of the CIA before the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Armed Services Committee, the Subcommittee on Central Intelligence, and the Appropriations Committee. I have listened carefully to all said testimony.

As a result of the appropriations testimony of the distinguished Secretary of Defense, prior to his latest appearance before the Foreign Relations Committee, I came to the conclusion that there was a difference between these two gentlemen, and that the difference was chronological.

Therefore, as the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee will remember, I called up and stated, in my opinion, both of these gentlemen were sincere, and the difference was a chronological difference.

To make my point, I went over the appropriations testimony of the distinguished Secretary of Defense with the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

We later had that last hearing, and I must say I felt at that time that over 90 percent of any difference was cleared up to the satisfaction of all concerned.

Mr. President, I take this opportunity not only to observe that I have great respect for the integrity and ability of the Secretary of Defense, but also have the same convictions about the Director of the CIA. It has been my experience during the some quarter of a century that I have been in Government, that every time we draw the Central Intelligence Agency into public discussion or debate—and I must say that this time no Member of the Senate was involved—we get ourselves into a situation which is not in the best interests of the security of the United States.

I would hope, above everything else, that this debate does not in anyway hinder the fine work that Mr. Helms is doing. In my opinion, he is the best Director the CIA ever had.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would say that I feel as the Senator does. He is an excellent man. I have always felt that we got the most objective information from him that could be had in our Government.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, one of the crucial points in this whole debate, not only in this debate but in the justification advanced for deployment of the ABM, is the question of Soviet intent to seek to achieve a first-strike capability.

The able chairman will recall that when President Nixon announced to the

American people his decision to recommend deployment of the ABM, he placed great emphasis upon the necessity of ABM deployment to preserve the credibility of this country's deterrents.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is right.

Mr. GORE. Then when Secretary Laird went before the Armed Services Committee, he made the same point. In fact, it was the principal point. It was the principal reason advanced for the deployment of the ABM weapon system.

Then, when he came before the subcommittee of which I have the honor to be chairman, before an audience of the American people of many millions via television he said, as the chairman has now quoted him:

With their great tonnage, they are going for our missiles, and they are going for a first strike capability.

Then, for emphasis, he added:

There is no question about that.

Does not the Senator recall that the next day the newspapers of the Nation headlined that the Secretary of Defense had said that the Russians were going for a first-strike capability, and, therefore, that ABM's must be deployed?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. So, Mr. President, with the American people involved in this issue, this became crucial, crucial in debate, and crucial in the decision. If in fact the National Intelligence Board had reached a conclusion that the Soviets were going for a first-strike capability, which means, in the terminology of the military, the ability to render against this country such a blow that we could not retaliate with unacceptable risks for them, then, Mr. President, ABM's would not be sufficient.

Oh, no. ABM's would not be sufficient, because then we would be facing the threat, if not the intent, of annihilation of this country should the Soviets achieve a first-strike capability, the United States would not then have the power to deter a nuclear war.

Mr. President, as I tried to say time after time on the floor of the Senate, our whole strategy to avoid nuclear war has been postulated on deterrence.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is right.

Mr. GORE. We realize that in a nuclear exchange between the United States and Russia, there would be no winners. In fact, Dr. Kistiakowsky expressed the opinion to us that an all-out nuclear exchange would render at least the Northern Hemisphere uninhabitable.

Thus, we are not only talking about a nonvictor as between the United States and Russia, but the world would also lose. All would be lost.

Not only have we postulated our position on deterrence to prevent a nuclear war, so have the Soviets. Now we have reached this balance of terror, when both countries have a second-strike capability and thus the power of deterrence.

I doubt whether many Americans are frightened by the Russian ABM's. Is the Senator from Arkansas? They are not aimed at Little Rock. [Laughter.] In fact, they go only a short distance.

By the same token, I doubt whether the Russians would be very apprehensive about some of our ABM's in Montana

and North Dakota which have a range of not more than 500 miles.

