

to fight in a war which many of them believe to be immoral and unjustified. The only way in which the dilemma facing thousands of draft eligible young men can be resolved is to eliminate the Selective Service System.

A few months ago, over 250 student body presidents and college newspaper editors issued a statement in which they stated their intention to refuse induction into the Armed Forces so long as the war in Vietnam continues. The dilemma which they face is shared by thousands of other young men.

I have introduced a resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 278, which would express the sense of Congress that the President should suspend the draft calls for 6 months. This would prevent the drafting of any more young men to fight in Vietnam and would provide Congress with a period of time in which to devise alternatives to the existing draft system.

This bill, and those introduced by other Members, which would eliminate the Selective Service System, must receive the immediate attention of Congress if the crisis of conscience which confronts thousands of draft eligible young men is to be alleviated. I urge my colleagues to

support action on this legislation and to give careful attention to Senator Gruening's thoughtful and persuasive letter.

The letter follows:

DRAFT AS SERVITUDE

To the Editor:

Your July 11 editorial "A Moral Obligation" which chides the Congress for not holding hearings on President Nixon's draft reform proposals in my view misses the vital point. There is no moral obligation to implement either Nixon's proposals or the other so-called draft reforms which were urged in the last Congress by Senator Kennedy and other Senators, on which hearings were held but did not result in any legislation.

These reforms, merely altering the method of selecting draftees, do not go to the heart of the issue which is that the draft itself for this war is the inequity, the injustice, the immorality. What difference does it make whether our young men are selected by a lot or any other way to become cannon fodder in a war which many consider totally unjustified and immoral?

What this means is that they are compelled in violation of their consciences to kill people against whom they feel no grievance, perhaps get killed or maimed in the process, with the alternative, if they refuse, of imprisonment for five years at hard labor with probable ruin of their future career in civilian life.

This is an infamous dilemma, and no American citizen—indeed no member of a society that calls itself free—should be subjected to it. But so far as the executive and legislative branches of our Federal Government are concerned, neither has had the vision or understanding to face this issue. Neither (with the exception of Justice William Douglas) has the Supreme Court, which has repeatedly refused to overrule the draft convictions.

It is difficult for a layman—and for this layman—to understand why the 13th Amendment of the Constitution which the Warren Court has done so much to interpret and implement is not applicable to the draft.

The draft is involuntary servitude and it is a betrayal of our finest traditions and of everything America should stand for. The moral obligation on the Congress should be not to reform its procedure but to abolish it for the rest of this war, particularly as we continue to exact the wanton sacrifice of our young men in a war that we can't win, shouldn't want to win, and which President Nixon has declared we have no purpose to win militarily.

No wonder there is unrest, bitterness and rebelliousness among our young people.

Why should we keep on sending our boys to die or be crippled in vain?

ERNEST GRUENING,
Former U.S. Senator.

WASHINGTON, July 11, 1969.

SENATE—Wednesday, July 23, 1969

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by Hon. HARRY F. BYRD, JR., a Senator from the State of Virginia.

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

O God, who art the truth, deliver us from all that is false. We pray Thee to teach us step by step what we do not know, to preserve in us what we do know, to correct us in our mistakes, to strengthen us when we fail, and enable us to grow in grace and wisdom. May we and the people of all nations learn to trust not in the power of their arms, but in the power of love. In the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C. July 23, 1969.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. HARRY F. BYRD, JR., a Senator from the State of Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 22, 1969, be dispensed with.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

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

On July 19, 1969:

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

On July 22, 1969:

S. 648. An act for the relief of Ernesto Alunday.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Acting 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 FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR TYDINGS AND SENATOR JAVITS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the concurrence of the distinguished Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), and without infringing on his time, I ask unanimous consent that after the distinguished Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY) has completed his statement, the distinguished Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS) be recognized for not to exceed 30 minutes; and that following his remarks, which would be a little after 1 p.m., which is the time the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) desires, the distinguished Senator from New York

(Mr. JAVITS) be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

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

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from New York, there be a brief period for the transaction of routine morning business, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

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

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR JORDAN OF IDAHO, AND SENATOR HART

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of morning business, the distinguished Senator from Idaho (Mr. JORDAN) be recognized as the first speaker, for a period not to exceed 45 minutes.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Idaho, the distinguished Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) be recognized for a purpose which he will elucidate at that time.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees

be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated, as requested by the Senator from Montana.

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Roderic L. O'Connor, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Agency for International Development.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Spurgeon M. Keeny, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the distinguished Senator from California for being so gracious.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Chair recognizes the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) for a period of 1 hour.

THE SPECTER OF ESCALATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, the specter of escalation in Vietnam has risen to threaten us again.

It is stalking the Halls of Congress, and lurking in the minds of millions of our countrymen.

Like many Americans, I thought the dangerous notion that the way to end the violence in Vietnam is to intensify it had been thoroughly discredited. I

thought we had learned through the futile and bloody years, painfully and at great price, that escalation in Vietnam leads only to counterescalation and to higher and higher levels of violence and death.

Like many Americans, I thought that the escalation theory was shot down when President Johnson ordered a halt to the bombing of North Vietnam.

And, like many Americans, I thought it had finally been slain and buried when President Nixon, in his address on May 14, forswore a military solution in Vietnam.

Yet, even now, responsible and influential Americans are once again suggesting that escalation is the way to end our tragic plight.

In the course of the current debate on the military authorization bill, I have heard Senators say that we could have won the Vietnam war long ago if our military efforts had not been throttled by civilians.

I have heard Senators say that we could win a military victory now.

I have heard Senators say that military authorities in both this administration and in the previous administration have stated that we can still win the war if we decide to spend the money and make the sacrifices.

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

Mr. CRANSTON. I yield with pleasure to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If anyone has made a statement to that effect, I would hope most sincerely that he would keep in mind that the casualties—the dead—in Vietnam overall are now somewhere in the vicinity of 44,000; that the wounded are well in excess of 200,000; that the cost of the war is approximately \$100 billion; and that the war is in danger of becoming the longest war in which this country has ever engaged.

If there are those, as indicated in the statement made by the distinguished Senator from California, who think that this is possible if only we spend the money and make the sacrifices—and that means using up the manpower—I would hope that they would think again. Vietnam is a tragedy. It is an area in which we never should have become involved. It is a difficulty which has been responsible, directly and indirectly, for many of the difficulties which beset us internally and externally.

I would hope that those who seem to advocate that kind of proposal would take to heart what the President seems to be doing in that respect, and that is to bring about a gradual deescalation and an honorable solution of the war. This is something which no American should ever forget, and certainly something which all of us should keep in mind.

I would say that the President has been trying as hard as he knows to find a way out of the impasse which Vietnam is and that those of us who would advocate otherwise would be doing a disservice to him and, more important, to the country.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader.

It may sound as though what I had started out to say stems from a nightmare of my own. Actually, what I am saying reflects what I have heard said on the floor of the Senate. I have heard these things said by men of great influence in the Senate.

So the specter of escalation, the suggestion that we should step up the war, is present on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere as my remarks will make very plain; and remarks made on the floor of the Senate are documented and appear in the RECORD.

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

Mr. CRANSTON. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I do wish to thank the Senator because, after a rather hasty reading of the Senator's speech, I feel that probably we are all saying the same thing. I wish to congratulate the distinguished majority leader, who is always a man of conscience and conviction. I think what we are all saying is that all three of us are in favor of a deescalation of this war as soon as we can. If that helps clarify the matter, I wish to make it clear that I am in no way finding any fault or criticism of what the Senator from California says. It is true that some people do advocate escalation. I think it is much better if the President has the benefit of all our thoughts, particularly with respect to how we may deescalate the war and find a way to get out of it honorably as soon as we can.

I thank the Senator for yielding. In my opinion he is contributing some very important thoughts to this dialog.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I am deeply grateful to the distinguished acting minority leader. I know he is an advocate of a sensible course in Vietnam. I know I have never heard, and I am certain I will never hear, from his lips advocacy of the escalation that would be so disastrous in Vietnam.

Mr. President, I wish to recount a few other things I have heard said on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere. I have heard Senators say that military authorities in both this administration and in the previous administration have stated that we can still win the war if we decide to spend the money and make the sacrifices. Those references are to conversations with these military authorities that are not on the public record; but the statements about such conversations have been heard here and appear in the RECORD.

I have heard Senators downgrade the enemy in Vietnam as one-half of a country which does not have a single production complex, which cannot build a tank, which cannot build a plane, which cannot produce big ammunition, which cannot build modern electronic equipment, and which has to rely entirely on handouts from Communist allies.

I have heard these statements from the lips of Senators who have great influence in the White House.

I have read, too, that the presidential

candidate who came so close to throwing the 1968 election into the other body—and who now stands waiting in the wings for 1972—demands that we escalate the war if peace is not soon achieved.

I know also that every opinion poll shows that a very substantial number of Americans want the administration to adopt what is loosely referred to as a "win it" Vietnam policy. I have seen in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a recent poll taken by a Representative revealing that 39 percent of his constituents favor "an all-out offensive against North Vietnam, utilizing full available military power." And I know that the President, and every Senator, and every Representative, daily receive heartbreaking letters like one that came to me a few days ago from a Californian who has just lost his son in Vietnam. In his grief, he asked simply:

Why?

Why have we dropped more bombs in Vietnam than in World War II and not accomplished a thing? Why do we keep taking objectives in the conflict and then withdrawing? Why do we turn around again and sacrifice our best of youth for an ideal which seems to me to be all in vain?

Do you wish to have us bow our heads in shame and negotiate a peace with no victory for our great Country? Let us have total victory or give it up altogether. The sacrifice of our Boys has already been too great a loss of lives.

And he concludes:

Let's make the one Big Push and win.

Mr. President, these are signs of a frustration, disillusion and anger over Vietnam that all of us share.

All of us pray that the present lull in the fighting offers hope for peace. But General Wheeler, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, discounts the significance of the lull. And when we make positive suggestions at the Paris peace talks, all we receive is a response which Secretary of State Rogers must characterize as "totally negative," "intransigent," "unreasonable," and "inhuman."

We hope that even without peace the killing and maiming of American boys in Vietnam will end in 1970 as President Nixon pursues his goal of de-Americanizing the war ahead of Clark Clifford's schedule. But General Wheeler declares the South Vietnamese Army cannot take over the full war effort by the end of 1970, and President Thieu agrees with him. Meanwhile, young Americans die daily in Vietnam.

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

Mr. CRANSTON. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I read in the RECORD today the debates had in the Senate yesterday in which some of our distinguished colleagues praised the recently publicized proffer of President Thieu for elections in South Vietnam. I also read today wire dispatches from South Vietnam which reported a speech President Thieu made this week in which he said that those elections which he promised could not occur until some 2 years after the National Liberation Front agreed to his proposals.

This leads me to wonder how valid is the offer of elections as a means of arriving at peace. I wonder if the able jun-

ior Senator from California read that dispatch.

Mr. CRANSTON. I read it and I share the concern expressed by the Senator from Tennessee. It seems to me this is but further evidence of delaying tactics by South Vietnamese rulers, and further evidence that they will do all they can to postpone deescalation, to keep us there with our combat troops so that Americans do the bleeding and dying and the South Vietnamese evade their responsibility for their own self-defense. Until we take firm steps, and make plain that we are taking firm steps, in Vietnam they will never undertake that burden and we will carry it.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CRANSTON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have listened with rapt attention to the remarks of the able junior Senator from California. I believe it is true that there is sentiment held by a goodly number of people that the United States should use whatever force is necessary to bring a peace by victory in South Vietnam. If the silence of death is peace, then this would be within the power of the United States because within a matter of hours by the unleashing of nuclear war the inhabitants of North Vietnam and South Vietnam could be obliterated and the country made uninhabitable. I do not believe such sentiment is held by a majority of our people, nor by the leaders of our Government. Yet so many of our leaders who have become enmeshed in Vietnam policy seem, somehow, to have become mesmerized. I would not have anticipated that a pragmatic man like Secretary Laird would say so soon after becoming Secretary of Defense:

We have certainly turned the corner in the war.

He made that statement in colloquy with me before a committee. I thought I recognized that corner when he turned it. I have heard and watched other people turn it. I hope, indeed, that we are nearer to peace, but I recall that other people have made such statements.

For instance, on April 10, 1968, General Westmoreland said:

We have never been in a better relative position.

Then, on July 13, 1967, former President Johnson said:

We are generally pleased—

Then he added—

We are very sure we are on the right track.

Ambassador Lodge said, on January 9, 1967:

I expect the war to achieve very sensational results in 1967.

I hope the Senator from California is willing to yield to me a bit further.

Mr. CRANSTON. I most certainly am. Mr. GORE. Secretary McNamara, in October 1965, said:

We have stopped losing the war.

I seem to remember, too, that our boys were going to be home by Christmas. Does not the Senator from California recall that?

Mr. CRANSTON. I do. I recall the sad

series of hopeful predictions which we heard from so many leaders.

Mr. GORE. Assistant Secretary of Defense Arthur Sylvester said:

The corner has definitely been turned toward victory in South Vietnam.

Secretary Rusk said the struggle in Vietnam "is turning an important corner."

I am not sure that all these are the same corners, but it is hard to find which corner we turned.

Mr. CRANSTON. If we turn four corners, we get back to where we started, do we not? That is where we seem to be.

Mr. GORE. All of us can be wrong in our assessment. There is enough blame to attach to everyone. Therefore, I do not rise to be critical but, rather, to plead that all of us—particularly those in executive authority—avoid becoming mesmerized by policies or words and maintain the capacity to look the situation squarely in the face and realistically consider the facts.

It may be that I have fallen victim to my own criticisms. No one can be certain. But, for whatever it is worth, it has not been my view, and it is not my view, that a phased withdrawal of a relatively few men at a time, over a long period of time, is not the path to an early peace.

More certainly, it has the earmarks of a formula designed to prolong the war by retaining in South Vietnam sufficient U.S. forces to maintain the Thieu-Ky regime in power.

It is my further view that the United States should utilize its pervasive presence, its influence, and its power, to persuade a coalescence of forces, factors, personalities, factions, religious groups, tribal sects, and other diverse elements in Vietnam, into a formula by which they could agree to live together in peace.

I do not know how there can be peace in South Vietnam unless the people who live there have a will to live together in peace.

It seems to me it is no more within the capacity of the United States to force that will for peace than it is within the Senator's capacity to force the man and wife living next door to live together in peace. If they wish to live together in peace and harmony, we know from our own experience it is possible, but if they wish to fuss, fight, and harangue each other in continuous domestic turmoil, the Senator has no power to force them to live together in peace and harmony. If he tries to intervene, or to force it, he may suffer the consequences.

This oversimplification of the situation, ridiculous as it may seem, nevertheless, in principle, is about what we face in Vietnam.

We intervened there in what was essentially a civil war. It became more than that, but it was essentially a civil war. We took sides. In my view, as long as we seek the objective of a society in South Vietnam made in our own image, run by people of our own preference, or perhaps of our own choosing, the war will continue, and there will be much more bloodshed.

I submit that that has been the objective of our Government. Secretary Laird, in testifying before the Foreign Relations Committee recently, testified that there had been no change in either U.S. objectives in Vietnam or orders to our military forces there by the present administration from the orders and objectives of the previous administration. So if our objectives are the same, if the tactical and strategic orders are the same, and the indigenous conflicting forces remain adamant, that certainly does not lead one to the easy and optimistic conclusion that we have "turned the corner."

Now if the Senator will yield further—and I apologize to him—

Mr. CRANSTON. I wish to say, along the way, that I agree wholeheartedly with the Senator's statement that we cannot achieve our objectives and defend the American interest properly if we have a long, drawn-out, phased withdrawal from Vietnam. I do think President Nixon has suggested what would be a proper timetable, and that is to try to beat Clark Clifford's timetable and get out of Vietnam by 1970. Anything more rapid than that probably would lead to other great difficulties in Vietnam.

I would also like to say that, in a sentence in the Senator's remarks, he summed up what I am taking a speech to say; and that is, if the silence of death is peace, then we can achieve peace; because that silence of death would be the consequence of the escalation that the Senator and I and many others are so concerned about.

Finally, I would like to say that the Senator's sense of others' intentions is even more acute than mine. It was not until a week ago that I learned how strong the sentiment is for escalation. But 1 month ago the Senator from Tennessee most astutely referred to the fact that he saw lurking everywhere that sentiment for escalation.

Mr. GORE. Well, I have spent each week this year in Tennessee, and, therefore, have had personal contacts with a great many people. I believe I correctly assess the situation with reference to the one sentiment held by the largest number of people. There are various ideas, views, and sentiments, but the single largest group, it seems to me, holds the view that we ought to win or come home. And, I dare say, this sentiment is held by a great many people in all States, and many people still want to win a military victory.

Anything short of victory is very hard for our people to take. We are a new and a vigorous, a young and a powerful nation. Victory has been ours in some other conflicts. One of the most difficult political and diplomatic movements for any nation to execute, and particularly a young and vigorous and powerful nation and a democracy such as ours, is a settlement of a war short of victory or something which can be camouflaged as victory.

So I am not without sympathy for the President as he undertakes to execute a gradual disengagement from Vietnam. My view does not stem from lack of sympathy and lack of understanding of the difficulties. My view

stems, rather, from the impracticality of a phased withdrawal tied to a survival of the Thieu-Ky regime.

Mr. CRANSTON. I totally agree.

Mr. GORE. So long as we equate our security and our interest with the political survival of the Thieu-Ky regime, we are on a hazardous course.

I know that political face is involved. I know that prestige is involved. I know that great forces—psychological, political, and economic—are involved. And yet I know, too, that the lives of American boys are at stake. We have suffered more than 50,000 casualties since President Nixon's inauguration.

A great deal has been made of the fact that 25,000 of our sons are being brought home.

Mr. CRANSTON. Does the Senator know we have more troops today in Vietnam than we had on January 20, when President Nixon took office?

Mr. GORE. I did not know that. I inquired of the Pentagon as to how many American sons had been sent to Vietnam since the conference at Midway between President Nixon and President Thieu. I placed that information in the RECORD yesterday. More than 51,000 have been sent to Vietnam since that conference.

I know one can hardly equate the two, because men are there until they serve their time and there is necessarily a replacement program underway, unless those who are there are to be required to stay beyond their terms—

Mr. CRANSTON. Yes; some are going in and some coming out all the time. The fact is that we have a few thousand more in Vietnam today than we had on January 20, despite the commencement of the withdrawal of 25,000.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator yield once more, and then I will close?

Mr. CRANSTON. Certainly.

Mr. GORE. I wish to return to the principal thrust of the remarks of the able Senator, which is that there lurks in the country a sentiment held by an indefinite but, I agree with the Senator, substantial number, including some political leaders and military leaders, who believe we should yet strive for a quick military victory. In this, I submit, great dangers are involved.

Mr. CRANSTON. The sentiment indeed lurks in the Capitol and in the country, and I think our responsibility is to seek to portray exactly what the consequences would be to us and to others if those who advocate that course were able to cause our country to embark upon that course.

I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his extremely helpful statements and discussions.

Mr. President, there is indeed reason to feel frustrated, disillusioned, and angry.

If our hopes for an early end to the American tragedy in Vietnam are not fulfilled, I fear we will soon face new and grave dangers. So will the North Vietnamese.

We must face the fact that our hopes for an early peace may not be fulfilled.

We must also face the fact that if our hopes are not fulfilled, American patience may run out.

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

Mr. CRANSTON. I am happy to yield to my esteemed colleague from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if I may refer back to what the distinguished Senator from Tennessee said, I was one of those who were impressed by the offer by President Thieu, 2 days ago, of all-Vietnamese elections, North and South; but I must say that because of later developments, as the distinguished Senator from Tennessee has pointed out, I was distressed, because what he said, in effect, was that these elections could not take place until 2 years after a peace agreement had been reached.

It would have been far better had he said nothing, because on that basis, it looks like a diplomatic ploy that offers no real hope. It had been my hope that on the basis of the offer of President Thieu, which, I repeat, I approved at the time it was made, and thought was a good offer, the elections could well take place in a minimum of 3 months to a maximum of 6 months.

This is most important, because the one missing ingredient in the Geneva accords of 1954—which in a certain way, perhaps a most significant way, laid the groundwork for the difficulties in which we find ourselves today, the impasse which we cannot seem to break out of—is that under the 1954 Geneva accords it was stipulated that there would be all-Vietnamese elections 2 years after the signing of the agreement. The accords have not been put into effect as far as that particular stipulation is concerned. I think that is one of the handicaps which will keep the North and South Vietnamese apart and prevent the carrying out of these provisions, to which all of the parties agreed except Ngo Dinh Diem, the then President of South Vietnam, nor did we agree, because, while our State Department was careful not to do so openly, it participated indirectly in the negotiations, but this Nation is not a signatory to the accords.

I wanted to bring out that particular point, which the distinguished Senator from Tennessee thought was pertinent—it is highly pertinent—and make some comments on it at this time.

Mr. CRANSTON. The majority leader, in his usual perceptive and penetrating way, has put his finger right on the fundamental flaw in the position taken by President Thieu of South Vietnam. If there are to be no elections until peace is negotiated, that hands over to the Communists the power to prevent elections from ever being held. That is, because without negotiation with the Communists, there can be no peace unless there is conquest, or unless we escalate to achieve conquest through escalation, and that in itself leads to disaster.

It seems to me, as I am sure it seems to the Senator from Montana and to many others, that it is time for us to start making some decisions of our own, and it is also time for South Vietnam to start doing that also, without permitting the Communists to call the tune and determine both of our courses. It is time for us to start determining our own course.

As I stated a moment ago, we must face the fact that if our hopes are not fulfilled, American patience may run out.

It would be well if Hanoi faced that fact, too.

For it is far from certain that the end of American patience would mean the end of fighting in Vietnam.

It could mean the exact opposite.

It could mean that the advocates of escalation will finally carry the day, and that we will set out to "win" the war in Vietnam.

That day must never come.

Before it is too late, we must come to grips with the false god of "military victory" in Vietnam.

We must destroy that false god once and for all, before it destroys us.

The question, more urgent now than ever, is: What is victory in Vietnam?

Is victory something that can be achieved by full military escalation?

What would escalation be likely to cost in additional American lives?

What would it be likely to cost in additional American tax dollars?

What are the estimated costs—in men and money—of an expanded war, including China? or Russia? or both?

Was President Johnson, despite all his Vietnam mistakes, right in determining to limit the nature of the war? Was he right, at the end of his term, in deciding that we should not seek military victory?

Is President Nixon right in ruling out military victory in Vietnam?

I hold that President Johnson was right then. I hold that President Nixon is right now.

The struggle in Vietnam is basically a political and social upheaval that can be won only by the people of South Vietnam themselves. We can help them but we cannot do their work for them. We cannot create for them the sense of national unity; we cannot build the political climate; we cannot compel the economic and social reforms that are essential if South Vietnam is to survive. The Vietnamese must do these things themselves.

American military power cannot build a nation in Vietnam. The South Vietnamese must build it.

The traditional theory of a military victory simply does not fit in the Vietnam situation. In a guerrilla struggle you win by winning over the people, not by winning in battle against the enemy. If the people are with you, the enemy is defeated; if they are against you, you are defeated.

The "win-it" theory assumes that our military power is so superior that all we need do is escalate the war to a height which the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese can neither match nor endure. According to this notion, our enemies will then crumble and fall.

The advocates of escalation concede that American casualties and expenditures will rise for a time. But they believe the final result would be total military victory.

This reasoning overlooks some essential facts.

First off, as we all know, the men in Hanoi and in the southern jungles and villages are not alone. They are backed by the Soviet Union and Red China. So the fact is that we are not fighting only a small, undeveloped nation.

Compared with our massive efforts, Communist assistance from outside has been relatively modest. But they seem to

have gotten a much better return on their investment than we.

And, if we step up our activities, they have the option of stepping up theirs.

A second fact that escalationists neglect is that this is not a conventional war to be fought and won with conventional military approaches. It is a special guerrilla type of war.

It conceivably might have been forgivable to misunderstand the distinctive features of the Vietnam engagement years ago. But the military activities there have been described with increasing detail over the years by press and radio, and on television. And high Washington officials have had access to more detailed, classified intelligence reports.

Thus it is difficult to understand how anyone can still ignore the fact that though certain areas have been "conquered" by American and South Vietnamese troops, military operations still go right on, and continue to go on, as long as a significant part of the population in the area is intent on sabotage and possesses devoted hatred of the occupying forces.

Now that we have taken these often overlooked factors into account, let us imagine that the stalemate in Vietnam persists, accompanied by rising frustration and fury in America, until proponents of escalation finally are given their way.

Let us consider a number of forms that escalation could take.

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

Mr. CRANSTON. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it is very wise of the Senator to raise this question, but what interests me is what leads him to believe there is serious consideration being given to escalation of the war, by which I presume he means resuming, on a bigger scale, the search and destroy missions, and even possibly renewal of the bombing of the north. Does he have any evidence that leads him to believe that this may occur?

Mr. CRANSTON. I have evidence that there are powerful Senators with influence in the White House, who believe that this is the course we should follow. My evidence is that I have heard them make remarks along those lines on this floor.

One Senator said that he has talked with many military leaders during this administration and during the previous administration, and that they tell him we could win now if we were prepared to pay the costs and make the sacrifices.

I note the polls that indicate that many people, out of frustration and anger, now feel that we should escalate.

The poll was placed in the RECORD on the House side recently by a Member of that body. It indicated that 39 percent of his constituents feel that we should go in this direction.

The mail that I receive every day—and I am sure that in the mail that other Senators receive—reflects a rising anger and frustration.

I find daily in my mail—and I am sure that the Senator does in his—suggestions and demands that we win the war. These

sentiments suggest that if the frustrations and delays go on and on, we may find rising and conceivably irresistible demands in our land that we take the necessary although devastating and catastrophic steps to win.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I agree that there are signs that the failure of the administration to move in any noticeable way in the Paris negotiations toward a solution is contributing to the frustration.

That, together with the suggestion that troops in some small numbers will be withdrawn, creates almost a schizophrenic attitude.

People are even more confused than they were before over the announcement of troop withdrawals when they see no progress being made in the negotiations.

Is that what the Senator is saying?

Mr. CRANSTON. The Senator is correct. And I think we have to separate the need for American extrication, the need for American troop withdrawals in accordance hopefully with the timetable suggested by the President, from the peace negotiations, because the peace negotiations may never succeed. If the Communists do not want them to, they never will result in peace.

We cannot let the Communists decide what we should do in Vietnam. We must proceed with care and honor and without waiting forever for the Communists to talk peace.

I would like to cite one further bit of evidence regarding the danger of escalation. Vice President Ky, of South Vietnam, has suggested that we should forget all about the Paris peace talks and walk out on them. He has said that we must renew full-scale combat. The trouble is that he means us. He means that the Americans should stay there and do that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator's interpretation is correct.

It strikes me that the one reason why no progress has been made in the peace talks is that there has been no progress by the U.S. Government in making up its mind that it does not intend to stay there, either itself or by proxy—meaning the continued control and support of the Thieu-Ky government.

If maintenance of that government is a condition for a negotiated, political settlement, I am afraid there will not be any settlement. And I am not sure that has been made clear enough.

As I read many of the public arguments by the administration, they would indicate that our policy is to support the Thieu-Ky government to the point where that government can maintain itself in power regardless of whatever else might happen and whatever that may require in the way in money and arms and time.

I agree with the Senator from California. I think the Senator is raising the very timely point that we have been on this particular track now for some 6 months and no progress is being made.

The only progress has been in the de-escalation of our casualties due to the fact that there has been a lull, certainly on the other side, participated in recently by ourselves.

That has been all to the good. Fewer men have been killed and wounded dur-

ing the past few weeks. But that is about the only change I know of.

While I would like to see that continue, I do not think there has been much other change. I would hope that what the Senator is saying will be taken most seriously by the administration and our colleagues. I realize that some people still think the war can be won in a military sense. I have never been quite sure what would be won if we were to win.

I remember one of the earlier questions raised with Secretary of State Rusk—I believe it was by the Senator from Tennessee—was the question, "If we win a military victory, what do we win?"

That was a very difficult question to answer. And it has not quite been answered yet.

The ultimate objective, even if there is a military victory—at least on the part of the last administration and this one—would appear to be that we should then depart gracefully from the continent of Asia and leave it to whoever might succeed in those particular circumstances—which would probably be the same ones who would succeed if we had a negotiated peace.

I think it is timely to raise this question. We become so frustrated by going to the moon and having the All-Star game rained out and various other things that people have almost forgotten about the war in Vietnam. Yet, it grinds on and kills hundreds of our men each week and consumes vast sums of money.

It is time that we come back to earth and examine some of the questions that plague us here.

I am pleased that the Senator has brought up the matter.

Mr. CRANSTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

In response to the question he more or less left hanging in the air at the end of his remarks, it would seem to me that if we would proceed to take the steps advocated by some in the Senate and achieve what is loosely called a military victory, we would be required to stay in Vietnam everlastingly in order not to lose what we thought we had won. There would be so much chaos and hatred there that we would, I think, have to stay there forever.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct. What I meant was that the previous administration—and I think this administration—has suggested that we do not seek one inch of territory. I know the previous administration was always saying, "We do not seek to gain a colony. We do not want a base. All we want is to guarantee the people the right of self-determination."

That is about what it came down to. It was an oversimplification. However, the Senator is right. If we did win, it would be a great tragedy if it were to mean that we would be saddled with occupying that country until we ourselves became so weak, as France did, that we could no longer maintain ourselves and would go bankrupt as a society. None of us would want that.

I do not wish to impose on the Senator's time any longer. However, I am very happy that he brought up the matter.

I do not know what to do. Does the Senator have any ideas of what we can do in the Senate? I have exhausted my brain trying to think of something we could persuade or influence the administration to understand that they should close out this horrible tragedy.

Does the Senator have any good ideas on that? I agree that we do not want to escalate the war. However, is there any suggestion the Senator might make to bring the war to a close?

Mr. CRANSTON. The President has indicated what I think is the right course to pursue. He has stated that he would like to get all of our combat troops out by the end of next year. He is now being pushed by many Americans, including some Senators, in the opposite direction.

I think there are those who do not wish to see the President meet that timetable or to succeed in seeking a solution.

I think one of our responsibilities is to support the President in that laudable objective.

I think that we should do all we can to assist him.

He will fail to meet that timetable unless several things are done.

First, we must convince those in power in South Vietnam that we will move out and that they cannot upset our timetable.

Second, we should make it plain that after we get our troops out of Southeast Asia, we will give them assistance in terms of supplies and training roughly matching that given the other side from outside sources—Russia and China—but that that aid will come only if they make the necessary reforms to earn the allegiance of their people. If they refuse to do that, they cannot be saved. And they cannot win the allegiance of their people.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am very glad to hear the Senator say that he feels that what the President has proposed for the withdrawal of our troops, on our timetable, is what we should support. I am prepared to do that if he continues to advocate it and there is no wavering in his determination to go through with what I think is his statement—with this one reservation. A question is left in my mind—this is not clear—as to whether or not we are tied to this particular regime and intend to see to it that it is capable of maintaining itself. I am not saying that we should reverse on that and throw them out. They should be given an opportunity, along with other people in Vietnam, to establish, as the Senator has said, a broad base of political support among the people, if they can do it. We support other dictators in other countries, because circumstances are such that I do not think we have an alternative. But that is not the same as saying they have the same opportunity as other factions to participate. But I think that to say we are going to escalate or to say we are just going to leave unilaterally is impracticable.

I hope I have never contributed to the idea in North Vietnam that we were just going to turn around and leave, as much as many people would like to do so—simply because this would lead, I guess, to the North Vietnamese refusing to negotiate. I had hoped we could have an orderly, negotiated settlement, carrying

out what President Nixon has said in his objective, which is the withdrawal of our troops, but in an orderly manner. I mean without chaos following and there being economic, moral, and political disorder following our withdrawal.

This is what I think we contemplated in the Geneva Conference. I think the accords entered into at Geneva tried to set down the principles on which withdrawal of the French could have been done at that time. I have said many times since then that if we would follow that course as closely as possible now, I think it would still provide the framework in which we could withdraw; that is, we could disengage or we could do—whatever words one wants to use—to end this war and leave it to the Vietnamese people to determine what kind of country and what kind of government they want.

As I said earlier, I am prepared and am eager to support the President, with this one reservation: I do not think it will work, nor will they get an agreed settlement in accordance with the kind of principles entered into at Geneva, unless we make it clear that we are not there to support the existing government, without any alternative, without anyone else having an opportunity to participate. I think that is the key to getting the kind of agreement that would be the most civilized and most useful for everybody concerned.

Mr. CRANSTON. I agree with every view expressed by the Senator from Arkansas in regard to the current situation and to the need to support the President, to strengthen the President, and to persuade him to take the additional steps that the Senator has suggested, in order to make it possible for the President to achieve the policy he has offered to the American people.

I thank the Senator from Arkansas for making a very important contribution to this effort to clarify the thinking in this body, in this Capital, and in this country on this crucial matter.

Let us, then, consider a number of forms that escalation could take.

The other day, I heard a powerful Senator complain, because we have not interdicted the port of Haiphong.

The U.S. Navy could surely stop all sea shipments to Haiphong and elsewhere into North Vietnam, and could halt most of the local small marine traffic along the coast.

This would require a major step-up in American military activities, however; and our vessels engaged in this activity would at once be targets for North Vietnamese retaliation. Soviet-produced, land-based and STYX missiles would almost certainly be hurled against our forces.

We would have to step up our air activities to protect our naval operations.

The new dimension of naval and air operations would cost us additional billions a year, plus additional casualties.

We could choose the simpler course of mining the approaches to Haiphong and other North Vietnamese harbors. We would, in either case, face a major confrontation with the Soviet Union the first time we stopped or sank a Russian ship.

For all that, sealing off North Viet-

nam's ports would not stall the North Vietnamese war machine. The Soviet Union, and perhaps China would simply step up supplies to North Vietnam by land. Even now, virtually all military supplies come to North Vietnam by overland routes, and at the height of our bombing we were unable to cut off these supplies.

Another step many escalationists have urged is unrestricted use of American airpower over North Vietnam. The airpower alone, they believe, could bring the North Vietnamese to their knees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EAGLETON in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CRANSTON. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CRANSTON. This argument ignores all the history of the air age. It has been shown repeatedly that conventional airpower alone cannot defeat a nation.

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

Mr. CRANSTON. I yield with pleasure to the distinguished senior Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that my distinguished colleague will be finished in 15 minutes?

Mr. CRANSTON. I hope to be finished in 15 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY. I ask for a general purpose. I have reserved time, as he has, and I have made a complete schedule. I wonder how long the Senator desires to continue.

Mr. CRANSTON. I believe I can complete my remarks within 15 minutes, particularly if the current moment of time is not deducted.

Mr. MURPHY. I realize that the Senator has been interrupted, and I was concerned. It is not my intention in any way to deny him the floor. I am just wondering about my schedule and my arrangements.

Mr. CRANSTON. I believe I can conclude in 15 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY. I have no objection.

Mr. CRANSTON. If other Senators wish the floor, it may take a little longer than that.

Mr. MURPHY. In this case, then, I am afraid I reserve the right to object.

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

Mr. CRANSTON. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. First, I desire to congratulate the distinguished junior Senator from California on his outstanding speech today. I am in complete accord with many—in fact, most—of the statements he has made. I feel that I know something about the matter, as I spent nearly a month in Vietnam in 1965 and again last year.

Very definitely, in asking for an orderly, negotiated settlement, the Senator is taking a position that all Americans feel is sound. This should not be, as it has become, an American war in Vietnam.

The distinguished junior Senator from California has expressed the factually correct statement that there are at the present time more Americans fighting in the ugly civil war in Vietnam than there were on last January 20. It is to be regretted that while we hear about deescalation from the White House, one of the first actions of the President was to remove a distinguished negotiator, a truly great American and diplomat, Averell Harriman, and put in his place Henry Cabot Lodge, who is a close friend of Vice President Ky, the flamboyant air marshal.

So it is discouraging to contemplate the situation with which we are now confronted. The period of service of most of the 4½ percent of the Americans withdrawn from Vietnam by order of President Nixon had about expired.

I am in agreement with the views of the Senator from California with respect to escalating the combat. It seems to me that combat has been escalated in recent months despite what has been said. Any person who reads the statistics of the number of troops killed and wounded in Vietnam cannot help but agree. During May, June, and so far in July more Americans have been killed and wounded in Vietnam than the total number of South Vietnamese.

The Senator is so correct in calling attention to bombing by our airpower, and what would happen if that is escalated, as some Senators on the other side of the aisle have been advocating recently, and what would happen if we interdict the port of Haiphong, where few supplies come in anyway. The Senator is correct in stating that that course would jeopardize our position there.

I am sure the Senator and I are in agreement that Vietnam is of no importance whatever to the defense of the United States. I shall not take any more of the Senator's time except to say that Gen. James Gavin has said that to increase the bombing and to bomb Hanoi would add to our problems rather than detract from them, and that it would not stop the penetration of North Vietnamese troops into the South. General Ridgway, who was the commander of U.S. Forces during the Korean war, and who is an expert on Asian affairs—he was also my commander during World War II—said:

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

Again, I compliment the distinguished Senator from California. I agree with him. Vietnam is a national tragedy of immense proportions and the war must be brought to an end as soon as possible by negotiation. Then we will have an opportunity to take care of the problems which need our attention so much at home.

Mr. CRANSTON. I thank the able Senator from Ohio for adding those constructive thoughts and useful facts to this discussion on Vietnam.

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

Mr. CRANSTON. I yield with great pleasure to the distinguished Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from California for making what I consider to be a very timely speech with respect to the risks and some of the problems connected with possible escalation in the fighting in South Vietnam.

That frustrations do exist is revealed, I suspect, in the mail of every Senator—as people contemplate the sacrifices being asked of our young men, and as taxpayers contemplate the burdens imposed upon them without the prospect of an end.

I wish to emphasize one point which the Senator made in this connection. Hanoi and the other side should not misread this frustration and misinterpret its possible consequences. I think the enemy is relying quite heavily on the hope that this kind of frustration may lead us to panic for unilateral withdrawal, whatever the consequences, in Vietnam. I think the pressure, indeed, be in the other direction, pressure for the kind of escalation which the Senator is discussing. I think Hanoi should pay attention to what the Senator is saying.

On our side, and indeed among some Senators, there appears to be sentiment for escalation, total military victory, and the big push. That same kind of sentiment exists in Vietnam if we are to believe the evidence available to us. Its existence apparently inhibits movement in Paris on the part of negotiators for Hanoi and the National Liberation Front.

We are not going to achieve a negotiated settlement until each side concludes that a negotiated settlement is in its own best interests.

This factor of the possibility of escalation, it seems to me, is a complicating factor here and it is a complicating factor and influence in Hanoi, as well as the National Liberation Front. So I compliment the Senator for making this point.

Secondly, I wish to compliment the Senator for pointing out the fruitless consequences that escalation would bring. We have not had this kind of discussion of the escalation options that might be considered for a long time. I think it is good for us to be reminded of them. Only one outcome of this war can serve the best interest of all the parties, and that is a negotiated settlement which will convert the conflict from a military struggle to a political struggle. That has got to be our objective. It is in the best interests of Hanoi; it is in the best interests of the National Liberation Front; and it is in our best interests.

I wish to compliment the Senator for making a speech which deals with the frustration and the difficulty of devising a formula, approach, or policy which can contribute constructively and visibly toward the objective of a negotiated settlement. It frustrates us all.

The Senator makes some suggestions in the closing pages of his speech, and I commend him for making them. I have suggested that the President should consider the formal offer of a standstill cease-fire to the other side. I think that kind of offer, coupled with the unqualified offer of free elections, which unfortunately, has now been qualified by President Thieu, could serve as an addi-

tional initiative which might just possibly move the other side another step or two toward a negotiated settlement. It is this sort of thing to which we should address ourselves: What meaningful steps can we take in our interests, and those we seek to protect, to advance the possibility of a negotiated settlement? New and continuing initiatives in this direction—an escalation of our efforts to achieve an end to the fighting and a political settlement, rather than an escalation in the fighting—should be our objective.

I commend the able Senator.

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

Mr. CRANSTON. I shall yield to the Senator, but, first, I wish to thank the Senator from Maine and say that he is one of the great leaders of this Nation. I hope that the American people will heed his words today. I hope also, as he suggested, that his words and other words spoken in this Chamber today will be heeded by the men in Hanoi, Peking, and Moscow. If that be the case, today could get a message across that could lead to a solution in Vietnam.

I thank the Senator. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator for yielding. I do not ask the distinguished junior Senator from Maine or the distinguished junior Senator from California to agree with the senior Senator from Tennessee. I just must say that I question the validity, probity, and actuality of a so-called peace proposal by which President Thieu offers elections which are to be conducted under his administrative authority, even though observed by an international body, and in which the Vietcong would be permitted to vote only after forswearing force and arms, such elections, we are now told, to be held 2 years after the end of the war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) has expired.

Mr. CRANSTON. May I ask my colleague from California what his time situation is.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I do not in any way wish to impede my distinguished colleague. I think the colloquy and dialog now going on is most important and I also would like to enter into debate. I have no intention of cutting it off. I should like to suggest that, in order not to impede my distinguished colleague, that he be permitted all the time he desires, and, to that end, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my time, which was supposed to begin at 5 minutes after 12 be moved up to 1:30 p.m. instead, in order to accommodate my distinguished colleague from California. I think that would take care of it, would it not?

Mr. CRANSTON. Yes. I am very grateful to my colleague for his suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the request of the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY)?

Mr. MURPHY. That all the time desired be given to my distinguished colleague from California (Mr. CRANSTON) and that the time which had been re-

served for me, which I believe was at 5 minutes after 12, be moved up to 1:30 o'clock p.m. in order to accommodate him, and let other Senators continue the colloquy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would advise the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY) that the difficulty is that there are a series of orders already agreed to, one following another after the expiration of each speech, and thus to agree to this new arrangement would throw everything out of order.