I dare say they would be concerned, were they contemplating an attack upon the United States, about the Poseidon missiles in our nuclear submarine fleet; about our intercontinental ballistic missiles; about our missiles on the surface of naval vessels; about the missiles in certain foreign countries near them; about our tactical missiles in Western Europe under our command, some of which can reach the Soviet Union; or about our intercontinental bombers.

I think they would be concerned about that with which we could retaliate upon their country, and not about an ABM "shoot-'em-down-maybe" short-range defensive capability.

Mr. President, here we are talking about the central issue in this battle. The Secretary of Defense arrogated to himself, it seemed to me, some special responsibility that Senators do not have for the security of their country. He does have a responsibility, but so do we. Before millions of the American people and a Senate committee he said, and I repeat:

They are going for a first strike capability. There is no question about that.

We promptly set about to examine it and found, I say unequivocally—and if there is a secret session, we will show the record—that there has been no finding of the National Intelligence Board to support that conclusion.

The Secretary of Defense has a right to reach any conclusion which he feels justified. I do not question that. But so do Senators.

We found no evidence that the Soviets were going for a first-strike capability; and that was the principal justification given for deploying ABM's.

Mr. President, they have retreated from that. The Secretary of Defense has retreated from that. It is no longer advanced. Now the principal reason given in support of ABM deployment is that the President needs it in order to go to the conference.

In other words, we arm to parley. That has failed many a time in history. But now, fortunately, this afternoon, it seems to me the senior Senator from Vermont has pointed a signal for accommodations. I stand ready, in the hope that such an accommodation can be reached in the national interest, and I say in the interest of the President, and in the interest of the Senate. He advocates continuation of research and development but no deployment. I agree, but it must be only research and test.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I appreciate very much what the Senator from Montana has said. He said it extremely well, as he always does. He made a great contribution to the hearings and to the clarification of this very point, which I think is now understood.

I agree with what the Senator said about the Senator from Vermont. I think he has pointed a way to a settlement of this question which I hope can be brought about. I hope it will be brought about.

I agree with the Senator that the best way to strengthen the hand of the Presi-

dent in the forthcoming trip—or in the negotiations with the Russians would be a good, solid vote on this matter, which, if you would like, can be called an accommodation. I am not quite sure of the terms in this—an accommodation in the sense I believe the Senator from Vermont used that phrase. I hope that can be worked out.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator want me to yield to him?

Mr. STENNIS. On this one point.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I think these letters from the men referred to speak for themselves. One word about Mr. Helms. I certainly want to point out, with great force, that, as it seems to me, he is outstanding in his work. I do not have the slightest indication that there is any other sentiment than that toward him or Mr. Laird or anyone else. I have not talked to Mr. Laird about Mr. Helms except in a general way, and I know he has a very high regard for him.

I did not want to leave this discussion in a way that might cause disagreement if something came up.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I really said what I did as a preventive. If something happened, it would be too late. I wanted to take the opportunity to say in advance that I, certainly, and I believe the Senator from Mississippi shares my view, felt Mr. Helms speaks very forthrightly. I refer not only to this event, but I go back 3 or 4 years, when he used to report his findings. It seemed to me that subsequent events justified his estimates of affairs and supported his findings, particularly in the Vietnam area and others, a great deal more than they did some of the optimistic findings of some members of the Department of Defense. So I already had a considerable prejudice in his favor in the reliability of his estimates.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, to the extent that I am the floor manager, I do not know of any other Senator who desires to address the Senate this afternoon on the pending measure. There will be debate tomorrow. We have already set the speech of the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER), by a special order, for tomorrow, following the morning hour, I believe.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I rise to comment on the remarks made a few minutes ago by the Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN). I regret that he is not on the floor, but I am delighted that the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER) is.

First, may I explain the reason for my absence at the time the Senator from Vermont was speaking. Unfortunately, I was chairing a subcommittee meeting.

The Senator from Vermont was gracious enough, before he made his remarks, to see that I had a copy of them. I have read them. I rise now simply to express delight that the Senator from Vermont counseled the Senate that we are not yet ready to deploy an anti-ballistic-missile system; that we need to

move forward in research and testing. What Senator AIKEN counsels us is, I think, the counsel of wisdom, as we hear so often from that magnificent Senator from Vermont.

I would hope that we would recognize the desirability that the testing be of maximum value and utility. You do not get that kind of testing in the middle of the continent of the United States. You get that testing out in the reaches of the Pacific.

Additionally, when you put equipment that relates to an anti-ballistic-missile system in the Pacific and you say you are testing it, there is credibility to it, because that is its only real virtue out there. There you get the opportunity to lob missiles at it, and you can readily identify its weaknesses and react accordingly.

However, I think it would be a mistake for us to assume that we could get that kind of effective test or believability if we placed these devices, and labeled them "test only," at the ABM missile sites themselves in either Montana or the Dakotas.

I understand that our able majority leader, in reacting to the suggestion of the Senator from Vermont, made the point that Kwajalein and Eniwetok will be appropriate and suitable for fully effective tests. We really want to find out where the "bugs" are. We really want to fix that machine up for the day, if it ever comes, when we have to deploy it in fact. That is the test area in which to find out.

We all recognize that the stakes are very high, and we are all devoted to insuring the security of this country. We disagree on occasions as to the means, and indeed as to the definition of security. But I am delighted that Senator AIKEN has spoken as he has against the deployment of an anti-ballistic-missile system as recommended by the committee and the administration.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HART. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Is it the view of the Senator from Michigan that the leadtime involved in the emplacement of radar and computer components, as well as other components, is greater than would be the case for missiles which have already been tested, which can be moved into place in a relatively short period?

Mr. HART. It is my understanding that the leadtime is greater.

Mr. GORE. So we could not, in good faith, undertake in the name of research and development the essential and most difficult parts of an ABM system and, with credibility and good conscience, say that this is merely research and development?

Mr. HART. I could not.
I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (S. 1583) to provide that appointments and promotions in the Post Office De-

partment, including the postal field service, be made on the basis of merit and fitness.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 4153) to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard.

PROPOSAL THAT JULY 21 BE PROCLAIMED AS A NATIONAL DAY OF PRAYER AND THANKSGIVING

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, the spirit of America will be committed on July 21, as our resources have been for 10 years, to the concept of liberating man from a single planet. On that day we shall abolish horizons as the limit of vision and open the opportunity for a future that is literally without limits.

It should be a time to celebrate the personal achievement of the two men who walk the Moon that day and of their brother astronauts and 200 million fellow Americans who walk with them in spirit. It should be a day of prayer that this achievement, which draws upon the knowledge and wisdom and experience of all men everywhere, will bring peace by showing the fruits of man's peaceful labors.

On July 21 we can pray that as man is released from Earth's bonds, he may be relieved of Earth's ancient scourge of war; that as man turns his eyes to the stars, he shall no longer live in the shadow of Cain, who was his brother's killer; that through peace the marvels of God's universe should be unfolded before us.

I am, therefore, by resolution, which I shall propose in the Senate, and by a letter, which I shall send to the President of the United States, suggesting that the 21st of July be proclaimed as a national day of prayer and thanksgiving.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. 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. KENNEDY. 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 UNTIL 11 A.M.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 11, 1969, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 10, 1969:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Leonard C. Meeker, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Romania.

The following-named person, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a Consular Officer of the United States of America: William B. Kelly, of Ohio.

For appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 2, a Consular Officer, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

John M. Thomas, of Virginia.

Now Foreign Service officers of class 3 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also Consular Officers of the United States of America:

John T. Dreyfuss, of California.

Ronald A. Galduk, of Florida.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, Consular Officers, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Leo Arel, of Maryland.

Richard Elliot Benedick, of California.

Marvin E. Brenner, of Pennsylvania.

Miss Gloria L. Gaston, of the District of Columbia.

For reappointment in the Foreign Service as a Foreign Service officer of class 4, a Consular Officer, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Stanley P. Harris, of Maryland.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, Consular Officers, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Robert L. Gingles, of Florida.

Herbert G. Hagerty, of New Jersey.

Miss Carol M. Sheehan, of Massachusetts.