Mr. MURPHY. In other words, the Chair rules that he would cancel my request, is that right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would point out that following the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS) will have the floor, and then the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), and their time, of course, would be contingent upon the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. Well, Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is willing to rule the request out of order.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President—

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I thank the Chair. I will accommodate myself to my colleague.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed regardless of the pending order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For what period of time?

Mr. CRANSTON. For 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I have no intention to ask for the regular order. I congratulate my colleague on being so alert, but I have no intention of asking for the regular order.

Mr. CRANSTON. I am very grateful to my colleague from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, evidence has just been placed before the Senate that my colleague and I do agree on procedural matters, and I want to say that there are also some substantive matters on which we agree, even though our views may be different on the matter I am presently discussing.

Mr. President, the other day I heard a powerful Senator complaining because we have not interdicted the port of Haiphong.

The U.S. Navy could surely stop all sea shipments to Haiphong and elsewhere into North Vietnam, and could halt most of the local small marine traffic along the coast.

This would require a major step-up in American military activities, however. And, our vessels engaged in this activity would at once be targets for North Vietnamese retaliation. Soviet-produced, land-based and STYX missiles would almost certainly be hurled against our forces.

We would have to step up our air activities to protect our naval operations.

The new dimension of naval and air operations would cost us additional billions a year, plus additional casualties.

We could choose the simpler course of mining the approaches to Haiphong and other North Vietnamese harbors. We would, in either case, face a major confrontation with the Soviet Union the first time we stopped or sank a Russian ship.

For all that, sealing off North Vietnam's ports would not stall the North Vietnamese war machine. The Soviet Union, and perhaps China, too, would simply step up supplies to North Vietnam by land. Even now, virtually all military supplies come to North Vietnam by overland routes, and at the height of our bombing we were unable to cut off these supplies.

Another step many escalationists have urged is unrestricted use of American airpower over North Vietnam. The airpower alone, they believe, could bring the North Vietnamese to their knees.

This argument ignores all the history of the air age. It has been shown repeatedly that conventional airpower alone cannot defeat a nation. It did not work in Vietnam where our earlier restrictions were designed primarily to keep our bombs away from populated areas. It did not work against Germany in World War II when we bombed without restriction, nor did it work against Japan until we went to nuclear bombs.

The evidence is clear that terror bombing does not break a people's morale. In some instances after saturation bombing of populated areas military production actually increased. Short of nuclear warfare, airpower alone cannot win in Vietnam.

Suppose, instead, that we invade North Vietnam. Our aims would be to take over all of North Vietnam, and capture Ho Chi Minh if we could. We would want to gain complete control over North Vietnamese production, transportation, and communication facilities. And, by firm military occupation, we would seek to suppress hostile activities of the population to eliminate North Vietnam as a viable military force.

But, clearly, that could not be done without calling up added millions of American troops.

A half million Americans have been sent to South Vietnam where only some of the population is hostile and where a very substantial part is either actively cooperative or neutral.

If we took on all of North as well as South Vietnam, we would be tackling a totally hostile population that has been propagandized for years with an intense hatred of Americans as foreign invaders.

Even with millions of Americans fighting, we still would be outnumbered by people who surely will never meet us in a conventional military engagement of large-scale forces.

There is absolutely no reason to think that the North Vietnamese would ever surrender to us.

Let us admit the best and the worst of our foe: He has demonstrated his willingness to resist until the last man, woman, and child.

The North Vietnamese are now in their 28th year of almost constant fighting: First against Japan, then France, then South Vietnam, and now the United

States, Korea, Australia, Thailand, and the Philippines.

We have learned to our sorrow that the will, the determination, and the morale of the North Vietnamese are no less today than on the day they forced the French to withdraw.

If we invaded North Vietnam, the leaders and most of the trained men would simply pull out before we took over, retreating into neighboring non-Vietnamese territory where they would be free to continue their sabotage and guerrilla activities.

American casualties would rise in proportion to the rising numbers of men in combat.

With a half million Americans in South Vietnam, 36,000 have been killed.

Many more would be doomed to die over the years if we tried to conquer a hostile, seething, rebellious North Vietnam.

This bleak picture of an American expeditionary force sentenced to futile, endless punishment in Asian jungles does not even take into account Russian and Chinese reactions to an expanded land war.

We must expect, at the very least, that ample Soviet and probably Chinese supplies would be available to the Vietnamese opposing American occupation.

The entire Vietnam land, with its jungles and mountainous terrain, would be unsafe for Americans anywhere at night. Even in the daylight, except where we had large troop concentrations, our forces would be continuously subjected to harassment, sniping, and shelling.

The Soviet Union and Red China would probably do more than simply step up the flow of supplies if we try to occupy all of Vietnam. But even assuming that is all they would do, the best we could hope for would be years of increased American casualties, and increased American spending. We now spend \$30 billion a year on Vietnam. The figure could easily rise to 50, 70, or even a hundred billion dollars a year.

Taxes would be vastly increased, and so would our inability to come to grips with our critical domestic problems.

With casualties and expenditures up at a new high, escalationists would have only one direction in which to go; up, to still more escalation. Inevitably, they would demand that we attack the suppliers of the guerrilla sabotage operation.

Their argument would be that we could not "straighten it out" and "win it" as long as the North Vietnamese had sanctuaries to flee to, and allies to help them.

Their cry would now be: Occupy Laos and Cambodia.

So we would reach the logical next step of escalation; further escalation.

I said that it was probably foolish to imagine the Soviet Union and Red China sitting idly by through all of this.

If they did, it would only be to watch us bleed ourselves into military impotence abroad and economic bankruptcy at home.

The Soviet Union today provides North Vietnam and the Vietcong with the means to sustain such strong activity against U.S. operations in South

Vietnam that it costs us \$30 billion and unacceptable American casualties each year. It costs them an estimated \$2 billion a year, and no casualties.

If we were to build up toward \$100 billion a year, while putting perhaps 3 million Americans in Vietnam and suffering vastly increased casualties, the Soviet Union might be very content to let that situation continue for years.

While neither the U.S.S.R. nor Red China could be totally pleased to see the United States occupying still more territory in Asia, they would weigh that against the severe penalties the United States would be paying for undertaking so foolish an escalation.

Red China would uncontestably be uneasy with proponents of escalation in command of our Nation and moving closer to their borders. Faced with this threat, they would unite internally. The United States, meanwhile, would be a scene of increased division and turmoil.

If the Chinese found our escalation too threatening to them, their next logical countermove would be to send their massive land armies into North Vietnam to contest our occupation.

Then we would be at war with Red China—the major Asian land war that General MacArthur repeatedly warned us against. He knew, as every American military authority knows, that the United States must never engage in a ground war over the sweeping terrain of Asia against China's vast population.

Our military leaders know that we could not vanquish China by dropping conventional bombs across the great Chinese land mass.

They know that we could not possibly contain the situation without disaster—unless we went to nuclear weapons against China.

And that, too, would mean disaster. American nuclear weapons would kill Chinese by the millions.

But they would not create a stable peace in Asia. Quite the opposite.

Nuclear war would fragment China. Along with anarchy, suffering, disease, starvation, and massive deaths without burials, there would come worldwide horror directed against the United States.

The revulsion within our Nation would leave an irreparable wound in America's soul.

And, to add futility to dishonor, the villages in South Vietnam that are now in Vietcong hands would still be in the hands of the Vietcong on the day we occupied Peiping.

The Soviet Union, I suspect, would simply stand by and enjoy the utter chaos.

What does all this add up to?

Clearly, escalation would take a bad situation and make it worse. It would lead only to further escalation, and to a nightmare of consequences.

There is another way.

President Nixon pointed to this other way when he expressed the hope that we can replace all American combat troops with South Vietnamese troops before the end of 1970.

Our task, I believe, is to support and strengthen him in that effort.

Once and for all, we must stop think-

ing of military escalation as an alternative to diplomatic frustration. No matter what happens in Paris, we must not reverse what should be an irrevocable commitment to extricate ourselves militarily from Vietnam.

Indeed, it is because peace negotiations keep dragging on endlessly that I believe we must speed up the process of extrication. We must start moving our troops out of Vietnam in significant numbers before the frustrations of Paris overtake and overwhelm us and get us in deeper than ever.

I would like to see us move faster, and I know President Nixon would like to do so.

The way to move faster, I believe, is to make two things absolutely clear to the Government of South Vietnam.

First, that we are determined to withdraw all our men from combat in accordance with a timetable of our design—our design and no one else's.

Second, that after our troops are gone, we will keep on providing supplies and training only if the regime there takes effective steps to rally to it those courageous men, women, and children who have resisted both the callousness and corruption of Saigon and the cold ruthlessness of Hanoi and its southern minions.

The South Vietnamese Government will not assume the combat burden that is rightfully theirs as long as we are willing to carry it for them.

The rulers of South Vietnam will not broaden and reform their government and share power with other non-Communist South Vietnamese, as long as we are willing to prop up their government while it jails avowed anti-Communists, tolerates torture in its prisons, and suppresses freedom of speech and religion.

We simply cannot let our course be determined by men in either Hanoi or Saigon. In Vietnam, as elsewhere, we must remain the masters of our own fate.

In the last analysis, certain basic truths remain.

There are approximately 15 million South Vietnamese, and 15 million North Vietnamese.

South Vietnam and North Vietnam are roughly equal in geographical size.

South Vietnam is stronger than North Vietnam in vital resources—agriculture, mineral, and timber.

Thus, if the aid we give a united South Vietnam matches the aid China and Russia give to North Vietnam, the people of South Vietnam will be able to defend themselves—if they possess the character, the will, the determination, and the desire.

Surely, the last thing Ho Chi Minh wants to face is a strong and united South Vietnam prepared to stand on its own feet and defend itself. Then he would lose the "hated foreigner" slogan that he has used these many years to recruit his fighting forces. A stalemate in a war strictly between Vietnamese would be the circumstance most likely to produce a reasonable settlement in Vietnam.

If South Vietnam lacks the character and capacity to produce that stalemate, we could stay forever fighting its battle—

and forever fail to achieve victory or peace.

That we cannot do.

That we will not do.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I congratulate my colleague on a very careful and well-designed presentation. At this time, just to make certain that there can be a minimum of misunderstanding, I would like to read exactly what the President has said with regard to troop withdrawal. He said:

This, then, is the outline of the settlement we seek to negotiate in Paris. Its basic form and terms are very simple—mutual withdrawal of non-South Vietnamese forces from South Vietnam and free choice for the people of South Vietnam. I believe that the long-term interests of peace require that we insist on no less and that the realities of the situation require that we seek no more.

In other words, as my distinguished colleague has pointed out, the President would be more than happy to withdraw troops as fast as possible, provided we had the assurance that other, non-South Vietnamese troops are withdrawn at the same time. To do otherwise I think would be very foolhardy.

CHANGE IN ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR TYDINGS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the previous order, the distinguished Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS) be recognized immediately following the address by the distinguished Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), rather than following the address by the senior Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from California.

THE SAFEGUARD ABM SYSTEM

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I rise to speak in favor of the inclusion of the Safeguard system in the military authorization bill for fiscal year 1970, as requested by President Nixon.

At the outset, I wish to compliment most highly the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Senator STENNIS, for the excellent job he did in conducting the enormously complicated hearings on this issue.

I would also like to congratulate Senator MARGARET SMITH, the ranking minority member of the committee, as well as Senator MCINTYRE, on whose Subcommittee on Research and Development I had the pleasure of serving.

I think that all concerned deserve a great deal of credit for doing such a thorough and productive job in bringing this bill to the floor of the Senate at this time.

I am somewhat sorry that the results of their efforts and of the admirable work of the full committee must be subjected to such a long and exhaustive debate because of considerations which, in many cases, appear to be matters of policy rather than procurement, or international politics rather than arms purchase.

However, in these troubled and com-

plex times, I guess that this is the way it has to be.

Regardless of the length of the debate and the far-ranging issues discussed during it, a final decision regarding the President's request for a Safeguard system must be made on the merits, and this decision quite properly should be made now.

For over a week I have listened attentively to both proponents and opponents of the Safeguard system as they have made their arguments, pleaded their cases, and reached conclusions which I found sometimes enlightening, sometimes most confusing, and often, I fear, based more on wishful thinking than fact, more on whim than substance, and more on desire than reality.

For instance, I have heard statements in this Chamber which amaze and dismay me at the same time, such as "aerial bombardment has not been effective." I wish to assure my colleagues that this statement is very misleading and does not tell the entire story. In spite of impossible imposed restrictions laid on by civilians during the past several years in the Department of Defense, I have seen adequate proof and have heard reports which would indicate that airpower has been very effective and that the power of the B-52's in North Vietnam was one of the most effective things we had going for us.

I suggest that my colleagues might request and look at the films of the relief of the siege of Khe Sanh, and see the magnificent job done by our airmen—not in indiscriminate bombing, but in bombing more careful, more precise, and with greater concern for civilian non-combatants than ever before in the history of war.

Beyond that, I have been informed that during the first weeks of October, by hitting supply roads and river crossings, practically all of the overland supplies and reinforcements from North Vietnam into the south were almost completely shut off when President Johnson ordered the bombing stopped. Many North Vietnamese regiments had given up the fight and had gone into sanctuary because of lack of food and lack of ammunition. At other times I have heard it stated repeatedly, "we could not win the war militarily." I can only accept this statement as being incomplete. We could not win the war militarily because that was the policy decided on by our so-called civilian leaders and because they decided that certain conditions be imposed to accomplish exactly this conclusion. To me it seems false, misleading, and provocative and, of course, when used as propaganda by the North Vietnamese Communists, it unquestionably gave false hopes to the Communist forces at Hanoi and inspired them to continue the fight. Then, too, we have heard from so many who have given the impression that we should get out of Vietnam regardless of the cost or conditions. I am very pleased that some of my colleagues, within the last several days, have taken the occasion to speak on the floor of this Chamber, in order to make the record crystal clear that this is not the wish, the intent, or the plan of the American

people. We Americans hope very much to arrive at an honorable and lasting negotiated peace, but we have no intention of walking away from our obligations or our national commitment to the principles for which so many of our young men have sacrificed their lives, regardless of the urgings of the "peace at any price" groups. Many military experts believe now and have believed for the past several years that had our military men been permitted to fight in the conventional manner, the war in Vietnam would have been won, or at least the fighting could have been concluded, some time ago.

I should like to point out, at this point, that their suggestion did not include what has been spoken of here today as grand style escalation. It was rather de-escalation. The plan was to cut off the enemy's supplies, and thereby make it impossible for him to continue fighting. This is not a new idea in warfare; it has been used effectively for many, many years in the past.

We had almost exactly the same condition and experience in Korea, and for almost the same reason. Our policymakers decided that there would be no military victory and consequently in Korea we had what we called a "no-win" policy, whereas in South Vietnam we find the same policy dressed in a new package now called "limited response."

I was glad to hear my distinguished colleague refer to the comments of General MacArthur. To complete his study of the views of that distinguished gentleman, I would suggest that he read the remarks of General MacArthur with regard to the restrictions placed on him in Korea. That, too, was a strange war. We did not lose; we were not permitted to win, and it dragged on and on, I believe in some cases unnecessarily.

I might say that others who have the same desire for peace that compels all of us keep suggesting that we take one more first step toward appeasing the Communists in their design for world domination. I might say that I have listened to this suggestion, at first hopefully, later with some suspicion, and finally with a feeling of frustration. And it has seemed to me that if we keep taking the "first step," as suggested, our national shoes would be worn out before the Russians give any sign of reacting favorably to our friendly gestures. We are now, I believe, in about our 40th year of having done good to the Soviets time after time without getting anything in return but abuse and vilification, and further threats of destruction of our system. It would seem that historically they have only reacted properly when there has been a threat of force or a show of force as in Greece, Lebanon, and Cuba, and I believe that the time has most certainly arrived when we must be completely realistic in our assessment of the needs for the security of our Nation and how to achieve this security. I have even heard that one of the most distinguished Members of this body asked the rhetorical question, "has anybody psychoanalyzed the Russians?" In answer, I would say that I do not think psychoanalysis is particularly called for when the records of

the last 40 years provide us with a full and complete story by which we may judge their motives, their methods, their national interests, and their final hopes. They have been most definite in their design—we should learn from our experience.

With these things in mind, and having studied the presentations of my colleagues and reviewed them in the light of the testimony regarding the proposed ABM system that I have heard during the debate here in the Senate and during the hearings of the Armed Services Committee, I feel that the most important considerations to which we should direct our attention in our evaluation of the Safeguard system are these:

First. Do we need it?

Second. Will it work?

Third. Will it offend, in any way, the Russians or increase their activity to hasten the arms race?

Fourth. Can we afford it?

Fifth. Is it important to the defense and future security of the United States?

Sixth. Should the decision to construct and deploy be made at this time?

I would like to discuss these points one by one.

First, Mr. President, is the question, "Do we need it?"

The opinion of those on both sides of the argument is almost unanimous that we should, without question, have an effective ABM system and that we should proceed with all possible speed to research and develop such a defense but not build it.

The major argument seems to revolve around the timing and location of the actual construction of the system.

We must remember, Mr. President, that a great deal of the research and development has already been done on most of the components which will go together to make up the Safeguard system.

Therefore, the next important step is to assemble these component parts and program them into one operational unit so that the end result will be a workable, viable ABM system, as requested by the President.

Where and when this should be done has been discussed at length. One of our colleagues who opposes the Safeguard defense system as requested by the President suggests it might be practical to use existing facilities in Kwajalein and add to these facilities the necessary components which would make it effective as an ABM system. In answer to this, may I say that the suggested Pacific deployment would fulfill the requirement—providing the needed radar facilities—but only that. It would not provide any capability nor would it provide a basic installation which might be later expanded if the threat indicated the need for such expansion. In this regard, the suggestion to build the installation in the far-off Pacific is, to my mind, without value and would merely serve to cause a delay in starting construction or deployment in the continental United States, where it would be effective if needed. Also, I would point out, there is the matter of cost. It must be recognized that construction in faraway areas such as Kwajalein would be much more ex-

pensive than construction in the United States. Therefore, I would conclude that the Pacific installation as suggested would be unacceptably expensive, provide no defense, and would only serve to delay the start of the much-needed defense of the Minuteman.

But underlying this entire debate there seems to have been a general agreement that we do, indeed, need a defensive system against any present or future plans for a nuclear attack on our country or against any miscalculation or mistake on the part of some other nuclear nation which, if not intercepted, might cause us catastrophic damage.

I like the way it was put by the distinguished Senator from Vermont (Mr. PROUTY) the other day when he said that it would be nice to give the President of the United States the option of several buttons and that if there were a mistaken, unfortunate launch, we would not have, in our own defense, to launch our offensive weapons. We would have a choice of using defensive weapons which would cause no destruction to anyone or anything except the unfortunate weapon that was headed our way.

Therefore, Mr. President, I suggest that to the question, "Do we need Safeguard?", the answer, without any doubt whatsoever, is that we most certainly do and we need it very badly.

Next we come to the question, "Will the proposed system work?"

This, of course, is a most important consideration, and the answers which have been offered to it cover a range as broad as the entire scientific spectrum and involve factors as complex as the proposed construction of the Safeguard system itself.

I regret to say that I have listened to some of the most extreme and unsubstantiated statements I have ever heard during recent weeks, some even from men of high scientific and legal reputation who should have exhibited more professional expertise or at least more restraint in their statements.

Others have backed up their statements with impressive presentations.

We find, then, that some of the very best scientists say, "Yes, the system will work."

Others give an unequivocal "No." And a few faint hearts, who seem to be keeping their options open, say "Maybe."

The net result of all the testimony seems to assure us that we will only know for sure—after we have built one. All seem to agree on that.

It is extremely important to note, however, that all of these experts agree—whether they say "yes," or "no," or "maybe"—that the Safeguard system is the only possible ABM system presently available to us at this moment in history and that this is the only one available as far as I have been able to find out within the state of the art.

So, logically, we really have very little choice.

Furthermore, we must look at the deterrent aspects of Safeguard, too, as the Los Angeles Times did so effectively in an editorial entitled "ABM Deserves 'Yes' Vote."

In the editorial, the Times pointed out:

A number of prominent scientists have expressed skepticism that Safeguard will actually work. But equally prominent scientists are convinced that it will.

The Russians are unlikely to gamble on who is right. As one eminent scientist put it, "They will be deterred by the very fact that it might work"—and deterrence, after all, is the name of the game.

I agree deterrence is the name of the game, or at least of a vital part of it.

In fact, this one consideration alone is, in my opinion, important enough to justify an "aye" vote on this floor for the Safeguard system.

Yes, deterrence is a prime consideration, but still we have an obligation to ask, "Will it work?"

Consequently, I have given careful study to the lineup and past performances—the track record, so to speak—of the scientists who have entered into the ABM debate, and I have tried to the best of my ability to evaluate their opinions in the light of their scientific background plus their past performance.

Being a realist, I have, in some cases, also considered their political persuasions since, I am afraid, there have been some few indications that certain statements have reflected political philosophy rather than purely scientific evidence and opinion.

I have listened to arguments from men such as Dr. DuBridge, Dr. Teller and General Schriever, who was charged with the development of our entire space program, and they have been most helpful on a completely nonpolitical basis on one side. They all seem to agree. They are in favor of the ABM.

I have also heard testimony from those with opposing views, including Dr. York, who has done a great deal of work with the so-called military-industrial-scientific complex in California, Dr. Panofsky and Dr. Jerome Wiesner. All are eminent men with wide-ranging backgrounds as physicists, nuclear physicists, propulsion experts and so on, but at times they have failed to limit their testimony to their particular specialties and, instead, have strayed into the field of international relations, foreign policy and the possible political consequences of some of our scientific endeavors.

As I have indicated, I have tried to evaluate the record of these scientists in the light of their accomplishments in their specialties as well as in the light of their past history as effective advisers and their disposition to confine their observations to objective statements dealing only with their own fields of expertise.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970 FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, AND FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF MISSILE TEST FACILITIES AT KWAJALEIN MISSILE RANGE, AND RESERVE COMPONENT STRENGTH

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 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 SAFEGUARD ABM SYSTEM

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, the result is that I find that I am inclined to prefer the recommendations of those who advocate proceeding with the development of Safeguard, and consequently I myself am convinced that if, God forbid, we ever need Safeguard to ward off a nuclear threat, it will work.

This conviction, which stems from the evidence I have heard, is based on the fact that there seems to be wide agreement among the entire scientific community that each of the integral component parts of the system will work, or at worst has an excellent chance of being made to work.

Since this is the case, I am quite certain that our great American scientific-industrial complex will be able to harness its know-how, its capability, and its skills and provide us with a system which will be not only a deterrent but also, in reality, an effective defense against any attempted nuclear strike.

In other words, I am certain that our scientists will make this system work, just as in the past, whenever they have been permitted, they have managed to keep this country ahead of all of the other nations of the world in scientific accomplishments. If there is any question in anyone's mind as to this capability, I suggest that it should have been wiped away completely by the magnificent exhibition we have all had the privilege of watching over the last weekend by the astronauts in their tremendous achievement with regard to the moon shot.

Having seen, therefore, that we need an ABM system and that Safeguard will work—as a deterrent, at the minimum, and almost certainly as an effective defense—we must ask ourselves the third question I originally proposed: "Will it offend, in any way, the Russians or increase their activity in the arms race?"

There are those who have told us, Mr. President, that any deployment of Safeguard would impel the Russians to speed up their present arms buildup and thereby increase the danger of nuclear war which, of course, nobody in this Chamber desires.

I wonder how those who make this claim are so sure of how the Russians will respond in this situation when they have admittedly been unable to predict Russian reactions in the past.

Be that as it may, I would like to remind my colleagues that on several occasions the Russians have indicated—and their statements are in the RECORD—that our construction of a defensive

weapon would in no way influence their planning or decisions concerning offensive weapons.

In other words, they would not consider the ABM to be provocative and our deployment of Safeguard would have no adverse effect on any disarmament talks which might be conducted. As a matter of fact, the announcement of the plan seemed to speed up the Russians' desire to enter into such talks.

Now, Mr. President, as most of my colleagues know, I am not one who is willing to give blind acceptance to statements from the Soviet Union. I have studied their history carefully; I have watched their actions and reactions over the years with interest.

I think they should be studied, analyzed, and reviewed in the context of history, and, when all of this has been done, judged in the light of their stated purpose as well as the political self-interest which seems to determine Russian policy.

Then, and only then, can we hope to find out whether the Russians are, in fact, saying in this instance what they mean.

In this case I believe they are.

There is no evidence to indicate otherwise.

In fact, judging from their past pattern of obstructionism and harassment, one would have thought that the mere mention of Safeguard would have been enough to inspire a torrent of vicious propaganda from the Soviet leaders.

Instead, the Russians stated their position clearly, and in the absence of any evidence to indicate that they are not sincere, we should take them at their word.

The Safeguard system would not—I repeat, would not—cause any acceleration of the arms buildup on the part of the Russian Government. They have said so, and I suggest that we believe them.

I might point out that Russia is now completing the deployment of Galosh ABM missiles on launchers around Moscow, but this is not causing us to increase our missile capability; nor, I suppose, will we do so if the Tallinn defense system, which is very extensively deployed throughout the Soviet Union, is upgraded to give it an ABM capability.

Safeguard is purely defensive.

It cannot be converted into an offensive system.

I am sure that the Russians know this as well as any of us in this Chamber.

Before concluding my remarks on this specific point, I would like to make one comment on the debate which has taken place concerning the value which approval of Safeguard might have to the President in any disarmament negotiations with the Russians.

The other day we were told by one of the most knowledgeable and respected Members of this body that in his opinion a close vote in favor of Safeguard would give the President a weak hand in his bargaining for an arms limitation agreement whereas a top-heavy vote for some sort of a watered-down compromise would strengthen the President's position.

I can only say to this, Mr. President,

that I have the deepest regard for the always statesmanly views of my colleague, but in this case I must disagree with him, and disagree completely.

I would much rather see this body, if necessary, cast a 51-to-49 vote to give the President an ace than agree unambiguously to hand him a deuce as he goes to the upcoming "international poker game."

We now come to the question, "Can we afford to build Safeguard?"

I would like to remind my colleagues that the President has pointed out that Russia may be substantially ahead of us in overall nuclear capability by 1972 or 1973 if we stabilize our forces at present levels and they continue building ICBM's and *Polaris*-type submarines at the present rate, and then I would like to rephrase the question I just asked, as follows: "Can we afford not to build Safeguard?"

It is my opinion that the ABM question must be studied on its own merits and should not be made conditional on any other national issue, whether it be poverty, health, urban development, or even the war in Vietnam.

However, even if other critical matters are injected into the consideration, it is obvious that we would have a hollow victory, indeed, if we conquered the problems of our poor and our ill and our oppressed and then had our (utopian) civilization blasted from the face of the earth by an aggressor's unchallenged nuclear bombardment—or some miscalculation or mistake.

That, it seems, is self-evident.

But let us look at the actual dollar amount of Safeguard, too, since even those of us who are convinced that it is necessary are concerned about the expenditures it will entail.

We are talking today, Mr. President, about an expenditure of \$793.5 million, not \$10 billion or \$50 billion or \$100 billion, but \$793.5 million. That is all this bill provides. This will pay for the start we need at the time we need it.

And no more can be spent unless this body agrees. It is that simple.

If we discover that our initial efforts do not produce the desired results or if, hopefully, it developed that they are no longer necessary, we can terminate the program. The President's plan calls for yearly reassessment and either renewal or if necessary, cancellation if it appears safe. If we find later that we acted too soon, we can curtail our deployment schedule.

On the other hand, I find it appalling to think of what might happen if some day we were suddenly to find that we acted too late.

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

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

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

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, there is one other matter that seems to get lost or heavily laminated in the conversation which I think is of extreme importance. All of the experts, and, as far as I can ascertain, nearly all of my colleagues,

agree that we should continue with the research and development. The present "hang-up," as the young people, say, only concerns the word "deployment"—or, to translate it, the actual building or construction of the system at the two sites suggested by the President.

Now, let me point out that the entire figure provided in this bill for research and development on the Safeguard system amounts to \$400.9 million, and let me point out further that the projected cost of research, development, and deployment, amounts to \$793.5 million, so that really the difference in cost between research and development alone and research, development, plus deployment, as requested by the President, is a matter of \$392.6 million. I consider this a very small price to pay for the added security which we could acquire in this matter.

I personally am convinced, as I have said, that we need Safeguard and we need it now, but to those who still have misgivings about the necessity or the timing, I say this: If we are to err, let us err on the side of caution and security rather than on the side of carelessness and vulnerability.

I submit that the price of the investment is right—\$793.5 million. I emphasize that not one dollar more than that amount can be spent without the approval of this body.

It might well be that the annual costs will continue and that in the years ahead we will have to authorize additional expenditures to provide us with an ABM system worthy of an increasing Russian threat.

If this happens, we will have been buying safety.

On the other hand, it might be that we will find in the near future that for one reason or another we can safely discontinue our Safeguard program.

If this happens, we will have bought safety and important time—time in which we were able to keep our options as open and as flexible as possible.

In either event, it will, I feel, be a case of money well spent.

Now, Mr. President, for the last question I offered, "Is it important to the defense and future security of the United States?"

I have touched on this point in commenting on several of the other questions I proposed, but I would like to conclude my remarks by pointing out that, yes, it is important to our defense and future security.

Who says so? The President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense and his military advisers, a majority of the members of the Committee on Armed Services, probably a majority of the Senate, probably a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives and certainly, according to all the polls that I have been able to see, a great majority of the people of the United States.

Mr. President, I cannot withstand the temptation to recall to the Members of this distinguished body a happening which took place not too many years ago in a place called Munich in Germany. There was a meeting held there and representatives of two great nations met at a most critical time in history for discus-

sions which would decide whether or not the world would become involved in World War II. One man was lampooned and cartooned and millions of jokes were made about him and his umbrella going to such an important meeting.

I would like to point out, Mr. President, that when Neville Chamberlain went to Munich to represent the British Empire against the German maniac, Adolph Hitler, about the only weapon he had to strengthen his position was this same umbrella.

Wishful thinkers and dreamers in his own country had so weakened his position militarily that Mr. Chamberlain was forced to accept what Hitler chose to give him. Thereby the advent of World War II was assured. This must not happen to President Nixon or any President in the future.

Now for my last point. Should the decision and determination to go forward with the construction and deployment of the ABM be made at this time?

It is my belief that it most certainly should and the reason is simple. It has been carefully explained that to delay this decision 1 year at this point would hold back the capability of finalizing the system by 2 years and I do not believe that we can afford the luxury of this time under the known military plans and progress of both the Soviet Union and Communist China. If there is to be an error of judgment that error must be in favor of the security of the United States. Therefore, Mr. President, I am completely convinced by all the discussion and debate that it is without question in the best interests of the United States of America that we accede to the President's request and vote him the funds for the initial phase of the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system and do it now. Therefore, I would urge that all of my colleagues review these most pertinent points in the hope that our conclusion when we vote will be overwhelmingly in favor of the future safety of America.

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

Mr. MURPHY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, first, I wish to express my thanks to the distinguished Senator from California for making such a tremendous contribution to this debate in his usual lucid and eloquent fashion.

I think we all feel a sense of elation this week after having placed two men on the moon and successfully recovered them from the moon, and now have them speeding home for what we hope will be a routine recovery.

Much has been made of the fact we have not tested all the components of the ABM system which will go into it as an integrated unit.

Is the Senator aware that the rocket that lifted the—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional 10 minutes of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

Mr. TOWER. I was saying that the engine and vehicle that lifted our astronauts off the moon to rejoin the command module had never been tested before; is not the Senator aware of that?

Mr. MURPHY. I was aware of it. I am glad that my distinguished colleague has brought it to the attention of the Senate. I point out that many of the components that went into the successful moon shot were made in many different parts of the country. They were assembled and skillfully put together by men of imagination and accomplishment and we have watched the components work successfully.

It seems to me to be a shallow argument of some of the members of the scientific community to say, "Well, it won't work."

I recall one of our witnesses, not a scientist, but a highly publicized legal adviser to a former President of the United States, when I asked him before the hearings, "What about the Russian system?" replied, "It doesn't work. I think it's a bunch of junk."

I asked him further if he had any personal, firsthand knowledge to come to that conclusion, and he admitted that he had none.

I think it probably will work. They have good scientists in Russia. Fortunately, we have better. Man's accomplishments in the scientific field have gone clearly beyond his imagination.

I have not the slightest question that the ABM system can be made to work. I know from the testimony that this is the only system available at the present time.

Mr. TOWER. In light of the events of the past few days, does not the Senator agree that American technology can make this thing work, that the argument the system is not sufficiently advanced to the extent it can intercept missiles is a little bit shallow, in light of the events of the past few days?

Mr. MURPHY. The Senator is exactly right. Anyone who makes that statement should go back and watch a re-run of the action of the past few days, and I think he will possibly have more confidence in the so-called scientific-industrial-military complex than he exhibits now.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the Senator from California very much.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

SAFEGUARD: THE QUESTION OF RISKS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, during the debate concerning the Safeguard ABM, I had a colloquy with the distin-

gushed Senator from Texas (Mr. Tower), who is now in the Chamber, on the question of "risks" to our national security inhering in the ABM issue. In his prepared remarks, the Senator from Texas made his usual able presentation of the issue of risks to our security, as seen from his point of view, a point of view shared by other like-minded Senators. While I respect the sincerity of these Senators, I feel very deeply that the question of risks to the national security as it relates to the ABM has not been accurately assessed by the supporters of Safeguard deployment now.

The question is whether to deploy or not to deploy now. Both sides are in agreement that research, development, testing, and evaluation should go forward in every way up to the point of deployment. If it proves impossible within a given period of time—which those of us against present deployment have set, generally speaking, as 1 year—to arrive at an arms limitation agreement which will encompass the ABM, then we may very well be for some deployment ourselves. However, we believe that a better perfected ABM system could then be available and that we will probably have a new decision to make.

The proponents of Safeguard have made conspicuous use of the argument that we cannot afford the risk to our national security of any delay in the Pentagon's timetable for deployment. In my judgment, this argument must be met directly by the opponents of ABM deployment, because all of us in this debate are equally concerned with the security of the United States. In my view, the risk to our national security of proceeding now with Safeguard deployment is much greater than the risk of delay.

The implication that the opponents of present Safeguard deployment are prepared in effect to weaken the security posture of our Nation and to incur serious risks to win a better Soviet attitude on nuclear arms control assumes a lack of sophistication in the ABM opponents which is extreme and regrettable. Particularly regrettable, in my judgment, is the effort that has been made to characterize ABM opponents as "unilateral disarmers." Such arguments of this sort debase the level of the debate and suggest a lack of confidence by such proponents in the merits of their case.

Hence, today, I wish to speak more fully on the question of risks to our national security with respect to the Safeguard deployment.

Practically no one in this debate has challenged the view that the greatest addition to our national security would be an effective nuclear arms limitation agreement with the Soviet Union. That would be of even much higher security importance than the claims for Safeguard.

Another one of the exchanges I had with the Senator from Texas (Mr. Tower), related to the prestige of the President of the United States and how it is involved in respect to the Senate's pending action. In my judgment—and I feel deeply that this is true—he will go down as a much bigger President for

bringing about a nuclear arms limitation agreement with the Soviet Union than he would be if he won on Safeguard.

I do not believe there is a Senator who would not agree that the next generation of strategic nuclear weapons will be even more awesomely dangerous and destructive than the present weapons upon which the "balance of terror" rests.

Thus, we come down to the question of whether the risk of not trying our utmost to achieve a really substantial nuclear arms limitation breakthrough now—before crossing the Rubicon of the next generation of nuclear weapons—ABM and MIRV—is greater than the alleged risk that we might not be ready to meet a Soviet threat to our Minuteman force in 1975. I believe the former risk to be so much greater than the latter that I want to defer Safeguard deployment for, say, a year to give the negotiations a chance to prevail.

The key issue is not whether the Soviets will not be deterred from the negotiations by the phase 1 deployment recommended by the President. They will not; that is admitted. The real question is what effect will the arms limitation negotiations and a possible agreement have? Will they be capable of bringing about a freeze on strategic nuclear weapons now, or will the beginning of ABM deployment by the United States mark a new plateau in the nuclear arms race requiring the Soviet then to review its position in view of the new situation? Therefore, the ABM deployment would, in effect, abort the SALT negotiations and make possible only some peripheral agreement—say about nuclear weapons on the sea bed—instead of the historic breakthrough for which the moment is propitious to freeze the nuclear arms race at this point.

Some miscellaneous arguments have been made about the deployment of Safeguard. For example, Secretary Laird has said that both the United States and the Soviet Union could agree to have limited ABMs—both understood to be addressed to the "Chinese threat," which is likely to be of a very limited nature even 5 years from now.

The Defense Department takes the view that the acquisition of a MIRV capability by both ourselves and the U.S.S.R. would also not be an impediment to reaching an arms control agreement.

In other words, Mr. Laird says we can agree both to have limited ABMs, within the compass of an arms control agreement. The Defense Department also says both of us can have MIRV without interfering with such an agreement.

I cannot agree with these complacent viewpoints. The prime characteristic of United States-Soviet behavior in the nuclear field is the "action-reaction" cycle described so clearly by Secretary McNamara in his San Francisco speech of September 1967. If the military planners in the Pentagon and in the Kremlin are both determined to get ABM and MIRV in "under the wire," so to speak, before the SALT talks begin, we can look for very long, drawn-out negotiations with a very minor result at best. Both sides will have moved up the lad-

der from the current plateau—a plateau which provides both sides with a "comfortable" degree of security and a workable "balance of terror." It will be necessary for planners on both sides to reassess the entire situation, before agreeing to any significant nuclear arms limitation agreement.

Let us understand that the whole nuclear arms race is some unbelievable chess game of "war gaming" in which the risk of obliteration of each of the superpowers is so great that it might well be decided by nuclear blackmail rather than nuclear weapons.

On several occasions, Defense Department spokesmen have explained the assumptions upon which our strategic planners work with reference to the U.S.S.R. It can be described as the "worst case" approach. Dr. Foster, Director of Defense Research and Engineering, most recently described it in the following language:

We continuously make a series of calculations starting with intelligence to compare our own estimated leadtime with the worst case for the deployment leadtime of a potential enemy. . . . Where information is inadequate and uncertainty high, we run some risks of overinvestment to insure that our capability will be adequate, that it is sure to fulfill our strategic objectives.

I have noted that Senator JACKSON, who spoke on the policy unreliability of the leaders of the Soviet Union, described the Soviet approach to strategic weapons, in the debate on Wednesday, July 16, in the following way:

The Soviets, in my judgment, have decided on what they feel they might need if they ever got into a nuclear war, in order to be in a better position than the opponent if such a war does come.

This conceptual approach, as I understand it, is very similar to the approach of our own strategic planners which Dr. Foster described. In essence, each superpower strives to be in a position to achieve its strategic objectives against the other in the event that nuclear war should occur. But, it is just not possible for both to possess nuclear "superiority"—but both can possess nuclear "sufficiency." So long as both seek "superiority" there will be an endless arms race, especially as each takes a "worst case" view of the other's capabilities. Both the costs and the risks mount with each new generation of nuclear weapons systems. And, more and more, we must rely on automated and preprogrammed command and control systems—the inevitable result of such a race is automaticity of response and loss of nuclear weapons' control by either the United States or the U.S.S.R.

The argument has been made that the United States has possessed nuclear "superiority" over the past decade, and that we cannot afford to lose that "superiority" now. If by "superiority" the advocates of this viewpoint mean a greater "overkill" capability then we must concede that the United States has possessed "superiority" in this sense. Moreover, we must also concede that the ratio of our "overkill" capacity in relation to the U.S.S.R. "overkill" capacity may be diminishing from perhaps 4 to 1

down to 2 to 1. But, in real terms, what does all this mean?

It has been estimated, for example, that the United States presently has the assured capability of destroying each of the 50 largest cities in the Soviet Union, and then of charring the rubble 47 more times with additional "overkill" weapons.

On the other hand, for more than a decade, the U.S.S.R. has had an assured destruction capability against the United States as well as an impressive "overkill" capability to make the rubble of our destroyed cities burn again and again. Probably the Soviets are "catching up" with us, relatively speaking, with respect to the number of times they could make the rubble of our population centers burn in a full nuclear exchange.

To be panicked by such information will do no good and can do much harm. I would much rather concentrate our national energies on halting the nuclear arms race at the present uncomfortable resting point.

In this historic ABM debate, Secretary Laird, at a rather late date, introduced the idea that the Soviet Union was striving for a "first strike"—that is, a preemptive—capability with its multiple warheaded SS-9. After a great deal of controversy that position now seems to have been laid to rest. Secretary of State Rogers publicly expressed his disagreement with this notion, and now Secretary Laird himself has backed off after the Foreign Relations Committee confronted him with the formal assessment of the U.S. Government's intelligence community.

But, speaking of risks, even assuming that the Kremlin was seeking a "first strike" capability with its SS-9—even then the risks of going ahead with Safeguard as now designed would be greater than the risks of not deploying now, but proceeding with perfection of the system. The components of the Safeguard system are the same as those designed for the Sentinel system, but the strategic mission is very different. Testimony of the scientific experts is, I believe, convincing that Safeguard is not the optimum system for its mission; that the vital missile sight radars are just too "soft" and vulnerable, and that the problems of computer technology and especially of computer programming for the Safeguard system are just not sufficiently solved. If we go ahead to deploy Safeguard, we will be deploying a system that could be defective. I consider this to be a great risk—an unacceptable risk—if we are, indeed, to counter a possible U.S.S.R. "first strike" preemptive capability.