For promotion from Foreign Service officers of class 6 to class 5:

A. Edward Elmendorf, of California.

Joseph Edward Lake, of Texas.

For appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 5, a Consular Officer, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Lawrence D. Russell, of Florida.

For promotion from Foreign Service officers of class 7 to class 6:

Charles S. Ahlgren, of Iowa.

David Russell Beall, of Michigan.

John P. Bell, of Virginia.

Charles G. Billo, of New York.

Miss Janina Bonczek, of California.

William G. Crisp, of Virginia.

Vincent J. Farley, of New York.

Leon S. Fuerth, of New York.

Robert A. Gehring, of Connecticut.

Victor S. Gray, Jr., of New York.

James H. Holmes, of Pennsylvania.

William A. Kirby, Jr., of New Jersey.

Arthur L. Kobler, of New Jersey.

James B. Leonard, of Vermont.

Robert A. MacCallum, of Pennsylvania.

John F. Malsto, of Pennsylvania.

Kevin J. McGuire, of New York.

Jonathan C. Menes, of California.

Richard N. Otto, of New York.

Richard R. Peterson, of Illinois.

Kenneth M. Quinn, of Iowa.

Samuel Vick Smith, of Washington.

David H. Stebbing, of the District of Columbia.

Miss Carol K. Stocker, of Illinois.

Keith L. Wauchope, of New York.

Stephen W. Worrel, of Ohio.

Lacy A. Wright, Jr., of Illinois.

John William Zerolis, of California.

For promotion from Foreign Service information officers of class 7 to class 6:

Miss Mary J. Anderson, of Iowa.

Robert Barry Fulton, of Pennsylvania.

Richard J. Gilbert, of New York.

David W. Hess, of Iowa.

David K. Krecke, of Michigan.

George D. Langham, of Arizona.

Jeffrey H. Lite, of Illinois.

Paul E. Paryski, of New York.

Douglas S. Rose, of California.
Daniel Scherr, of New York.
Terry B. Shroeder, of California.
William J. Weinhold, of Wisconsin.
John G. Wilcox, of Michigan.
For promotion from a Foreign Service officer of class 7 to class 6 and to be also a Consular Officer of the United States of America:

Charles L. Daris, of California.
For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, Consular Officers, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Harry E. Jones, of Pennsylvania.
Robert B. Lane, of the District of Columbia.

Chester F. Polley, Jr., of Illinois.
For promotion from Foreign Service officers of class 8 to class 7:

John Christopher Grigassy, of Texas.
Arthur J. Hardman, of New York.
Sherman N. Hinson, of Vermont.
E. Stewart Johnston, of California.
John R. Malott, of Illinois.
Scott Huston Ochiltree, of Connecticut.
Peter S. Perényi, of Connecticut.
Miss Judith Rodes, of Texas.
Miss Ernestine H. Sherman, of Oregon.
Robert E. Snyder, of Massachusetts.
Frank J. Spillman, of Hawaii.
Randolph A. Swart, of Maryland.
Miss Xenia G. Vujnovich, of New York.
Matthew P. Ward, Jr., of Pennsylvania.

For promotion from Foreign Service information officers of class 8 to class 7:

L. Michael Haller, of Illinois.
William H. Maurer, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Miss Joanne A. Rinehart, of Pennsylvania.
For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, Consular Officers, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Douglas B. Archard, of Wisconsin.
Bruce Anthony Beardsley, of Nevada.
Robert W. Beckham, of Florida.
Daniel V. Clark, of New Jersey.
Louis Creveling, Jr., of California.
Jeffrey Davidow, of Minnesota.
Daniel Linus Dolan, of Maryland.
James R. Goesser, of Illinois.
George A. Gowen III, of North Carolina.
Mahlon Henderson, of Virginia.
Richard W. Hoover, of Ohio.
Robert F. Hopper, of California.
John David Isaacs, of New York.
Charles Bowman Jacobini, of Illinois.
Ralph R. Johnson, of Washington.
James D. Lee, of Virginia.
D. Thomas Longo, Jr., of the District of Columbia.

Randolph I. Marcus, of New York.
Joseph Hanthorn Melrose, Jr., of Pennsylvania.

John P. Moddero, of Maryland.
David Richard Moran, of Nebraska.
Miss Alynne Joelle Nathanson, of New York.
Michael P. Owens, of Texas.
David A. Pabst, of Washington.
John L. Pitts, of Washington.
Ints M. Silins, of the District of Columbia.
Richard L. Stevens, of Iowa.
Lawrence Palmer Taylor, of Ohio.
Albert A. Thibault, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Stanislaus R. P. Valerga, of Texas.
Paul H. Wackerbarth, of New Jersey.
George F. Ward, Jr., of New York.
Reed T. Warnick, of Colorado.
David M. Winn, of Texas.
Geoffrey E. Wolfe, of Maryland.

For appointment as Foreign Service information officers of class 7, Consular Officers, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Miss Allison Arshat, of Delaware.
Sheldon H. Avenius, Jr., of New York.
Mark A. Glago, of New York.
Edward J. Hinker, of Minnesota.
Edward S. Ifshin, of Florida.
David L. Jamison, of Maryland.
Miss Kathryn L. Koob, of Iowa.
Anthony A. Markulis, of Virginia.

Michael J. Nugent, of Maryland.
James C. Palmer, of Utah.
Miss Cornelia M. Sheahan, of New York.
David P. Wagner, of New York.
John David Watt, of Texas.
For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, Consular Officers, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Paul H. Blakeburn, of New Hampshire.
Miss Ann S. Carroll, of the District of Columbia.

Daniel Chester Cochran, of Illinois.
Miss Susan Jo Crane, of New York.
Jan de Wilde, of Virginia.
John Seabury Ford, of Ohio.
Miss Carolee Helleman, of Nebraska.
Karl K. Jonietz, of Illinois.
Stephen Kindel, of New York.
Frederic William Maerkl, III, of California.

David Jordan Mangan, Jr., of Wisconsin.
Bennett A. Marsh, of New Jersey.
Miss Mary Helen Maughan, of Utah.
David J. Peashock, of Pennsylvania.
William Morris Pollack, of New York.
John F. Schunhoff, of California.
William H. Siefken, of Texas.
Jeffrey R. Siegel, of New Jersey.
Charles B. Smith, Jr., of New York.
Miss Susan J. Walters, of Connecticut.
Franklin Miller Zuttermeister, Jr., of Florida.

For appointment as Foreign Service information officers of class 8, Consular officers, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Miss Geneviève N. Cerisoles, of New York.
Miss Ann Jeryl Martin, of Tennessee.
Miss Susan Davis Todd, of Virginia.
Foreign Service reserve officers to be Consular officers of the United States of America:

Ramon Frank Durand, of California.
Miss Margaret Ann Murphy, of California.
Haviland Smith, Jr., of Virginia.
Foreign Service Reserve officers to be Consular officers and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Ernest C. Baack, Jr., of California.
Charles R. Baquet III, of Louisiana.
Gordon H. Bell, of South Dakota.
Brendan A. Burns, Jr., of Florida.
Johnnie Carson, of Illinois.
Royal E. Carter, of California.
Taylor M. Chamberlin, of Virginia.
Thomas A. Clayton, of California.
Philip C. Cohan, of Maryland.
Gordon F. Compton, of New Jersey.
Vytautas A. Dambava, of Virginia.
Miss Ruth A. Davis, of California.
Warren Burton Duerbeck, of Maryland.
Jake M. Dyels, Jr., of California.
Joseph D. Ellis III, of Virginia.
John K. Eney, of Virginia.
John T. Enkoji, of California.
Joseph L. Fisher, Jr., of New York.
Daniel Flores, of the District of Columbia.