Mr. President, another one of the justifications offered for Safeguard is the protection it is alleged that it would provide against an "accidental launch" of an offensive missile by the U.S.S.R. or some other nuclear power such as Communist China. Dr. Teller has argued in favor of this proposition. At first glance, there might seem to be some plausibility to this argument. However, there is not a sufficient case in the accidental launch to justify the ABM deployment—especially in view of the inevitable escalation of the nuclear arms race inherent in an ABM deployment at this time.

In his "white paper" presentation to the House Appropriations Committee, Secretary Laird cited as one of two "minor purposes" of the Safeguard system, "Protection against the improbable, but possible, accidental launching of an ICBM toward the United States."

The fact that the Pentagon itself regards the accidental launch threat as "improbable" and gives scant mention to Safeguard's defensive capabilities in this regard under the heading of "minor purposes" is a good indication, in my judgment, that a persuasive justification for ABM deployment cannot be made on these grounds. There is also the admitted fact that even full Safeguard deployment will still not be a perfect defense against all incoming missiles, because, in the case of Safeguard, we would seek to protect the Minuteman silos, whereas, in the case of Sentinel, we thought we were going to attempt to protect population centers. Even the best estimates concede that the system could never "kill" all incoming missiles and could be overwhelmed by an all-out attack.

In addition to the "improbable" nature of the threat of accidental launch, there are grave problems in adjusting the Safeguard system to cope with them. First, there are serious "command and control" problems. The Safeguard system is designed to be fully operative only when it is fully "tuned on" under Presidential command. This presupposes a political "warning time" which just would not be available in case of an accidental launch. And, the risk of maintaining the Safeguard system in a "fully-tuned" readiness state at all times is greater than the protection it would provide against an accidental launch. It is greater, Mr. President, because the Russians would surely take that as evidence of our reaching out for a first-strike capability.

We would then also be faced with the possibility of accidental or unauthorized firings of Safeguard—a risk which many experts consider more dangerous than an accidental ICBM launch. Moreover, there would be inevitably serious political consequences to any decision to maintain the Safeguard system at a full alert status at all times. Given the degree of suspicion which already exists, and the "worst case" assumptions of strategic planners in both the United States and U.S.S.R., there is little doubt that the Soviet Union would feel compelled to make extra compensation in its own security posture if faced with a "hair-trigger" ABM in the United States—which is what would be needed if Safeguard were to provide serious protection against the possibility of an accidental launch.

However, the overriding point in the whole debate is that the Nixon administration—like the predecessor Johnson administration—has, in my judgment, failed to grasp the urgency and the imperative necessity of a nuclear arms control breakthrough. It has failed also to comprehend the significance of the opposition in the Senate, and the Nation as a whole, to the deployment of the Safeguard ABM system.

With the evidence showing how hard it is in the United States to resist the Pentagon's desire to move ahead with

ABM and MIRV, it is not surprising that moderate elements in the Soviet Union have also thus far failed to halt the SS-9 buildup. Yet Mr. Gromyko's speech indicates that there is at least a struggle going on in the Kremlin between the moderates and the hardliners—just as there is in this country. The U.S.S.R. has many concerns and pressures, both domestic and external. I do not believe that the Stalinists have won any final battle against the modernizers and moderates in the U.S.S.R. And I think that even the Kremlin "hardliners" are becoming increasingly concerned about Communist China. In short, I feel that there are at least enough real and potential inducements on the Soviet side to reach a nuclear arms accord, or nuclear detente, with the United States to justify a really big effort by our side to make the SALT talks a watershed in the arms race.

The evidence presently at hand indicates that the United States and the U.S.S.R. will begin the SALT talks soon. The evidence also indicates that these talks will be conducted at the "trading" level. The longer they are delayed—while both sides press on with the development of the very weapons the talks are designed to obviate—the less are the chances of a really meaningful agreement. The result of negotiations conducted in a "trading" frame of reference cannot help but fall far short of the goal mankind demands of them.

The United States now has the opportunity to transform the frame of reference of the SALT talks by the exercise of restraint with regard to deployment of Safeguard. If we stay our hands now, the incentive to negotiations on both sides of the table will be much greater than if we routinely move ahead. Something dramatic is needed to provide an escape from the action-reaction cycle of the arms race. One of the superpowers must be able and willing—I emphasize both words—to forgo for a time the deployment of a nuclear weapons system in pursuit of an historic international nuclear arms limitation agreement.

Given the accelerating momentum of technological advance in both the United States and the U.S.S.R., the dynamics of the arms race are such that each step forward in the development of weapons technology has an exponential effect on the total question. We are now poised on the brink of a vast new escalation of the arms race which could well gather so much momentum as to preclude for all time the possibility of meaningful international control agreements. It is literally possible that at the end of the next round of the nuclear arms race we could each find ourselves sitting on top of an automatic doomsday machine—where computers have replaced the element of human judgment and control.

The path to that tragic new plateau of nuclear arms equilibrium will be the most perilous mankind has yet trod in all history. It will be the most expensive also. We must not fool ourselves about the cost. The figures could run in the hundreds of billions of dollars. The expenditure of that kind of resources on military hardware over the next decade will foreclose much of our option to rehabilitate our cities, to meet the needs of

black America, and to assure our posterity an unpolluted environment.

The challenge before the Nixon administration is to rise above the conventional course it is now following. The fact that the Soviet Union today—with the increasing influence of a group of old guard marshals and generals—is following true to their course and seems headed also conventionally down the path of a new round in the nuclear arms race is added reason why the United States should put itself into a position to seek nuclear arms control limitation on the level of high purposes which the present circumstances demand. This requires that we forgo ABM deployment for, say a year—which can be done without endangering the security of the United States. This may be a fateful turning point for all mankind. There may not be another such opportunity to insure mankind's survival for years to come.

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

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

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At this time, under the previous order, following the speech of the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), routine morning business is to be taken up. At the close of routine morning business, the Senator from Idaho (Mr. JORDAN) is to be recognized.

Is there routine morning business to be taken up at the present time?

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT OF ACTUAL PROCUREMENT RECEIPTS FOR MEDICAL STOCKPILE OF CIVIL DEFENSE EMERGENCY SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT PURPOSES

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, reporting, pursuant to law on actual procurement receipts for medical stockpile of civil defense emergency supplies and equipment purposes for the quarter ended June 30, 1969; to the Committee on Armed Services.

RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES AT HYDROELECTRIC PROJECTS LICENSED BY THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of the publication, "Recreational Opportunities at Hydroelectric Projects Licensed by the Federal Power Commission" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Commerce.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1969

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend

the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the effectiveness and administration of the Atterbury Job Corps Center for Men under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, Edinburg, Indiana, Office of Economic Opportunity (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS BY RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, reporting, pursuant to law, on the settlement by the Board of claims of civilian personnel for damages to or loss of property incident to service during fiscal year 1969; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the New York Department, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, Island Park, N.Y., protesting against the use of property or personnel of the United States without fair and adequate compensation to the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 212. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to expend additional funds from the contingent fund of the Senate;

S. Res. 213. Resolution increasing the limit of expenditures for hearings before the Committee on Armed Services;

S. Res. 215. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on the Utility Consumers' Counsel Act of 1969 (Rept. No. 91-329);

S. Res. 218. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of part 18 of Senate hearings on Riots, Civil and Criminal Disorders (Rept. No. 91-330);

S. Res. 219. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of part 17 of Senate hearings on Riots, Civil and Criminal Disorders (Rept. No. 91-331);

S. Res. 220. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the District of Columbia to expend additional funds from the contingent fund of the Senate;

H. Con. Res. 208. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of parts 1, 2, and 3 of the publication entitled "Subversive Influences in Riots, Looting, and Burning" (Rept. No. 91-332);

H. Con. Res. 209. Concurrent Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the committee print "The Analysis and Evaluation of Public Expenditures: The PPB System" (Rept. No. 91-333); and

H. Con. Res. 291. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of inaugural addresses from President George Washington to President Richard M. Nixon (Rept. No. 91-334).

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time and, by

unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware:

S. 2680. A bill to provide for the recapture of accelerated depreciation on real property;

S. 2681. A bill to provide for the repeal of capital gain treatment for sales of livestock;

S. 2682. A bill to provide for the removal of interest rate ceiling on certain government bonds and to provide for the issuance of U.S. savings and retirement bonds; and

S. 2683. A bill to deny an income tax deduction for a charitable contribution by a public official of his collection of letters and other papers, and to limit the tax benefits of other gifts to charity of certain property which has appreciated in value; to the Committee on Finance.

(The remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware when he introduced the bills appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate headings.)

By Mr. DODD:

S. 2684. A bill for the relief of Antonio Da Cunha Cerqueira Da Costa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

S. 2685. A bill to require a special report to the Congress by the President on the current status of research and application techniques in the field of weather modification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. DOLE (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. PELL, Mr. PERCY, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TOWER, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota):

S.J. Res. 139. A joint resolution providing for the establishment of an annual "Day of Bread" and "Harvest Festival" Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 2680—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO MAKE CERTAIN NECESSARY TAX REFORMS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I send to the desk a series of bills for appropriate reference, the purpose of which is to make certain necessary reforms in our tax structure. Each of these bills will be reintroduced as amendments to the major tax reform package when it is received from the House.

The first bill provides for the recapture of accelerated depreciation of real estate when sold at an early date.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill and explanation thereof be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2680) to provide for the recapture of accelerated depreciation on real property, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2680

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

section 1250(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to gain from dispositions of certain depreciable realty) is amended—

(1) by striking out "one percentage point" and inserting in lieu thereof "one-half of one percentage point"; and

(2) by striking out "20 full months" and inserting in lieu thereof "40 full months".

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to dispositions of section 1250 property (as defined in section 1250(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The explanation, presented by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, is as follows:

RECAPTURE OF ACCELERATED DEPRECIATION ON REAL PROPERTY

Present law provides an incentive for the construction of new real property by permitting the owner of real property to claim depreciation at a higher rate (accelerated depreciation) during the early years of the property's life than could be claimed if depreciation were taken in equal amounts each year (straight-line depreciation). If the property is sold after ten years, the owner has the advantage that depreciation has been deducted from income subject to ordinary income tax rates, while the difference between the depreciated cost of the property and the actual sale price is taxed at capital gains rates—a maximum of 25 percent. To prevent a situation where new property is constructed and sold soon afterward solely to reap tax advantage, the law provides for the recapture of part of the tax benefits attributable to accelerated depreciation. If the property is sold before ten years, only a part of the difference between depreciated cost of the property and the actual sale price may be taxed at the lower capital gains rates; the rest is subject to ordinary income tax rates. If the property is held 20 months or less, the entire tax advantage is recaptured by taxing 100 percent of the cumulative difference between the amount depreciated under accelerated depreciation and the amount that could have been attributed to straight-line depreciation at the ordinary income tax rates. For each month after 20 months, one percent less of the difference is recaptured by being subject to ordinary income tax; the balance is taxed at the lower capital gains rates. Thus, after ten years (120 months), the entire difference is taxed at capital gains rates. This bill doubles this period of time, providing that the entire tax advantage will be recaptured if the property is held 40 months or less, with one-half percent less subject to ordinary income tax rates for each month thereafter. No part of the tax advantage would be recaptured if the property is held more than 20 years.

S. 2681—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL ON TAX REFORM

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the second bill deals with the question of the so-called hobby farming and proposes to correct this inequity by repealing the capital gains treatment for the sale of livestock.

In my opinion there is no reason why the sale of livestock should be treated any differently under our tax laws than that of other agricultural commodities.

I know the suggestion has been made in some quarters that this could be corrected by extending the holding period in order to be eligible for capital gains treatment. However, in my opinion, the real answer lies in the outright repeal of the capital gains provision.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill

and explanation thereof be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2681) to provide for the repeal of capital gain treatment for sales of livestock, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2681

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) Section 1231(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of property used in the trade or business) is amended—

(1) by striking out "or" at the end of paragraph (1)(B);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (1)(C) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and";

(3) by inserting after paragraph (1)(C) the following new subparagraph:

"(D) livestock (including poultry)."; and

(4) by striking out paragraph (3).

(b) Section 1221 (relating to definition of capital asset) is amended—

(1) by striking out "or" at the end of paragraph (4);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

"(6) livestock (including poultry)."

(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act, but only with respect to sales, exchanges, and involuntary conversions occurring after such date.

The explanation, presented by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, is as follows:

REPEAL OF CAPITAL GAIN TREATMENT FOR SALES OF LIVESTOCK

Under present law, the capital gains tax (instead of the higher ordinary income tax rates) may be applied to profits realized from the sale of livestock (other than poultry) held for draft, breeding, or dairy purposes for at least 12 months. From the Congressional Committee reports written when this provision of law was enacted, it is clear that the term livestock was meant to be given a broad interpretation. Treasury regulations have indeed given it a broad interpretation, including cattle, hogs, horses, mules, donkeys, sheep, goats, and fur-bearing animals. The courts have broadened the interpretation still further. As a result of court decisions, race horses, cattle used for show or exhibition, and even chinchillas have been considered livestock for purposes of capital gains treatment. The 12-month period specified in the law dates from the acquisition of the animal rather than from its first use for draft, breeding, or dairy purposes. In fact, the animal may never have been put to the prescribed use (or even be old enough to be capable of it), as long as it was being held for the purpose of being put to that use. Present law accords a different tax treatment to the expenses associated with raising livestock compared with the tax treatment of the profits associated with their sale. While the costs of livestock husbandry may be deducted currently from income subject to ordinary tax rates, proceeds from the sale of this sort of livestock are subject to capital gains rates, which are at least 50 percent lower.

This bill would delete the provision of law specifying that sale of this kind of live-

stock is subject to capital gains taxation. In fact it would go further and clarify the law by stating specifically that livestock does not qualify for capital gains treatment. This clarification is desirable for the reason that before this special livestock provision was written into law in 1951, there was considerable confusion as to the extent to which livestock sales could receive capital gains tax treatment. This was due to conflicting legal interpretations by the courts and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue of the 1942 amendment allowing capital gains treatment of certain property used by the taxpayer in his trade or business. To avoid a return to this confusing situation, the bill makes it explicitly clear that livestock may not be considered either a "property used in trade or business" for capital gains purposes or a "capital asset."

S. 2682—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO REMOVE THE INTEREST RATE CEILING ON CERTAIN GOVERNMENT BONDS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the third bill provides for the removal of the interest rate ceiling on long-term Government bonds and for the issuance by the U.S. Government of savings and retirement bonds providing for the rate of 6 percent. This new series of savings bonds would have a lower limit allowed for each individual.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill and explanation thereof be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2682) to provide for the removal of interest rate ceiling on certain government bonds and to provide for the issuance of U.S. savings and retirement bonds, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2682

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the first sentence of the second paragraph of the first section of the Second Liberty Bond Act (31 U.S.C. 752) is amended by striking out "not exceeding four and one-quarter per centum per annum".

(b) Section 25 of the Second Liberty Bond Act (31 U.S.C. 757c-1) is amended by striking out "": *Provided, however, That in no event may the interest rate or the investment yield exceed 4¼ per centum per annum".*

(c) Section 22A(b)(1) of the Second Liberty Bond Act (31 U.S.C. 757c-2) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) (1) Retirement and savings bonds shall be issued only on a discount basis, and shall mature ten years from the date as of which issued. Such bonds shall be sold at such price or prices and shall be redeemable before maturity upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, except that the issue price of such bonds, and the terms upon which they may be redeemed at maturity, shall be such as to afford an investment yield of 6 per centum per annum, compounded semiannually. The denominations of such bonds shall be such as the Secretary of the Treasury may from time to time determine and shall be expressed in terms of their maturity values. Not more

than \$2,400 in maturity value of such bonds issued in any one year may be held by any one person at any one time. Within the limitation prescribed by the preceding sentence, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized by regulations to fix the maximum amount of such bonds issued in any one calendar quarter that may be held by any one person at any one time."

(d) Notwithstanding any provision of subsection (a) of section 22A of the Second Liberty Bond Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, beginning not later than July 1, 1969, issue United States retirement and savings bonds authorized by section 22A of such Act in such amounts (subject to the limitations imposed by section 21 of such Act) as may be necessary to permit individuals to purchase such bonds in the amounts permitted under subsection (b) (1) of section 22A of such Act (as amended by subsection (a) of this section).

The explanation, presented by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, is as follows:

Interest on long-term Federal Bonds.—This bill repeals the 4¼ percent ceiling on interest paid on long-term government bonds. It also repeals the 4¼ percent limitation on the interest paid on United States savings bonds. Savings bonds are currently being issued at the maximum rate.

United States retirement and savings bonds.—In 1966 a law was enacted authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to issue a new type of savings bonds called "United States retirement and savings bonds," paying an investment yield of up to 5 percent annually (compared with a 4¼ percent limit on series E savings bonds). An individual could purchase up to \$3000 of such bonds each year. The period of maturity for these bonds could range between 10 years and 30 years. Despite the new authority, no retirement and savings bonds have been issued by the Treasury since the law was passed. Section _____ of this bill contains several revisions of the retirement and savings bond authority. First, the bill would require the Secretary of the Treasury to issue retirement and savings bonds, beginning July 1, 1969. Second, the interest rate for the bonds would be set at a mandatory 6 percent. Third, the maximum amount that could be purchased in a year would be set at \$2400, but the Secretary of the Treasury would be authorized to fix the maximum amount of these bonds that could be purchased in any quarter of the year.

S. 2683—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL DEALING WITH CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS OF APPRECIATED PROPERTY

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on May 22, 1969, an article appeared in the Wall Street Journal telling how personnel in the executive department, how legislators and members of the judiciary are making money by giving their official papers to schools and colleges.

The Wall Street Journal article explained the tax gimmick in the following manner:

The tax-saving device is simple: A Representative, Senator, governor, Supreme Court Justice or perhaps even a President—when retiring or when still in office—donates his office files to a library, a university or a historical society. The recipient or an outside professional appraiser puts a dollar value on the papers. When tax time rolls around, the donor deducts the appraised value from his income as a gift to an educational organization, thereby reducing his tax.

The article indicates that several dozen past and present lawmakers are trim-

ming or planning to trim their taxes through such deductions. The article also states that former Vice President Hubert Humphrey is giving the Minnesota Historical Society 589 boxes bulging with documents from his career as mayor of Minneapolis and Senator from Minnesota. The article states:

One knowledgeable Government source says Mr. Humphrey has already taken "substantial" tax deductions.

The article also states that ex-President Lyndon Johnson may be planning to deduct the value of certain materials he is deeding to his presidential library at the University of Texas. The article indicates that the items he is donating number some 20 million.

One of the things that bothers me about getting special tax benefits through the gift of official papers is that the parties doing this are making a profit from the "charitable" giving of what are really official papers which, in my opinion, properly belong to the Government and not to them as individuals. I am sure that in many cases many of the papers are just plain junk, but to the extent that they do have value, they were developed by Government officials on Government time with the aid of Government staff personnel, were typed by Government secretaries on Government paper, and were even stored in Government files. I ask leave to insert in the RECORD at the end of my remarks the article from the Wall Street Journal to which I have referred.

You may ask how can one make money by giving property of any kind to an educational or charitable organization. The answer to this problem lies in the fact that in the case of gifts of property which have appreciated in value there are two tax benefits involved in each charitable contribution. One is the deduction the taxpayer receives for the charitable gift itself. This benefit is the same whether the taxpayer gives cash or other property. The second benefit, however, is different. This exists only where the taxpayer has given appreciated property. By giving property which cost the taxpayer little or nothing, yet has a substantial market value today, the taxpayer receives a second tax savings since he can dispose of this property without having to include this unrealized appreciation in income.

Let me illustrate the double benefit first with the example of a taxpayer in the 50-percent bracket. Let us suppose that he gives property having a fair market value of \$100 to an educational organization. The \$100, first of all, is a charitable contribution deduction which will reduce this taxpayer's taxes by \$50. If the property he is giving to the educational institution represents papers which cost him nothing, there is a second tax saving of \$25. This is the capital gains tax he would have incurred had he sold the papers for \$100.

As an aside let me say it seems to me that the papers in this type of case should result in ordinary income rather than capital gain income. If this were true his additional saving in this case would have been \$50 instead of \$25.

However, even where they are considered capital gain his total saving is at

least \$75—and if the sale were to represent ordinary income his saving would be \$100. I think you can see from this that since the total tax saving for a taxpayer in the 50-percent bracket is at least \$75—\$100 if the gain from the sale of the papers were ordinary income—it should be evident that for higher bracket taxpayers these savings would be substantially greater.

For a 70-percent bracket taxpayer the double saving from the charitable contribution in the case of a \$100 contribution of papers, even when the sale is treated as giving rise to capital gain, is a saving of \$95. If the property were treated as giving rise to ordinary income rather than capital gain the savings would actually be \$140, or \$40 more than the value of the property given. This is how you can make money by giving to charity.

For someone subject to the top bracket 70 percent plus the surcharge, even in the case giving rise to capital gain, the saving is \$104.50. Where the saving is ordinary income, the saving on the charitable contribution actually is \$154.

It seems to me that tax savings of this type, especially on something that really belonged to the Government in the first place, are entirely inappropriate and should not be allowed to continue.

Because of my concern over this problem, I am introducing a bill at this time dealing with this tax avoidance device. The bill I am introducing provides that in the case of a charitable contribution of letters and other papers collected by a public official during his term of office, any copyright or literary, musical, or artistic composition, or any other tangible personal property given to educational institutions, or to charities, or other organizations for which tax deductions may be taken, the deduction taken is to be limited to the cost or other basis of the taxpayer in the property. In other words, he can take a charitable deduction in the case of these types of contributions, only for what the property cost him less any depreciation deductions he may have taken with respect to it.

An alternative treatment is provided for those who prefer to take as a charitable contribution deduction the full fair market value of the property given to charity, educational institution, or other organization. Taxpayers may take this full charitable contribution deduction, but if they do so they must include as income in that same year the appreciation in the value of the property given to charity which has never before been taxed to the taxpayer.

Let me illustrate with an example. If a work of art which cost the taxpayer \$10 is given to charity when it has a value of \$100, the taxpayer can elect to treat the transaction as a sale. In such a case there would be a long-term capital gain of \$90 but the taxpayer would be treated as having contributed \$100 to charity for which he would obtain a full charitable contribution deduction. Ordinarily if a capital asset is donated to charity it would be to the taxpayer's advantage to elect to this treatment—that is, to treat the transaction as a sale to charity followed by a gift of the proceeds. In other cases the taxpayer may permit the gen-

eral rule in my bill to apply—that is, restrict the deduction to the cost or other basis of the property in his hands and include no additional amount in income.

My bill makes another change in the law with respect to the tax treatment of letters and other papers collected by a public official. As I said previously, it seems to me that if a Government official has the right to dispose of the papers at all—they should at least be treated as giving rise to ordinary income, in the same way as when an individual writes a book and subsequently sells it.

Because of this, my bill provides that such papers—including papers prepared by persons other than public officials—are not to be treated as capital assets. As a result, if a public official or other person sells his collection of letters and papers he will have ordinary income and not capital gain from the sale. Moreover, if he makes a gift of such papers to a charity and elects to have the transaction treated as a sale his gain on the sale would be ordinary income, and he would then be allowed a charitable deduction for the full fair market value of the property.

The amendment made by this bill applies to dispositions of property made after January 1, 1969.

I shall make all efforts possible to see that this tax loophole is closed. I think it is a serious matter for people to be developing a racket out of giving to charity by getting double benefits from gifts of this type. I believe that charity and education would be much better off if they depend upon real contributions rather than on these "tax gifts."

Mr. President, I introduce a bill to correct this loophole in the law. The bill would approach the matter by making the value placed upon this property taxable income to the individual who is making the donation and thereby offsetting the tax advantage.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill and the Wall Street Journal article to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2683) to deny an income tax deduction for a charitable contribution by a public official of his collection of letters and other papers, and to limit the tax benefits of other gifts to charity of certain property which has appreciated in value, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2683

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 170(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to special rule for charitable contributions of certain property) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) Special Rules for Charitable Contributions of Certain Property.—

"(1) No deduction for appreciation in value in certain types of personal property.—

In the case of a charitable contribution of—

"(B) any copyright, any literary, musical, or artistic composition, or

"(C) any tangible personal property, the amount of the charitable contribution, for purposes of this section, shall be equal to the adjusted basis (for purposes of determining gain) of the property in the hands of the donor or its fair market value, whichever is the lower, less the amount of any consideration received by the donor for the transfer of the property. This paragraph shall not apply if the donor has made an election under section 82 to have the contribution treated as a sale of the property followed by a contribution of the proceeds.

"(2) Contributions of real property.—The amount of any charitable contribution taken into account under this section for a gift of real property shall be reduced by the amount which would have been treated as gain to which section 617(d)(1) or 1250 (a) applies if the property contributed had been sold at its fair market value (determined at the time of such contribution)."

(b) Section 1221 of such Code (relating to definition of capital asset) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence:

"In applying the provisions of paragraph (3) and section 1231(b)(1)(C), letters and other papers collected by a public official during his term in office (including papers prepared by persons other than the public official) shall be treated as property created by the personal efforts of the public official and as similar to the other types of property described in such provisions."

(c) Part II of subchapter B of chapter 1 of such Code (relating to items specifically included in gross income) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 82. Certain gifts to charity treated as sales of property.

"(a) Election to Treat Certain Gifts as Sale of Property and Donation of Proceeds.—

In the case of a charitable contribution of—

"(1) letters and other papers collected by a public official during his term in office;

"(2) any copyright, any literary, musical, or artistic composition, or

"(3) any tangible personal property,

such charitable contribution shall be treated for purposes of this subtitle, if the donor so elects and the fair market value of the property exceeds the adjusted basis (for purposes of determining gain) of such property in the hands of the donor, as a sale of the property to the donee for an amount of money equal to the fair market value of such property, and the gain on such sale shall be recognized. If such election is made, the donor shall be considered, for purposes of section 170, as having made a charitable contribution of money equal to such fair market value reduced by the amount of any consideration actually received by the donor from the donee for the transfer of the property.

"(b) Election.—The election to have this section apply with respect to any contribution or gift of property shall be made in such manner and at such time as may be set forth in regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate."

(d) The amendments made by this Act shall be applicable with respect to disposition of property made after Jan. 1, 1969

The article, presented by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, is as follows:

POLITICIANS' LOOPHOLE: MANY OFFICEHOLDERS CUT TAXES BY DONATING FILES TO VARIOUS INSTITUTIONS — CONGRESSMEN, SENATORS USE DEVICE; HUMPHREY GIVES PAPERS TO HISTORICAL SOCIETY—DETERMINING VALUE IS TRICKY

(By Jerry Landauer)

WASHINGTON.—Most Congressmen are talking loudly these days about reshaping the tax laws to shrink loopholes. But at the same

time many officeholders are quietly enlarging a little-known loophole that lets them pay less than they otherwise would.

The tax-saving device is simple: A Representative, Senator, governor, Supreme Court Justice or perhaps even a President—when retiring or when still in office—donates his office files to a library, a university or a historical society. The recipient or an outside professional appraiser puts a dollar value on the papers. When tax time rolls around, the donor deducts the appraised value from his income as a gift to an educational organization, thereby reducing his tax.

Several dozen past and present lawmakers are trimming or planning to trim their taxes through such deductions. Among them: Democratic Congresswoman Leonor Sullivan of Missouri, former Democratic Reps. Frank Karsten of Missouri and Eugene Keogh of New York, former Republican Sens. Frank Carlson of Kansas and Kenneth Keating of New York and ex-Congressman William Miller of New York, the GOP's 1964 Vice Presidential candidate.

A GIFT TO CORNELL

Mr. Karsten, among others, doesn't care to tell how much he saved. "It's none of your damned business," he snaps. But Mr. Miller is not a bit shy in saying that papers he gave to Cornell University were appraised at \$26,000; the deduction has surely saved him many thousands.

Gifts by still bigger political names can bring much higher appraisals, and some famous figures are taking the donation-deduction path. Former Vice President Hubert Humphrey is giving the Minnesota Historical Society 589 boxes bulging with documents from his career as mayor of Minneapolis and Senator from Minnesota. One knowledgeable Government source says Mr. Humphrey has already taken "substantial" tax deductions.

What's more, ex-President Lyndon Johnson may be planning to deduct the value of certain material he's deeding to his Presidential library at the University of Texas. The items he's donating number some 20 million.

"I assume there will be an appraisal, but I'd better steer clear of that subject," says library director Chester Newland. He claims he doesn't know the purpose of a recent visit to Austin by Ralph G. Newman, Chicago appraiser-dealer, LBJ aides profess ignorance of the former President's tax plans.

ENCOURAGED BY LAW

Every taxpayer, of course, can deduct the presumed value of property given to religious, charitable, educational, scientific or literary organizations. The tax laws are designed to encourage such giving, and the Internal Revenue Service says the practice contributes significantly "to the welfare of our nation." Tax breaks for donated material considered valuable for research or teaching are being taken by all manner of people—generals, scientists, novelists, labor leaders, television commentators and newspapermen.

But it can be argued that political figures are different. Most of the material they give away—correspondence, bill drafts, speeches, studies, reports, memos, photographs, tape recordings, office diaries—was generated or accumulated at taxpayer expense in Government offices by employes who, like the boss, are on the public payroll.

Some of the donated material, in fact, consists of ordinary Government publications; occasionally this winds up in Government institutions, including the Library of Congress, after the giver has taken a deduction from Federal taxes. One Congressman even hopes to save on taxes by giving away bound volumes of the Congressional Record; the IRS is discreetly trying to discourage him.

SOME SHUN PRACTICE

Whatever the material included in a gift some politicians doubt that taking a tax deduction is legitimate. "It doesn't seem ethical to me," says Republican Rep. Albert

Que of Minnesota, who donates papers to his state's historical society. "After all, it's nothing that I paid for."

Republican Rep. Fred Schwengel takes a similar view: "I don't think it's right." He gives material to the University of Iowa and takes no deduction. Democratic Sen. Stephen Young of Ohio believes he would be a hypocrite if he deducted the value of documents given to the Western Reserve Historical Society. "I'm always speaking out against tax loopholes," he says. "I'm not about to take advantage of any."

Yet the belief that tax breaks for donated office documents are improper appears to be waning. "When I began 20 years ago, taxes were never mentioned," says Lucile Kane, manuscript curator of the Minnesota Historical Society. "Now there's a contagion about it." A spokesman for another Midwestern depository agrees: "Once upon a time you were honoring the man by preserving his papers. Now it has become very much a matter of money."

Appraiser Newman and a handful of other experts who specialize in the tricky, subjective task of evaluating politicians' papers are increasingly busy these days. Mr. Newman is currently assessing the Humphrey papers lot by lot; while no one is forecasting how much the 19-year mayoral-Senatorial collection may be worth altogether, some idea can be gained from the value placed on the papers of the less renowned Mr. Miller—\$14,100 for those covering his 14 years in Congress, \$5,600 for those gathered while he was chairman of the Republican National Committee and \$6,300 for papers tracing his 1964 campaign as Barry Goldwater's running mate.

Some donors stretch gifts over several years to avoid bumping against the tax law's ceiling, generally 30% of a taxpayer's annual income, on charitable and similar deductions; under IRS rules, a deduction can be taken only for the year in which the contribution is made. Mr. Miller says he spread his gift to Cornell over three years. Former GOP Sen. Keating, now President Nixon's ambassador to India, similarly stretched out his gift to the University of Rochester.

Not surprisingly, lawmakers who have served on Congressional committees dealing with tax legislation seem most aware of the donation-deduction possibility. But some of these donors are dissatisfied with the tax savings they're getting.

AN IRS CHALLENGE

Mr. Keogh of Brooklyn, an alumnus of the House Ways and Means Committee, complains that his gift to Syracuse University trimmed just \$7,500 from his income and that even this "very conservative" appraisal is being challenged by the IRS. "Frankly, I did the university a favor," Mr. Keogh contends. "I have no sense of guilt or conscience or anything."

Congresswoman Martha Griffiths of Michigan, a present Ways and Means member, seems miffed that her papers, given recently to the University of Michigan, will yield tax deductions of only \$4,500 on next year's return. "If Bill Miller's are worth over \$25,000, mine are worth at least \$50,000," she says. (Nonetheless, Mrs. Griffiths leans toward legislation to end the donation-deduction practice: "We're giving away stuff that's of no value to us, and we're getting something for it.")

In contrast, Republican Ways and Means member Barber Conable seems surprised that a four-year collection of his papers, covering two years' service in the New York State Senate and two in Congress, brought deductions of \$2,200 this year. "I was thinking in terms of a couple or maybe three hundred dollars," he says. These papers have gone to Cornell, and Rep. Conable expects to keep donating documents to the university at frequent intervals; he wants to avoid building up a "great big tax break" all at once.

Whether the appraisals are fair or not, taxwise legislators seem eager to take deductions. Frank Carlson, who served as a Senator from Kansas from 1950 to 1968, shipped 800 boxes of political memorabilia to the Kansas State Historical Society after his retirement. In the Senate, he was a member of the tax-writing Finance Committee. Each year's accumulation was appraised at about \$1,000, according to Nyle Miller, secretary of the Kansas society.

SENATOR ANDERSON'S GIFT

Sen. Clinton Anderson of New Mexico, the ranking Democrat on the Finance Committee, sent \$50,000 items to the Library of Congress in 1967; the library lists the material as deposited but not yet donated, possibly because Mr. Anderson intends to stretch out the tax saving. The Senator's secretary says her boss is too busy to answer questions about the dollar-value, and the library won't even tell whether the deposit is being appraised.

Another Senate incumbent who's donating documents is Republican Sen. Gordon Allott of Colorado. He, like many other givers, says he wasn't originally aware of the tax benefit to Sen. Allott promised his papers years ago to his alma mater, the University of Colorado. "When I first committed myself the tax angle didn't occur to me," Mr. Allott says. But now he knows: "I'm going to utilize it from tax standpoint that is most advantageous to me," he says.

One member of the judiciary who employs the donating device is Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas. He gives to the Library of Congress—and takes a tax deduction for—more of the voluminous "personal files" he has amassed while on the court. The Justice's gifts totaling some 30,000 items over the years, include legal memoranda plus diary-like docket books showing the disposition of cases and the votes of brethren Justices. Scholars consider such documents most important for tracing the evolution of court decisions. How rich the Douglas papers are can't be determined yet; they will be sealed from public view until after Mr. Douglas' death, and the Justice, speaking through a secretary, says it would take some digging on his part to refresh his memory about the appraised value for tax purposes.

As a service to donors, the Library of Congress staff offers free "advisory evaluations" on manuscripts, rare books and other materials though urging donors to hire commercial appraisers, too. It's exclusively up to the donor to decide how much he'll try to deduct.

The library's appraisal work is highly secretive. Since the Government's legislative branch is exempt from the Freedom of Information Act, library officials refuse even to identify gift-givers, for whom evaluations are made. "This is confidential information," General Counsel Lewis Coffin argues. "For us to give it out would be an invasion of the donor's privacy."

The preservation of manuscript collections for research isn't a recent development, of course, for the papers of notable men are the raw material of history. Moreover, the files of Presidents and their immediate staff have been considered private property ever since George Washington took his Presidential papers home to Mt. Vernon. Congress appropriated substantial sums to buy from heirs or executors the papers of President Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe and Jackson.

What's relatively new is the donation-deduction practice. The trend is being spurred by spirited bidding for certain material by universities, regional archives and historical societies. Some academic scouts regularly prowling Capitol Hill corridors looking for good prospects. "My university leans on the tax angle pretty hard," one Congressman confides.

Former GOP Senate Whip Thomas Kuchel's papers were solicited by Bancroft Library at

the University of California, and when Mr. Kuchel indicated interest the library dispatched a negotiating agent to Washington. A deed of gift was signed last New Year's Day, but Mr. Kuchel doesn't yet know the appraised value of 870 crammed cartons that have been shipped to the library.

Tax considerations both ease and complicate the archivists' task. "If an income-tax deduction is the incentive I'm all for it," says Philip Mason, director of Wayne State University's archives of labor history and urban affairs, where the papers of Detroit Democratic Congressman Charles Diggs and John Conyers are being appraised. But Mr. Mason adds: "Probably there's no more critical problem for archivists and librarians than appraisals for income tax purposes. . . . It gets to be pretty subjective really."

EVALUATING PAPERS

In general, the tax deduction allowed for donated property equals its fair market value. But document collections are rarely sold, so it's necessary to fall back on subjective judgments: How many scholarly monographs or doctoral dissertations are likely to be written from the donated documents? How many similar collections bear on the same subject? Were the donor's recorded experiences unique? How thoroughly do his papers trace particular events?

Until recent years the Library of Congress was the nation's favored political depository. Nowadays, the richest documents often wind up in the growing network of Presidential libraries.

In encouraging the construction of these libraries (built with private funds but staffed by Government employes), Congress may be encouraging tax havens for a favored few. A departing White House aide can take his papers with him, use the documents to write a best-selling volume of memoirs, then donate as tax-deductible gifts to a Presidential library not only the White House papers but the manuscripts of his book, too. Among other Kennedy aides, Arthur Schlesinger and Theodore Sorensen both hired professional appraisers to assess the value of material they intend to give to the John F. Kennedy Library being built at Cambridge, Mass.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 139— INTRODUCTION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN ANNUAL "DAY OF BREAD" AND "HARVEST FESTIVAL" WEEK

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution along with 21 other cosponsors designating October 28, 1969, as a "Day of Bread" and the last week of October as a period of "Harvest Festival." The joint resolution requests the President to proclaim a "Day of Bread" and "Harvest Festival" this year and in successive years and to call on the people of the United States to join with those of other nations in the observance of these occasions with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

But why a "Day of Bread"? Mr. President, it seems to me that in times like these—when so many serious agricultural problems beset us—we sometimes fail to recognize the positive contributions being made by numerous farm products. Bread—symbolic of the harvest and of all foods—is one of our greatest assets. Wheat and the products of wheat, most commonly bread, are perhaps man's oldest crop and cultivated food.

Wheat provides more nourishment for peoples of the world than any other food, serving as a staple in 43 countries with almost a billion people. The word "bread" gains greater meaning every day in the growing concern of governments around the world with the problems of feeding the hungry and malnourished.

In recognition of these values, the inheritance of the past merges with the custom of the present throughout the world. Since 1953, the people of West Germany have celebrated a "Day of Bread" as part of a harvest festival on a commonly-accepted date in October. The observance has spread to Austria. In the United Kingdom, the Anglican Church annually joins in a similar occasion marked by a display of different breads and ecclesiastical mention of their significance.

The practice of marking a "Day of Bread" each year is being introduced in Central and South America, and the Orient. Consideration of an international observance has also been indicated by the Bread Institute of Sweden and Millers' Associations of Switzerland and other European nations.

In the United States, the idea of a "Day of Bread" encompassed by a week of "Harvest Festival," has been reviewed and enthusiastically accepted by the American Bakers Association, the Millers' National Federation and the National Association of Wheat Growers. Wheat producer groups, flour millers and bakers in almost every State have embraced the concept.

From such tradition, cooperation, and potential participation, the conclusion is apparent that the "Harvest Festival" and "Day of Bread" transcend national consideration. They represent an effort to promote greater international communication and understanding among the nations of the world.

The coordination of an international "Day of Bread" carries bright promise as more and more countries adopt the concept to celebrate the annual harvest. Understandably, nations of the Southern Hemisphere would mark the date during autumn in that area. March 26, 1970, has been under consideration in Venezuela, where a display of bread would be housed in the Industrial Palace in Caracas and members of the milling-baking union would receive a holiday. Great Plains Wheat, Inc., has served as a coordinating agency through offices in Latin America and Europe. Western Wheat Associates serves the same function in the Far East and it is anticipated other international associations will extend the influence of the movement.

Mr. President, my State of Kansas is the leading wheat producing State in the Nation. I am proud to represent the people of an area which has contributed so much toward the production of a wholesome nutritious food. As a member of the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, I am aware that much needs to be done to alleviate malnutrition in this country.

I would add, in all seriousness, that if the American public had increased, instead of diminished, its consumption of enriched wheat products, we would have much less evidence of dietary de-

fiency diseases than we have today. The wheat producers, millers, bakers, and other end product manufacturers are working hard on the development of new, highly nutritious wheat-based foods, and on the nutritional improvement of the existing basic products.

Our recognition of a "Day of Bread" and a "Harvest Festival" will provide important evidence to the U.S. wheat economy that we in Congress support and encourage its efforts.

Mr. President, in order that these industries may move ahead with their carefully worked out plans, I urge that the Senate give speedy approval of this joint resolution establishing a "Day of Bread" and a "Harvest Festival" Week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 139) providing for the establishment of an annual "Day of Bread" and "Harvest Festival" Week, introduced by Mr. Dole (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

S. 2554

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE) I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) be added as a cosponsor of S. 2554, the proposed Federal Employees Pre-Retirement Assistance Act of 1969.

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

SENATE RESOLUTION 222—RESOLUTION TO PAY A GRATUITY TO ERMA POPE CURRY

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported the following original resolution, which was placed on the calendar:

S. RES. 222

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Erma Pope Curry, widow of James G. Curry, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to eleven months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PROVISION OF TAX CREDIT FOR ORGANIZATIONS AND GROUPS WHICH ESTABLISH AN APPRENTICESHIP-JOB INSTRUCTOR PROGRAM—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 100

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on June 19, I introduced legislation, S. 2450, which would provide a tax credit for organizations and groups which establish an apprenticeship-job instructor program.

I said then that the key to a successful program is to provide the young apprentice with an older, interested counselor to instruct and supervise the development of the apprentice's skills.

However, it has come to my attention that there is an organizational gap in the proposal which should be filled.

Therefore, I am submitting an amendment to S. 2450 which will include the salary of a full-time coach-coordinator for the corps of job instructors as an expense of the program.

The role of the coach-coordinator would be a dual one: First, he would train and supervise the corps of voluntary job instructors. In addition, he would guide the overall administration of the apprentice-job instructor program.

No group would be eligible unless 50 apprentices and 30 job instructors were enrolled.