Lyman P. Flynn, of Maryland.
Jack W. Gallagher, of Pennsylvania.
Robert W. Garrity, of Massachusetts.
Comer W. Gilstrap, Jr., of Maryland.
John P. Gower, of Maryland.
William J. Graver, of Maryland.
Harris C. Greene, of Virginia.
Theodore J. Groll, Jr., of Ohio.
Paul B. Henze, of Maryland.
John H. Hicks, of Missouri.
Philip P. Holts, of Maryland.
John W. Isaminger, of West Virginia.
Gerald L. Jacoby, of Virginia.
Wesley D. Johnson, of Minnesota.
Serge Karpovich, of the District of Columbia.

Milton Kovner, of Maryland.
Arthur T. Ladenburg, of Nebraska.
William D. Lieser, of Virginia.
Kent W. Long, of Virginia.
Richard F. Long, of Maryland.
Kenneth Longmyer, of California.

Robert N. Margrave, of the District of Columbia.

John E. Marsh, of Virginia.
Ernest Mayerfeld, of New York.
Donald R. Morris, of Virginia.
Jack H. Mower, of California.
James A. Natsios, of Virginia.
Donald J. Nicol, of California.
James B. Noland, of Colorado.
James J. Olson, of Washington.
James M. Potts, of Maryland.
Ross S. Quan, of California.
Phillip H. Ringdahl, of the District of Columbia.

Jonathan Roosevelt, of the District of Columbia.

McKinney H. Russell, of Florida.
Brooks Ryno, of Virginia.
Verne F. St. Mars, of Minnesota.
Clifton J. Schaefer, of Maine.
Sol Schindler, of Pennsylvania.
Oleg N. Selsky, of Virginia.
David G. Smith, of New York.
Lewis C. Smith, of Missouri.
R. Harden Smith, of Maryland.
Miss Sylvia G. Stanfield, of Texas.
Miss Diane K. Stanley, of the District of Columbia.

Edwin M. Terrell, of California.
José Villalón, of Puerto Rico.
David Wei-Tsi Wang, of Maryland.
William G. Warnell III, of the District of Columbia.

James M. Warrick, of Nebraska.
Robert A. Wood, of Maryland.
Foreign Service staff officers to be Consular officers of the United States of America:
Miss Katherine E. Barry, of New Hampshire.

Samuel C. Case, of California.
Miss Patricia R. Clark, of Iowa.
William T. Cozort, of Oklahoma.
Richard V. Davis, of West Virginia.
David C. Fields, of California.
Phillip D. Gutensohn, of North Dakota.
Richard G. Haeghe, of Illinois.
Mrs. Eva May Heathcote, of West Virginia.
Howard T. Jackson, of the District of Columbia.

George E. Knight, of Pennsylvania.
Arnold C. Long, of Washington.
Stewart W. Macdonald, of Rhode Island.
Jerry J. Malone, of Arkansas.
Gerald S. Mathews, of Illinois.
Edward M. Milburn, of Illinois.
Dean R. Miller, of Iowa.
Herbert B. Moller, Jr., of Florida.
Stephen E. Montgomery, of Texas.
Clyde A. Plunkett, of Tennessee.
Cecil S. Richardson, of New York.
Alan A. Rogers, of California.
Miss M. Virginia Schafer, of Washington.
Leonard J. Scioli, of Pennsylvania.
Everard S. Taylor, of Florida.
Gerald R. Toney, of Texas.
Walter A. Weber, of New Jersey.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. William Joseph McCaffrey, xxxxxx, U.S. Army.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283 through 3294 and 3311:

To be major

Kinder, Jimmie B., xxxxxxx.

To be captain

Allison, Raymon E., Jr. xxxxxxxx.
Alm, Philip F., xxxxxxxx.
Brophy, Edward P., xxxxxxxx.
Byrd, Roscoe W., Jr., xxxxxxxx.
Christensen, Christen, xxxxxxxx.

Chun, Merton M. K., [REDACTED]
 Courtney, William H., [REDACTED]
 Czechut, Mark, [REDACTED]
 Donnelly, James H., [REDACTED]
 Fahringer, Robert H., [REDACTED]
 Giron, Amos D., [REDACTED]
 Hagwood, Henry M., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Hamilton, Donald C., [REDACTED]
 Key, Robert C., [REDACTED]
 Kunde, Gerald R., [REDACTED]
 Meisel, Bernard F., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Morse, Decatur W., [REDACTED]
 Murphy, John E., [REDACTED]
 Patterson, Gordon W., [REDACTED]
 Peterson, Samuel B., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Robbins, Frederick E., [REDACTED]
 Roberts, Donald A., [REDACTED]
 Sanzotera, Robert H., [REDACTED]
 Serwatka, Walter J., [REDACTED]
 Soehren, Stephen E., [REDACTED]
 Stemsley, Sylvester [REDACTED]
 Sundstrom, Carl F., [REDACTED]
 Thompson, Charles F., [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenant

Atkins, Edsel R., [REDACTED]
 Augsburg, Grayson T., [REDACTED]
 Banks, William C., III, [REDACTED]
 Barry, Russell W., [REDACTED]
 Barta, Donald F., [REDACTED]
 Blaylock, James R., [REDACTED]
 Bond, Leroy M., [REDACTED]
 Bouldin, James R. M., [REDACTED]
 Bray, William G., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Cejka, David C., [REDACTED]
 Coschignano, Maximill [REDACTED]
 Cramer, Walter E., [REDACTED]
 Findlater, John W., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Fousek, Richard J., [REDACTED]
 Garrett, Jimmie L., [REDACTED]
 Hallam, William H., [REDACTED]
 Halliday, Arthur J., [REDACTED]
 Heimericks, Leonard L., [REDACTED]
 Herge, John C., [REDACTED]
 Hicks, Thomas M. B. IV, [REDACTED]
 Holcomb, Vernon A., [REDACTED]
 Hoyt, Ronald J., [REDACTED]
 Hopkins, Roger N., [REDACTED]
 Howe, James R., [REDACTED]

Hunt, Carl V., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Hunt, William O., [REDACTED]
 Hutcheson, Marguerite, [REDACTED]
 Kollenborn, Byron B., [REDACTED]
 Lempke, Duane A., [REDACTED]
 Lightner, George M., [REDACTED]
 Long, Walter M., [REDACTED]
 Lumpkin, William L., [REDACTED]
 Mancini, Thomas M., [REDACTED]
 McClaskey, John R., [REDACTED]
 McCloy, Michael N., [REDACTED]
 McGraw, Marvin E., Sr., [REDACTED]
 McGurk, Francis W., [REDACTED]
 Meador, James E., [REDACTED]
 Mitten, John N., [REDACTED]
 Moss, Paul R., [REDACTED]
 Muse, Frank R., [REDACTED]
 Orell, Patrick H., [REDACTED]
 Orr, Robert V., [REDACTED]
 Pack, John T., [REDACTED]
 Palmieri, Ralph A., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Person, Rodney M., [REDACTED]
 Pheneger, Michael E., [REDACTED]
 Robb, John Francis, [REDACTED]
 Sanders, Luther L., [REDACTED]
 Scott, Billy L., [REDACTED]
 Seymour, Richard S., [REDACTED]
 Shamanski, Daniel M., [REDACTED]
 Siegrist, George E., [REDACTED]
 Tarowsky, Edward G., [REDACTED]
 Thompson, Marilee, [REDACTED]
 Walters, Billy F., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Weiskopf, James D., [REDACTED]

To be second lieutenant

Alton, John F., [REDACTED]
 Bale, Hugh O., [REDACTED]
 Brownfield, John R., [REDACTED]
 Caldwell, John E., [REDACTED]
 Dennard, Hoyt L., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Goates, Donald R., [REDACTED]
 Groome, Nelson S., III, [REDACTED]
 Hansen, William W., [REDACTED]
 Heindl, Francis J., [REDACTED]
 Hutchinson, Craig R., [REDACTED]
 Jeffery, David G., [REDACTED]
 King, James C., [REDACTED]
 Montgomery, John E., [REDACTED]
 Onning, Lester C., Jr., [REDACTED]