With this leadership, the smoothly geared replacement process to provide young skilled craftsmen will be insured. The importance of the apprenticeship program is clear. However, competent leadership is vital to its success.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to give S. 2450, and the amendment which I introduce today, full consideration, and to act upon them at the earliest possible date.

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

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Finance.

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—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 101

Mr. HART (for himself, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. GORE, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. PELL, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. PERCY, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. GOODELL, Mr. CASE, Mr. SAXBE, and Mr. NELSON) proposed an amendment to 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, which was ordered to be printed.

(The remarks of Mr. HART when he proposed the amendment appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 85

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, on July 18 I submitted an amendment, No.

85, to S. 2546, the military procurement authorization bill. At this time, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) be added as cosponsors of this amendment. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

C. Nelson Day, of Utah, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Utah for the term of 4 years, vice William T. Thurman.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Wednesday, July 30, 1969, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON ALASKA NATIVE LAND CLAIMS, AUGUST 6, 1969

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has scheduled a further hearing on S. 1830, the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1969, for August 6, 1969. The hearing will begin at 10 a.m. in room 3110 of the New Senate Office Building.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive additional testimony from the Alaska Federation of Natives, the State of Alaska, and the administration with respect to their positions and recommendations on the land claim issue and the settlement proposed in S. 1830.

The prepared statements of other interested persons will be received and made a part of the committee hearing record.

EXPENDITURE CONTROLS AND EXTENSION OF THE SURTAX

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, last year in enacting the 10-percent surcharge Congress included a section in that bill placing a limitation on Government expenditures. This expenditure control section was of equal importance to the surcharge itself in controlling inflation.

Today there is pending on the Senate Calendar H.R. 12290, the purpose of which is to extend this surcharge through the remainder of 1969 and at a reduced rate for the first half of 1970.

Earlier this year as a part of H.R. 11400, Congress enacted an expenditure control provision which in the opinion of many of us was not effective.

I expressed my concern over the flexibility of the expenditure control provision as finally approved by the Congress and in conversations with the executive branch found that the President was equally concerned.

As a result, the President, under date of July 16, 1969, forwarded to me a letter wherein he spelled out in definite terms that the administration would not take advantage of the flexible provisions of the expenditure controls as approved in H.R. 11400 by the Congress but that he would recognize the \$192.9 billion as the maximum ceiling on fiscal 1970 expenditures.

I read for the information of the Senate the President's letter of July 16, 1969:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 16, 1969.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: I am aware of the concern over extension of the surtax and repeal of the investment credit unless expenditure controls are made clearly effective. Possibly some of this concern arises from the flexibility of the expenditure control provision of H.R. 11400 just passed by the Congress.

In this legislation the limit on expenditures for fiscal year 1970 would appear to be \$191.9 billion—one billion below the \$192.9 billion projected in my revised budget. However, the actual language (1) authorizes me to exceed this ceiling by two billion dollars for increases in specified items of uncontrollable spending, thereby raising the ceiling potentially to \$193.9 billion; and (2) enables Congress to raise expenditures by any amount for any program, thereby permitting automatic Congressional increases in the ceiling.

There is an obvious advantage in having a precise ceiling—one which clearly specifies the maximum allowable expenditures. I therefore assure you and your colleagues that I accept in good faith the \$191.9 billion ceiling as passed by Congress. More than this, barring a plainly critical and presently unforeseeable emergency, I will hold total expenditures for fiscal 1970 within the \$192.9 billion indicated in my April budget proposals.

I will regard this \$192.9 billion maximum as a ceiling on fiscal 1970 expenditures, on this premise—that when an increase is approved by Congress or develops in one program it will be offset by a corresponding decrease in another program, thereby keeping the total budget within the \$192.9 billion maximum.

For the Executive Branch this means that if uncontrollable spending, such as interest on the public debt and social security benefits, should exceed the April estimates, or if other spending essential to the national welfare is approved, the additional spending will have to be offset by reductions elsewhere. Further it means that, if the Congress should vote expenditures above those provided for in the breakdown of the \$192.9 billion total, it will also need to impose compensating reductions in other programs. Failure to establish such priorities in allocating funds within the \$192.9 billion total will compel the Executive Branch either to impose offsetting reductions itself in programs approved by Congress or to refrain from spending the increase.

I believe this firm expenditure control, prompt extension of the surtax and the excises, and repeal of the investment tax credit will give us the tools our country needs to brake and stop inflation. It is my understanding that the Ways and Means Committee and the Finance Committee will follow this action with prompt consideration of a major tax revision package which will include many of the reform proposals I recommended to Congress last April.

Working together, I am confident that the Congress and the Administration can establish sound priorities and keep within a \$192.9

billion expenditure total for 1970. I assure you that I intend to see that this is done.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

As evidence that the President is determined to keep total Government expenditures within this prescribed ceiling I call attention to an article appearing in today's Washington Post by Richard Homan entitled "Nixon Cuts Spending \$3.5 Billion, Hits Hill."

This article calls attention to the fact that President Nixon, as the result of increased expenditures in certain programs, is finding it necessary to make offsetting reductions in other areas totaling \$3.5 billion.

I compliment President Nixon upon the firm stand he is taking to combat this inflationary danger, first, by emphasizing the need for the extension of the surcharge, and second, by making a determined effort to hold Government expenditures within the agreed limits.

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

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

NIXON CUTS SPENDING \$3.5 BILLION, HITS HILL (By Richard Homan)

President Nixon, chiding Congress for failing to accept a number of his money-saving proposals, yesterday ordered a \$3.5 billion cut in spending by Government departments and agencies to offset increases in areas over which he has no control.

More than half the \$3.5 billion will probably come from defense spending not associated with the Vietnam war, Budget Bureau Director Robert P. Mayo said.

Mr. Nixon blamed Congress for \$1 billion of the anticipated \$3.5 billion growth over his Administration's proposed budget for the current fiscal year. The rest is unexpected increases in "uncontrollable" areas of Government spending such as Social Security, interest on Federal borrowing and Medicare.

The cuts would not reduce the Administration's proposed \$192.9 billion budget for the current year. Rather, since programs the President cannot control appear likely to add \$3.5 billion to the budgeted spending, Mr. Nixon has ordered an identical amount cut in other areas to keep the budget at \$192.9 billion.

The President said that "some highly desirable programs will have to be stretched out—others reduced" and he said that the "dollar reductions will be accompanied by a further lowering of the personnel ceilings established last April."

Mayo said his office would recommend detailed cuts to the President by early August. Multi-billion-dollar cuts in the Pentagon budget would probably require a significant reduction in the size of the armed forces—a move already being considered by Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird—or outright elimination of major weapons programs.

The President and his budget chief accused Congress of failing to match the Administration's cost-cutting efforts—by adding costly programs, failing to reduce others and failing to enact revenue-producing legislation proposed by Mr. Nixon.

"Last April I presented a revised 1970 budget to the Congress," the President said in a statement. "That budget contained specific reductions totalling \$4 billion from the budget left by the previous Administration."

"It brought the proposed Federal spending figure for this fiscal year down to \$192.9 billion, a figure I still believe reflects a responsible fiscal policy in our highly inflationary environment."

"If we hold the line on that spending figure, as I intend to, and if the requisite revenues are provided, this fiscal year will produce the kind of budget surplus needed to cool off an economy that was dangerously overheated before we assumed office."

Mr. Nixon said Congressional action "has been inconsistent" with his cost-cutting proposals made in April.

Congress has not acted on his request for a postal rate increase that was to have taken effect July 1, it has not ended special milk and agriculture conservation programs as he recommended and, instead of reducing aid to schools in Federally impacted areas, as he recommended, it is moving to increase them.

On Monday, Mayo noted, the House Appropriations Committee voted to raise the Administration's proposed \$15.9 million for merchant marine shipbuilding to \$200 million.

"Thus our current estimate of Fiscal 1970 spending has risen to \$196.4 billion even though we in the Administration have done nothing in the way of discretionary action to add to our earlier \$192.9 billion estimate," the President said.

Mr. Nixon announced the spending cut as he signed into law the final supplemental appropriations bill for the fiscal year that ended June 30. The bill contains a \$191.9 billion ceiling, with some exemptions, for spending in the current year.

"The new ceiling will be of little help in keeping Federal spending under control if the Congress that imposed it does not cooperate fully with the Administration in meeting it," the President said.

THE BOYCOTT ON CHINESE GOODS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in a week in which man has reached out and touched the moon, it is also heartening to see an attempt by man on earth to reach out to touch his fellow man. I refer to the administration's decision, early this week, to end partially the secondary boycott on Chinese goods as it applies to American citizens traveling abroad. It is my understanding that they will now be permitted to purchase up to \$100 worth of goods originating in mainland China. In addition the administration has decided to validate automatically the passports of six categories of American citizens for travel to mainland China.

Regardless of Chinese reactions, these are steps in the right direction. I would hope that they will lead to the removal of all special restrictions on the travel of Americans and also to our placing trade with China in nonstrategic goods on the same basis as trade with other Communist countries.

I hope that the Government of mainland China will respond to these overtures in some way. But even if there is no response, these actions on the part of the administration will have been useful and important if they mark, as they seem to do, the beginning of a more rational and more realistic official attitude on the part of the executive branch toward relations with the most populous country on earth.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

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

DISSENT ON THE ABM: A CONGRESSIONAL OBLIGATION

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, debate on the administration's Safeguard system is nearly complete. Over the course of the past weeks the Senate has thoroughly discussed the principal substantive aspects of the proposed ABM system: its strategic implications, its probable capabilities, its likely effects on the arms race, its cost.

On April 25, in a speech delivered in the Senate, I attempted a careful analysis of the arguments offered in support of immediate deployment of the Safeguard system. It was my conclusion that deployment would not enhance our national security—indeed, it was more likely to initiate an arms race that would ultimately leave us less secure—and that the billions of dollars required for deployment could better be invested to meet other national needs.

In short, it was my considered judgment that deployment at this time would be a dangerous and unwise decision both in terms of national security and opportunity costs.

However, during the waning days of this debate, the Safeguard's supporters have introduced an additional argument that must be confronted seriously before any final decision on deployment can be rendered. The argument, stated in its most persuasive form, reads:

Whether or not the Safeguard system performs up to expectations is not the most relevant consideration. The President has stated unequivocally that he desires deployment of the Safeguard to strengthen his hand in arms control negotiations with Moscow and in his dealings with other governments. Since the President is the principal government official charged with the conduct of the nation's foreign policy, the Congress should not deny him the tools he believes necessary for the successful implementations of that policy.

The effect of this new tack by Safeguard supporters has been to shift consideration of the system from strictly a defense authorization context—in which Congress' right to exercise independent judgment is undisputed—into the more contentious arena of foreign affairs. Instead of debating the strategic importance and cost-effectiveness of the Safeguard, the proposition to be tested becomes Congress' moral obligation to grant the President what he requests for the conduct of our international affairs.

In order to pass judgment on the soundness of this proposition, we must undertake a definition of the respective roles of the President and Congress in the area of foreign policy; the constitutional issue debated during consideration of the foreign commitments resolution last month.

Turning to the Constitution itself does not yield a ready answer to the question of who shall possess the final or determining voice in the formulation of our foreign policy. What the Constitution does, and all that it does, is to confer on the President certain powers capable of affecting our foreign relations, and certain other powers of the same general kind on Congress. The question of who should defer to whom in time of disagreement between these two branches of Government is not resolved.

However, according to an eminent student of the Presidency, Edwin S. Corwin:

Actual practice under the Constitution has shown that, while the President is usually in a position to propose, the Senate and the Congress are often in a technical position, at least, to dispose. The verdict of history, in short, is that the power to determine the substantive content of American foreign policy is a *divided power*.¹

An issue raising the same constitutional questions as the proposition that Congress is morally obligated to give the President the Safeguard system if he requests it for the conduct of U.S. foreign policy came before the House of Representatives in 1798. The issue was whether Congress was obligated to grant the President the funds to dispatch a given number of ministers to foreign capitals.

In the historic debate that ensued, Representative Albert Gallatin, of Pennsylvania, delivered a brilliant defense of Congress' right and duty to exercise its independent judgment in such situations.

After establishing the constitutional fact that "Congress, having the sole power of granting money, are judges of the propriety or impropriety of making a grant, and that they have a right to exercise their discretion therein," Representative Gallatin, in 1798, moved to the core of his case:

Whenever the powers have been so distributed between two departments, in relation to another certain act, that neither of the two can complete the act by virtue of its own powers, then each department is controlled by the other, not in relation to the operation of its appropriate powers but in relation to the act itself. Each department, in that case, may go as far as its own authority will permit, but no further. The refusal of the other department to exercise its powers in relation to that act, in the same direction and in concurrence with the first department, is no abridgement of the legitimate powers of the first. It is the Constitution which, in that case, abridges the powers of both, and which has rendered the concurrence of both necessary for the completion of the act. If either of the departments, . . . after having exercised its own authority towards the completion of the act, shall pretend to have a right to force the powers of the other in the same direction so as to have the act completed against or without its voluntary consent, it is that department which abridges the legitimate exercise of the powers of the other. Thus, in the instance before us, the President may appoint as many public Ministers as he thinks fit, and if he can [induce them to go, he may] send them to their intended mission without the assistance of any act of the Legislature; if he can, as in the case of the Consuls, find men who will serve without a salary, he has a right to do it, and thus to act uncontrolled by the Legislature; because, on this supposed instance, his own authority is sufficient to carry into effect his intentions. But further than that he cannot go; for the Constitution, in no part, gives him any power to force the Legislature to grant the money which may be necessary to pay the Ministers. In the same manner the Legislature have a right to appropriate a sum of money for the purpose of paying twenty public Ministers, if they shall in their judgement think so many necessary. But further than that they cannot go; they cannot force the President to

¹ Edward Corwin, *The President: Office and Powers, 1787-1957*, New York, New York University Press, p. 171.

appoint twenty Ministers, if he does not think them necessary. In this instance the act is placed partly under the jurisdiction of the Executive, and partly under that of the Legislature—under the jurisdiction of the Executive so far as relates to the creation of the office and to the appointment—under the jurisdiction of the Legislature so far as relates to granting the money—and the concurrence of both departments is necessary to complete the act.

Mr. President, as if to anticipate the case before us today, Representative Gallatin concluded:

When it is found that the Constitution has distributed the powers in a manner different from that contended for, although there is no clause which directs that Congress shall be bound to appropriate money in order to carry into effect any of the Executive powers, some gentlemen, recurring to metaphysical subtleties and abandoning the literal and plain sense of the Constitution, say that, although we have a Constitutional power, we have not a moral right to act according to our own discretion but are under a *moral obligation* [italics added] in this instance to grant the money. It is evident that where the Constitution has lodged the power, there exists the right of acting and the right of discretion. Congress is, upon all occasions, under a moral obligation to act according to justice and propriety.²

In short, it is clear that Congress has vast powers to determine the bounds within which a President may be left to work out a foreign policy—powers which certainly include denying the President the Safeguard as a card in his negotiating hand if Congress determines it is not needed. Indeed, as Edward Corwin has written:

The Congress may effectively block presidential policy by simply declining to pass implementing legislation—for example, appropriations. It results that, in proportion as the prosecution of a foreign policy—"The Marshall Plan," for instance—requires lavish expenditure, so is the insistence of the body that controls the nation's purse strings that it be accepted as a partner in the determination of the objectives of our diplomacy likely to increase.³

I believe it is imperative to firmly establish this point. I say this not simply because it effectively counters the argument that Congress ought to give the President the Safeguard because he wants it—though it does cut the ground from under this case—or out of some peevish desire to defend congressional prerogatives. Congress' right and obligation to rule independently on the Safeguard must be established beyond question—whether viewed as a defense appropriation or in a foreign policy context—because we have permitted the steady erosion of the fundamental principle on which our political system was founded: the separation of powers. Senators in this Chamber have seen this happen, particularly in the last 10 or 15 years.

Thus, far more is at stake as we approach the vote on the Safeguard than a complex of expensive military hardware. For the Safeguard has become a crucial test of the Senate's will to exercise its

judgment independently of the wishes of the Pentagon and the President.

Too often since World War II we have neglected our constitutional responsibility by interpreting the wise injunction to keep partisan politics out of international affairs to mean the Senate must act as a rubberstamp for the Executive's foreign policy.

Too often in recent years we have failed to exercise the same critical judgment in appraising military and international matters that we afford domestic programs and proposals. Continued failure to abandon this course and to restore the vital balance in our system prescribed by the framers of the Constitution will surely invite disaster. For as Gibbon wrote in "The Decline and Fall":

The principles of a free constitution are irrecoverably lost, when the legislative power is nominated by the executive.⁴

That is one of the issues in the vote pending on the Safeguard system.

Having attempted to demonstrate Congress' right and responsibility to render an independent judgment on the ABM—even if it is regarded as an element in the President's foreign policy plans—I would like to conclude by turning briefly to the question of whether denying the President the Safeguard actually will weaken his position in arms talks with the Soviets and in his dealings with other governments.

The weight of the evidence indicates it will not.

Surely, Soviet understanding that we can proceed with the deployment of an operational ABM system if they appear intransigent in arms negotiations or begin to expand their own limited ABM system around Moscow provides sufficient incentive for the Kremlin's representatives to seriously discuss limitations on systems like the ABM in Geneva.

On the other hand, deploying at this time could well undermine the chances for successful talks. In the judgment of Nobel Prize Laureate, Professor of Physics Bernard Feld:

What we are dealing with here is the tendency until now for arms control negotiations and agreements to lag behind weapons technology. If we and the Russians continue to insist on the criterion that an agreement be both foolproof and riskproof before it is accepted, while at the same time being willing to deploy new weapons systems whose operations and implications retain considerable uncertainties, then arms control will continue to lag hopelessly behind military technology, and the arms race will continue on its merry but deadly upward spiral.⁵

As for the effects of the decision to deploy the ABM on our relations with other states, I believe they can only be detrimental. In return for agreeing to sign the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, the nonnuclear nations of this world insisted on the inclusion of article VI in the treaty. This article binds each of the nuclear parties to the treaty to un-

dertake to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament, and on a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control."

The nonnuclear nations can hardly regard a decision to deploy the Safeguard system as anything but contrary to the terms and the spirit of this agreement. Based on his experience in negotiating this treaty as our Ambassador to the United Nations, Arthur Goldberg has stated:

I do not hesitate in stating that the world community views with apprehension what appears to them to be an escalation of the nuclear arms race through deployment of competitive ABM systems.⁶

Mr. President, last year after much deliberation, I voted against funds to deploy the Sentinel ABM system. In April, after carefully studying the present administration's Safeguard system, I stated that I would oppose deployment of an ABM system at this time because I felt it would not contribute to the security of this Nation.

Nothing has happened in the interim to change my mind.

CHANGES IN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I was interested and I must confess somewhat dismayed to read in the press today a statement attributed to President Thieu of South Vietnam saying it would take 2 years to set up machinery for holding elections in South Vietnam after the Vietcong agree to participate in such voting.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Election Delay Seen by Thieu," published in the Washington Post today.

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

ELECTION DELAY SEEN BY THIEU

SAIGON, July 23.—President Thieu has been quoted as saying it will take two years to set up machinery for holding elections in South Vietnam—after the Vietcong agree to participate in such voting.

SAIGON newspapers reported today that the president made that statement in a speech Monday at the seaside resort of Vungtau, where he spoke before a graduation class of pacification workers. No official text of Thieu's speech was made available.

The newspapers quoted Thieu as saying South Vietnam is "now strong and steadily growing stronger."

"The National Liberation Front realizes that once they agree to participate, it will take two years to set up the machinery so elections can actually take place," he said.

"By that time, we will be so strong that the Communist army of North Vietnam will have to withdraw completely."

Thieu was reported to have added that under those circumstances "the NLF would not dare stump openly as Communists be-

⁶ Arthur Goldberg, "The Attitude of the World Community Toward the ABM," *ABM: An Evaluation of the Decision to Deploy an Antibalistic Missile System*, Washington, 1969, p. 1.

² *Annals*, 5th Cong., 2d session, pp. 1120-1122.

³ *Op. cit.*, Corwin, pp. 192.

⁴ Edward Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, New York, Random House, Vol. 1, pp. 54.

⁵ Bernard Feld, "The ABM and Arms Control," *ABM: An Evaluation of the Decision to Deploy an Antibalistic Missile System*, Washington, 1969, pp. 9.

cause the elections will be under the watchful eyes of foreign observers."

In his recent peace proposals, Thieu suggested that an international body be set up to oversee elections in South Vietnam. The next regularly scheduled elections for a President are to be held in 1971. There have, however, been suggestions that the voting could be moved up if the Communists agreed to take part and abide by the results.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, that statement on the part of President Thieu leads us to some other reflections on the political situation in Vietnam.

The Nixon administration's commendable changes in American policy are at last being manifested in Vietnam. President Thieu's proposal for Communist participation in free elections in South Vietnam indicates that the voice of America has at last been heard in Saigon. Now we may hope that the voice of the Vietnamese people may also some day be heard in that embattled city.

Today, however, Thieu seems to grant more rights to the Communists than he does to his non-Communist opposition. While he invites the Vietcong to join an electoral commission and to take part in a free vote, the best he has to offer his anti-Communist opponents is free food and lodging—in his country's congested jails.

Thieu's democratic pretensions will be more convincing when he allows Vietnamese not in the ruling military clique to take part in their country's politics—even if they do not choose to join the Vietcong.

At present, a convention of anti-Communist South Vietnamese leaders to select democratic opposition to the military regime could only take place in prison. There are uncounted tens of thousands of non-Communist prisoners convicted for advocating too soon such negotiations as have now at last been undertaken or for otherwise offering encouragement to the enemy. Among them are: Truong Dinh Dzu who received over 900,000 votes and came in second in the 1967 elections; Thich Thien Minh, leader of the Buddhist youth movement and regarded as one of the two most important Buddhists in this dominantly Buddhist country; and Nguyen Lau, publisher of the Saigon Daily News, the most influential English language newspaper.

Last week my office was in touch with Dzu's son, David Troung, who is in New York, and who fears, on the basis of what he believes to be authoritative reports from inside the Saigon Government, that his father's life is in danger. The usual method, he says, is to transfer a prisoner to a hospital, contrive a grenade attack and attribute it to the Vietcong. This previously happened to Thich Thien Minh, the Buddhist.

Fearing incarceration, other leaders have fled the country. Trung Thanh, often envisaged as a possible leader of a reconciliation government, is in France. Duong Van Minh, known as Big Minh, leader of the coup against Diem in 1963 and excluded from the 1967 elections because of his popularity, has just returned to Saigon from exile in Bangkok. He is currently being subjected to surveillance so intense it amounts to house arrest.

Such men are as opposed as ever to Vietcong control of their country. According to the recent report of the U.S. study team on political and religious freedom in Vietnam, the overwhelming majority of prisoners represent, in fact, the middle ground of Vietnamese political opinion on which a non-Communist political alternative to the current regime must be based.

An alternative is clearly needed. As General Ky's recent comments indicated, the military regime cannot be maintained without a continued American military presence. In fact, since the total number of South Vietnamese among our Communist adversaries in the country is continuing to increase, continuation of the Thieu-Ky regime enlarges the likelihood that it will be succeeded by Communist rule.

At present, American policy seems devoted to the proposition that although we must withdraw our forces from Vietnam, we cannot withdraw our support from the present government. This policy both makes our withdrawal more difficult and Communist victory more likely.

The self-defeating implications of this approach are symbolized by Thieu's apparent offer of free elections to his Communist but not to his anti-Communist opponents. The United States should not tolerate it. We can no longer permit ourselves to be exploited, at incalculable cost of blood and treasure, by a regime that is systematically destroying both its own minimal public support and the available non-Communist alternatives to its leadership. We must as a matter of most urgent priority encourage the kind of democratic political processes indispensable to the creation of a government in South Vietnam with a sufficient popular base to survive without continued engagement of American military force.

The first step in opening new possibilities in Vietnam is to open the jails. Dzu and the others must be released. Political popularity must no longer be treated as a crime. The second step is truly to open the elections. The Thieu-Ky government is becoming as great a threat to democratic self-determination in that country as the Vietcong.

President Thieu's statements show a change chiefly in American, not South Vietnamese policy. The Nixon administration is to be commended for beginning the necessary process of American withdrawal. But our policy cannot succeed unless it is accompanied by a change of heart—and change of course—in Saigon.

THE CHALLENGE OF URBAN PROBLEMS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, good government has always been a matter of adapting institutions to changing social conditions. In an era of rapid social evolution, an urban crisis has developed, and the demands it places on our political system are increasing.

The measure of that system will be determined, to a great extent, by the character of its response to those demands. We are at a decision point in

history: what we do now to meet the challenge of urban problems will shape the Nation's future. Our decisions must be well considered, but they must not be delayed. "Too little, too late" would be a fitting epitaph for a political system which decided not to decide, and thereby made the worst decision of all.

On June 19, 1969, former Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey addressed the Minnesota League of Municipalities, and presented a forthright plan for the solution of our pressing urban problems. In calling attention to the crisis confronting American cities, Vice President Humphrey expressed confidence that with decisive leadership from government, most urban problems could be solved.

Because of the timeliness of his remarks, and because of the importance of his proposals, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, MINNESOTA LEAGUE OF MUNICIPALITIES, JUNE 19, 1969

Today we are part of a massive, concentrated society. Seventy percent of the U.S. population lives in metropolitan areas. Indeed, one out of five people lives within the limits of cities with a population of over one million.

We hope to land a man on the moon within a month. We are deciphering the innermost secrets of the human cell. We have created enormous energy from minute nuclear reactors. The science of communication—telephone, radio and television and radar and computers—has made commonplace occurrences which my father—and your father—would have regarded as supernatural.

We have an industrial economy which this year will record a gross national product of one trillion dollars. Only eight years ago we somehow existed with a GNP of only 500 billion dollars.

Can we keep pace with these changes? Can we preserve the dignity of the individual?

Can our educational institutions transmit an ever-increasing body of knowledge?

Can our religious institutions become a force for justice in a changed world which complicates spiritual and moral concepts?

Can our labor and business institutions change so that management techniques and technology are the benevolent servants of man, rather than their malevolent masters?

Can our financial institutions find new ways of allocating credit other than by increasing interest rates?

Can our law enforcement institutions, now costly and slow-moving, change so that swift justice is available to all?

These are the questions which concern the American people—and these are the questions which concern persons—like yourselves—who are charged with making our municipalities true communities of people, living rewarding and satisfying lives.

Change is inevitable. Change creates crisis only when our response is inflexible and rigid. Today I want to propose two specific programs which I believe will provide a much needed flexibility and adaptability to our basic economic, political, and social institutions—those established structures which in large measure must decide the kind of local communities we are able to build in the final third of the 20th century.

My first proposal is for each state government to create and establish a new department or office for Community Development. The title and the purpose of the department should reflect the development of urban

centers. Therefore, it could be called a Department of Urban Development or preferably a Department of Community Development. This new department in state government should be the equivalent at the state level, to the Department of Housing and Urban Development at the national level. The Department of Community Development should be authorized to coordinate and activate all housing and urban development programs, particularly those from the federal level which require state participation. This new department should have its own Community Development program and budget designed to assist and stimulate local activity. It must engage in broad research pertaining to urban needs such as community planning, economic development, the proper use of land and such areas as zoning, building codes and all social services. Urban research must not be the special prerogative of the federal government. We desperately need the input—the ideas, the long-range proposals—of local and state government. This new department should be strengthened by the creation of a broadly representative advisory committee on urban and community development. This advisory committee to include representatives of local government, business, labor, the academic community, social services, financial institutions and other community leaders. Active participation by state government in urban development is essential if there is to be any hope for our cities. State governments must recognize that we are essentially an urban, industrialized nation with a highly mobile population.

But emphasis on development of urban America and new cities does not mean less attention to rural America. It means above all making rural America a more inviting place to live—making rural America modern, forward looking and attractive to its children. After all, when we talk of cities, we talk of people and new cities will have to find their location in rural America.

The second proposal outlines a new approach to amassing the credit cities need to supply basic community facilities for the coming years.

Even if our population remains stable—and it certainly will not—the amount of capital needed to clean our air and water—to build schools and hospitals—to improve law enforcement and justice is truly staggering. But this country is *not* standing still—we will have to provide for an additional 27 million people in the next 6 years.

A conservative estimate of the cost of replacing obsolete facilities, reducing backlogs, and meeting needs of an expanding population by 1975 is \$625 billion.

Between now and the turn of the century, the Institute of Public Administration estimates that \$6 trillion will have to be raised just for housing and community facilities.

In the past, current tax revenues supplied about ½ the cost of community facilities. For the other half, states and cities issued bonds—a well-established method of obtaining credit and one which should be preserved.

But we must also realize that this magnitude of borrowing will likely force interest rates beyond the point which many municipalities can pay. In addition, procedures for issuing bonds are cumbersome, expensive, and time consuming.

Many municipalities will find it difficult—if not impossible—to raise the needed money. Moreover, a bond resolution creates rigid patterns of obligations which can be changed only at great cost to the municipality.

In order to lessen these burdens, I have proposed that the U.S. Congress establish a National Metropolitan Development Bank, and I have been developing legislation which I hope Senator Mondale will introduce.

The Metro Bank—as I call it—would provide an alternative source of low-interest credit for communities. It would raise money

in investment markets throughout the nation from all groups of investors. Of greater significance to local governments, it would relieve the pressure on bond markets so that communities could pay less for money whether they borrow from the Metro Bank or whether they issue municipal bonds.

The Metro Bank would sell federally guaranteed bonds and debentures on the national investment market, and then lend to local governments at rates of interest 30–50% below the rates of the federally guaranteed bonds. The range of interest rates insures that local governments would not pay more to borrow from the Bank than they would to issue tax exempt bonds.

The Federal government would make up the difference by an annual appropriation. Because the federal bonds are taxable, however, this would not constitute a net cost to the government.

The Bank would be authorized to make long term—40 to 60 years—low interest loans for building basic community facilities. It would also make “soft” loans for up to 20 years to promote economic development in those areas where an increase in investment would be in the national interest. Such a determination would be made by the Council of Economic Advisors, with the advice of counsel of the various Federal departments with responsibilities for urban and economic development.

The Metro Bank would be chartered by act of Congress, but it would not be a Federal agency. It would work closely with the Federal government and appropriate Federal departments and agencies would be represented on the Board of Directors.

I propose the Bank be capitalized at \$6 billion—½ to be borrowed from the U.S. Treasury over a 10 year period, and the other \$3 billion by the sale of commercial stock. Each user would be required to purchase a portion of this stock based on the number of persons within its jurisdiction.

The Metro Bank would not only provide a wholly new alternative source of money for local governments, but it would also enable the Federal government to utilize flexible approaches in aiding the construction of essential community facilities.

The third proposal I want to discuss today involves a broader view of the future of our cities—how and where our people will live, work, learn, and play—30 years from today.

I believe we must find a way to build brand new cities. Whether they are located on the fringes of today's suburbs, on the sites of existing small towns, or on wide open spaces, we need no less than 100 new cities flourishing by the year 2000. Population increases alone could make necessary 20 new cities of one million population.

New cities provide an alternative to both excessive concentrations—up to 140,000 persons per square mile in New York's Harlem—and excessive sparseness found in area of suburban and rural sprawl.

In new cities we have the opportunity to avoid the mistakes of unplanned cities—to eliminate parking on the street, on-street loading and highway clutter. We can begin with new communications, using tunnel economics for the delivery of essential services, utilities and goods, and we can plan open spaces and pedestrian pathways.

Can our social and political institutions meet the new challenge?

We already possess the technical knowledge for building such cities. We have the management tools and skills—computers, cost-benefit analysis.

We have an understanding of the economic forces which must serve as a basis for a new city. The most vital task in building a new city is the creation of an industrial and employment base.

We know some of the social problems we want to avoid, and to a certain extent, we know how to avoid them.

What we lack is a public policy—a framework in which all our knowledge can be put to use. City planners, architects, sociologists, financiers, public officials and bureaucrats have produced considerable insight and knowledge about what to do—now we must generate the popular support and the governmental structures to carry out these plans.

I propose that a joint committee be created in the United States Congress charged with the responsibility of

defining the fundamental social, economic, demographic, and ecological objectives to help guide the growth of new cities;

deciding how many new cities we need and where they can be located;

designing the public development corporations that would be necessary to establish and manage the new cities until local governments are elected.

A word about the corporations themselves. First, it is absolutely essential that they be formed jointly by states and the Federal government. It is the state, and only the state, which can delegate the legal power of local self government. On the other hand, the national interest in the success of the city is so great that the corporations must reflect national developmental goals.

Second, the corporation must have available the planning skills and management skills necessary for such a complex undertaking. And the corporation should have the power of eminent domain to procure adequate land area.

But the work of our political institutions is not fulfilled solely by the activities of the Joint Congressional Committee. As I stressed earlier, the task of creating an economically viable city is essential. While much of this task can be accomplished by imaginative recruiting and promotion, or by inexpensive or free land, other incentives will be required. The Federal and the state governments can help provide these incentives.

This issue is not whether the Federal government should try to influence local development; the issue is whether the influence which the Federal government already exercises will be haphazard or directed by fundamental national goals for urban development.

The government is a major buyer. Its defense procurement practices have literally created Los Angeles.

The Congress must define national goals of development and then it must assure that practices of the Federal government contribute to those goals.

The placement of government facilities has a profound effect on local community life. The government is a major employer. The location of a defense installation, a new university, even a government office complex can mean new economic life for a community. Federal financial incentives such as tax, loan, or direct payment arrangements can foster growth in new cities. Placement of Federal procurement contracts and construction projects can provide jobs.

Federal policies such as resettlement allowances, on-the-job training allowances, and job placement, can neutralize the factors producing excessive population concentration.

These will be cities to protect and foster man's natural inclination toward community. The physical design of these cities can relieve the pressures of urban living pressures which too frequently result in the breakdown of the family. Families in our new cities can prosper, can develop a viable, modern form of this most natural and basic unit of human organization.

These cities can also relieve the pressures confounding our old cities. They can provide a moment of relief, a pause in their constant struggle against the intertwined problems of urban life.

In order to do the things which I have

been talking with you about, we need a willing electorate—a clear political decision by the American people to get the job done.

We also need creative and decisive leadership from mayors, governors, and particularly from the President of the United States.

Because the task is so complicated, because the problems are so vast, our people must be inspired to act. Only qualities of real greatness can inspire our people to greatness.

SPACE AND EARTH PRIORITIES

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the very fact of the moon landing is so remarkable that there is little one can say which will embellish it. It was truly an achievement for all mankind, and a striking symbol of our common destiny.

Our responsibility now, it seems to me, is to try to determine how man can take hold of that destiny—how he can “spin off” from this great scientific success solutions for some of the world’s political, social, and economic problems.

Of course, the moon walk must not be the end of our space odyssey. We must continue a steady program of development with the idea that someday we will go on to other planets in our own universe—even to other galaxies of stars. But it is premature now, I believe, to talk of going on to Mars as though that were to be the objective of another feverish 10-year plan.

We must set some national priorities, and our first priority must be to use the great technological breakthroughs which took us to the moon to improve our lives here on earth.

Our commitment should be first to America.

How can a society which can perform such miracles as putting men on the moon condone the highest crime rate in the world?

How can we justify having so many poor—so many who do not have enough to eat and who live in houses that are little more than shelter?

How can we tolerate our polluted water and air; our expanding concrete jungle; our unequal opportunity for an education, our untrained, and our jobless?

How can we explain that we do little to control our galloping population which will soon expand our pollution and education and training problems into monsters which even our most advanced technology will not let us conquer?

Mr. President, we must turn more of our national effort to our problems on the globe’s surface, and I am hopeful that the mind-opening events of the last few days, and the technology which made them possible, will allow us to attack our age-old sore spots here on earth with greater skill and plausibility.

PLANETARY EXPLORATION

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, I have probably a little more interest than other Members of the Senate in what lies ahead for NASA now that the moon venture is practically completed and successful. Under the National Academy of Sciences, the National Research Council of the Space Sciences Board has sub-

mitted a report entitled “Planetary Exploration.” I do not want to burden Senators with the complete text of the report, which is extremely interesting, so I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a summary of the principal recommendations of this learned group.

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

SUMMARY OF PRINCIPAL RECOMMENDATIONS OF “PLANETARY EXPLORATION”

1. We recommend that the planetary exploration program be presented, not in terms of a single goal, but rather in terms of the contribution that exploration can make to a broad range of scientific disciplines (page 3).

2. We recommend that a substantially increased fraction of the total NASA budget be devoted to unmanned planetary exploration (page 3).

3. (a) We recommend that duplicate missions for a particular opportunity be undertaken only when a clear gain in scientific information will result from such double launches (page 4).

(b) We recommend that NASA initiate now a program of Pioneer/IMP-class spinning spacecraft to orbit Venus and Mars at every opportunity and for exploratory missions to other targets (page 5).

(c) We recommend the following larger missions to Mars: A Mariner orbiter mission in 1971, and a Mariner-type orbiter and lander mission, based on a Titan-Centaur, in 1973 (page 5).

(d) We accord next priorities (in descending order) to a Mariner-class Venus-Mercury fly-by in 1973 or 1975, a multiple drop-sonde mission to Venus in 1975, and a major lander on Mars, perhaps in 1975 (page 6).

4. (a, b) Rather than attempt to define in detail payloads to be carried aboard high priority missions, we have selected several sample payloads (page 6).

(c) We recommend that with regard to Mars and Venus, NASA continually reassess, in the light of current knowledge of the planets, its program, methods, and mathematical model for meeting the internationally agreed objectives on planetary quarantine (page 11).

5. (a) We recommend strongly that NASA support radar astronomy as an integral part of its planetary program. In particular, we recommend that NASA fund the development and operation of a major new radar observatory to be used primarily for planetary investigation (page 12).

(b) We recommend that NASA planetary program planning be closely coordinated with Earth-orbital telescopes being designed for the 1970’s and with the infrared aircraft telescopes now under construction (page 13).

(c) We recommend that the NASA program of ground-based optical planetary astronomy continue to receive strong support and that opportunities for planetary astronomical investigations be increased by:

(1) Construction of an intermediate sized optical telescope in the Southern Hemisphere.

(2) Construction of an infrared telescope employing a very large collecting area and permitting interferometric measurements at a dry site

(3) Development of new infrared devices, including improved detectors and high resolution interferometers (page 14).

(d) We recommend that steps be taken to facilitate the analysis by qualified investigators of the data secured by the photographic planetary patrol (page 14).

6. (a) We recommend that NASA openly solicit participation in all future planetary missions by the issuance of flight opportunity announcements with adequate time for response from the scientific community (page 15).

(b) We recommend that NASA develop a summer institute program expressly designed to introduce interested scientists and engineers to the science, technology, and administration of the planetary program (page 15).

7. We recommend that those resources currently intended for support of manned planetary programs be reallocated to programs for instrumented investigation of the planets (page 16).

8. We recommend a coordinated effort involving representatives of NASA, the Department of State, and the National Academy of Sciences, for the purpose of contacting knowledgeable Soviet scientists in an informal way with regard to the possibility of joint planning of planetary exploration (page 16).

THE EL SALVADOR-HONDURAS WAR

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Honorable Murat W. Williams, who was U.S. Ambassador to El Salvador from 1961 to 1964, and who is now retired, has been kind enough to send me a copy of a letter he has written to the editor of the New York Times concerning the war between El Salvador and Honduras. I ask unanimous consent that Ambassador Williams’ letter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Ambassador Williams has some cogent comments to make concerning the role of the U.S. military missions in both of these countries, and he recounts his unsuccessful attempts as an ambassador to reduce the size of the mission in El Salvador where, as he points out, there were more men in the U.S. air mission than there were fliers in the Salvadoran Air Force.

It is hard to see how the United States can totally avoid some of the responsibility for the present war. There seems to be little doubt that the activities of the military missions and the military assistance program have contributed to the growth and influence of the national military establishments in both Honduras and El Salvador.

The war between these two little countries has been partly overshadowed by the flight of Apollo 11, and its comic opera aspects tend to obscure the tragedy which it represents for the countries involved and potentially for all of Central America.

It is long past time for the withdrawal of U.S. military missions from Latin America and for a halt in military assistance. I hope that Congress will take steps to bring this about when it acts on the pending foreign aid bill.

EXHIBIT 1

JULY 16, 1969.

To the EDITOR,
The New York Times.

DEAR SIR: It is easy to imagine U.S. Military Missions as “seconds” to the fighters in that bloody and useless contest in the Salvadoran-Honduran forests.

The Missions should not be in either country. With transient encouragement from Dean Rusk, I urged our Government in 1963 and 1964 to fade out our ridiculously large Missions in El Salvador. (We had more men in our Air Mission than there were fliers in the Salvadoran Air Force.) The Secretary was getting too busy with other problems and he left my plea to deputies. One of these said:

"I agree with you, but we can't do anything. You have annoyed the Pentagon by making the suggestion." A many-starred general was sent to "negotiate" with me. After several days, he consented to cut back two out of about forty positions, but not until the end of the tours of duty of the individuals concerned, a year or so later.

Anyone can see now that if money spent on Military Missions and supplies had been put into more economic development, not only would more have been done to root out the social and economic causes of this war, but also we would not be guilty of helping to build up armed forces, on both sides, that make fratricidal war possible. We would not have helped thwart progress towards the fraternal union that the peoples of Central America have dreamed of achieving in their *Patria Grande*.

By now the Missions may have wistful instructions to "urge restraint," but do we need still more arguments against fomenting military buildings in the once Good Neighborhood?

Respectfully yours,

MURAT W. WILLIAMS,

U.S. Ambassador to El Salvador, 1961-64.

IN SUPPORT OF THE ABM SYSTEM

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on the ABM issue, I will cast my vote with the President of the United States simply because I believe he is right; and I call upon my friends in the Senate to support him on this very crucial matter.