Ott, John J., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Padovano, Daniel J., [REDACTED]
 Pike, Joseph L., [REDACTED]
 Powell, Raymond F., [REDACTED]
 Rolston, David A., [REDACTED]
 Savage, Calvin K., [REDACTED]
 Shadburn, Robert P., [REDACTED]
 Sienkiewicz, Richard, [REDACTED]
 Singer, Joseph B., [REDACTED]
 Swinehart, Lewis S., [REDACTED]
 Vukelich, Vincent M., [REDACTED]
 West, Charles E., [REDACTED]

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 2106, 3283, 3284, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

Ackroyd, Harry E.	Heard, Gerald M.
Allen, Harry C.	Hernandez, Samuel I.
Antu, Emilio G.	Hester, Ellsworth G.
Armour, Raymond L., Jr.	Jones, Richard B.
Arness, Gary N.	Jones, William W.
Astheimer, Peter F.	Jurchenko, Daniel A.
Ball, George T.	Katzmann, Steven E.
Barker, Rodney W.	Kunzig, Michael B.
Becker, Ronald J.	LaRue, Charles D.
Best, Robert E.	Leatherman, Marlin G.
Brown, Bruce R.	Leigh, Joseph J., Jr.
Buffington, John C.	Lynn, Milton N.
Castonguay, Cleo P.	Malkasian, Douglas E.
Ceo, John J., Jr.	Maxwell, Frank F., Jr.
Chesnut, James R.	McClinton, Nathaniel
Cortes, Carlos R.	Olson, Donald E.
Deboer, Michael D.	Peek, Robert S., II
Devault, Lee	Peterson, Michael H.
Dozier, Larry H.	Rice, Kenneth E.
Fargo, Richard E.	Rodriguez, Emilio
Forte, Michael	Russell, John W.
Galloway, Arthur L., Jr.	Stacy, David R.
Gibbs, James R.	Stevens, Vlad
Gillette, John Milton	Stone, Steven C.
Gladd, Edward J.	Suir, Burton J.
Goodson, Gerald L.	Taylor, Lewis J., III
Gore, Bernard L., Jr.	Terrell William F.
Guttau, Michael K.	Till, Peter W.
Hagewood, Eugene G.	Watson, Jesse L., III
	Williams, Dwight, Jr.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, July 10, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
 Rev. Milton B. Crist, Metropolitan Memorial United Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Gracious Heavenly Father, from the very beginning of time the human heart has sought Thee, desiring guidance and understanding.

So, we today would bring our restless spirits into the calm strength of Thine everlasting purpose.

In the confusion of shifting ideas and principles, so prevalent in the world today, help us to hold fast to that which is eternal, because it is grounded in Thy will for mankind.

Bestow upon us the patience to seek more deeply a firm understanding of the true values in life, so that we do not drift first one way then another, but walk steadily in the path of righteousness that Thou hast set before us.

Help us to enlarge our capacity for appreciation and grant to us that waiting and receptive attitude of soul, wherein we may find the hidden springs of high endeavor and fruitful action.

May we have the courage and the wisdom to build justice into every area of our national life.

Lead us to discover the thrill of true brotherhood—when every man can trust his neighbor, because he, himself, has learned to be trustworthy.

Grant to each of us the dedication necessary to play our part in the things that matter most in our time, and thus leave the world a better place for our having been here. 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 agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11400) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate concurred in the House amendments to Senate amendments Nos. 6, 7, 8, 40, 42, and 90.

The message also announced that the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 1583) entitled "An act to provide that appointments and promotions in the Post Office Department, including the postal field service, be made on the basis of merit and fitness," together with all accompanying papers.

ACTION ON DDT BY AGRICULTURE

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, it has been announced that the Department of Agriculture has suspended use of DDT and eight other "hard" pesticide compounds in its programs, pending a 30-day review.

In the face of overwhelming evidence that DDT is a menace to environment and wildlife, I feel sure that definite danger to man will be proven in relatively short order. In the meantime, getting this pesticide out of mass circulation and use is imperative, and this has been a necessary first move by Agriculture. Now individual States and jurisdictions have excellent reason to follow this example.