There has been a great deal of criticism regarding the technical feasibility of the ABM system. I suppose if the academic community were polled it would be quite evenly split on the question of whether or not the Safeguard system would work. Those who oppose the system at this time must base a major part of their argument on the position of that section of the scientific community which believes it will not work. I suppose a logical reaction to that is to base the argument for ABM on the position of the scientific community that says it will work.

There is, however, a third group in the scientific community which I think must be reckoned with. May I quote from Dr. John Foster to prove my point:

The Safeguard system has been designed by competent people, and the best that are available. Its design has been reviewed by outside experts. Those who do, in fact, study the aspects of the system that are within their area of technical expertise are convinced that it will do what it's designed to do. There are some eminent scientists who for one reason or another claim that it will not work. On that I would like to say first that they have offered no problem which we have not long since addressed and resolved. Second, I want to point out that one does not obtain a meaningful, technical judgment by taking a vote of the scientific community, or even of Nobel Laureates.

Dr. Foster's statement is critical to this debate. What he is saying—and I believe he is correct—is that our scientists who are working with this system and deeply involved in its development know it will work. I submit further, Mr. President, that these are the men most qualified to say if it will work. While I have a great deal of respect for the scientific community that says it will not work, I am afraid their judgment is less convincing, simply because they do not have a first-

hand working knowledge of the ABM system.

I am reminded of a great scientist who freely predicted that the hydrogen bomb would not explode. His position was once described as that of a man who did not want it to explode, but of course, history has proven that nuclear power, in spite of the early doubts and predictions against it, is a reality.

I wish to point out, further, not so much for the sake of this body but for the people of my State, that the Sprint interceptor, which is a part of the Safeguard system, has been tested at the White Sands Missile Range. Ten of the first 11 test firings have been completely or partially successful. The Spartan interceptor, also a part of the system, has undergone seven launches in the Pacific. Five have been completely successful; two have been partially successful. These facts have convinced me that the ABM system is technically feasible. I recall the days in the late 1950's and the early 1960's when we used to watch the test firings of early ICBM's and wondered what percentage would be successful.

The only aspect of the ABM which we cannot test is the actual interception in cases where nuclear warheads are being used. We are precluded from doing that, as we all know, by the 1963 Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

Yet the opposition continues to say it will not work. The futility of their arguments and the blindness of their position is epitomized in a New York Times editorial dated March 29, 1969. The editorial did not deal with ABM directly. It reported test firings of ICBM's in North Dakota. Not content with covering the ICBM's itself, it had to draw an analogy with the ABM and question the reliability of the intricate rocketry which powers the Minuteman system and the ABM. No one has argued that both will work perfectly. Nonetheless, the New York Times editorial states:

Farmers who plow around the Minuteman are skeptical that it will ever fire when needed.

I suppose that if the Times had its way, farmers would be the determining factor in our rocket programs, and because farmers doubt that it will work, we should give up. Mr. President, I believe our scientists have developed the American rocket program to the point of sending man to the moon. They have developed a highly reliable ICBM system and are in the process of developing a workable and effective ABM system notwithstanding the highly technical scientific expertise of farmers and the New York Times editorial board.

Let me turn now to a second aspect of the ABM. The Soviet Union, according to our best intelligence, as pointed out by President Nixon in his March 14 statement, "has already deployed an ABM system which protects to some degree a wide area centered around Moscow. We will not have a comparable capability for over 4 years. We believe the Soviet Union is continuing its ABM deployment directed either toward improving this initial system or, more likely, making substantially better second generation ABM components."

The distinguished Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON), in his recent speech concerning four myths about the Soviet Union, pointed out that the Soviets acted first to test fire an ABM against an incoming nuclear armed missile. They did this in 1962, and are the only nation to have done so. We are some 7 years behind and will never, so long as the Test Ban Treaty remains in force, be able to test the actual interception of a nuclear armed missile.

I suppose some Members of the Senate would say that because we are thus denied a key aspect of the testing, we should bury our heads in the sand and give up. The other side of the argument is that the Soviet Union has tested all aspects of their ABM system; they know it will work in spite of the New York Times, the farmers, and the academic community which has never worked on it.

I wish to emphasize again what President Nixon has said. The Soviet Union is working on a second generation ABM, which proves it will work and which I think very significantly affects the nuclear balance of power in the world. I think the evidence is overwhelming that a workable and effective ABM can and should be built by the United States.

I now turn to the question of Soviet diplomacy within the context of the ABM debate in the United States. I am neither an apologist for the Soviet Union, nor do I advocate a return to the coldest days of the cold war. However, I do believe that in deciding whether we should build an ABM, the postwar history of the Soviet Union must be considered.

It is an old axiom in international politics that power more than anything else determines the conduct of a nation. Whether we like it or not, the nuclear superiority of the United States enjoyed from 1945 until this year has disappeared. Secretary Laird has testified—and I for one accept his information as reliable—that in ICBM's, conventional forces and in many other aspects the Soviet Union is equal to the United States and its major allies. Furthermore, if the current military trend being followed in Moscow continues, the situation will change from nuclear parity to nuclear superiority favoring the Soviets. Some will say, "So what?" Let me list briefly some of the things Russia has done in the past 25 years, at a time when the United States had the upper hand in nuclear power.

She gained control of Eastern Europe and fomented the war in Korea. She initially aided China in the acquisition of atomic weapons and has been the major supplier to North Vietnam in its efforts to subvert the Saigon government.

Perhaps if we turned our cheek, we could forget those episodes, but I think we cannot dismiss the current role of the Soviet Union in other parts of the world. As its military position has been strengthened, it has become more ambitious in its worldwide objectives. It is now a major influence, perhaps more than we wish to admit, in the very critical and highly strategic Middle East. It has a major fleet in the Mediterranean and is even now seeking to obtain naval bases

in South Asia and Southeast Asia. It has built the world's largest merchant fleet and is producing Polaris type submarines at a rate of about seven a year. It has an ally 90 miles from the coast of the United States, where, we all too painfully remember, it attempted to place offensive missiles in 1962.

I am sure the New Left and the apologists for the Soviet Union can explain these things away, but I think they are the hard facts of international politics and the United States cannot ignore them. I believe that Soviet diplomacy in the past decade has been brazen and in many ways very successful. If the United States makes a decision not to deploy the ABM, not to retain nuclear parity with the Soviet Union, then I predict that Soviet diplomacy will become more brazen, more pushy throughout the world, and a greater threat to American security. I do not know how else to explain the new Soviet missile the SS-9 with its capacity to deliver nuclear warheads up to 25 megatons.

There has been a great deal of debate about the significance of the SS-9. Secretary Laird has described it as a first-strike type capability. Others have derided this assessment, but they cannot explain what it really means if it is not a first-strike capability. A 25-megaton warhead seems to qualify for that definition. It is not unlike sitting in a trench when the attacker comes forth with a tank of the first magnitude.

I am sure the boys in the foxhole and the trench might convince themselves that the tank is not an offensive weapon, but the fact is that the tank and the SS-9 are offensive weapons, and the latter can be and probably has been designed as a first-strike capability.

During the past 8 years, American nuclear strength has been gradually reduced from the 5-to-1 advantage which President Eisenhower left this Nation. In the last 2 years of the Johnson administration we were told on several occasions that the Soviets would reach a plateau in their feverish nuclear weapon production and then level off. This simply has not occurred. On top of this dramatic progress in offensive nuclear weapons, we now have a Soviet ABM system in place and to a large extent operational.

I cannot accept the position of the apologists for the Soviet Union, simply because the facts of the matter are otherwise. How else can one explain the Soviet MRV and FOBS systems, the Cuban missile crisis, its submarine and merchant fleet, its frantic nuclear weapons program, and, most unfortunately, the Brezhnev doctrine and the rape of Czechoslovakia.

I find it truly incredible that anyone could call the American safeguard ABM system a provocation. On the contrary, I predict that if we do not build it and do not retain at least a nuclear parity with the Soviet Union, we will see a Soviet diplomacy the likes of which we have not seen since Lenin came to power in Moscow.

Let me turn now to the issue of disarmament. I have been appointed as an observer and adviser to the U.S. disarmament

conference in Geneva. I believe that if the major nations of the world can jointly reduce arms with a foolproof system of safeguards, we should work to that end with all our energies.

I disagree strongly, however, with those who say that the ABM decision of President Nixon will hamper our disarmament efforts. I submit that the Soviet Union is not in a disarmament mood as evidenced by its frantic pace of nuclear arms production in the past several years.

I also strongly believe that to build a defensive missile system very similar to the Soviet system which is now operational is in no way provocative. To say so is the height of naivete. I think the President has every indication from the Soviet Government that such a decision by the United States to build the ABM would not be provocative and even if it were, that is no reason for us to back down. Perhaps, though, the Soviet ABM system is provocative to certain Americans.

Another argument—and I think past experience bears me out—is that any new disarmament agreements may well take several years. I need not remind any Senator that the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty took many years of painstaking negotiations. We worked on the Non-proliferation Treaty for a long time before it was realized, and those were areas where the interests of both major powers were served and were not in conflict. The problems we are now facing are of the first magnitude, and it could be many years before there is any type of arms agreement.

Are we asking the American people in the meantime to take a second place in terms of national security? Are we asking them to disregard the nonpartisan assessment of ABM by President Nixon and by President Johnson before him? Are we asking the American people to ignore the assessment of our finest civilian and military defense planners and scientists? I think those are critical questions, and I for one would not ask the American people to accept the status that would be imposed upon them if ABM is defeated by the Senate.

I am afraid the ABM debate, in large measure, stems from our frustration about Vietnam and our oft-times unjustified criticism of the military-industrial complex. I do not believe the Pentagon planners, be they military or civilian, have gained control of American society, and I think to deny this defense system to the American people on those grounds is fallacious, foolish, and would create a security risk of the first magnitude. I will cast my vote with the President simply because I believe he is right, and I call upon my friends in the Senate to support him on this very crucial matter.

I do not believe that people who support this necessary defense system are insensitive to the domestic needs of this country. Rather, I think they realize the consequences of defeating the ABM system. Let me close by saying that if the advocates of the system are wrong, we may have spent unnecessarily some \$5 to \$10 billion. If the opponents of the system are wrong, it may not matter

since there might be few people left in the United States to remember the debate about the cost of building a system they opposed. I think the gamble is too great, and I for one will not ask the American people, nor the people of my State, to accept the risk involved should the Senate defeat the Safeguard ABM system.

THE PESTICIDE PERIL—XXVIII

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the growing controversy over the use of persistent, toxic pesticides is not confined to the United States. At the beginning of this year Sweden became the first country to ban the use of DDT, and Denmark recently announced that a similar ban will go into effect this fall.

Now the British press reports mounting pressures on its Government to curb the use of DDT.

The quality of our environment is of concern to all nations. The carelessness and abuses to the environment in one country will have an effect on the environment of its neighboring country. The threat is international, and we can no longer afford to be careless.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD three articles from the British press regarding the pesticide problem.

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

DDT—AS PRESSURE FOR A BAN GROWS (By William Breckon)

Mounting pressure is being put on the Government to curb the use of DDT pesticide in Britain.

For a growing mass of evidence, from all over the world, shows that DDT—one of the most widely used agricultural pesticides—presents a major threat to our wildlife, from the smallest garden creature to the golden eagle.

In Denmark and Sweden they have recently banned its use; it is banned too in Michigan, U.S.A.; in Arizona and Australia they restrict its use.

In Britain, yet another Government committee is slowly sifting the evidence—it should report by the end of the year.

There is no doubt that over the years DDT has proved to be one of the greatest chemical boons ever discovered. But in the last decade, niggling doubts have begun to accumulate about DDT—doubts which have sparked a vociferous international campaign for a ban.

These are the facts:

DDT is NOT going to kill anyone—in Britain the average person has some two to three parts per million of the chemical in his body, that is, about 100th of an ounce for the average man.

In the U.S., where it has been used far more indiscriminately than here, the levels are about four times as high. The average U.S. man has a higher concentration of DDT in his bloodstream than is permitted in meat on sale there.

BALANCE

But for wildlife DDT is potentially far more dangerous. It is, unfortunately, a chemical which can be stored in the body and deposits can slowly accumulate.

These probably will not be fatal, but they can radically affect the breeding habits—and hence the very existence—of whole species.

Recent experiments have shown:

1. In killing off micro-organisms in the soil, DDT has upset the delicate life-balance

which keeps the soil "sweet." But no one knows what the long-term effects could be.

2. Plankton in the sea accumulate DDT and so do the fish which eat them—and the bigger fish and birds which eat those fish. Similarly the birds that eat the slugs and the birds of prey that feed on them steadily build up DDT residue.

The trend towards extinction in birds of prey—notably the golden eagle and the peregrine falcon—has been attributed largely to DDT residue.

There ARE other ways to control pests, although some are more expensive and less effective.

But we must weigh the short-term gains against the long-term potential hazards. We must take steps now to control our growing pollution of the world about us—and the evidence is weighted against the continuing unrestricted use of DDT.

CASE FOR MORE BANS ON DDT

The Danish Government's ban on DDT, announced this week, may strengthen the case of those who wish Britain to take the same course. The campaign against DDT has been gathering recruits rapidly in the past few months.

Sweden, the first country to ban it, declared in March a two-year ban on DDT to start in 1970. In April the state of Michigan banned the pesticide in spite of a court case which went against the opponents of DDT. A petition to end the use of DDT is being heard in Wisconsin and legislation has been introduced in the United States Senate.

In Britain a decision on DDT and related pesticides is more than two years overdue. A Ministry of Agriculture committee recommended in 1964 that no restrictions should be put on the uses of DDT then current, but that this should be reviewed at the end of three years.

The committee charged with the review, the Advisory Committee on Pesticides and other toxic chemicals, is not expected to publish its report until the end of this year. Evidence being prepared by its scientific subcommittee is likely to be the major influence in whatever decision is reached.

In Britain the average person carries two to three parts a million of DDT in his body, or about a hundredth of an oz. for a 150lb. man. The concentrations are four times as great in the United States, where for many years DDT was used indiscriminately over large areas.

CONTAMINATED ENVIRONMENT

As far as is known these quantities of DDT are not toxic to man. Nevertheless the presence of DDT in man and animals, even at levels that cannot be proved to be poisonous, is alarming evidence of man's contamination of his environment.

DDT and the other organochlorine pesticides, which include dieldrin, aldrin and lindane, are highly persistent in nature because they resist chemical degradation by the usual biological processes. DDT and its residues last in the soil for months or even years. They are spread by rivers and winds and creep up extended food chains because of their tendency to accumulate in the fat of animal tissues. Small quantities are absorbed by the plankton that inhabit the surface of the oceans. It accumulates in the fish that eat the plankton and in the birds that feed on the fish.

DDT and its derivatives are now one of the most widely distributed synthetic chemicals on earth. The kind of evidence that ecologists find particularly disturbing is the detection of organochlorine residues in birds and fish of the Antarctic, thousands of miles away from main sites of application.

As a general index of contamination round Britain the Monks Wood experimental station monitors the organochlorine residues in the eggs of seabirds. Typically these average

a few parts a million, which is not a lethal concentration. But evidence is coming to light that sub-lethal concentrations may exert a pernicious long-term effect, for instance by reducing the reproductive ability of certain species.

In Sweden particular concern was caused by the discovery that DDT residues in nature were greater in the northern part of the country, where population is sparser and less DDT is used, than in the south. Dr. Norman Moore, a member of the Advisory Committee on Pesticides, believes this was one of the factors behind the Swedish ban, though the extent of DDT contamination was similar to that in Britain.

DAMAGE TO ANIMAL LIFE

The case against the organochlorines rests in part on the natural dislike among biologists of unnecessary pollution of the environment and in part on the damage, some of it half proved, some merely suspected, that the pesticides may do to numerous forms of animal life. The scientific case for outlawing The organochlorine pesticides are used in fore. The evidence before the advisory committee will doubtless point towards tighter restrictions or a trial ban on DDT and possibly the other organochlorines.

Whether the committee will take this action depends on the economic cost of a ban. The organochlorine pesticides are used in Britain not because they are essential—less persistent pesticides have already been developed for most uses—but because they are still cheaper than the alternatives. Dr. Moore has calculated that a total ban on aldrin, dieldrin, Heptachlor and DDT would add about £1m. to farmers' yearly pesticide bill.

Britain's general policy towards the organochlorines has been one of phased withdrawal. This gradual approach is reasonable on the argument that DDT residues have been at their present levels in animal and human tissue for several years without any catastrophic effect.

But so little is known about the toxicology of the organochlorines that their long-term effects may be more damaging than is realized. Dr. Moore believes that all countries that can afford to ban organochlorines without serious harm to health or agriculture should certainly do so.

DUTCH COUNT COST OF RHINE POISON FIASCO

(By Peter Deeley)

FRANKFURT, June 28.—The Rhine, the open sewer of Europe, flows poisonously on today.

Holland will stay on emergency water supplies until well after the weekend, said the Dutch Secretary for Foreign Affairs and Public Health, Dr. Roelof Krusinga.

He is unwilling to allow the water purification plants which supply Rotterdam, The Hague and Amsterdam to draw water from the Rhine again until the level of insecticide which has poisoned the river has dropped to under one-tenth of the dose lethal for fish. The latest tests put the level at one-fifth.

The Dutch are busy adding up the cost to their disrupted inland shipping fleet, industries without water supplies and depletion of the fresh-water fishing stock (alone estimated at £300,000). Even the tourist industry has been hit by cancellations from abroad. Now Holland intends to ask Bonn for compensation.

Holland has suddenly woken up to the fact that it could be paralysed by a slow-dissolving poison further up the Rhine. Emergency reservoirs hold only four weeks' supplies. The Government has now promised a new early-warning system to spot contamination of the Rhine and bigger reservoirs.

It was about two o'clock in the afternoon of Wednesday 18 June that the trouble was first discovered. Shoals of dead fish were spotted floating on the surface of the Rhine at Bingen-loch, about 20 miles from the

Hoechst chemical factory at Geisenheim near Frankfurt. Twenty-four hours later the district Ministry of Agriculture got the warning and alerted the water board in Dusseldorf. But that warning did not filter through to the Dutch authorities for another five days.

Holland knew its fate then only because of the watchfulness of the Nijmegen police. They saw a tidal wave of dead fish floating down river ahead of the contaminated water. Meanwhile every fish in the Rhine from Bingen-loch downward—an estimated 25 million—has died.

Nijmegen warned The Hague. The drinking-water purification plants there and in Rotterdam and Amsterdam switched to emergency reservoirs. The Dutch State Institute for Public Health asked the German authorities what was causing the pollution. The Germans said they did not know.

The lack of prior communication spotlights a serious flaw in the so-called "early-warning system" which the river authorities along the Rhine have set up.

NERVE GAS RUMORS

This time, either, as some people suspect, the Germans simply forgot or they underestimated the seriousness of the problem.

At 4 o'clock on Tuesday morning the State Institute for Public Health at Bilthoven in Holland sent out its floating laboratory. Samples were taken back to the institute's toxicology division. Sinister rumours, since discounted, were floating the length of the Rhine that the poison was a basic component of nerve gas.

By Tuesday evening the analysts had discovered an insecticide, Endosulfan, which is lethal for cold-blooded animals such as fish.

It took the Germans several days to reach the same provisional diagnosis. The Germans say the Dutch were just lucky, the Dutch wonder if their German neighbours, with all the resources of the chemical industry on tap, might have been deliberately dragging their feet.

The German chemical firm of Hoechst is the only manufacturer of Endosulfan in Europe. It is widely used in crop-spraying against over 400 types of insects and is classified as an organo-chlorine compound of persistent nature.

How did it get into the water? Hoechst is convinced that the Endosulfan did not get in from its Geisenheim plant on the River Main, a Rhine tributary which is clear. Tests have shown that fish there have been unharmed and that the pollution began several miles down-river.

German police checked 23 ships which passed Bingen-loch on Wednesday afternoon and by today had eliminated all but two. Hoechst checked the contractors' barges which carry its cargoes of Endosulfan down the Rhine to Rotterdam for export, three barges loaded with 11-gallon lead-welded tin canisters, marked 'Poison,' passed down-river during the crucial days. The barges and the crews and receiving agents have been questioned. They have told Hoechst that all the journeys passed without incident and that every canister was accounted for at the unloading point.

The firm is unwilling to say that the insecticide alone caused the pollution, "With the Rhine in such a contaminated state it is possible that Endosulfan dealt a lethal blow to fish which were already half poisoned," it said.

THE 88TH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF JUDGE EDWARD A. BARNEY, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. COTTON, Mr. President, Judge Edward A. Barney, one of the most beloved and colorful sons of New Hampshire, celebrated his 88th birthday anniversary yesterday.

Judge Barney is a resident and native of Canaan, N.H., where his father founded the Canaan Reporter in 1867. At his father's death Judge Barney continued as publisher of the paper until his retirement. He has continued, as has Mrs. Barney, as a writer and contributor to the Reporter.

For 37 years he was justice of the Canaan Municipal Court, which embraces neighboring towns. During my 9 years as county attorney, I appeared in his court frequently and have been honored by his friendship for many years.

As a young man, he came to Washington and served for a period of years as secretary to Representative Frank D. Currier, who represented New Hampshire's Second District for 12 years, starting about the turn of the century.

A reminiscent article by Judge Barney appeared in the Union Leader of Manchester, N.H., on his 88th birthday, July 22. Obviously, the judge has not lost his skill as a writer, because the article portrays such a vivid picture of Washington and Capitol Hill in the early 1900's that I am sure present Members of Congress will find it fascinating reading. With the knowledge and consent of the present Representative of the Second District, JAMES C. CLEVELAND, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD:

There being no objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUDGE RECALLS CRUCIAL DECISION: NEW HAMPSHIRE CONGRESSMAN REFUSED SENATE SEAT; CURRIER SWALLOWED A BITTER PILL

(By Edward A. Barney)

The wall telephone in Rep. Frank D. Currier's committee room in the national Capitol broke in on the stillness of a dull afternoon. One with a vivid imagination would have said afterward that the bell jangled with a tone of authority that no mere routine call could assume.

Be that as it may, the ring proved the precursor of an ordeal that would demand the most crucial, off-the-cuff decision of the Canaan Congressman's political life.

The date was Jan. 7, 1907. The little city on the Potomac was a sprawling, yet close-knit community vastly different in its quality of neighborliness than the overcrowded metropolis of today.

SAFE STREETS

It was a leisurely area of unlimited elbow room in which everybody and his wife knew everybody else—a proper town whose streets, even the waterfront, one could traverse at midnight, as this writer so often has done, without fear of molestation or annoyance.

The streets were as tidy as it was possible for any city thoroughfare to be, but Washington's buildings presented a study in contrast with the swanky new Willard and Raleigh Hotels looking down their noses at musty Pennsylvania Avenue neighbors that had seemed equally elegant as places of public accommodation in the days of James K. Polk. Even on fashionable Connecticut Avenue an imposing residential pile would as likely as not actually abut a squalid cabin.

Theodore Roosevelt was the White House tenant in 1907 and the notable nonentity who served as his vice president was Charles W. Fairbanks of Indiana. Fairbanks' duties were not so onerous as to deny him an abundance of time for hobnobbing in his office at the Senate end of the Capitol and he was as genial and companionable a gentleman as any nextdoor neighbor in Enfield or Canaan.

No caller was allowed to nurture an inferiority complex in his presence.

Rev. Edward Everett Hale, most illustrious of all Senate chaplains and the creator of Philip Nolan, The Man Without a Country, was equally approachable. Conversations with lovable Doctor Hale were priceless privileges.

CLEVELAND LIVING

Grover Cleveland was the nation's only living ex-President; he divided his time between Princeton and Tamworth and he made no secret of his love for New Hampshire. A tinge of Abraham Lincoln still lingered about the Capital. There were Washingtonians barely turned 50 able to recall the tall, gangling figure who perambulated the District's noisome streets much like any mere denizen.

An aging group of Lincoln's contemporaries and at least one associate—Uncle Shelby M. Cullom, senator from Illinois—were in service yet on Capitol Hill. A mile to the northwest, a buoyant young lady was making elaborate preparations for her White House wedding with Nick Longworth, Ohio's bachelor congressman. It was the boast of Rep. Thomas W. Hardwick of Georgia, that he had won his seat in the House by receiving every one of the 1,700 lily-white votes cast in the November election.

STAFF OF THREE

Currier as a committee chairman commanded an office staff of three. His second assistant was Fred Batchelor of Littleton, a Dartmouth sophomore who was taking time out from his college course to pursue a year of special study in Washington.

And there was Sam Butler, an 18-year-old youth of chocolate hue who had served from time undated as guardian of the committee portals and courier par excellence. No crook or cranny of that Capitol building nor even the city itself was too remote to thwart Sam in his quest for information or the discharge of other appointed rounds.

Sam received an annual salary well in excess of many a white adult's and during his long period of service he never drew a word of censure or criticism.

But regardless of such recognition of his intelligence and efficiency, Washington drawing rooms and dinner tables were off limits for Sam. His money would buy him an aerial-like perch in a theatre commanding an eagle's-eye view of the stage, but he couldn't tuck a napkin under his chin in even a second-class Capital eatery.

Teddy Roosevelt had evoked bleats of protest from higher social echelons by entertaining Booker T. Washington as a dinner guest in the White House and Lew Dockstader, the nation's premier minstrel man burlesqued the incident in his show until a brusque directive from headquarters commanded him to cease and desist.

"WE HAVE THE VOTES"

The chairman's aide, alone in the office, took the phone call. The voice came through loud and surprisingly clear for a day when long-distance communication could be the antithesis of unalloyed delight.

"This is — at the State House in Concord. Is Frank there?"

Currier was on the floor of the House and the caller was so apprised.

"All right; I'll get him there. We want to place Frank in nomination at the caucus tonight. And don't let him say no. We have the votes to put him over. Goodbye."

The call came as something of a thunderbolt. The man at Concord was a commanding public figure whose wishes and will carried a lot of weight. He was one of an emerging progressive element that was already making its power and influence felt in state politics.

Only the previous summer had the liberals' standard-bearer, glamorous young Winston Churchill, America's most successful novelist and certainly no demagogue,

thrown a scare into the regular organization by coming within a cat's whisker of bearing off the gubernatorial nomination.

The caucus referred to by the Concord communicant was the one at which the Republican candidate for the upcoming United States Senate term would be named. By way of making the situation clear a few words of explanation are pertinent.

LEGISLATURE MADE CHOICE

The time was long before the Constitution granted the right of election of senators by the people. The choice still was one for the members of state legislatures to make, and as far back as the birth of the century there had been smoldering dissatisfaction with such an archaic mode of selection. In New Hampshire this year, Sen. Henry E. Burnham of Manchester was announced as a candidate to succeed himself and he had up to now been faced with only token opposition.

There was no kindlier, better-loved gentleman in his state's public life than Judge Burnham. But even in a period when thrift and fiscal integrity in national affairs were not the profane words they were later to come to be, his extreme conservatism had lost him the favor of a dissident bloc of young Republicans.

In their view the senator was a hopeless anachronism—a disciple of an outmoded philosophy, blind to the needs and the ability to supple an affluent nation of eighty millions.

Even in the councils of the state delegation, his fellow members found themselves occasionally irked by his mood of excessive caution. But the antipathy was purely political. Judge Burnham had not an enemy in the world.

CURRIER DOMINANT

Frank Currier's razor-sharp mind and parliamentary talents had made him a dominant figure in the arena of New Hampshire politics. At the age of 33, as a freshman, he had been elected to the presidency of the State Senate, and later while speaker of the House he had fulfilled his pledge of legislative adjournment by Town Meeting Day.

During his 12 years in Congress, Currier never failed of unanimous nomination by his party. He conducted his campaigns from his office desk, or, more accurately, a plain, long table with an inkstained felt top that with a few chairs comprised the furnishings of his Canaan office.

Notwithstanding his love for politics he was no ruthless climber. He had deferred his congressional debut out of a decent consideration for the deserts of other men. But on this fateful afternoon an organized draft movement was to force him to decide which to forfeit: His loyal attachment to Senator Burnham or his own political advancement. His ascent would project him into the contest with better than even chances of winning; and the politician indifferent to acquiring a seat in the U.S. Senate was then even as today an all but non-existent figure. An abortive attempt to wrest the prize from the incumbent would have no significant effect upon his future for he still had in reserve a full elective House term that would not begin for another two months.

TELEPHONE BARRAGE

And now the telephones in both committee and cloakrooms were beginning what was to be a barrage of urging and exhortation from determined party cohorts in the home state.

The calls were not alone from starry-eyed visionaries; they came, too, from stalwarts whose counsel had on past occasions been sought and gratefully considered, and the mode of approach ranged all the way from friendly persuasion to insistent demand.

Wonderful as it would be to move up to the prestigious job of senatorial aide, there was at least one involved person who found

himself hoping that the great decision would be negative.

Such an eleventh-hour onslaught upon the aspirations of a respected colleague who had up to now conducted a comparatively unchallenged campaign seemed hardly cricket. It would require a thick skin to face without embarrassment the good friends on the Burnham staff in the event of their ouster.

Maybe similar thoughts were having their effect upon the beleaguered congressman. Currier did not go to the length of burning his draft card, even in a figurative sense, but throughout the siege his response remained a tactful though resolute no, and in the end his decision prevailed.

REFUSES NOMINATION

After adjournment, Currier, his face plainly bearing the mark of inner turmoil, returned to the committee room where he was helped into his overcoat by the faithful Sam. Then he seated himself at his desk.

Instead of talking over the House events of the afternoon as was his habit, he was silent for a full 20 minutes. At last he arose, and with hand on the doorknob he spoke for the first time.

"... I wouldn't give a tinker's dam to be a United States senator. Goodnight."

It was a brave disclaimer but it fooled not even the stripling to whom it was addressed.

Even without benefit of nomination in that night's caucus, Currier received a handsome complimentary vote well above that of Senator Burnham's active opponent.

THE MOON, THE FUTURE, AND JOHN DAVID HOLT

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, late on July 20, I watched the landing on the moon and watched the first man ever to reach another celestial body step out of a lunar module onto the strange soil and a strange, but still very familiar, planet. With me at the time were my wife, our youngest daughter, our latest grandchild, John David Holt, who has a total of 3 weeks behind him, and his mother, our youngest daughter, Peggy Holt.

My wife and I viewed this unique spectacle through probably the same eyes of other 60-year-old people who had become convinced long, long ago that Americans dedicated to a specific problem and dedicated to the work and the task involved in that problem can accomplish literally anything.

Our youngest daughter viewed the spectacle through the eyes of a younger generation filled with complete wonderment and awe, but still I feel that in her heart she knows that what we know is right, that an unshackled American can accomplish anything; knows no bounds.

But, Mr. President, it is what my 3-week-old grandson, John David Holt, will think in his coming years that is going to prove what all of this really means to mankind. We have heard accolades from all parts of the world, and they were richly deserved; we have heard statements to the effect that this event completely changes the entire outlook of man and that from here on in we must be thinking along different lines on different planes. I tend to doubt this to some extent, but there is no question that one important and vital thing has happened as a result: People across the length and breadth of this great America have once again been filled with a great sense of patriotic pride, a great sense of participation and a realization that only

in an atmosphere of freedom can human beings perform at their maximum efficiency and effectiveness. It is true that the Russians have made flamboyant efforts in the space field with some success. There have been some great achievements in this field; but when the chips were down, we were the ones who pulled in with the experience and the results.

Ever since that dreadful day when my friend President John F. Kennedy was killed and the emotional accolades began to pile up, I kept saying to myself that someday, something that this young man did would stand out as a lasting monument to his memory. I felt that it would not be the renaming of airports; it would not be the naming of streets; it would not be the changing of historical and geographical names; it would not even be the eternal flame that burns at his grave. What it will be came clearly to me on July 20 as I watched the moon spectacle with my youngest daughter and my youngest grandson, even though I must admit that my youngest grandson did not know what was going on.

The point is, I believe, that he will come to realize in the future that the moon landing was a target established by a young President when he addressed a joint session of Congress in 1962. At that time, John Kennedy proclaimed as a mission for America the placing of a man on the moon by 1970. He set up a target which was probably the most difficult of any ever established by any man in the history of the world, and that target was hit on July 20.

So, to the everlasting memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy will go the belief in American ability and the inspiration which his decision gave to those chosen to be astronauts, those chosen to serve NASA as scientists, and those chosen from many walks of life to put this whole moon venture into being. It represented a reawakening of the vital idea that man, operating freely with all of his ingenuity and dignity and unhampered by a meddling Federal Government, can really achieve the seemingly impossible.

That young grandson of mine, John David Holt, will come to realize this in a more profound way than was the case with my generation. For this venture, successful as it is, should convince all the skeptics in this country that there is nothing that free man cannot achieve.

This monument, hewn out of the substance of the basic principles found in the Declaration of Independence and carved from the concepts of man's dignity, wisdom, knowledge, and judgment, will be something more enduring to the memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy than the Presidency or all of the other honors that man has tried to bestow upon him. This conquest of the moon was an idea of his, a product we might say, of the inborn knowledge that he possessed of the goodness of America and the greatness of America. It was founded in his faith in the ability of Americans to achieve what they set out to do.

I would suggest, in closing, that one approach we might make to further this great addition which he made possible would be a serious effort to bring together the great and small countries of the

world through an interchange of scientific knowledge, academic knowledge, and eventually political knowledge. This is another goal, an even higher goal than reaching the moon, because with it comes a real chance for world peace.

THE FUTURE OF "BROWN AMERICANS"

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I think it is now widely recognized that America awakened many years too late to the problems facing its Negro citizens—problems of which we all were vaguely aware decades ago but on which the Government and society as a whole failed to take prompt action at a time when the problems were more manageable. As a result, our land is plagued today with racial bitterness, violence, and a growing polarization of the races.

Our lesson with the problems of the American Negro should alert us to the urgent importance of recognizing the problems of another group of Americans who are fewer in number but who generally have even more complex and difficult problems—the Mexican-Americans.

This is a group of Americans, more than 5 million in number, who occupy one of the very lowest economic rungs on the ladder of American society. They are called Latins or Chicanos; in the new lexicon that labels many simply as blacks and whites, Mexican-Americans are called the browns.

Mexican-Americans live all across the great Southwest and hold as a common bond a language and culture which is considered foreign by many of their fellow citizens. In Wisconsin, we see them mainly when they come north to pick cucumbers and cherries, hoping to earn enough money through a hard summer's work to exist for another year.

The message which these people are sending us today is that Mexican-Americans are tired of waiting to be granted their full and unqualified rights as American citizens.

These Americans, most of them native born and with deep roots in this country, have been forced to make their way in an alien world. And their children, accustomed to speaking Spanish at home, have been forced to attend schools where only English is spoken.

The Spanish-speaking American's place at the bottom of the economic ladder puts him even below the disadvantaged Negro in the fight to live a decent life. The unemployment rate of Mexican-Americans is at least twice the national average and higher than the rate for Negroes.

This is not a pretty picture in a land made great by diversity, but it is an accurate picture.

Just who are these people who are treated as foreigners by so many in their own land?

For one thing they are not foreigners. Eighty-five percent of all Mexican-Americans are native born and virtually all of them are citizens of the United States. The 1960 census gave a figure of 3,464,999 as the number of persons with Spanish surnames, but updated estimates

count more than 5 million Mexican-Americans in this country. The majority of our Spanish-surnamed citizens live in five Western States—Arizona, New Mexico, California, Colorado, and Texas, but there are Mexican-Americans in many other States, including Wisconsin.

Historically, the first Mexicans to become citizens did not acquire their citizenship; the United States acquired them—by forceful annexation. They did not come to the United States; the United States, through a war with Mexico, simply extended its boundaries to include a large territory, about the size of present-day Mexico, in which some 75,000 Spanish-speaking people were then living.

Under the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, the United States formally assured the Spanish speaking that their property rights would be respected. In addition, the treaty guaranteed to them the right to use the Spanish language, to adhere to their own customs and traditions, and to retain their Roman Catholic faith. But in the end these assurances did not provide adequate protection for the Spanish speaking.

The Anglo-Americans who came surging into the vast territory which the United States had acquired from Mexico knew little about the region or its people, but they took over the land. As a result, the Mexican-American lost his footing in his own community to the invading pioneer. He became the governed in his village. His language became the mark of a foreigner.

The Mexican-Americans were pushed into menial jobs as the years passed; their children rarely reaped the benefits of education, and today this tragic cycle of neglect and discrimination is seen in figures like this:

The average Mexican-American child in the Southwest drops out of school by the seventh year, and almost 90 percent of them drop out before entering high school.

Along the Texas-Mexico border, four of five Mexican-American children fall two grades behind their Anglo classmates by the time they reach the fifth grade.

Although Spanish-surnamed students make up more than 14 percent of the public school population of California, less than one-half of 1 percent of the college students enrolled in the seven campuses of the University of California are of this group.

These figures of educational deprivation at all levels spell lives of abject poverty in most cases. Job opportunities, income levels, economic advancement, in fact, all aspects of personal and family well-being are closely linked to educational achievement and the ability to communicate effectively with one another. Even the Negro child, with all the marks of discrimination that affect his upbringing, completes 9 years of school on the average. That is almost 2 more years of schooling than the average Mexican-American child finishes.

In the Southwest, according to a special report by the University of Wisconsin based on the last census, Mexican-Americans average 7.1 years of schooling against 12.1 years for Anglo-Americans. In Texas, the Mexican-American child finishes 4.8 years on the average. Econ-

omists say a high school diploma is worth at least \$60,000 over a lifetime. But what if you do not even have a grade school diploma? The answer is, you pick fruit or cucumbers or sugar beets, and you maintain throughout your lifetime the low economic status of your father and your grandfather, the status of a poor, uneducated itinerant fruitpicker in a highly educated and affluent society.

What makes educational attainment so difficult for Mexican-Americans? The major problem seems to be the Spanish language and the prejudice and discrimination which it seems to provoke.

The Spanish-speaking child begins with an educational handicap the very first day he goes to class. English is the language of the classroom, but Spanish is the language of his home. Little children are trapped in a clash of cultures, discriminated against by teachers if they do not speak English, and sometimes by their peers if they do.

The whole school curriculum is often designed to make the Mexican-American child an Anglo-American. He does not want to become an Anglo, or he does not know how. The children around him, so friendly with one another and so much at ease, look at him with suspicion. There is little from which he can draw comfort.

Diversity should be a strength not a weakness, and bilingualism should not be considered a handicap, but a potential national asset, if we would only develop it as such. What an absurdity it is that our national educational policy has directed the expenditure of \$1 billion a year to teach foreign languages—in our high schools, colleges, universities and government agencies—while children who already have this ability find it a handicap as they struggle to learn English.

Salvador Ramirez, director of the El Paso, Tex., Boys' Club, said in a speech recently:

Getting a job—any job—is harder than it used to be for those without preparation for the world of work. For a Mexican-American male, 18 years old, a school drop-out living in the slums of a large city, the chances of obtaining employment are less, even less than for an Anglo, 18-year-old, high school drop-out who lives a few blocks away. Because in addition to the aforementioned characteristics, the Mexican-American youth happens to possess characteristics which are viewed by many employers as undesirable. Because his eyes are brown, not blue; because his skin is brown, not white, he is often thought to be "inferior, stupid, lazy, a poor employment risk."

Jobs, as Mr. Ramirez' comments indicate, are another critical problem of Mexican Americans. Unemployment is twice as high for Spanish-speaking citizens than the national average—around 8 percent—and underemployment is even worse. Although the number of Mexican-Americans living in urban areas has increased greatly, there has been little accompanying increase in the level of their occupational skills.

In fact, of the total number of Mexican-American males employed in urban areas in the Southwestern States, only 5 percent are in professional occupations. Three-fourths of the employed Mexican Americans are categorized as manual workers. State Senator Joe Bernall, of Texas, put those jobs in perspec-

tive recently in a speech before the National Association for Community Development in Washington. He said:

As I've said all along—everyone loves us. How could they hate us? We've been doing the dirty work in his country for a long, long time. We built the railroads, constructed the oil rigs, hewed the cactus and the cedar, and raised the children of the monied families of our area. As a matter of fact, they love us to death.

There are some signs of progress in bettering the lives of Mexican-Americans.

The Bilingual Education Act was signed into law last year as an amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; \$7.5 million was appropriated in fiscal 1969, a sum only one-fourth as large as that authorized, but at least it is a beginning. We can thank Senator YARBOROUGH, of Texas, who led the fight for bilingual education legislation, and has long worked for the betterment of Mexican-Americans.

Under the new legislation the U.S. Office of Education has approved 65 programs thus far involving 140,000 children, but there are 10 times that number needing help. The Bilingual Education Act will provide funds to school districts for special help to Spanish-speaking children. And the act gives moral and legislative recognition to the assets of a people whose mother tongue is not English. It also will provide a Spanish-speaking child the opportunity to learn educational concepts in all phases of the curriculum in his mother tongue while he is learning English.

Another progressive step is being taken by the Teacher Corps and the Mexican-American unit in the U.S. Office of Education, which itself is only 2 years old. Intensive Spanish language courses will be given this summer in Denver and Los Angeles to social workers, police officers, Teacher Corps interns, and regular teachers.

Other Teacher Corps projects are training Mexican-American youths at six universities in California, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas. Many of these youths are returning to teach in schools primarily attended by Mexican-Americans.

In San Antonio and Houston, Tex., the concentrated employment program, funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity, is making an impact in the Mexican-American community. CEP provides such services as outreach, recruitment, testing, skill and work training, job development and job placement to unemployed Mexican-Americans.

By and large, though, the steps taken to alleviate the immense problems of Mexican-Americans have been inadequate and time may be running out. There are accounts in the newspapers that indicate young Mexican-Americans are not as willing as their parents to accept poverty and discrimination. The crowded urban barrios are usually adjacent to the Negro ghettos, and the rising ferment among Mexican-Americans has been stimulated in part by the gains of the Negro civil rights movement. More militant than their parents, young Mexican-Americans cry "brown power" at demonstrations and threaten that if negotiations will not accomplish anything, violence will appeal to some.

A Roman Catholic priest in Phoenix, the Rev. Miguel Barragan, field representative of the Southwest Conference of La Raza—People—has warned:

If there are no immediate changes in the Southwest, no visible improvement in the political and economic status of the Mexican-American, then I definitely foresee that our youths will resort to violence to demand the dignity and respect they deserve as human beings and as American citizens.

We must not allow a breakdown in communications with young Mexican-Americans. That route has been traveled with young Negroes and has engulfed the country in a crisis between races, a polarization that the Kerner Commission said is dividing the Nation into two societies, separate and unequal.

The diversion of this Nation's migrant workers from the mainstream of society has already occurred, and it certainly is separate and unequal. Many of the 1 million migrants are Mexican-Americans and their existence amounts to a day-to-day fight for survival. Even that existence is now being threatened.

Mechanization is taking over the farms, and even though thousands of migrant families still flock to the fields the demand for their labor is declining.

In Wisconsin, one of the largest food processors completely shifted to machines on its 2,000 acres of pickle fields last year. Of the 5,100 picking jobs migrants held last year in Wisconsin, at least 1,000 have disappeared through mechanization.

The Milwaukee Journal recently published an excellent series of articles on the Mexican-Americans, which made clear that the Wisconsinites who share this culture are undergoing the same ferment we see all across the country.

The title of the Milwaukee Journal series was, "Viva la Raza—Long Live the People." The author, Jo Sandin, reported:

Led by a whole generation of young men—articulate, eloquent in English as well as Spanish—the former migrants and immigrants from Mexico and Puerto Rico are beginning to realize that poor housing, dead end jobs, and political powerlessness are not inevitable.

Those in Wisconsin who are taking the leadership in seeking to help these disadvantaged people are learning an important lesson: Mexican-Americans want to make their own decisions and manage their own affairs. The spirit of paternalism and charity with which well-meaning people approached disadvantaged groups in the past is no longer acceptable.

Father John Maurice, a Catholic priest who directs a Spanish center on Milwaukee's south side, is limiting his activities to providing advice and support.

Mexican-Americans in Wisconsin and elsewhere—just like black Americans—also are no longer willing merely to be absorbed into traditional white American culture. While they want to obtain the educational, social and economic advantages available to white Americans, they want at the same time to preserve their authentic Spanish culture.

The Reverend Orlando Costas, 28, pastor of Milwaukee's Evangelical Baptist Church, protests the tendency of public schools "to crucify Latin culture," a

mistake which Americans often have made in their missionary zeal to make others "just like us."

The Reverend Mr. Costas says:

We need to develop the kind of educational system that takes into consideration the cultural background of the student, operates in a bilingual situation, and seeks to involve the parents.

This is a country which is linked geographically, politically and historically to our fatherland. Immigrants from Latin America are not cut off from their culture in the way that those from Europe were. As long as Mexico remains just south of the border and Puerto Rico just three hours away by air, there are going to be ties.

The Protestant, Catholic, and Episcopal churches of Wisconsin have developed a program, United Migrant Opportunity Services, Inc., to help the Mexican-Americans and other migrant workers in Wisconsin who are facing a bewildering array of problems as a result of mechanization of farming. The UMOs program, funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity, has helped some 700 families already with job training, job placement, adult education, Headstart and day-care programs. It is one example of the kind of program which is so desperately needed by our Mexican-American citizens.

The problems of Mexican-Americans are severe. There is no denying that fact. But there are Mexican-Americans who have made their way. Perhaps we should listen to them.

Armando Rodriguez, chief of the Mexican-American affairs unit of the U.S. Office of Education, says:

I suggest that the time has come to develop strategies in all communities for facing forcefully the imperative need for turning our attention away from the minority problem and toward the majority problem. This cannot be achieved by just being well informed on culture and language and racial and ethnic differences and how they effect the performance of youngsters in school. Being informed is, however, a first and vital step.

There are other steps that should be considered, too:

Substantially increasing funds of the Bilingual Education Act to meet the language needs of all Spanish-speaking youngsters, not just 10 percent of them.

Developing through local, State, and Federal Government cooperation areas along the Texas-Mexico border that today forces Mexican Americans into the migrant stream because of a lack of jobs.

Helping migrants who are so inclined to relocate in States that have better job and educational opportunities.

Recognizing that cultural and language integration must be as acceptable as racial integration.

There is no question that a number of Mexican Americans are being reached by the poverty program; a few have emerged as successful entrepreneurs, and a number have been trained in the Job Corps.

But for the most part Mexican Americans still live in a separate world, denied the full advantages and opportunities of American citizenship. Our experiences with the Negro show this is disastrous in a modern society.

We cannot have two societies—one black, one white. We certainly cannot have three societies—one black, one

brown, one white. To break these barriers, to heal these divisions, to lead these longstanding Americans into the full rights and responsibilities of citizenship, is one of the urgent challenges facing this Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the Milwaukee Journal's excellent series of articles be printed in the RECORD.

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

VIVA LA RAZA—LONG LIVE THE PEOPLE: SPANISH SPEAKING WANT TO CONTROL OWN DESTINY

(By Jo Sandin)

"El patron esta muerto! Viva la raza!"

In English that means: The boss is dead. Long live the people!

Those two sentences summarize what is most important in the events of the last nine months for Milwaukee's Spanish speaking community.

What they mean is simply this: Latin Milwaukeeans no longer are content to let someone else speak for them or run their lives.

This is not to imply that, before last August, there were no vocal, active Latin American leaders. Or that Latin Americans suddenly have decided to expel all non-Latins—Anglos (English speaking whites) and blacks alike—from their friendships, their communities and their organizations.

VIEWS CHANGED

It is just that, as Juan Alvarez, 23, of 830 W. Maple st., said: "The eyes of the people have been opened."

Led by a whole generation of young men—articulate, eloquent in English as well as Spanish—the former migrants and immigrants from Mexico and Puerto Rico are beginning to realize that poor housing, dead end jobs and political powerlessness are not inevitable.

Among other things, they are taking exception to the fact that many organizations working in the Latin community are run by Anglos.

According to the Rev. Orlando Costas, 28, pastor of the Evangelical Baptist church, 1231 S. 7th st., "This doesn't mean we're not interested in working with Anglos. This means that there is a sense of dissatisfaction with the idea that Latins cannot be involved in decision making."

ORGANIZED UNION

Jesus Salas, 25, said: "There are a lot of people who really don't feel we can do things for ourselves, who feel we Latins are children."

Salas, who organized Wisconsin migrant workers into a union, Obreros Unidos, and who led a migrant march on Madison to demand better pay and working conditions, now is program co-ordinator for a federal antipoverty program which seeks to move migrants out of the harvest cycle and into better jobs and houses.

The fact that he occupies that position in a drastically reorganized United Migrant Opportunity Services (UMOS) is a dramatic example of what the Latin community can accomplish when it is organized.

Salas, who works out of the program's Milwaukee office at 809 W. Greenfield av., sees himself not as the head of an agency, but as the implementer of programs planned in large part by former migrants throughout the state.

Last July things were different. The agency not only had a head, but a chain of command which included five top administrators. When agency funds were cut by the federal government, positions eliminated were those of counselors who dealt directly with the relocated migrants.

From the viewpoint of the administrators, except for a shortage of funds, the program was going well.

Many of the relocated migrants felt differently.

To them it seemed that UMOS was doing too much administering and not enough problem solving. By November, that discontent erupted onto the floor of a board of directors meeting at which the former migrants voiced their complaints for several hours.

RESIGNATIONS ACCEPTED

By January, the five top administrators felt sufficiently threatened by the furor to say they would resign if they were not given contracts to insure their jobs until the end of the program year.

To their surprise, the board's executive committee refused to grant the contracts.

In February, at a five hour board meeting attended by more than 90 relocated migrants and other Latin Americans, the executive committee meeting was declared invalid on a technicality, but the resignations were accepted.

In the reorganized UMOS, the staff members are mostly Latins advised by other Latins, the latter being the relocated migrants for whom the program was established and who now have a place in its operation, not as clients receiving social service, but as participants planning their own progress.

The change was not easily effected.

Armando Orellana, 28, who was a UMOS counselor before joining the staff of the concentrated employment program, explained: "In our community people are not familiar with parliamentary forms."

Esquiel Guzman, 26, who works with the Spanish Credit union, 524 W. National av., said: "This is a new experience to them. They're not used to participating in this way. Many people are too used to belonging to a club that means just going to weekly dances."

Salas said: "It takes so long. It's frustrating to realize how long it took to change UMOS and discouraging for people to see that all we have won is a lot of hard work."

Yet all three are convinced that the process, however tedious, is absolutely necessary.

The battle cry of the Spanish speaking revolution here may be the passionate "Viva la raza," but the tactics are strictly pragmatic "self-help through community organization."

There is healthy skepticism among these young men about how much government can or will do to help their people.

By abandoning the agency's casework approach to helping the migrants, Salas hopes to build self-help groups that would continue to solve problems if UMOS were to be abolished.

Even if the agency survives, Salas said, he does not plan to remain in his present position for more than a year or two.

"Then it's time to let somebody else have a chance, he said. "This is an unnatural way to work, perhaps, since usually people try to maintain their own positions, but it is the way to continue to build leadership."

"ANGLO" ADVICE IS ENOUGH FOR LATINOS

(By Jo Sandin)

Friends of the Spanish speaking community must learn how to offer advice without taking over if they are to be helpful.

That's the opinion of Jesus Salas, 25, the former Wisconsin migrant leader who is now program co-ordinator of United Migrant Opportunity Services, a federally financed agency to relocate migrants.

Salas, who has set a time limit on his own position, said that other individuals, especially those in the church, also will have to relinquish their dominant roles if the community is to build a supply of experienced leaders.

Salas said: "The church has been the source of the most sincere effort from the largest organized group to assist poor people. But it also has been too long in a position of 'patron.'"

SOME HAVE LEARNED

Some clergymen and nuns have learned how to overcome their impulse to run everything. These people remain our friends and true sources of help. But there are still churchmen who approach our people in the old role of shepherd of the flock. We don't need that.

The Rev. Orlando Costas, 28, pastor of Evangelical Baptist church, 1231 S. 7th st., is a clergyman who agrees with Salas.

Costas said: "If we clergymen are going to be effective, we are going to have to stop being prima donnas and take only advisory roles."

Father John Maurice, director of the Spanish center, 524 W. National av., increasingly has limited his activities to those of providing advice and support.

At the time when the community considered joining the NAACP youth council to protest alleged discriminatory hiring by the Allen-Bradley Co. last August, he stayed away from the decisive meeting, saying that he had been for too long their "gringo priest."

At that meeting, 75 persons loosely organized into a group called the Latin-American community, voted to form a temporary coalition with the youth council for the protest.

DEMANDS MADE

They demanded that Allen-Bradley hire enough Spanish speaking Americans to make up 5% of the work force, start a training program for minority group members and halt expansion which, they said, was destroying the Latin neighborhood.

At the time 14 Latins were employed by Allen-Bradley. Now there are about 55.

From the young men who participated in the Allen-Bradley protest, the Latin American Union for Civil Rights was born. The 98 member union is trying to organize the community so as to solve its own problems and to insure that Latin-Americans will have a say in policies and projects that affect them.

The union's president, Miguel Rodriguez, 29, said: "To show people we are not a racist group, we welcome Anglo and black members. We are seeking the free exchange of ideas. But they only have a voice in our meetings. When the decisions are made, it is the Spanish members who have a vote. It is they who speak then."

Determined to see that Latins have a say in programs which affect them, the union has been no more inclined to accept black patronage than Anglo patronage.

SPURNS TOKENISM

Costas said: "We have learned a lot from the black community. To a great extent, it is a matter of black and brown together. But we are going to accept tokenism from those who have complained of tokenism from whites. The concentrated employment program (CEP) is a perfect example."

CEP is a federally financed effort to recruit, test, train, counsel and place in jobs the hard core unemployed.

Spanish speaking CEP workers have complained that decisions affecting the course of the program are always made in terms of north side community needs. On Apr. 17 they walked out of a board meeting in protest of such policies.

"We are not against anyone," Rodriguez said. "But we are tired of taking leftovers and we are not going to continue to take handouts. We want to make the decisions."

To develop strong community groups from which Spanish speaking leaders can emerge, the civil rights union employs a full time community organizer, Ernesto Chacon, who recently completed a training program in California and Texas.

His first year's salary and expenses of \$9,000 were scraped together from various church groups and individuals by an interim board for Spanish community organization, which has since voted itself out of existence, deferring to the union.

The union is in the process of getting a three year grant of \$77,000 from the Inter-Religious Foundation for Community Organization, New York city, which the Rev. Lucius Walker, formerly of Northcott Neighborhood House, heads.

Rodriguez said the union hoped to become an umbrella organization over a number of Latin groups.

MANY INVOLVEMENTS

Therefore, it has involved itself in everything from promotion of parent involvement in a bilingual education school program (to be explained in a later article) to the development of a Spanish language newspaper, La Guardia.

The project that has attracted the most attention is the union's effort to win a model cities program for the south side.

Co-operating with a number of other community groups and some social service agencies, the union has held a series of meetings for Latin and Anglo south siders to inform them about the model cities program and to sound out community interest in the program.

Because of the model cities program's many sided approach to multiple problems, "it's natural for us to be interested in model cities and to feel we need such a program on the south side," Rodriguez said.

Members realize the effort may fail. Rodriguez said: "If model cities were the only thing we were working on, then that would be bad for us. But we have other projects already successful."

Costas said: "Besides, the whole concept of failure has to be part of community organization. We use failure as a way of going forward."

At an informational meeting, he told 70 south siders: "Even if we do not get a model cities program this time, if we get together, they will not be able to ignore the south side in future programs. They will see that we are tired of getting handouts, leftovers and raw deals."

This impatience is currently expressing itself in traditional democratic processes.

Juan Alvarez, 23, a member of the Union for Civil Rights, said: "Up to now, hope is a good word for what everybody in the Spanish community feels. I don't think losing hope is something we will feel until a long way from today."

Salas said: "I think if you say you can bring about a change by going out and disrupting things, I hope you know you have tried all other avenues, because in such cases it's only our own people who get hurt."

"There is still hope for us now. The community is responsive. People want to participate. I'll bet the black community was like this at one time."

"But they've been burned so much that a lot of people have given up on anything that comes from the power structure. That hasn't happened to us yet. I hope it doesn't."

YOUNG LATIN LEADERS SERVE PEOPLE

(By Jo Sandin)

Juan Alvarez, a 23 year old artist who grew up in Texas and Mexico, is designing a 48 by 8 foot mural on the theme to which he is devoting his life: "La raza."

On the walls of the inner city development project office at 12th and W. Mitchell sts., he will paint his expression of the phrase which has become a battle cry for the migrant movement across the United States.

He speaks about "la raza" as vividly as he paints.

"To me, it means my people, especially the underprivileged, those who in Mexico are called 'los de abajo' (those on the bottom)," he said. "It is an emotion that I feel. I will keep on doing and working for my people until their problems are solved. I have given all myself to this—la raza."

TWO VOLUNTEERS

Alvarez earns his livelihood painting. Most of his formal education has been in art. A friend, Esquiel Guzman, 26, who has a bachelor's degree in political science from Texas A&I university, works at the Spanish center's credit union, 524 W. National av.

Both are members of the Latin American Union for Civil Rights, which works to give Latins a say in policies and projects that affect them. Both attend the same community meetings—on a bilingual educational program for four Milwaukee schools, on a proposed model cities program for the south side.

And when working committees are organized, both volunteer.

Neither thinks it strange that a political scientist and an artist have the same commitments and exercise some of the same responsibilities. Neither should.

TRUE TO TRADITION

Alvarez is simply being true to a tradition in which such greats as Diego Rivera and Jose Orozco concerned themselves with improving the lot of the people they immortalized in Mexico's mural art.

And that tradition is just a small part of the culture he and his friend and their fellow Latin Milwaukeeans are trying to preserve and communicate to the community at large.

The Rev. Orlando Costas, pastor of Evangelical Baptist church, said: "There is a great sense of loyalty to friends. A friend is someone to be helped, someone to be treasured, someone to be looked forward to . . . even if he needs your help at 2 o'clock in the morning.

For a Latin, then, moving into a city where people don't even know the name of the family in the next apartment is "a shattering experience," he said.

Costas said: "There is a sense of coldness, of formality in non-Latin society. He feels hurt when he expresses his warmth and the Anglo does not reciprocate."

One Anglo who did not keep his distance, of course, was Robert F. Kennedy. Costas feels that was why the late senator from New York was so popular among Latins.

Another Anglo who is a friend of the Milwaukee Latin community is Father John Maurice, director of the Spanish center.

"Persons, rather than ideas or structures, are what excite enthusiasm," he said. "Milwaukee is very fortunate right now in having quite a few personable, able young men who inspire the response necessary to lead."

But it is not only the young who are interested in "la raza."

Mr. and Mrs. Ponce Renteria, 2179 S. 6th st., have lived in Milwaukee for more than 25 years. Their grocery store provides enough income for them to be considered among those who have "made it" financially.

She is treasurer of both the state and local Mexican-American Political Education committees. As its name implies, the group, which has 150 members in Milwaukee, is devoted to educating Latin Americans to their citizenship responsibilities. Members also promote better educational opportunities for Latins.

SENSE OF UNITY

Mrs. Renteria described the community: "Most newcomers at first move into the near south side around 6th and National, although some come to the near east side. Once they get established and get jobs, they move out wherever they can find better housing—to Bay View, to Greendale, Wauwatosa, Mequon."

But despite the dispersal and the economic success of some, there is a sense of unity, she said.

"Latins have a great love for any other Latin," she said. "It is a matter of saying, 'No matter how little I have, I am always ready to give a helping hand.'"

That helping hand is extended in at least one way that the Anglo community finds incomprehensible.

Mrs. Renteria said: "I remember what people said when the Puerto Ricans started moving in (about 10 or 15 years ago). The neighbors were scandalized. A landlord would rent to one person and soon there would be six or seven persons living in the house. They didn't understand."

TIGHT FAMILY TIES

To be a Latin in the United States also is to have strong family ties in a society in which the family is said to be falling apart.

"A child is taught that his parents give him the gift of life, and for this they can never be repaid," Mrs. Renteria said.

Therefore, Latins usually have other members of their family living with them. There is no question of putting a mother or a father in a home for the aged.

"We have a saying," Mrs. Renteria said, "that 'even if I have only one tortilla, half of it will go to my viejita.'"

The term means "little old lady," but it is used, she hastened to add, with respect, not with familiarity.

JOBS FOR PARENTS

Similarly, Costas explained: "Being a mother and a father are considered full time jobs. The Spanish parent has a total commitment to his child."

That does not mean that the Latin American family is what American sociologists call child centered. The child is given love, not license.

According to Mrs. Enriqueta Gonzales, 49, of 1125 S. 2nd st., it does mean that "we are very strict with our children."

She explained that in her family, "I am the one to give permission for things until the children are 12. The older children have to ask their father for permission to go some place or do something. They have to tell him where they are going and what time they will be back. And I have to report whether they are back on time."

These, of course, are the traditions. Not all families have maintained their strong ties.

Costas said: "What happens is that our family patterns are threatened in a real sense by the wealth and dominance of the Anglo community."

Even the absolute dominance of the man as head of the Latin family is being modified, Costas said. A group of Spanish speaking couples in his congregation had suggested recently that one of the responsibilities of the housewife ought to be to learn to speak English and to participate in the community.

"We want to be good American citizens," Mrs. Renteria said.

"But we also want to preserve our cultural values," said Costas.

Miguel Rodriguez, president of the Latin American Union for Civil Rights, feels that preserving the warm, human Latin culture in a society in which people complain of alienation, can be a gift from the Latin to his Anglo neighbors.

AVOID ANTAGONISM

"We want to preserve cultural differences without promoting cultural antagonism and prejudice," he said.

He said: "People tell me that because this is an industrialized, highly mechanized society, people come to the point that they just use each other for their own gain and benefit. I don't accept that. That's not any excuse for you to become dehumanized."

Cultural exchange between Latins and Anglos can enrich both, he said.

"Yet there is a danger, for the man from Puerto Rico, for the man from Mexico, who has something in here," he said, pointing to his heart. "There is a danger he will forget all that."

"That's why maybe it is better for everybody if he does not become 100% assimilated."

IDENTITY FOR LATIN CHILDREN PRESSED

(By Jo Sandin)

"Our children have no identity!"

That anguished exclamation from the Rev. Orlando Costas expresses the fear that underlies much Latin American criticism of Milwaukee schools—public and private.

Costas, pastor of Evangelical Baptist church, will be leaving that post soon to work full time with Latin youngsters as administrative supervisor of the Spot, a teen age gathering place at 810 S. 6th St., sponsored by Milwaukee Christian center.

"Our children grow up with a tremendous cultural and social ambivalence," he said.

SCHOOL PRESSURES

Costas knows what he's talking about, from experience. The situation was much the same in Bridgeport, Conn., where his parents moved from Puerto Rico when he was 12 years old.

In school he was urged to "pass for Italian." At church he was told over and over: "You cannot be this way."

By 1962, when he went to Inter-American university in Puerto Rico, where he also served as minister of a local church, "they had made me into a good New England pastor," he said.

Costas said: "I am just in the process of becoming myself. Not until I went back to Puerto Rico was I ever allowed to be myself. So I can look at some young people and see what they're going through—it is a conflict of to be or not to be what we are."

In the absence of Latin teachers, the ignorance of Latin culture on the part of Anglo teachers, and the counseling of Spanish speaking students to prepare for technical vocations rather than college, Costas sees an attempt of the educational system "to crucify Latin culture."

GEOGRAPHIC LINKS

He said: "This is a country which is linked geographically, politically and historically to our fatherland. Immigrants from Latin America are not cut off from their culture in the way that those from Europe were. As long as Mexico remains just south of the border and Puerto Rico just three hours away by air, there are going to continue to be ties.

"Yet our kids grow up learning about what the German and Polish and Italian immigrants did, but nothing about the contributions Latin Americans have made."

Lack of cultural awareness on the part of teachers complicates the basic problem facing Spanish speaking students in Milwaukee's schools—the language barrier.

Mrs. Ponce Renteria, of the Mexican-American Political Education committee which has concerned itself with improving the education Spanish speaking children receive, said: "Many children have never spoken a word of English until they go to school."

PUPILS FALL BEHIND

Even though they pick up the language as they go along, they slip steadily behind until many are two to three years below grade level, according to Father John Maurice, director of the Spanish Center.

Some even have a worse problem—they speak English without an accent.

Although their teachers cease to think of them as Spanish speaking, their English vocabularies are still limited enough so that they may miss a key word in an explanation or the crucial phrase in an assignment, Mrs. Renteria said.

"Latins are proud," she explained. "They do not want to have to ask for another explanation in front of everybody."

Even teachers who are not prejudiced need to supplement their good intentions with

some kind of cultural understanding, she said.

For example, a well meaning teacher may encourage a teen aged girl to participate in extracurricular activity.

"It does no good to tell that to the girl without winning the parents' approval," she said. "Many Latin parents are very strict. The girl may have to be home immediately after school every day. If she is not, her father may even beat her."

Mrs. Enriqueta Gonzales, president of the parent-teacher association at Vieau school, 823 S. 4th st., where 70% of the students are Spanish speaking, explained further.

"There are a lot of teachers who are very sarcastic, who don't respect the child," she said. "Children have their pride, too, and once you kill that pride, you can't get anything from them."

Spanish speaking students, Costas said, are routinely guided toward vocational training rather than toward courses that would prepare them for college.

PUPILS MISJUDGED

Mrs. Gonzales said: "Lots of the counselors don't tell the kids things they need to go to college, the courses they should take. Sometimes I think the teachers judge a child because he doesn't look like someone who would go to college, maybe because his clothes are wrinkled. Who knows? Maybe his family can't afford an iron."

Mrs. Renteria said: "Our children can do it, if they have the incentive."

Until now, it has been up to the family alone to provide that incentive.

As a high dropout rate among Latin students reflects, that is not always enough.

TELLS OF REASONING

Mrs. Renteria explained one of the reasons: "Many people who come here, especially migrants, have no more than a fifth or sixth grade education. So when Juan gets to be a sophomore or a junior in high school, the parents think, 'Juan is very well educated. Now he can stop school and start working full time.'"

That's why parental involvement in the schools is important, she said.

However, Mrs. Gonzales points out that involving Latin American parents has its difficulties.

In the first place, United States schools traditionally contact families through the mother.

"In our culture, the man is boss," she said. "That means he is in charge of the children's education as well."

The father often works at night, when school meetings are being held, said Mrs. Gonzales, and he's reluctant to have his wife leave home.

REQUIRES COURAGE

There is another problem.

"We look at the school with big respect," Mrs. Gonzales said. "Many people don't know English too well. They are scared to speak the wrong word. It happens to me. And to speak in front of teachers, you have to be brave."

Costas said: "We need to develop the kind of educational system that takes into consideration the cultural background of the student, operates in a bilingual situation, and seeks to involve the parents."

Such a system is being developed on an experimental basis for four schools at which there are large numbers of Spanish speaking students—Vieau, Holy Trinity, 621 S. 4th St.; South Division high school, 1321 W. Lapham St., and Lincoln high school, 820 E. Knapp St.

CITY GETS FUNDS

Under a 1967 extension of the elementary and secondary education act, small amounts of federal money are available to cities which want to develop pilot programs of bilingual, bicultural education.

Last September the Milwaukee public school system filed an application for such a

program. It has received \$45,000 for a one year pilot program, which, if successful, could be continued and expanded.

Coincidentally, the application was filed shortly after Father John Maurice, director of the Spanish Center, had filed a complaint about treatment of Latin Americans in the schools with the civil rights commission.

The committee planning the program includes five members of the community at large, two students (one from each high school involved in the program) and eight parents. All were elected at a public meeting Apr. 15.

BEWILDERING IDEA

Mrs. Gonzales, who is one of the parent members, is a bit bewildered by the idea of giving students an opportunity to learn both in Spanish and English from kindergarten on.

She explained: "For years they (the school system) have been telling us not to teach the children Spanish because they have to learn English."

Juan Alvarez, who was elected from the community at large, said he thought the program would be an advantage for both Spanish and English speaking students.

"Maybe if we had had this kind of a program long ago," he said, "we in the United States wouldn't be in such trouble in Latin America."

CERTAIN OF BENEFITS

Sister Charles Anne, director of the Guadalupe Head Start center, 239 W. Washington St., is certain of the benefits. "Our experience here has shown that small children who are made comfortable and at ease about themselves learn very easily," she said.

She sees another advantage: "I would hope that the principal result of such a program would be the development of a respect for whatever culture the young student has, so that he may be accepted as different, but not bad, and so that we may enrich all our students with what is best from each culture."

GOOD JOBS HERE ARE SCARCE, LATIN AMERICANS DISCOVER

(By Jo Sadin)

In terms of statistics, the employment picture in Milwaukee's Spanish speaking community is bright. In terms of people, it is grim.

Armando Orellana, 28, instructional supervisor for the concentrated employment program, said: "Any official will tell you how wonderful the employment situation is here in Milwaukee, how unemployment is lower than the national average, how many job openings there are."

Unemployment among Latin Americans here is hard to figure, since no definite current figures on the population here are yet available. However, guesses range from as low as 3% to as high as 15%.

According to Orellana, whose group attempts to coordinate all federal job development programs in the inner city, the real question is not how many Latins have jobs, but how many have good jobs.

The answer, Orellana said, is few.

For many Mexicans and Puerto Ricans who moved to Milwaukee to find better opportunities, the move has meant trading a \$25 a week job in a warm climate for an \$80 a week job in a cold climate.

For many former migrant laborers who left the harvest cycle for a place where their children could go to school year around, the move has meant abandoning the familiar rural life for the harsh big city ghetto, which they find terrifying.

Francisco Rodriguez, a job development specialist with the concentrated employment program, explained what happened to them.

LITTLE HOPE

With little formal education and less ability to speak English, he said, they take the

first job available, usually a nonunion position with no hope for advancement.

"That's the end of the world," he said.

Sometimes even a bad job is hard to find. Orellana said: "They tell us all about how many jobs are open. But when I send someone to apply for that job, they say: 'Have you a high school diploma? No? Then I'm sorry, we can't use you.'"

Unrealistically high job qualifications distress people like Rodriguez, who insisted: "You don't need a high school diploma to be a good machinist, if you have been trained as a machinist."

LANGUAGE BARRIER

In other cases, the language barrier has kept educated Latins unemployed.

Charles Salas, who also works with the program, told of a young man with a bachelor of science degree in social work who had two and a half years of experience in Puerto Rico.

Because he spoke virtually no English, he was considered unqualified for anything more than, perhaps, carrying skins in a tannery.

In a city and county where hospitals, the welfare department and other agencies which deal with Latin Americans have virtually no Spanish speaking employees, Rodriguez finds the young man's case ironic.

"The city and county are telling everybody else to help find jobs for the poor, but they're not doing anything themselves," Rodriguez said.

The concentrated employment program has funds for English classes, but they're in conversational English. Although this is necessary, the course doesn't help a person to fill out a job application properly. And it doesn't help him acquire the technical vocabulary he may need to get job advancement.

"Giving a person a job is not the solution," Rodriguez said. "The whole object is in upward mobility so that Latin Americans won't run into dead ends as the majority are now, spending the rest of their lives in entrance level jobs where hardly any skills are needed."

SEEKS VOLUNTEERS

The program office at 809 W. Greenfield av. is seeking English speaking volunteers to offer supplemental training in English. Similarly, the adult basic education program at the Spanish Center offers English instruction that is job related.

Rodriguez said: "We encourage them to come back to practice their English. But it is difficult. Many people have a long hour's drive across town to and from where they work. They find it is too hard to have a full time job and come back at night and study."

There also is the problem of apathy.

Salas explained: "The migrant has a fantastic ability to survive. He has worked for years in the fields with bad pay, bad housing, not enough food. But that kind of experience makes him resign himself. And even when he is in a position to work himself out of the hole, he cannot believe it possible. We have to motivate him."

The Rev. Orlando Costas, pastor of the Evangelical Baptist church, said there also was fear of risking something sure for something uncertain, even if it was the next step up.

He said: "Maybe a man makes \$80 a week. It still may not be enough to feed his family, but is more than he has ever made before, and he is afraid of losing it."

Providing motivation may be difficult, but it is not impossible.

Salas told of a migrant family of 10 relocated by United Migrant Opportunity Services. The man makes \$105 a week but knows he will never go any further unless he learns English. So he attends class from 8 a.m. to noon each day and then goes to work for a full shift at 2:30 p.m.

Rodriguez's job is to encourage companies to provide opportunities for such individuals.

He wants "upward mobility built in to any program of hiring the poor."

He spoke with pleasure of a truck drivers' training program that will teach Latins a skill that is in demand and help them get drivers' licenses, often unattainable for those with limited English.

Although some companies "play the different government programs against each other for their own benefit," Rodriguez said, he has met with co-operation by such firms as Borden Co. and Patrick Cudahy.

AGREEMENT WITH FIRMS

Some firms even have agreed to notify counselors from the employment program if one of the new employees is in danger of losing his job.

Often the matter is a misunderstanding of the kind Father John Maurice, director of the Spanish Center, described:

"The Latin is a member of a person-oriented culture. He moves to Milwaukee and gets a job. To his employer, the important thing is that the guy get to work on time. But then the guy's child becomes ill. If you are a Latin father, you are the head of the household and you do not leave it to your wife to bring the child to the doctor. This is your responsibility, and you perform it. Meanwhile, maybe you forgot to even to call the plant to say you'll be late.

SEEKING UNDERSTANDING

Rodriguez is trying to develop sensitivity programs in firms which employ Latins so that supervisors will be able to deal intelligently and sympathetically with such conflicts.

Counselors also tell new employees what will be expected of them.

But it is not enough to have co-operation from the companies.

Salvador Sanchez, field operations co-ordinator of the United Migrant Opportunity Services, which seeks to relocate migrants in better houses and jobs, knows of openings for unskilled workers in Hartford, Oshkosh and Beaver Dam.

The problem is to make those openings available.

They are not available, Maurice said:

When the job is 40 miles away from the only house a man can find for his family.

When there's no public transportation between a man's neighborhood and his livelihood.

When a man can't speak English well enough to get a driver's license and couldn't afford a car if he had a license.

Maurice told of 200 entry level jobs about which the Spanish Center was notified last year by the Mirro Corp. in Manitowoc.

"The problem was finding someplace for families to live," he said.

HOUSING, JOBS CLOSELY TIED IN LATIN COMMUNITY

(By Jo Landin)

To talk about jobs in Milwaukee's Spanish speaking community is also to talk about housing.

As the people at United Migrant Opportunity Services know, there is no way to separate the two problems. The service is a federal program which tries to offer migrant workers an alternative to the harvest cycle by relocating them in better jobs and houses.

Salvador Sanchez, 31, field operations co-ordinator for the program, said one of the complaints which led to its reorganization was that 75% of the persons relocated during the program's first three years had been brought to Milwaukee.

It would have been easier for them to adjust to a new way of life somewhere other than in a big city, he said.

CHOICE OFFERED

Under the program's new policy, migrants who want to relocate will be given a choice.

"There are lots of smaller towns—Beaver Dam, Hartford, Oshkosh—where there are jobs available the year around," Sanchez said, "if we could just get a few houses."

That's the hard part.

Father John Maurice, director of the Spanish Center, 524 W. National av., said: "It would be much easier for Mexican Americans or Mexican immigrants, most of whom come from a rural environment, to adjust in a semirural, small town setting. But there's no housing available for them."

FEW HOMES FOR RENT

Maurice said active discrimination wasn't necessary to keep people out of many places.

"This is the damnable thing about Wisconsin," he said. "This is the point on which you get a clear idea of the insidious nature of prejudice."

He said most small communities had very little rental property.

"What there is, is beyond the realm of possibility for a family living on the wages of a man in an entry level job," he said.

Ironically, Maurice said, many small Wisconsin towns were waging campaigns to attract industries which would need to employ the very people for whom there was no housing.

"This is prejudice," he said. "People think they can make money off the poor, but they don't want the poor to come and live with them."

Even federal housing programs help confine poor people to city ghettos, he said.

"When you analyze the federal programs for housing, you find that those of the most benefit to low income people can only be used in cities with a total program for urban renewal," he said. "And only two cities in the state—Madison and Milwaukee—qualify."

However, he said, public housing under present regulations really is not much of a solution to the problem facing Latin Milwaukeeans.

RELATIVES WELCOMED

The closely knit Latin family is an extended family in which the maiden aunt, the widowed uncle, and the aged grandparent are not merely tolerated, but welcomed into the home, he explained.

Yet regulations require that only the father, mother and children live in a public housing unit.

"A Latin—for whom the extended family is everything—says to himself: 'Who wants to live in such housing?'" Maurice said.

Ruben Garcia, a counselor with the migrant service, said: "It's real hard to get houses for large families. Nobody seems to want to rent to a family with more than five children, and most Latin families have more than five children."

RENT TOO HIGH

Where housing is available, he said, it's at rents of \$130 to \$190 a month, which is out of the question for large families with small incomes.

Another problem is location. Relocated migrants, for whom a large city can be a terrifying experience, understandably want to live near the largest concentration of other Spanish speaking people. Here, it is on the near south side.

Maurice said: "There is a more critical housing shortage on the south side than on the north side, a fact which many people want to ignore."

What was torn down for freeway construction and industrial expansion has not been replaced.

Some view the city's plans to expand the south side industrial park as a direct threat to the Latin community.

"They're zoning us right out of this area, just like they zoned us out of Juneau Vil-

lage," said Avelardo Valdez, 21, a senior at the University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee.

The housing left is old.

Sanchez said: "You know that migrants live under severe conditions in the field—in shacks, nothing more. So you know when you show a former migrant a house for rent and he says 'I cannot live in that!' what kind of housing we have available here."

Even where the rent is low, total housing expenses are high.

"People don't count on having to spend \$90 a month on heat," Maurice said. "That throws a lot of budgets out of whack."

CENTER MOVED

When the Spanish Center moved to its present location, a family moved into its previous quarters, a converted store at 818 S. 6th st.

It rented for only \$40 a month, Maurice said, but it cost \$80 a month to heat, even with plastic sheets on all the windows, "and still I had to keep my coat and boots on when I was working there."

Some of the housing is in considerably better condition according to Anthony B. Gruszka, inspector for the city health department in an area bounded by 1st and 8th sts., the Menomonee river and Lapham st.

In other cases, conditions are appalling, he said.

One large old house he routinely condemned once a year.

After Gruszka's annual warning, the landlord would put it back together again, using the cheapest materials, because he couldn't afford anything else.

ALL WORN OUT

Four families—a total of about 30 people—were living there.

Gruszka said: "With that kind of wear and tear and no yard space for the kids to play outside and the dirt from the expressway and surrounding industries, things are bound to wear out."

Now the house is being torn down to make way for a service station, he said.

Gruszka explained that he depended more on persuasion and warnings than on court orders.

There are many structures he'd like to condemn but can't, he said. The reason: "There's no place else for the people to go."

Maurice provided an example. Last year Gruszka condemned a house where a family with seven children lived. It took nine months for the Spanish Center and the welfare department and the health inspector himself to find them another place. The day after that family moved, the house was rented to another couple with five children.

"I advise people that a place is dangerous to live in and tell them they really should move," he said. "But there's no use in condemning one house if it means the family just has to move into someplace as bad or worse."

CASUALTIES IN VIETNAM

Mr. SCOTT, Mr. President, on July 17 and again yesterday, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE) noted in the Senate the number of casualties in Vietnam since the inauguration of President Nixon. I point out to the Senator that prior to President Nixon's inauguration, 30,000 Americans had been killed in Vietnam and another 192,000 had been wounded and 1,200 were missing in action.

These are tragic statistics—just as tragic as the number of Americans killed since January.

It does not help the cause either of winning the war or bringing about peace in Vietnam, however, to have these sta-

tistics labeled with a name. It does not help the men in Vietnam to label 50,000 of their casualties as Mr. Nixon's any more than it does to label 220,000 of their casualties as Mr. Kennedy's and Mr. Johnson's.

I submit that every effort is being made to bring this bloody and devastating war to a speedy end.

The cause of peace can best be served, I believe, by all Americans showing a united effort to bring about peace.

OUTDOOR RECREATION IN THE WEST

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, it gave me great pleasure to see that Newsweek magazine has joined the growing number of national publications which have acknowledged the tremendous benefits which millions of people now derive from multipurpose dam projects in the West. Reporting on the recent trip of our colleague (Mr. KENNEDY) and his party down the Green River in my home State, the July 21 issue of Newsweek observes correctly that before the advent of hydroelectric dams on the Green, the Colorado, and other western rivers, these streams were wild, unsafe for boaters, and wholly unmanageable. Only a handful of the hardest outdoors types dared brave their hazardous waters.

On the other side of the coin, some of the rapids have dried up in the summer in past times. Now, the article notes:

Daily releases of water at the Glen Canyon and Flaming Gorge dams keeps the Green and Colorado white-water rapids in interesting, manageable turbulence.

Now persons of all ages can safely enjoy the pleasures of those rivers.

That is just a part of the remarkable recreation picture in our reclamation West and throughout the Nation. It seems to me that a water recreation explosion has occurred. Each year additional millions are attracted to water's edge for swimming, boating, fishing, water skiing, and sun bathing.

According to the report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission to the President:

Water is a focal point of outdoor recreation. Wherever they live, most people seeking the outdoors look for water to swim and to fish in, to boat on, to walk, picnic and camp by, and just to look at. The demand for water-based recreation is increasing more rapidly than the demand for outdoor recreation in general.

The Outdoor Boating Club of America reports that some 40 million people participated in recreational boating last year. They spent about \$3 billion in retail purchases of equipment and they own more than 8 million boats. And skimming and banking in graceful precision behind those millions of boats are about 8 million water skiers; about 750,000 of these are newcomers to the sport within the last year.

Not to be outdone are more than 23 million licensed fishermen, who managed to spend about \$2.6 billion last year on assorted rods, reels, lures, boats, licenses, food and lodging. Then there is that increasingly popular sport: skindiving; a leading sports publication says

that there are now more than 3 million skindivers in the United States.

How did all this happen? Well, we naturally have to consider as basic factors the growing affluence of our country and the constantly increasing amount of leisure time available to our expanding population. But you have to have places to do all this and that is what river management—thanks to dams—has provided for our people.

And where are all these glorious recreation areas? The Federal Power Commission has a publication available now which gives a summary of the 515 reservoir-lakes and the more than 6,200 recreational facilities that are maintained for the use of the American public at hydroelectric power projects in the United States. It was my purpose to discuss only the recreational values of dams today; I will take up their many other economic and human benefits at a later date.

I ask unanimous consent that the Newsweek article be printed in the RECORD.

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

RAFTING THE RAPIDS

Sixteen soaked and sunburned members of the Kennedy clan, led by Sen. Edward M. Kennedy and accompanied by an equal number of assorted congressmen, boatmen and mountaineers, celebrated last July 4 weekend by shooting the rapids on Utah's Green River. The Kennedy pontoon rafts bounced, slithered, submarined and skyhooked down 63 miles of boiling white water, carrying the group on the kind of four-day river trip that is the freshest Western tourist bit since the invention of the dude ranch.

The West's turbulent rivers are drawing thousands of summer thrill seekers. In addition to Utah's Green and San Juan rivers, vacationers are riding the Colorado River through mile-deep Cataract Canyon, Marble Canyon and the Grand Canyon, gliding through the scenic Tetons on the upper Snake River in Wyoming and adventuring on the Salmon River in Idaho. National Park Service officials estimate this season that about 12,000 float-boaters will brave the Colorado and Green River rapids alone.

One reason for the boom in white-water boating is that historians are focusing attention on the centennial of John Wesley Powell's pioneering 1869 exploration of the Green and Colorado rivers. A hundred years ago, on May 24, Powell, a one-armed, self-educated geologist, began his historic run down the Green to its junction with the Colorado, through a vast region marked "unexplored" on the maps of the day, and on through the Grand Canyon, to emerge—1,000 miles, three months and six days later—at the site of today's Lake Mead.

DANGERS

Powell's ten-man group started off in the face of reports that the rivers vanished underground, plunged over waterfalls higher than Niagara, and were inhabited by savages. The dangers were hardly exaggerated. Two of Powell's four wooden boats were wrecked, most of his supplies were lost, three members of the party were killed by Indians and the surviving explorers emerged from the Grand Canyon near starvation and total exhaustion.

Powell left behind some moving descriptions of his trip. Camped in Lodore Canyon, the same area the Kennedys ran, Powell noted in his journal: "This evening as I write the sun is going down, the shadows are settling in the canyon and vermilion gleams and roseate hues are slowly changing to

somber brown above. Black shadows are creeping over them below and now it is a dark portal to a region of gloom, the gateway through which we are to enter tomorrow. What shall we find?"

COMFORT

Today's Colorado River tourist still finds awesome sights—sandstone pinnacles, prehistoric cliff dwellings—but his white-water trips make quite a contrast to Powell's journey. Most canyon adventure seekers arrive by jet at Salt Lake City, transfer via feeder airlines to Vernal, Utah, or Page, Ariz., and travel to the white water in air-conditioned station wagons. At an average cost of about \$30 a day per person, boating firms provide plenty of comfort along with roller-coaster spins through the rapids, furnishing everything from bedrolls and cots to portable toilets. And at the end of a day's runs, the vacationer can cool off under white waterfalls, while his dinner broils over a charcoal fire.

The boating itself is usually safer than driving on U.S. highways. Since 1949, river runners have been using uncapsizable World War II surplus pontoon rafts, equipped with outboard motors to stabilize the raft, prevent swamping and keep voyagers from being swept past good camping spots. Even the rivers themselves have been partially tamed. In the past, some of the rapids have dried up in the summer. Now, daily releases of water at the Glen Canyon and Flaming Gorge dams keep the Green and Colorado whitewater rapids in interesting, manageable turbulence.

BUILDING CONTRACTS SHAKE-DOWN

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Philadelphia Inquirer of July 20, 1969, contained an article entitled "Former Housing Aide Tells of 'Shakedown' on Building Contracts," written by Donald A. McDonough and Leonard J. McAdams.

In the article Frank M. Steinberg, a former director of the Philadelphia Housing Authority, is quoted as having made the charge that developers seeking to obtain contracts with the housing authority had been forced to make contributions to the Democratic City Committee in order to get on the approved list to rehabilitate used housing.

This is a serious allegation, and in view of the fact that Federal money is involved in this program I am asking the Attorney General of the United States to investigate.

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:

FORMER HOUSING AIDE TELLS OF "SHAKE-DOWN" ON BUILDING CONTRACTS—STEINBERG ACCUSED OF "IRON RULE"

(By Donald A. McDonough and Leonard J. McAdams)

A former top official in the Philadelphia Housing Authority told the District Attorney last February that developers had to make contributions to the Democratic City Committee to get on the approved list to rehabilitate used housing.

The required contribution was believed to be \$500, he alleged.

He also charged that Frank M. Steinberg, who resigned last week as chairman of the housing authority, operated it like a "feudom"; that he pushed for a firm partly owned by his brother to get 100 houses approved for rehabilitation, and that some firms got financing at inflated interest rates from a prominent Democratic contributor.

FORMER AIDE

All this reportedly was told by Christy P. Emerson, former director of development for the Philadelphia Housing Authority, in an interview last Feb. 24 with Assistant District Attorney Robert E. Gabriel.

Gabriel confirmed Saturday that he had met with Emerson in February but he refused comment on the nature of the interview.

Emerson, known in his professional field as a "good-government" man, is reported to have said he would be willing to repeat his allegations under oath and, if necessary, go before a grand jury.

The only string he attached to his offer was the assurance that something good would come of it and not just publicity.

IRON HAND RULE

Steinberg was pictured by Emerson as ruling the activities of the housing authority with an iron hand. At one point when the members were approving developers, Steinberg suddenly came up with the name of Cotler Associates. Herman Steinberg, Frank's brother, is a partner in this firm.

Herman and his partner Paul Cotler were arrested on charges of obtaining money under false pretense in District Attorney Arlen Specter's preliminary investigation which led to his petition for a special grand jury investigation.

Emerson testified before that grand jury on Thursday. The district attorney's office flew him in at a cost of \$300 to testify from Berkeley, Calif., where he is a housing consultant.

LAUDED BY TATE

Frank Steinberg's resignation as chairman of the Housing Authority was disclosed Thursday by Mayor James H. J. Tate who said the resignation was accepted with regret and recounted Steinberg's long service in many positions with the city.

In conjunction with other development firms, Steinberg, 69, had participated in the erection of some of the newest and largest additions to the center city landscape.

The district attorney's office apparently had not intended to call Frank Steinberg before the jury until all phases of the authority's activities had been looked into.

CANNOT BE FOUND

But with the announcement of his resignation the D.A.'s office set about to call him in when they found he could not be located. Reporters visiting his American Steel Engineering Co. in East Falls were told he was out of the country.

First Assistant District Attorney Richard A. Sprague ordered a subpoena for him and Gabriel set up a telephone search that stretched to California, Florida and some of the offshore islands where a passport would not be necessary.

Two weeks ago it was disclosed that Steinberg had sold his holdings in Citizens Bank of which he is a director. Oddly enough it was a suit by Steinberg and Sander L. Field, chairman of the bank, which also helped spark the grand jury investigation.

BANK SITE

They had purchased a property on 16th st. for use as a banking site and this was later included on the block-square tract the Redevelopment Authority assigned to National Land Investment Co. for development.

This firm is headed by Jack Wolgin, chairman of the Art Commission, and a staunch supporter of Mayor Tate—as had been Field.

Field charged the Redevelopment Authority members with conflict of interest and filed the suit which eventually was settled out of court.

But the charges had already attracted public interest and were made part of Specter's petition for a special grand jury. The project, called 1500 Market Street, had ground-breaking ceremonies last week. Known now as Center Square it takes in the

area between Market and Ranstead, 15th and 16th sts.

Field had testified three times before the grand jury before entering the hospital for treatment of a heart condition. This condition has prevented his appearance before the jury since.

THE POTENTIAL OF OCEANOGRAPHY FOR HAWAII AND THE PACIFIC

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, the role of Hawaii and the Pacific in oceanography was the subject of an informative speech given in Honolulu by Dr. Edward Wenk, Jr., executive secretary of the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development.

In his keynote address before the Governor's Conference on Oceanography on June 26, Dr. Wenk discussed opportunities in two different dimensions: from the points of view of Hawaii as a pivotal State in our national effort; and second, as a staging area within the Pacific basin, from which to mount new efforts that will mark this region's special maritime development.

Dr. Wenk performed a real service not only for the State of Hawaii but for all who are interested in the potential of the vast Pacific Ocean in the future of oceanography.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Dr. Wenk's address be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BEFORE THE GOVERNOR'S CONFERENCE ON OCEANOGRAPHY, HONOLULU, HAWAII, JUNE 26, 1969

(By Edward Wenk, Jr.)

It is always a great pleasure to return to these gorgeous islands and to your gracious and unforgettable hospitality. And, it is a very great privilege to be your keynote speaker before this distinguished audience on this occasion to discuss Hawaii's Stake in the Sea.

Although our Nation has a proud maritime legacy, no one of our 50 States has a greater claim to a significant involvement with the sea than does Hawaii. Matching its oceanic geography is the vision of your leadership. Governor Burns, your congressional representation in Washington, your scientists, and your citizens, have long understood the potential role of the oceans in the destiny of this State. And they have also perceived the unique contributions Hawaii could make to our Nation's and the world's effective use of the sea.

This conference, first responding to the challenge recently presented by the National Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources, can be the turning point in matching opportunities with action. To this end, I bring you special greetings and good wishes from Vice President Agnew—the Chairman of the Marine Sciences Council. As a former Governor, he especially recognizes the value of state initiatives and welcomes this partnership with the Federal Government.

In a few opening words, I should like to paint a backdrop about your opportunities—opportunities in two different dimensions: from the points of view of Hawaii as a pivotal State in our national effort; and secondly, as a staging area within the Pacific basin, from which to mount new efforts that will mark this region's special maritime development.

These remarks are bound to reflect a viewpoint from the Nation's capital. But I in-

tend to emphasize an underlying theme to our goals and our plans, however—a recognition that the ideas, the capabilities, the leadership and even some of the capital will come from the grass roots. Thus, in speaking as a "Potomac Oceanographer," I am also eager to listen and to learn as to how Hawaii views the future—nationally and internationally.

OUR NATIONAL INTERESTS

For a Nation with strong maritime origins, it is a paradox that this interest has waxed and waned. Since 1959, when a National Academy of Sciences report reawakened our Nation to the untapped potential of the sea, that neglect has fortunately become a matter of continuing policy-level attention.

Two circumstances stimulated this new outlook:

We have begun to recognize that the resources of the sea may help meet our Nation's and mankind's most pressing economic and social needs, and

A new marine technology has evolved that will make these aspirations possible.

The Congress, even before the executive branch, sensed these converging forces. Beginning in 1959 and continuing to this day, both branches of Government are probing the question of whether the Nation is adequately equipped to meet this promise of the sea—equipped in terms of oceanographic research and engineering capabilities, but also whether it is equipped in terms of institutions by which the energies of the Federal Government, and the energies of our States, industry, and universities can best be mobilized, strengthened and welded together in what would be a truly national effort.

We have made progress toward that end. As Vice President Agnew has characterized this era, the 1960's have been a "Decade of Preparation." The decade of the 70's should be the "Decade of Realization." Thus, today we are at one of those hinges of history by which our collective decisions may make a considerable difference as to how promptly and how effectively we make the future happen.

THE DECADE OF PREPARATION

As to the Decade of Preparation—funding for research and exploration has increased since 1959 by over a factor of five. We have added 50 ships of 65,000 tons to our oceanographic fleet. Training and education has been sharply emphasized so that today we are enrolling ten times as many graduate students as a decade ago and annually conferring six times as many Ph. D. degrees.

I am among those who have been impatient in getting on with this job. But we must not let impatience blind us as to how far we have come, how primitive, feeble and inadequate were the beginnings of this endeavor. And how steady has been our course during these ten years in not being lured into unproductive side roads, but in assembling the tool kit for the longer pull ahead.

This Decade, at least the latter part, must be characterized yet a second way—in terms of a transition from scientific oceanography to one which now adds, a concern for human affairs. The result of this broadening of perspective has been:

To elevate concerns as to use of the sea to a new policy level of consideration in the Federal Government;

To bring these opportunities to a policy level of interest among industrial leaders, university presidents, State officials and statesmen throughout the world.

To study the potential of the sea: to contribute to world order and humanitarian concerns; to preserve the environment for esthetic and spiritual values; and to foster economic growth and well-being.

In other words, we have sought to control and bring to the service of man the forces generated by what Victor Hugo called "an idea whose time has come."

Put another way, we have identified new maritime solutions to old problems and we

have taken steps to make these solutions work:

To match the productivity of ocean fisheries and means of producing protein concentrate with the critical problem of imbalance between the burgeoning population and world food supply;

To anticipate the accelerated concentration of urban areas along our coastlines, and provide for harmonious accommodation among competing uses of our seashore, our wetlands, our bays and estuaries;

To make sure that the increasing volume of pollutants generated by an industrialized society are not simply dumped further downstream;

To turn to the sea for economical sources of petroleum, gas, and minerals to match the requirements of a growing industrialized society whose appetite for fuel, ore and chemicals is growing exponentially;

To recognize that the sea still furnishes the most economic highway for the commercial transport of bulk commodities;

To tap our knowledge of the sea to improve forecasting of weather and storms, and to "learn the code" for eventually controlling climate;

And finally, to recognize that cooperative endeavors among nations to explore the oceans may be a further step to unite rather than divide mankind.

In examining these peaceful uses of the sea, we must not forget that the oceans have played a significant role in national security. As our Nation enlarges its quest for world peace we have had to maintain whatever naval forces are required to assert a persuasive seabased deterrent and undersea warfare capability, to balance our military forces with a maritime versatility and readiness to meet the uncertainties that lie ahead.

The most significant event that marks the transition from oceanography to marine science affairs was passage in 1966 of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act.

The Act declared it to be a policy of the United States "to develop, encourage, and maintain a coordinated, comprehensive, and long-range national program in marine science for the benefit of mankind"; assigned responsibility to the President to give the field necessary leadership and direction; created an interim Cabinet-level, policy planning Council, chaired by the Vice President, to help set goals and strategies, coordinate resources of 11 Federal agencies internally and with many interests that lie outside the Government; established a public advisory commission to recommend major next steps, especially related to Federal organizational structure—a Commission of 15 distinguished citizens and four congressional advisors.

MARINE SCIENCES COUNCIL

Immediately after the legislation was signed in 1966, the Council was activated and has since operated as a creative, goal-oriented body, seeking to relate the oceans to the full spectrum of national objectives. It has sought to establish targets and priorities, to identify unmet needs and opportunities and to eliminate marginal ones, to isolate impediments to progress and to coordinate Federal programs of 23 bureaus to insure that the Government speaks with one voice. It has sought to improve communications among participants in ocean activities, for example, through consulting with private industry to ascertain its views on needs for reasonable investment incentives, and with State officials.

As you know, the Council was designated to expire a few days from now, on June 30. The Congress, however, recognized the significant contributions to be made by the Council in advancing its mandate. And the Administration, in examining the Council, considering it to be an effective instrument of Government well-tuned to the management concepts of the new President. On May 23,

President Nixon signed the bill extending the Council's life for another year.

As to the Council's actions—the past three years have seen identification of a number of steps to meet the needs and opportunities mentioned earlier to assist in the War on Hunger, through a new Food-from-the-Sea program; to improve our comprehension of the sea, chart its resources and foster international cooperation in ocean exploration, through an International Decade of Ocean Exploration; to strengthen multi-disciplinary research and broaden our sources of manpower, by implementing the Sea Grant college legislation; to insure safety of life and property at sea, developing and putting into effect contingency plans to meet potential disasters from massive oil spillage; to meet conflicts in use of the coastal zone where people and the sea meet, laying the groundwork for both quality standards in our bays and estuaries and for locally or regionally managed coastal authorities responsible for land management in the public interest; to foster development of marine resources, it has taken steps to evaluate international law that would preserve the traditional freedom of the seas, create incentives for private investment, and recognize the legitimate interests of all nations in eventual benefits from that portion of the deep ocean floor beyond national sovereignty.

As a further step toward world order, this Administration has just laid before the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference a draft treaty which would limit the arms race by prohibiting emplacement of nuclear weapons on the seabed of the deep ocean.

MARINE SCIENCE COMMISSION

January 7, 1969, is yet another milestone in the Decade of Preparation. On that day the Marine Sciences Commission submitted its report after two years of intensive deliberations. One of your distinguished citizens—Taylor Fryor—was a member of that Commission and he must share the satisfaction of praise for a job well done.

The new Administration acted promptly and deliberately to examine these proposals. Almost immediately after his inauguration, President Nixon requested the Marine Sciences Council to review that Report and recommend immediate steps. Despite the problems which attend any major transition in Government, this study was accomplished. By March 27, comments from each individual Council member had been solicited, and analysis completed by the President's Science Adviser and the Council's Executive Secretary. Vice President Agnew then recommended to the President: (1) six priority areas for immediate attention, selected out of over 100 proposals by the Commission; and (2) procedural steps to evaluate within the broad context of a review of Federal organization the Commission's major, albeit controversial, proposal to establish a new independent agency—the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency.

The President has accepted these V.P. recommendations and issued instructions for all agencies to take the Commission proposals into account in their planning for 1971 and beyond; task groups have been established by the Council to evaluate these six areas in terms of Government-wide goals and programs, and the President's Science Adviser is examining marine affairs in the context of science and technology across the board.

These six priority areas, incidentally, are to: foster wise and productive use of coastal resources through encouragement of state action for coastal zone planning; expand exploration of coastal and deep sea resources and strengthen weather forecasting services; improve the competitive position of the U.S. fishing industry; establish national/regional laboratories and provide a stable base of support for them; establish a legal regime for the deep ocean floor that will encourage development of ocean resources; initiate a long-

range Federal contract program in basic marine technology.

We are not standing still. We are taking positive, deliberate and logical steps.

The President's Cabinet is considering these possibilities now as no prior Cabinet has ever done. The President's Council on Executive Organization was requested to give early attention to the question of NOAA in the time scale that could permit the President to make decisions and recommendations to the Congress on marine affairs in phase with other initiatives when he lays proposals of his Administration before the Congress next spring.

This is the national framework in which we look ahead to the decade of realization.

This is the perspective of national policy in which context all of the participants in the oceans can examine their roles, make their decisions, commitments and express their views to provide guidance to Washington as to what the people want.

Each State has a role to play. The coastal states have a special responsibility because they hold the coastal resources in trust for their citizens.

They decide how the mineral resources beneath coastal lands and the territorial waters are to be exploited. They decide how best to utilize the living resources of these areas. They decide how lands and waters are to be altered to benefit their people, and which uses should receive preference in the inevitable trade-offs which result. The States, through their universities, colleges, technical institutes, and extension programs furnish a substantial number of the researchers, scientists, technologists and other trained manpower needed to investigate and make use of the oceans and the coastal zone.

HAWAII'S ROLE

Thus Hawaii has an unprecedented opportunity to assess its surrounding marine environment and to contribute its experience, its talents, its vision and its resources to advance our own Nation's stake in the ocean. You have the opportunity to consider the opportunities related to our national activities in shipping, coastal development, fishing, mineral extraction, weather prediction, and exploration.

But Hawaii can do more. For one thing, the oceans are inherently international. Washing impartially the coastlines of over 100 nations, the oceans serve as a bridge of commerce and of culture. This State has known the strategic importance of the Pacific largely pivoted around the sea as a shield and as a lifeline to support ground forces and supply allies during conflicts of the Pacific basin. World War II, Korea and Viet Nam are still fresh in our memories. Now, however, we look to the oceans in terms of their potential for peace.

Since 1966, international interests in the oceans has sharply increased. This Nation has even taken the initiative in many forums to encourage other nations to examine their role so that the oceans will not become another site of conflict that has historically marked exploitation of all of our land frontiers. The world has much to learn about this evolution, with fishing boats still being seized off of Latin America, the *Pueblo* captured in international waters, with the Soviets and other nations expanding their influence in distant seas. The U.S. response to this challenge lies in sea power but in new dimensions related to the oceans as a vehicle for commerce.

THE PACIFIC BASIN

This Pacific basin has its own special challenges, and I look forward to its own special response. The people who border the Pacific basin are characteristically imaginative and energetic. Hawaii is the melting pot of these different races. You speak all languages.

Our own States of California, Oregon, Washington, Alaska and Hawaii are distinguished by their frontier spirit. Many of the

other Pacific nations—Japan, Korea, Australia are noted for their entrepreneurship. This is a region where things can happen.

You may question whether the Pacific basin is a natural entity for development, since most human progress is categorized by function rather than by geography.

History reminds us, however, of the development of the Mediterranean 3,000 years ago. The evolution of human culture, the development of political power, the extension of trade, largely involved transactions across that inland sea. It is hard to conceive of that epic in human history in the absence of either the Mediterranean or the activities that transpired on it.

It might be hazardous to consider the Pacific as an exact analogy. For one thing, people today can reach other lands by air, and in fact, prefer this over sea transport. Nevertheless, technology is shrinking oceans so that in terms of transit time and in terms of traffic, the Pacific today must closely resemble the Mediterranean of 3,000 years ago.

Not only has technology shrunk the oceans, but has stimulated the tempo. It is not only feasible but economically advantageous to use the sea in carrying fuel, ore and chemicals that an industrialized society requires. With the development of bulk sea carriers, particularly since the 1957 Suez crisis, the cost/distance factor has been so radically altered that coal can be shipped from Norfolk, Virginia, more cheaply to Japan by ship than to Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, by train.

Nations are linked together by such trade, but there are other political and economic factors which add significance to the family of nations bordering the Pacific.

Until World War II, many of these nation states were colonies or dependencies which looked to one mother country or trading entity for political and economic guidance. Now these nations have become independent. Notwithstanding the diversity of interests and levels of economic and political development, they all share a rising sense of nationalism and all are faced with similar expectations by their citizens for a rising standard of living.

While these nations strongly defend their independence, they have become increasingly aware of regional cooperation and as a consequence there are a growing number of harbingers of such advances. The Asian Development Bank, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, reflect but a few and this trend of cooperation is being extended to the oceans as well.

One of the measures of this progress is the rate of change of gross national product. The free world as a whole for which statistics are more readily available, show signs of doubling GNP over the next ten years. Omitting the United States, which as a heavily developed nation has by comparison a moderate rate of growth, the other Pacific basin states are expected to at least triple their GNP during this interval. United States exports to the Pacific basin are expected to double by 1980, but exports from the region are expected to quadruple. Among the phenomena reflected by such growth are triangles of trade involving today Australia, Japan and the United States, but we should expect other similar developments involving many other of these nations.

The political complexion and the economic promise of this area have sharpened attention on the Pacific for its resources as well as its function as a highway. Protein deficiency exists in many of the nations bordering the Pacific almost in close proximity to uncaught fish off these shores. Oil discoveries off the Indonesian coast and favorable geology in the Yellow Sea suggest that the emerging fuel requirements may be met even closer to home than is the case today. Air transport, though it might be thought of as competitive with the sea, has actually proved a boon to development of the region and no

area more than Hawaii recognizes the growth in recreational industries stimulated by the quick, convenient transport of people scarred by urban living on the mainland. The attractive setting and salubrious climate of the Pacific maritimes become yet another resource which is often overlooked.

Finally, we should not forget the oceans as a source of weather or climate and the influence which the Pacific Ocean thus has through its currents on the weather of all of its surrounding States and the mainland North America.

With the enormous size of the Pacific basin and its growing interest, we are immediately struck by the relative lack of knowledge of this region of the earth.

PACIFIC EXPLORATION

Here lie the incentives for exploration and if there is any single lesson we have learned in recent years about marine sciences, it is that our explorations must proceed simultaneously from two different motives—from scientific curiosity of the world around us and from the urgency of need.

Again, as we reflect on past events, we recognize that these same motives propelled explorers around the Pacific and from the Old World to the New. The quest for treasure and the quest for knowledge have become almost completely satisfied on the continents, but in the oceans we have just made an elementary beginning. To some extent we have been handicapped by a poor memory of even how to explore. Our early sailors frightened by the violence and the mystery of the sea sought mainly to traverse it quickly to meet the opportunities of the distant shore. But with 20th century marine technology, the sea is no longer hostile. Today, man can do on, in, or under the sea any of the things he long sought to do but was limited by his own frailty.

We are making a beginning. The United States has between 30 and 40 oceanographic ships operating all over the Pacific. Satellite navigation has improved the precision of ship location and observations from space provide us with precise charts and data on currents and sea state. Buoys are being deployed to study the formation and progression of thermal anomalies to increase understanding of their influence on continental weather; even the farmer in Kansas will benefit from what we learn of the Pacific weather machine.

Circumstances today thus weave new cohesiveness within the Pacific basin, particularly in terms of sharing knowledge about the environment that affects all the nations bordering the region, about the potential of resources and about the technologies by which they may be transformed to use, for a rapidly developing economy.

How will we go about planning exploration of our largest ocean basin?

The first step is to collate and assess all available data about ocean characteristics, and to interpret those data to delineate marine resources: unused fishery stocks, seabed manganese nodules, pockets of oil and gas.

This is the theme of the International Decade of Ocean Exploration.

This proposal is not merely a continuation of past efforts, but has several unique aspects. The approach anticipates a sustained exploration of the basin, planned and coordinated on a long-term basis, in contrast to the sporadic efforts of the past, developed project by project; is oriented as much toward delineation of marine resources as toward science, and is thus broader than past scientifically oriented oceanographic research programs; envisages more deliberate coordination of overlapping international interests; foresees an intensified effort toward more systematic collection of data and prompt dissemination, with particular attention to adoption of internationally agreed-upon standards to maximize the value of the data as a commodity for international exchange.

SCIENCE FOR COASTAL DEVELOPMENT

Understanding the marine environment must include inshore as well as remote reaches of the Pacific. The coastal margin—where ocean and land meet—is itself a resource, both scarce and perishable. On the mainland by the year 2000, 50 percent of our 300 million citizens will be located on 5 percent of our land—along our coasts. Management of that resource is essential, yet it is hopelessly fragmented by political subdivision, torn by conflict between competing private interests and the public interest; confused by greed for short-term versus long-term gain. We need scientific data to understand natural forces at work—waves eroding beaches and starfish decimating marine life; and information to predict consequences of man's own insults to his environment. With better knowledge, we can generate criteria to illuminate choices and bolster political courage.

As Thoreau admonished: "What is the use of a house if you haven't got a tolerable planet to put it on?" In other words, matching our advances in scientific knowledge must be creation of legal, administrative and institutional machinery to assure a rational development of these marine resources—with a foresight we did not enjoy on land.

We can also utilize scientific knowledge to create new industries.

One promising step in that direction is already being undertaken in our Strategic Trust Territory of Micronesia. The South Pacific Commission has recently approved a joint project with the United Nations Development Program to set up the South Pacific Islands Fishery Development Agency to identify, survey, and seek new ways—including through aquaculture—to increase fishery output in this vast area. (It would be nice to think that such developments would ultimately help reduce Hawaii's own high cost of fish.)

CONCLUSION

To summarize, Hawaii has a critical role to play in the effective and intelligent use of the sea: to contribute to your own economic development, to the growth of our Nation, and to the viability of the entire Pacific Basin. Lest I be misunderstood, I do not want to suggest that the oceans are a panacea for all of man's needs for food, for fuel, for living space. But they have been a neglected region of our planet and an untapped resource that—like our land frontiers—will yield to vision, to determination, to willingness to take risks, and to an appreciation that long-term investments will pay off.

You have a major role to play. You are at a crossroads for commerce, with a strategic reach into a rapidly developing heavily populated Asia. You are a focal point for recreation, for shipment of cargo, for naval deployment. You can also be a focal point for that part of the International Decade of Ocean Exploration which is inevitably to be carried out on a regional basis, perhaps as a data center. You can be a site for mounting and industrial development of the living and nonliving resources of the sea, which I predict will be more rapid in the Pacific than in any other ocean.

Your human resources are already developed—in your private laboratories, your universities, your state facilities and Federal facilities close at hand. Political leadership of your state recognizes this promise. You have all of the ingredients of success.

The challenge is to "turn on your ignition switch."

Your new Commission is undertaking its study of "Hawaii and the Sea" to convert these opportunities to plans for action. I would urge you to be bold but realistic—that you adopt a long rather than short, opportunistic view—that you blend together the basic elements of science with the other factors of engineering, economics, law, public administration, banking, and finance that carry the science into the real world.

This is perhaps the most difficult part of your undertaking. Scientists and bankers inevitably speak different languages. Even scientists from one discipline have trouble communicating with those from another. Simply having representatives of different interests around the table does not guarantee understanding. But this state, of all states, is multilingual, and I am confident that you will succeed.

In closing, may I offer you assistance from the Council. We have learned, for example, about the problems of bringing together the centrifugal interests of competing Federal agencies. I suspect at a different scale you may have the same problem within your state government. We have learned the importance of listening to what people outside the Government want. We have learned that many good ideas fall for want of follow-through.

We have learned that it is necessary to couple together the knowledge producers and the knowledge consumers—to consider the whole maritime system if we are to realize the true potential of the sea.

But most of all we have learned that the oceans offer a fresh vehicle for man to realize his noblest aspirations.

We welcome you as a partner in this adventure.

BLACK ECONOMIC UNION OF KANSAS CITY, MO.

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, the Greater Kansas City chapter of the Black Economic Union recently celebrated its first 400 days of service to the Kansas City community. This organization is a branch of the National Black Economic Union, a group devoted to involving the black community of this Nation in the mainstream of American economic life.

I had the privilege July 12 of touring the new headquarters of the Kansas City chapter and of visiting several businesses that have been started or assisted by BEU during its brief but auspicious history.

BEU is led in Kansas City by Mr. Curtis R. McClinton, Jr., the executive director. He works with a talented and able staff of individuals concerned with the future economic advancement and involvement of the black community.

Curtis McClinton has been a star for the Kansas City Chiefs for 7 years. During the early years of his career in professional football, Curtis became involved in numerous successful business enterprises in the Kansas City area. He was instrumental in establishing the first black-controlled bank in Kansas City, Mo. During 1968, McClinton started the local chapter of BEU with the cooperation of many civic-minded local residents. At a recent dinner celebrating its first 400 days, the Kansas City chapter was recognized by Jim Brown, the founder and president of the national organization, as the outstanding branch of BEU and McClinton was cited as the BEU director of the year.

The efforts of Curtis McClinton and his colleagues in the work of BEU in Kansas City are, indeed, praiseworthy. In this era of strident extremism, racial tension, unfulfilled promises, and frustration, the work of this group is deserving of the support of those interested in economic and social justice for all Americans.

The activities of this organization are motivated by the desire to assist black Americans in achieving a traditional American goal—economic prosperity and independence.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that editorials, published in the *Kansas City Times*, of July 15, 1969, and the *Kansas City Call* of July 18, 1969, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the *Kansas City Times*, July 15, 1969]

GOALS OF THE BLACK ECONOMIC UNION

The celebration the past week of the first 400 days of the Greater Kansas City chapter of the Black Economic Union took note of that young organization's impressive achievements. But characteristically, the meetings and most of the talk were directed toward the future. No one knows better than the men and women of the B. E. U. that the task has just begun of tearing down the barriers that have retarded black enterprise and Negro ownership of businesses in this country.

National officers, including the founder, Jim Brown, cited the Kansas City group as an outstanding chapter that has set the example for generating community support and participation. Brown observed that Curtis R. McClinton, the local executive director, established the Kansas City chapter before the national organization could help financially.

Primarily, the B. E. U. serves to help establish Negro ownership of businesses and to assist those already in existence. It is a complicated and many-faceted operation that helps arrange financing and makes available advice in taxation, insurance, credit and the numerous other important details that can mean the difference between success and failure. It also stands as a challenge to the total American economic system that cannot be ignored.

Essentially, the B. E. U. is saying that it is playing by the rules of the economic game as they have evolved and that it expects the co-operation, understanding and normal assistance to which black entrepreneurs are entitled.

At a time when the economic system is criticized as inflexible and unresponsive to large areas of human need, the B. E. U. is asking whether the system has room for people who have been on the outside and denied the opportunity to make use of their own talents and initiative. The successes so far of the organization are an encouraging trend. But the ultimate answer is ahead, and the entire community has a large stake in a fair and beneficial conclusion. The objectives of the B. E. U. are reasonable, logical and in the interests of us all.

[From the *Kansas City (Mo.) Call*,
July 18-24, 1969]

THE BEU'S FIRST YEAR

The Black Economic Union, which has just celebrated the completion of its first 400 days of operation in Kansas City, is an asset to this city in more ways than one and we congratulate it upon the long list of achievements it has chalked up over so short a period of time.

The BEU, as it is popularly known, has demonstrated in a tangible way its value to Kansas City as a whole as well as to the black community. In one short year, it has assisted in the establishment of 14 new businesses and has been instrumental in creating 65 new jobs. This in itself is no mean accomplishment. If it had done nothing else in its first year, the BEU would merit applause.

But its success is deeper and broader than that.

Dedicated to assisting black people enter the mainstream of American economic life, the B.E.U. has made inroads during its first year that offer untold possibilities, year probabilities, for the future.

The Black Economic Union follows the policy of self-help on the part of the black business man and at the same time utilizes resources in the white community for finance and expertise. This involvement of the total community is one of the basic tenets of the B.E.U.

The Black Economic Union is not a "union" in the ordinary sense of the word but it does seek to promote unity in the black community and among segments of the whole community. And the Black Economic Union is not "black" as its name might imply. Rather, it seeks the cooperation and affiliation of individuals and businesses of all types, regardless of race or ethnic background. The awards which the B.E.U. presented to firms and individuals at its annual Awards night, which climaxed its week-long first-year celebration, are indicative of the wide-spread cooperation which the new organization has received.

Jim Brown, founder of the B.E.U. and principal speaker at the banquet, put it well when he said: "We are not Uncle Toms and we are not radicals. We do not believe in separatism but neither do we believe in bowing down. We are for self-help and black pride. We also believe in whites and blacks working together."

In emphasizing the economic development of the Negro, the B.E.U. is concentrating on a long-neglected area in the Negro's struggle for freedom. It is working on the Negro's weakest link in the first-class citizenship chain. The Negro has reached the top in many fields—entertainment, sports, music and the professions, but in business and industry, he lags behind.

The Black Economic Union, in Kansas City and in the four other cities in which the B.E.U. operates, is striving to bridge this gap in our development. With the exception of Negro newspapers, Negro insurance companies and funeral establishments, Negro business has been limited in the past to small retail, service operations and we have too few of these.

Getting jobs for Negroes in other people's businesses is progress. But helping black people establish businesses of their own and thus provide employment for themselves and others will lead to a strong economic base.

We are proud of the far-sighted, unselfish athletes like Jim Brown, founder of the B.E.U., and our own Curtis McClinton who are using their money, their time and energy and their prestige to help strengthen their race rather than wasting their talents in frivolous activity and luxurious living.

WITHDRAWAL OF FEDERAL FUNDS FOR NEW ORLEANS EXPRESSWAY

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the Saturday, July 19, issue of the *Washington Post* contains an article written by Wolf Von Eckhardt on the Department of Transportation's recent withdrawal of Federal funds for the controversial riverfront expressway in the historic French Quarter of New Orleans. In my view, both Secretary Volpe and Assistant Secretary Braman are to be complimented for the action they have taken to preserve portions of our national history from the relentless pressures of development.

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:

VICTORY IN NEW ORLEANS

(By Wolf Von Eckhardt)

In one of those surprises you hardly dare hope for, these days, a powerful former road contractor has stopped a road.

Moved by what people all over the country who care about America's cityscape consider enlightened civic conscience, the Secretary of Transportation, John A. Volpe, has withdrawn Federal funds for the controversial riverfront expressway in the historic French Quarter of New Orleans.

The name of this enlightened civic conscience is James D'Orma Braman.

Braman was Mayor of Seattle and now holds the unlikely title of Assistant Secretary of Transportation for Urban Systems and Environment.

Urban transportation systems, he believes, ought to be balanced and the environment livable. What is more, Braman is optimistic and thinks it can be done. The Nixon Administration is starting to do it, he says with conviction.

"Look," he explained in a recent interview, "we have already saved the Vieux Carré (as New Orleans' French Quarter is locally known) and we are rapidly moving toward a Mass Transit Trust Fund."

And Volpe, too, must be aware that taking Braman's advice on the New Orleans decision has suddenly made him a hero among the very people who thought of him as a freeway bulldozer with shoes on.

The Vieux Carré is unique, of course. But the ten-year-long battle to save it from being mortally mauled by an elevated freeway has followed the same plot as the freeway battles in other cities—Washington, San Antonio, Philadelphia, New York, San Francisco, you name them.

In New York it was Robert Moses, in Washington it was Harland Bartholomew, who, almost a generation ago, doodled their prescription for the city's salvation on an Esso map. At the time these planners believed as firmly and sincerely that carving up the city with superhighways would cure traffic congestion as the medics of a century ago believed that leeches would cure cancer.

Then came the Highway Act of 1956 which, as a matter of national defense, ordained that the Federal Government, through the Highway Trust Fund, pay 90 per cent of all interstate freeways. This made it all but irresistible for the cities to convert the doodles on the map into six- and eight-lane concrete ribbons. If you are broke, it's not easy to pass up a chance to take all that money.

Most planners, not to speak of those concerned with poor peoples' homes, neighborhoods and public parks, soon saw that the leech cure did nothing but drain the lifeblood from the city. The mayors eventually did too.

But the lushly endowed doodlers prove very tenacious. They promise suburbanites a 60-mile-per-hour trip to work and back home to that martini. They are supported by Congressmen who get more campaign contributions from highway contractors than from displaced blacks.

And in New Orleans, as in Washington and other cities, the newspapers uphold the conventional doodle wisdom because they are prone to uphold the wisdom of the downtown merchants. The merchants think more cars will bring more trade. Though, as Victor Gruen put it, not even a Cadillac has ever brought a nickel's worth of merchandise.

What is more, whenever the freeway doodle system was challenged, the highway engineers would run another study which, of course, always proved what it was paid for to prove, namely that the first doodle was absolutely the last word of proven need and efficiency. Independent studies—in New Orleans and Washington they were made by the renowned systems analysts, Arthur D. Little—were ignored or poohpoohed.

Whether or not, in the face of indifferent Congressional unreason, Volpe can do anything about the Washington freeway-subway stalemate, his New Orleans decision may at last break this disastrous mold.

Nor was the decision only negative. At the urging largely of Congressman Hale Boggs (D-La.), the Federal funds withheld from the Vieux Carré will be spent on New Orleans' beltway, which, by most accounts will much benefit the city.

Much of the credit for the New Orleans victory goes, of course, to New Orleans' devoted preservationists, notably Martha G. Robinson and Mark Lowrey and their lawyer, Louis F. Oberdorfer. It must also go to the President's Advisory Council on Historic Preservation which backed them in their hope of developing the Vieux Carré riverfront into something the whole country can be proud of.

But when Braman, investigating the conflict for Volpe, found it "irreconcilable," he didn't mean just the conflict between old iron grillwork and elevated combustion engines.

He knows, as Lawrence Halprin, the San Francisco environmental designer, told the highway builders last year, that if historic preservation could succeed in New Orleans, "we may in fact turn the whole course of urban design in America."

Braman is no emotional anti-freeway fighter. Deep in his sixties, the former lumber and hardware business man looks and talks just like one.

As Seattle's mayor, Braman devised what is probably the Nation's one transportation plan that is truly integrated with a social and physical development plan for an urban region. If New Orleans had such a plan, it would have avoided a lot of infighting.

To develop it, Braman also devised what is now known as a comprehensive design team. It is comprised of not just highway engineers, and transportation experts but also architects, sociologists and other specialists in the various aspects of urban ecology.

The difference between Braman's design team and those that are now much publicized in Baltimore, Chicago and other places was that, in effect, he, the mayor, headed it. He was the usually missing link between paper planning and political action.

But to put such workable urban design into effect, the Federal Government must make it just as easy for the cities to get help for public transit transportation as it is to get freeway subsidies for private cars.

That is the idea of the Mass Transit Trust Fund, which Braman and the mayors are working for. He hopes to see it enacted by the time the present highway act expires in 1972. From then on, under new legislation, two-thirds Federal highway and mass transit trust fund money would be equally available.

SENATOR PACKWOOD ON
THE SURTAX

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I commend the junior Senator from Oregon (Mr. PACKWOOD) on the extremely thoughtful and persuasive speech he made yesterday on the surtax.

He outlined the issues clearly. This Nation is in the grip of inflation which, unless checked, will seriously distort our economy and weaken the dollar. Inflation is a tax on those who can least afford it. When prices of food, clothing, and housing go up constantly every American suffers and especially those on low or fixed incomes.

The President is doing what he can. He is reducing the Federal budget in every way possible. The Federal Reserve is attempting to restrict the flow of credit. It is now up to the Senate to take

responsible actions in line with those of the President. The surtax package we have before us would yield the Federal Government \$9.1 billion in additional revenue in fiscal 1970. This is needed to withdraw that amount from the stream of spending in this country and to enable the Federal Government to run a substantial budget surplus.

This is a nonpartisan issue. The economy of the country is at stake. To those who insist that tax reform must be coupled with the surtax. I say that the economy of the country cannot wait. Tax reform is coming and this year. The President has pledged it, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee has pledged it, I pledged it.

We must pass the surtax quickly, and I again commend Senator PACKWOOD for so well pointing out why it is needed, and needed now.

A POET'S EYE VIEW OF HUNGER

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the poets continually surpass those of us who are confined to prose to express our views.

I offer in support of this conclusion two pieces of poetry dealing with hunger which have been brought to my attention.

One is a poem written in April 1917 by Joseph Gladden Hutton, which appears in the April 1969 issue of the South Dakota State University Alumnus, illustrated by a photograph of an appealing little girl taken by Chuck Cecil on the Sisseton Waheton Indian Reservation in my State.

I ask unanimous consent that his poem, "Hunger," appear in the RECORD at this point.

The second poem is by a local author, Mr. Milton Hoffman, of 5800 Broad Branch Road, who hoped that it might be printed on the fence now surrounding Lafayette Park, but the space had already been committed to the Society for Historical Preservation by the National Park Service. As a consequence, Mr. Hoffman gave me his verses, captioned "Priorities," and they are worthy of circulation. I wish every American might read them. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

HUNGER

(By Joseph Gladden Hutton)

Behold me!
The arch enemy of all mankind am I!
All peoples I destroy.
Their bodies I consume.
Their souls I blast until their Maker
In their hideous forms
No longer sees His image.
With blood-shot eye and sunken cheek,
With ashen lip and wolfish fang I come.
The infant at its mother's breast
As my first prey I claim
When the fount maternal shrinks
And no longer satisfies the emptiness
Which only death can fill.
The aged and the ill,
Yielding up their last bit of strength,
Succumb: and, torn with mortal pain,
Are crushed in my relentless jaws
To appease my savage rage.

The maiden chaste her virtue flings to me
And to the lowest depth of shame descends
To save her rotting body from my greedy
maw;

But without avail, for she is mine
And she must be consumed.

The stalwart youth cannot escape me.
The groom who swore his bride to cherish,
The father and the mother,
The husband and the wife,
Damn all the ties of love and of humanity
And slay and gnaw each other
In their vain attempt to live.

Through the land I stalk
And leave behind a prospect hideous.
And my great ally is War.
When War has stormed the ramparts of
humanity,
Behold! I come. Beware!

PRIORITIES

(By Milton Hoffman)

What shall this park address
To those who do not eat
What shall this nation say
To those who cannot stand?

When will this nation learn
That all of us should weep
If there is one child hungry
In this land?

When will this nation learn
We should address ourselves
To building children
Saving men?

When will our statesmen learn
That happiness
Can but exist
When there is peace 'mongst men?

U.S. TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. President, the U.S. Training and Employment Service—long so overburdened with paperwork that it was able at times to render only the most cursory service to employer and applicant alike—has entered the age of automation.

Two experimental operations—the Baltimore Job Bank, a simplified print-out of job openings which is updated each night on the same computer that writes unemployment compensation checks during the day; and the Utah man-job matching system, a more sophisticated operation requiring computer equipment with random access and mass storage facilities—have proven the value of an automated employment service.

The Labor Department plans to duplicate the job banks in 36 additional cities and to extend the Utah system to three additional States within the next year. In line with President Nixon's wishes, a nationwide computerized job placement system is projected within the next 5 years.

Writing in the July 1969, issue of Business Management, Secretary of Labor George P. Shultz notes that the old system has at best "been frustrating for the applicant and harriving for the overburdened interviewer."

Secretary Shultz points out that the cost of fully automating the Federal-State employment service system is estimated at \$83 million annually.

He adds:

But the benefits of such a system are many. In human terms, the Baltimore prototype has already demonstrated improved

manpower services to the disadvantaged . . . In terms of sound business practice, the advantages of full automation are obvious.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article, entitled "New Management Boom: Automated Federal-State Job Placement," be printed in the RECORD.

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

NEW MANAGEMENT BOOM: AUTOMATED FEDERAL-STATE JOB PLACEMENT (By George P. Shultz, U.S. Secretary of Labor)

The U.S. Training and Employment Service has entered a new era—an era in which machines are aiding the men who, it was feared, they might one day replace.

The employment service has long been overburdened with paperwork—and the volume has increased markedly since the start of the drive to aid the disadvantaged. The result has been that trained professionals have been forced to devote their time to clerical work—time sorely needed for counseling and job development.

At best, it has been frustrating for the applicant and harriving for the overburdened interviewer.

Automation is changing all that and, at President Nixon's request, automation of the Federal-state public employment system is among the Administration's top priority items.

Two basic approaches have already been tried—The Baltimore Job Bank, a relatively simple, inexpensive system, utilizing existing equipment, and the Utah man-job matching system, a more complex statewide system in which the machine can match applicant with job in a matter of seconds.

BALTIMORE JOB BANK

The Baltimore Job Bank has proven highly successful in its first year of operation. It utilizes a second generation computer which is used during the day to write unemployment compensation checks. At night, the computer updates and prints out lists of job openings throughout the entire metropolitan area.

Each morning, about 30 sets of the Job Bank Book are distributed to desks in the Baltimore central local office and to 15 "out-reach" stations at key points throughout the metropolitan area. The book normally contains about 10,000 current job openings, arranged in DOT (Dictionary of Occupational Titles) code sequence. Training slots and orders from the National Alliance of Businessmen, the organization that spearheads the drive for jobs for the hardcore unemployed, are included in the listings.

The computer listings contain such information as the amount of education required, physical demands of the job, working conditions, whether bonding or security clearance is required, and whether a handicapped person would be considered, in addition to type of job and rate of pay.

Although many of the jobs listed require little or no experience, the Job Bank also shows openings for professionals—e.g., orders for a marine architect at \$14,000 and a group of flight analysts at \$7,000–\$17,000 were on a recent listing. Baltimore employers have become aware of the efficient service rendered under the Job Bank system and are increasingly turning to it for needed personnel.

A battery of order-takers, usually numbering eight, records new openings received during the day. If these openings are not filled the same day, they are key-punched after the offices close to appear on the Job Bank lists the next morning.

UTAH JOB-MATCHING SYSTEM

The Utah man-job-matching system is a pilot operation which became fully effective at the end of January. It requires more sophisticated computer equipment with ran-

dom access and mass storage facilities and is, therefore, a more expensive undertaking.

The computer is located at the central office of the Utah Department of Employment Security at Salt Lake City, with video data terminals and terminal printers in three local offices—Salt Lake City (serving about 300,000 population), Ogden (90,000) and Logan (30,000). Other local offices of the Utah agency batch and mail orders and applicant information to the central office, where they are matched overnight, or they may telephone urgent requests to the computer center or to one of the three pilot offices for immediate access to the data bank.

Within the next year, we plan to extend the Utah matching system to three additional states which have more complex labor markets. Installation of this sophisticated system as a nationwide network is projected for completion within the next five years.

In the professional field, the Department has taken a number of other steps toward facilitating the matching of applicants with jobs. In California, for example, where a three-city system known as LINCOS (Labor Inventory Communications System) connects Sacramento, San Francisco and Los Angeles, it was found that some feasible matches of higher-level applicants and jobs were being missed by reliance on DOT codes alone. As a result, the development effort in California now centers around the creation of a computer-resident vocabulary covering professional, managerial and technical jobs, which will supplant the DOT codes.

Even without this refinement, however, the LINCOS system has succeeded in placing a \$50,000 a year bank vice president who was squeezed out in a merger and a 78-year-old civil engineer who staked his last hope for a new position on the computer's job-hunting ability.

Another development is the installation of a self-service system in our professional placement offices. The idea is to offer better service to professional applicants and to employers seeking professional help by giving them immediate exposure to all available openings. It eliminates the need to spend time with an interviewer when both applicant and employer know just what they are looking for.

The professional offices in New York and Washington, D.C. are already operating on a self-service basis, although the system in New York to date is limited to jobs in the social work, academic and medical fields. The Chicago and Milwaukee professional offices expect to be on a self-service basis this summer and we anticipate that the system will ultimately be extended to the entire Professional Office Network operating in 103 cities.

The self-help concept has been operating in Washington for about a year and in a new ground floor location, where it is known as an Information Center, for the past six months. About 300 applicants per week use the center, where they have free access to a series of loose-leaf books broken down by occupation and geographical location. In addition, in some specialized fields, other books are available containing listings of both job openings and applicants compiled by our Convention Placement Service, which services 25–30 conventions each year.

Again, automation has entered the picture in the form of National Employment Registries for selected occupations—an outgrowth of our Convention Placement Service. Six such registries now exist—three in Washington for the American Anthropological Assn., the American Statistical Assn. and the American Correctional Assn.; and three in Chicago for the American Library Assn., American Economic Assn. and American Philosophical Assn.

Applications for jobs in any of these specialized fields are recorded on microfilm and can be automatically retrieved in seconds. Detailed resumes may be obtained from the files.

The Washington office also maintains on microfilm an Overseas Personnel Registry, containing applications from about 500 men and women, displaced as a result of the recent cut-backs in State, United States Information Agency and the Agency for International Development. Many of these individuals have experience applicable to private industry in this country or abroad—e.g., small-scale industry development, program development, or public information. Employers interested in this source of personnel may write or telephone the Washington office or contact their local public employment office.

A similar registry for retired military personnel is now in the process of development by the Washington office. It is expected to be helpful in locating suitable civilian jobs for those whose entire work experience has been in the military.

The cost of fully-automating the Federal-state employment service system is estimated at \$83 million annually—to be borne in its entirety by the Federal government.

But the benefits of such a system are many. In human terms, the Baltimore prototype has already demonstrated improved manpower services to the disadvantaged.

In terms of dollars and cents, if the more direct service provided by computer-aided systems were to result in a reduction of the unemployment rate by as little as 0.1%, the approximate increase in wages would be \$600 million annually and unemployment insurance would decrease \$50 million.

In terms of sound business practice, the advantages of full automation are obvious. Not only would the worker find his job faster, but the employer would have immediate access to information about availability anywhere in the nation of the skills he needs for his office, factory or service establishment.

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT NEEDED FOR THE FUTURE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the repeal of the investment tax credit will result in some additional revenue for the Federal Government but at the expense of much greater Federal revenue in the future. That lost revenue would have been generated by the increased productivity made possible by the investment tax credit. I oppose the repeal of the investment tax credit because it is not only bad economics but because it cannot effectively influence our present inflation.

The impact of the removal of the credit will not take effect until the last quarters of 1970 and early 1971. By that time, repeal will not be needed or will be hopelessly inadequate to control inflation. As a matter of fact, the need for repeal as an anti-inflationary device is seriously questioned by Secretary of Commerce Stans' statement on June 23, that "we expect inflation control to begin to show substantial results in 2 or 3 months."

The wisdom of the repeal of the investment tax credit should be judged then on the past experiences of our economy and the future needs of our businesses.

The investment credit was established in 1962 because of our totally inadequate pace in plant expansion and modernization during the fifties. The investment credit has done much to help productivity keep pace with expanding needs but the expansion in capital expenditures was not such as to eliminate its need.

Pierre Rinfret, a noted economist and adviser to President Nixon, estimates that in real noninflation terms, our pri-

vate capital investment did not rise from 1966 to 1968, and the real rise in 1969 is going to be small. At the beginning of this year, it was estimated that capital expenditures for new investment would be 14 percent higher than last year. Today it is quite obvious that capital expenditures will only be 7 to 8 percent higher. It should be remembered that inflated prices distort these figures. In terms of constant dollars, the present expectation for an increase in capital expenditures this year will probably be no more than 4 percent. A 4-percent increase in expenditures for plant and equipment is neither inflationary nor even adequate for our inevitably growing economy.

A soaring population, a shortage of skilled manpower, a technology explosion, and continued exposure to world trade makes the investment credit as necessary for the future as it was for the past.

Everyone talks about free trade but few are willing to implement measures that will make free trade possible. With our high standard of living and high labor cost, does anyone think we can compete with foreign producers in labor costs? If the United States is to compete in the world markets, we must have higher productivity made possible by the most modern techniques and equipments. The investment credit is one of the very few measures assisting American industry to remain competitive with foreign producers. Overseas industries enjoy not only low labor cost but also investment credits of their own as high as 25 percent.

The repeal of the investment credit would seriously injure our competitive position in world trade, with grave consequences for our balance of payments and monetary stability. For these reasons I oppose repeal.

Let me say to Senators who remain unpersuaded by my remarks that a temporary suspension of the credit would have the same alleged benefits as outright repeal, but would offer greater flexibility. If it should turn out that the effect of removal is detrimental to our economy, the administration would at least be able to respond with a quick restoration of the credit. I have, therefore, introduced a bill (S. 2648) that would suspend the credit for 1 year as an alternative to repeal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the Journal of Commerce of July 15 which states:

The arguments advanced by the Nixon administration for repealing the investment tax credit appear to have lost much of their relevancy.

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

TAX CREDIT REPEAL CASE WEAKENING: BUSINESSMEN BELIEVE POSSIBILITY OF REFORM LESSENS REPEAL NEED

(By Sidney Fish)

The arguments advanced by the Nixon Administration for repealing the investment tax credit appear to have lost much of their relevancy, owing to new developments in Congress and in the economy.

Businessmen have been strongly opposed to the "permanent cancellation" of the investment tax credit requested by President

Nixon. They have already sustained a substantial profit squeeze since Jan. 1, 1968, as a result of the 10 per cent income tax surcharge. Termination of the 7 per cent investment tax credit, as of April 18, as proposed by the administration, would mean \$3 billion to \$3.5 billion in additional income taxes for corporations.

The income tax rate has climbed, even before the proposed cancellation of the investment tax credit, to higher levels than prevailed before the two tax reductions of 1964 and 1965.

NEW FACTOR

A new factor in the tax outlook is the possibility that meaningful tax reforms will be enacted at the same time that the surtax is extended by Congress or shortly thereafter.

The tax reforms, if broad enough, could provide sufficient revenue to balance the federal budget. Businessmen contend that this would eliminate the need for the funds that would be provided by the termination of the investment tax credit. The tax reforms would basically be felt by individuals with large incomes who have successfully used tax avoidance provisions.

Furthermore, recent developments have shown that the anti-inflationary brakes have begun to grab even before the proposed termination of the investment tax credit.

OVERKILL OF THE BOOM

Retail sales have not shown real strength for months, housing starts have declined, and in the capital investment field, major corporations, such as Chrysler and Leasco have announced substantial cutbacks. To rescind the investment tax credit would represent an overkill of the boom, businessmen believe.

To obtain extension of the surtax, it now seems likely that the Nixon Administration will have to agree to such tax reforms as a levy on tax-exempt foundations; a reduction in the oil depletion allowance, and a minimum tax on individuals with great wealth who have avoided income tax payments through ownership of real estate, etc.

Altogether, it is possible that revenues obtained from these new taxes may reach a substantial sum. The federal budget will be balanced, in that event, even if the investment tax credit is not cancelled, particularly if deescalation of the war in Vietnam continues, and costs are reduced by further pullbacks of troops from the numerous overseas bases.

ORIGIN OF PROPOSAL

The proposal for cancellation of the investment tax credit had its origin in forces that have lost their urgency. First, it was felt that the rescinding of the tax credit would slow down the investment boom. But plant investments already seem to be leveling off, as a result of the money squeeze.

Groups who were opposing tax reform also thought they could work out a deal in Congress under which tax relief would be ordered to some low income groups and the investment credit would be ended, in return for an indefinite delay in passing any tax reforms.

Now this deal appears to be dissolving in thin air, like the smoke of the cigars of the lobbyists who were proposing it in Congress.

The average stockholder has already made a full contribution towards balancing the federal budget, through the increased tax payments paid by corporations under the surcharge as well as through his tax payments on dividends. The surcharge boosted corporation rates above the levels prevailing in 1963, prior to the tax cuts of 1964 and 1965. Taxes on individuals, on the other hand, remain lower than they were in 1963. Corporation earnings have failed to make any progress since Jan. 1, 1966, while living costs have risen 4 per cent a year.

The investment tax credit is needed to stimulate industry to modernize and expand, businessmen say. Such efforts tend to control inflation in the long run. Moreover, incen-

tives for investment are needed to enable U.S. corporations to compete with overseas industries. The latter not only enjoy investment credits running as high as 25 per cent, but they also have the advantage of low cost labor.

CASE AGAINST REPEAL

The case against repeal of the investment tax credit was summed up yesterday by Edwin A. Locke, Jr., president of the American Paper Institute, before the Senate Finance Committee.

"All the evidence we have examined has convinced us that repeal of the investment credit would expose the economy to grave and unnecessary risks. It would aggravate the long-term inflationary danger, do major harm to the nation's foreign trade, and dangerously retard our rate of economic growth.

"Moreover, repeal might well produce a major downturn in the economy. Already new investment in 1969, measured in constant dollars, has fallen far below earlier calculations. The full impact of repeal would not be felt until 1970-71. By that time, current anti-inflationary measures will almost certainly be slowing down the economy, and the additional pressure resulting from repeal would be dangerous.

"In advocating repeal, the report of the House Ways and Means Committee assumes that capital expenditures by industry in recent years have been excessive. In fact, however, our economy is now suffering from a deficiency in productivity which is pushing wages and prices upward."

TAX EXEMPT "FRINGE BENEFITS" FOR BUSINESS EXECUTIVES

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) recently placed in the RECORD an article I wrote for True magazine about tax loopholes, exemptions, and subsidies.

At the outset of that article I mentioned a circular I had seen issued by a New York business concern which offered for a tax-deductible fee, a service for business executives who wished to learn a variety of ways in which Federal income taxes on sizable personal expense items, otherwise taxable, might be avoided. Personal expenses involved include vacations, college expense, life insurance, auto expense, and some others.

I have had a number of requests for the circular, or the material on how to avoid taxes. It occurred to me that members of the Committee on Finance might also be interested in the tax-avoidance advice our citizens are getting. I am sure some citizens, not able to take advantage of such tax loopholes, would also like to know how others do it.

In order to make the information I have on the subject available to the public and the Finance Committee, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD the circular or letter sent out by Prentice-Hall, Inc., entitled: "These Great 'Fringe Benefits' Tax Exempt to Salaried Executives."

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

THESE GREAT "FRINGE BENEFITS" ARE TAX-EXEMPT TO SALARIED EXECUTIVES

If the bulk of your income is in the form of salary where it's all exposed to taxes and nothing goes tax-free, you should immediately request a copy of the special Hand-

book we're distributing, showing The "Fringe Benefits" Tax Free To Executives.

Here are the fringe benefits an executive can receive. Do you get them? Remember: As legitimate "fringes" they're completely free of tax:

1. An extra \$500, \$1000, \$1500 a year for car expenses—above what most men figure business driving usually costs;
2. \$50,000 of paid life insurance on you (and now your wife and children can be covered) at company cost—you pay no premiums and you pay no tax;
3. Vacation travel that can be so combined with business it's tax deductible by the company and completely tax-free to you;
4. Annual medical checkups not only for the executive himself but for his wife as well—completely free to both;
5. Loans at no interest charge! Here's an executive whose \$25,000 mortgage costs him almost \$1,000 a year for interest alone. On his 6%, 25-year mortgage he'd pay out \$23,893 and have nothing to show for it but interest receipts. Instead, he gets the \$25,000 as a no-interest loan and saves the entire \$23,893 interest!

But let us make clear at once that all this has nothing to do with tax tricks or deferred pay. The benefits we're talking about pay off now, are thoroughly legitimate, a recognized part of executive compensation.

Yet with this great difference.—If a man in say the \$24,000 bracket got another \$4,000 as salary, he'd have to hand over at least 36% of it for taxes. But a man can receive five, even ten thousand dollars the fringe benefit way, and pay no tax on it whatever! Why? Because that's the law. The law leaves legitimate fringe benefits tax-exempt as a partial recompense for the high tax rates on ordinary salary.

Let me give you an actual illustration of this without mentioning the name of any individual or company. This man—call him Mr. X—is a well-paid executive of a successful company. Yet if you saw his salary check you'd be surprised. You would have thought his compensation to be much larger.

It is much larger. Only he doesn't receive it as "salary." As salary it would be taxed—and taxed at the stiffest rate of all. The fringe benefit way, it comes to him completely tax-free.

He gets his life insurance, his health-and-accident policy, his medical checkups, and tax-free scholarships for his youngsters . . . all of which he'd otherwise have to defray himself with after-tax dollars.

And don't miss the big point: This "4,000" is equal to a salary raise thousands of dollars bigger for Mr. X, since the salary would be taxed—the fringe benefits aren't.

So many executives can get these un-taxed benefits but just never quite knew how to go about it, our editors have now explained them all in a special Handbook:

HOW TO REWARD TOP EXECUTIVES FOR MAXIMUM TAX ADVANTAGE

Open this Handbook and you'll see when and where a man can get—

1. Extra dollars each year for car expenses in business;
2. His family life insurance coverage paid;
3. Free travel, meals and lodging going to and from vacation spots;
4. Annual medical expenses for himself, wife, children, all paid;
5. No-interest loans.

The 24-page Handbook is yours with our compliments with a subscription to Prentice-Hall's regular weekly "Executive Tax Report"—a leading source of sound tax guidance in this country, which helps over 30,000 executives learn how to lighten their tax load.

But aside from that, one thing is sure: the Handbook, "How To Reward Top Executives for Maximum Tax Advantage," will come as a revelation if you have often heard of tax-

free fringe benefits and wondered how to get them. The Handbook will show you how. Merely return the attached card.

The page beneath shows why over 30,000 use Prentice-Hall's regular weekly Executives Tax Report.

Here is why over 30,000 tax-wise executives use Prentice-Hall's regular weekly "Executives, Tax Report"—

Many executives earn excellent income before taxes, yet have been unable to build up a decent retirement nestegg.

Because steadily rising taxes and inflation eat up such large portions of their income.

There may be other ways to lighten this tax load, but here is the one way that applies directly to top men. You'll find it in Executives Tax Report, where week after week—52 times a year—appear the tax-wise methods an executive can use to cut his income tax sharply.

1. Are you using all the methods whereby part of your compensation reaches you as Capital Gain, taxed but half? This way, on each \$10,000 only \$5,000 is taxed, and \$5,000 is tax-exempt!

2. Are you aware of that great rule in the Tax Law whereby money you set aside for your retirement can now go legitimately free of tax? You get your retirement nestegg from tax dollars!

3. We mentioned in our letter loans at no interest—no interest loans—did you know a company can reward a key man with \$25,000—even \$50,000—that's both interest free and tax-free?

4. If you own stocks, do you know about what amount to tax-free dividends?

5. Here's something even more surprising—the way to help put a youngster through college on tax dollars. Under this arrangement, a goodly chunk of the tuition is paid with the tax dollars saved.

6. Maybe you won't be drawing your profit-sharing or pension money for many years yet—but when you do you want to be sure you draw it in the way that gets half of it to you tax-free! You should learn this point now, so you know just how to start the thing.

You can see from the above samples that Executives Tax Report is built by some of the best tax brains in this country. It is built for those realistic executives who know that if they are going to offset today's living costs and shrinking dollar, it will have to be through taxes.

Executive Tax Report will help you do that job. And with it you'll now get free of charge your bonus copy of How to Reward Top Executives for Maximum Tax Advantage.

Here are typical comments on "Executives Tax Report":

"We have always saved enough from information in Executives Tax Report to pay the price of the subscription."—L. M. Blair, Richmond, Mo.

"The best publication of its kind that we have found."—C. H. Dake, Smyth Worldwide Movers, Inc., Seattle, Wash.

"Used in our overall planning."—L. D. Berry, Rio Farms, San Francisco, California.

"Helpful in handling family tax problems, corporate tax moves, executive compensation and personal taxes. Circulated and filed for future reference."—L. S. Pawkett, L. S. Pawkett & Co., San Antonio, Texas.

"In several instances Executives Tax Report has prevented us from laying ourselves open to additional tax."—J. F. Sheehan, Thomas J. Sheehan Co., St. Louis, Mo.

"Keeps me abreast of the latest rulings with a minimum of reading."—D. W. Malaby, Texarkana, Texas.

"For years, your Executives Tax Report has given me ideas in nearly every issue. It is good help for any business man."—G. C. Wharton, Wharton Coal Co., Wise, Va.

"I circulate Executives Tax Report to my associates. . . Comes in handy to me by

pointing out possible savings both personal and corporate."—A. L. Clifton, Waco, Texas.

"Has helped us make tax saving on executive compensation, also on handling of corporate expenses."—A. L. Nickson, Nickson's Machine Shop, Inc., Santa Maria, California.

Subscribers to the weekly "Executives Tax Report" include—

Calumet and Hecla, Inc.; King Motor Co.; Shamrock Oil and Gas Co.; Plains Sheet Metal & Roofing; Industrial Brush Co.; Kieley Corp.; Winslow Product Engineering Corp.; McCarthy Steel Construction; State Farm Mutual Insurance; Holly Corporation; Red Aircraft Service, Inc.; Hagstrom Holding Trust; Ezell Fruit Co., Inc.; Nunn Electric Supply Co.; Western Republic Life Insurance; Curry Motor Freight Lines; General Acceptance Corp.; Bethlehem Steel Corp.; Alice Cotton Oil Co.; Hupp Corp.; United States Sugar Corp.; Lake Garfield Nurseries Co.; Belleville Imported Motor Car Ltd.; Amarillo Plate Glass Co.; Caldwell Music Co.; K-B Farms, Inc.

To begin receiving the weekly Prentice-Hall "Executives Tax Report," simply return the attached card. You'll also get your free copy of the new Handbook, *How to Reward Top Executives for Maximum Tax Advantage*.

Mail this card for your Special Handbook on the Fringe Benefits that are tax-exempt to executives:

"HOW TO REWARD TOP EXECUTIVES FOR MAXIMUM TAX ADVANTAGE"

If you receive the bulk of your income in the form of salary, where it's ALL exposed to taxes and nothing goes tax-free, mail this card for your Special Handbook on the great Fringe Benefits that are tax-exempt to executives—shown in our letter.

It's free with a single year's introductory subscription to Prentice-Hall's regular weekly EXECUTIVES TAX REPORT (a leading source of tax-saving guidance for businessmen) . . . yours at only \$4 a month. The full annual cost is tax-deductible and not payable until after EXECUTIVES TAX REPORT starts reaching you.

Firm _____ Individual _____
Street _____
City _____ State _____ Zip _____

SENATOR MCGOVERN SPEAKS OUT ON MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. President, the question of Safeguard ABM deployment which is presently before the Senate exemplifies a vastly enlarged concern over what President Eisenhower described as the military-industrial complex.

The issue runs much deeper than the efficiency or advisability of a specific weapons system. After 25 years of arms race experience, the futility, danger, and enormous costs of arms competition are becoming quite clearly established. More and more Americans are insisting that we find a better way of preserving the Nation's security. At the same time, it is becoming increasingly apparent that the potentially unlimited appetite for new weapons systems cannot be fed without intolerable neglect of urgent domestic needs. Finally, the cost overruns, sweetheart deals, and lack of arms-length dealing between Government officials and defense contractors stand as shocking evidence of our failure to maintain adequate control over this vast portion of the Federal budget.

The highly respected Christian Science Monitor is one of a number of newspapers in the country which have devoted

special attention to the current national discussion of these issues.

On July 12, in the 15th of 16 articles on the subject, it published an extremely worthwhile interview with Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, of South Dakota, one of the country's most persistent and knowledgeable critics of our overgrown Defense Establishment. Senator MCGOVERN has been deeply involved in these questions as long as any Member of this body, and he has provided a most enlightening commentary. I commend it to the attention of other Senators and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

A SENATOR WARNS AGAINST "COMPLEX" POWER

(Sen. George McGovern (D) of South Dakota says the ties between American industry and the military are a threat to peace, economic stability, and civilian control of government. He answers questions submitted by staff correspondent Guy Halverson.)

Question. Last December, Sen. McGovern, you stated that the so-called "military-industrial complex" was the most serious problem facing the nation. What led you to this conclusion?

Answer. There are two broad reasons.

First, is the rapidly growing conflict between domestic needs and the budgetary hopes of military planners. It is not uncommon to hear predictions that when the war in Vietnam ends, military spending, instead of declining, will grow to \$100 billion or more. Meanwhile, we learn from the Urban Coalition and urban America that "we are a year closer to being two societies, increasingly separate and scarcely less unequal."

If we continue to neglect causes of internal division and dissatisfaction in order to accumulate overkill, we may well be inviting a much greater threat than those conceived in Pentagon hypotheticals.

Second, excessive military spending involves much more than a waste of precious resources: It can stimulate grave external dangers as well. The combination of the antiballistic missile system (ABM) and multiple independently targetable reentry vehicles (MIRVs) on offensive missiles is a case in point. If both the United States and the Soviet Union build these systems, we could find ourselves in a situation where both sides have lost their second-strike capability, or their deterrent, and where either side might hope to emerge the victor in a nuclear exchange in which it struck first. As opposed to the present relative stability, the dangers of nuclear war in such circumstances would be enormous.

Question. What about adequate defense for the nation?

Answer. I believe we have long since passed the point of diminishing returns in military spending. In strategic weaponry, we have total force loadings of about 4,200 warheads.

In contrast, [former] Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara estimated that only 400 deliverable one-megaton warheads would destroy the Soviet Union as a viable society. Moreover, our submarine-launched missiles, uniquely capable of surviving a preemptive strike, pack enough might to provide a full deterrent all by themselves.

No matter how much we spend, we can buy no more "security" than we already possess.

Question. How would you define the military-industrial complex?

Answer. It includes all groups and individuals that have an interest in more arms spending.

Defense contractors press for more business. Communities in which they exist or

where defense installations are located seek to preserve and expand the local economic stimulus of arms dollars. Workers want job security. The scientists and technicians who work in the research phases have a built-in interest in seeing their work bear fruit. Politicians list, among their accomplishments, their successes in bringing military business to their districts.

The military establishment headquartered in the Pentagon—in economic terms a bigger enterprise than all but seven other countries in the world—is at the center. It has four "legislative liaison" offices, and their combined budget for pushing the Defense Department's legislative program, providing services, and handling inquiries for members of Congress is about 14 times that of the largest private lobbying group. Trade and professional military associations keep their members informed on arguments for new weapons.

Question. How can we measure the influence of the military-industrial complex?

Answer. By examining its successes in winning approval of its programs. This will take the kind of thorough, critical analysis of the military budget that we ordinarily apply as a matter of course to other less costly federal activities. It is possible to infer from the few cases that come to light, as well as from its nature, that its influence is unsurpassed by any other institution in our society. But we have yet to explore it fully.

A major obstacle is simply the size and complexity of the military budget. It is not unusual for military spending programs totaling \$70 or \$85 billion to be approved by Congress in a matter of hours—while health, education, housing, and other domestic programs are examined for days and even weeks.

There are political, as well as practical, pressures contending against careful examination. There are important private defense plants and government installations in a great majority of the congressional districts. In addition the arms budget has going for it the respect and/or fear which Americans generally hold for men in uniform—plus the fear which Americans generally feel about threats to our security. Charges of "bomber gaps," of "missile gaps" or, most recently, of "security gaps" have great political strength. These factors combine to give the defense budget the sacrosanct status it enjoys today and has enjoyed for a number of years.

Question. In what ways is the American political process being affected by the presence of the military-industrial complex?

Answer. In theory the principles of American democracy have not been changed. But as a practical matter both the Congress and the executive branch are becoming less and less capable of exercising the powers we read about in government textbooks.

Surely the congressional responsibility to "provide for the common defense" is severely restricted when the Congress, because of practical limitations or political pressures, finds that its relationship with the military is one of master and servant, with Congress in the role of servitude.

In the executive branch the concept of civilian control is deeply ingrained in our traditions. But if the military can generate overwhelming pressure on behalf of its point of view, these roles, too, tend to be reversed.

The military is a massive enterprise. Its internal organization and orientation is, of necessity, authoritarian. Its leaders are affected only slightly, if at all, by the checks and balances of democracy—if they are not answerable to the president and to the Congress, they are answerable to no one. To the extent the military dictates policy, democracy is endangered.

It was essentially this trend which I believe President Eisenhower was warning against in his oft-quoted farewell address in

1961. He had said earlier, in March of 1959, that if considerations other than strict military needs were allowed to prevail, "everybody with any sense knows that we are finally going to a garrison state."

Question. What about effects on other areas of American life, such as secondary education, the films we see, our moral attitudes?

Answer. The influence in these areas is more subtle, but it does exist. The services, for example, cooperate with motion-picture companies in the production of films that improve or preserve their image. Research grants with colleges and universities—of the kind which have placed the Massachusetts Institute of Technology among the top 100 defense contractors—create a form of dependency for those institutions.

Just last year two well-known professors at the University of California who had received Army and Navy support for unclassified statistical research for some 16 years were notified that their contracts were being questioned. A letter they received from the Army said:

"While you as individuals have every right to your own opinions and convictions, your present position vis-a-vis that of the Department of Defense must place you in a most uncomfortable, and perhaps untenable, situation; continuance of this relationship could well serve as a source of embarrassment to you."

The professors had signed an advertisement in opposition to the war in Vietnam.

The military-industrial demand probably gets first call on the nation's scientific expertise. In 1968 federal research and development expenditures totaled about \$16.3 billion, far surpassing private industrial research spending. Of the total of \$16.3 billion, \$14.1 billion was spent by the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Question. Does the "complex" affect U.S. foreign policy?

Answer. In a broad sense the mission of defense is to accomplish foreign-policy objectives through force or the threat of force. If we rely too heavily on military advice, therefore, our foreign policy is likely to be characterized by the use of force in situations where it is unnecessary and counterproductive. The costs can be immense.

Vietnam may be an example. I suspect that our heavy involvement will someday be traced back to the Pentagon's confident assessments of what military power could achieve—assessments of the kind which led Secretary McNamara and General [Maxwell D.] Taylor to predict the return of American troops by the end of 1965. There was a misplaced reliance on a military solution when other factors—the degree of indigenous support for the government we seek to save, the intricacies of local politics, the probable political results of military escalation—were likely to have a much greater effect on the outcome.

Similar reasoning holds true in the cold war and in the area of strategic weaponry. If we believe we have the capacity to be the world's policeman we are likely to assume that role.

Question. Does the military-industrial complex have a "vested stake" in the perpetuation of the cold war?

Answer. If industry has billions of dollars tied up in capital equipment which would be rendered useless by a lessening of mutual suspicion then certainly it has a vested interest.

This does not mean this group deserves condemnation. It merely recognizes the reality that it is not their job to determine national priorities or to design foreign policy.

Certainly the power and the prestige of the Pentagon would decline if we were to reach accommodation with our enemies. I am quite skeptical of suggestions that the mili-

tary is consciously promoting conflicts to test its techniques or preserve its powers, but it does have a political stake in the cold war.

The crux of the question is not really the motivation of the military-industrial complex, but whether Congress and the executive branch will recognize that they have broader competence and broader responsibilities than either the industrial or military establishments.

Question. Are we gradually losing civilian control over the Pentagon?

Answer. We have certainly been moving in that direction. The freedom of civilian leaders to exercise their judgments, while it still exists in theory, has been very much diminished in practice.

Quite obviously the Secretary of Defense cannot singlehandedly counter the influence of the military-industrial complex. But he is in a critical position. If Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird sees his role as being an advocate for the military instead of a manager of the military, then the outlook is grim indeed.

Question. In what respect is military procurement based upon nondefense, political factors?

Answer. We can assume that no member of Congress escapes some form of direct or indirect persuasion from one or more elements in the military-industrial complex.

It may come in the form of a belief that if the military is offended a congressman's district will be looked upon with disfavor in site selections and contract awards. Or it may be that a specific cut in military spending will cause an economic decline for his constituency.

At a 1963 press conference, President Kennedy, in responding to a question about the ill-fated TFX or F-111 aircraft contract award to General Dynamics, did not deny that in some cases the falling financial status of a company could be an important factor in channeling arms business its way. He did, however, argue that that did not happen in the case of the competition between Boeing and General Dynamics.

I want to stress here, however, that often too few nondefense factors go into a decision. While we should not yield to political pressures which have us constructing superfluous weaponry, neither should we build systems that can be justified on military grounds if they interfere heavily with foreign policy or disarmament objectives.

Question. Are present Pentagon and congressional controls over military procurement practices adequate to prevent waste or malfeasance?

We have strong evidence that they are not. The C-5A aircraft is expected to cost some \$2 billion more than the original ceiling price of \$3 billion. The Mark II avionics unit for the F-111 is now expected to cost \$1.5 million, up 46 percent over the original contract estimates and more than was paid for many of the entire fighter aircraft currently in service.

These are not isolated instances. A former defense official recently wrote that 90 percent of the major weapons systems end up costing at least twice as much as was originally estimated. A Brookings Institution study of large military contracts in the 1950's found costs of from 300 to 700 percent higher than original contract plans.

We are even more shocked to learn that our great investments give us shoddy merchandise. Richard Stubbing, on leave from Princeton University to work on the Budget Bureau staff, found in his recent study that the performance of weapons systems started in the 1950's is bad, that those of the 1960's are worse, and that the Pentagon seems to be awarding the highest profits to the poorest performers.

Question. Should the American people be concerned by the large numbers of ex-high-ranking military officers employed by major defense contractors?

Answer. Since 1966 there has been an executive order prohibiting a retired officer from negotiating contracts with his former service, but it is questionable whether it is being enforced or is even capable of enforcement. The purchase of proprietary rights to the M-16 rifle which I questioned in the Senate last year was approved by a defense official who later went to work for Colt Industries, the seller of the rights. A recent random survey of six major defense companies found former Pentagon officials and officers in all of them.

Question. What can the public do to ensure that the military-industrial complex does not gain an inordinately large seat in the councils of government?

Answer. I think we need three distinct kinds of action, each of which will require strong public support if they are to be instituted.

First, Senator Proxmire has recommended a highly important series of steps to deal with excessive costs, contract overruns, and other forms of economic waste. They include zero-base budgeting for the individual services, more penetrating Budget Bureau review, more competitive bidding, penalties instead of rewards for cost overruns, uniform accounting for military contractors, penalties for late deliveries, stronger inventory control, and improved monitoring and auditing of contracts while they are in process.

Second, we must undertake a coordinated national effort to explore and establish alternatives for those elements of the military-industrial complex that are dependent on arms spending.

Just recently I introduced, with the co-sponsorship of 34 other senators, a "National Economic Conversion Act," designed to facilitate the conversion of human, industrial, and financial resources from military dependency to hopeful pursuits in other areas. The legislation takes into consideration the essential nature of most of the interests contending for more arms spending, not as a sinister conspiracy aimed at achieving a garrison state but as people who are legitimately concerned about the dislocations they would experience if our priorities were reordered.

In addition to removing some of the political pressures on military plans, it can bring the resources no longer necessary to the military into quick focus on the domestic challenges we need so desperately to meet.

Finally, we should begin insisting on a much higher standard of proof for arms-spending programs, recognizing that we have passed the point where more weapons can add to our security; that superfluous armaments are dangerous as well as wasteful; that military spending, as parasitic growth, is a poor way of stimulating the economy; that weapons become obsolete at a rapid rate; that military welfare or public works cannot be justified; and that military judgments on defense items fall short of the broad analysis which should be undertaken.

We must develop a countervailing force strong enough to overcome the political impact of the massive arms establishment.

THE PERCY-ACHESON DEBATE

Mr. SAXBE. Mr. President, on July 15, 1969, the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) and former Secretary of State Dean Acheson debated the ABM issue on national television. In so doing, they brought new dimensions to this controversy to which thinking Americans are devoting so much time in these days. Because the arguments are so well stated, I ask unanimous consent to bring the transcript of this televised debate before the Senate by having it printed in the RECORD.

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

THE DAVID FROST SHOW—ABM DISCUSSION WITH FORMER SECRETARY OF STATE DEAN ACHESON AND SENATOR CHARLES PERCY OF ILLINOIS

(Telecast in New York, July 15, 1969, WNEW-TV, 8:30-10 p.m.)

FROST. Welcome back. And will you welcome now—we're privileged to welcome, on my left—Senator Percy just pointed out he ought to be on the right—but Senator—will you welcome on my left the Honorable Dean Acheson, and on my right Senator Charles Percy.

And initially at the beginning we want to try to do something that's rarely done on television and open this, in a sense, first of all as a debate, and then open it wider. And first of all, particularly in view of the audience's views, and so on. I want to turn, if I may, to you, Mr. Acheson, and ask you if you could outline for us first of all what you regard as the imperative reasons why this country should have ABM.

DEAN ACHESON. I'll do my best. I've been involved in this nuclear business since the end of the war. Over twenty years, and every once in a while we come to what I think is a corner, a crisis, a turning point in the—in the development of our relations with the other super-state, which is the other great nuclear state, the Soviet Union.

And it seems to me we've reached one of them now. We started off with a great attempt on the part of our government to turn this whole nuclear matter over to international control. This was the first big effort that we made with our allies on the other side of the ocean. First of all in '46 when we presented the Baruch plan, and then in '51, when I presented the disarmament plan in Paris.

But the Russians turned them all down. In fact, Vishinsky said that my proposal kept him awake all night because he laughed so hard. Well, it didn't seem to me that was quite the right response to this effort. But at any rate, we did our best to have international control, and failed.

So we started protecting ourselves, developing our nuclear power, and they were already doing this also. And we have come, to put it very briefly, over the twenty intervening years, to a point where each of us is armed to the extent that Mr. Churchill said created the delicate balance of terror. By which he means that we were both in a position to prevent the other person from making a first move, because it would be what is called doomsday if that happened. The retaliatory power would be so great that once the other person shot, the riposte would kill everybody. This was the balance of terror.

Every once in a while, in this development, a new weapon is introduced. This has to be met. We now have on each side the old manned bombers. They're still in operation and still carry their bombs, and they are provided against by the other side.

The next development was land based missiles, in which the Russians had the lead. We rapidly caught up with them and passed them. And we are now, roughly speaking, approximately equal.

Then we developed the nuclear submarine, the Polaris, and they developed one. And again we had this balance of terror.

Now a new weapon has been introduced into the balance. And that is the S-99, which is a very large, long range, intercontinental ballistic missile, developed by the Russians, with three warheads which are discharged in space, separate, and each one goes to a target. Each one is not separately aimed, but the whole weapon is directed so that when they divide, each one will go to a predetermined target. And these are so developed that each warhead, if directed toward one of

our land based missiles, would, we think, destroy it.

Now there will be a difference probably between the Senator and his advisor, and me and mine, as to the efficiency of these Russian weapons. That is part of the argument that we will have here tonight.

To meet that there has been developed on both sides an anti-ballistic missile. The purpose of this is to meet an incoming missile in space and destroy it in space before it lands. This is to prevent the great destruction which the weapon causes when it hits either a city, or another missile, and the fallout which occurs if it attempts to destroy one of the silos on the ground and throws up a great deal of nuclear charged dust.

Now Russians have these deployed all around Moscow. We are now, under the President's proposal, developing anti-ballistic missiles to deploy around the sites where the Minute Men, our land based missiles are buried.

Now the debate between the Senator and me will be around several issues. One is, is the Russian S-99 a real danger? We claim it's a serious one. I think his attitude will be that it is not as serious as we think. Or that the Minute Men do not need as much protection as we think they need.

Another issue will be: does the ABM do what it is claimed to be able to do? That is, meet these S-99s as they come, and destroy them. Another issue will be: are there other ways of meeting this than the one that we propose, or the President proposes? Are they cheaper? Are they better? We say there are none as good. The Senator will doubtless believe that there are some equally good, or even better. That's another issue.

And finally there is an issue as to whether our deploying these weapons will inhibit in any way the furtherance of discussions with the Russians for the purpose of stopping further development of nuclear weapons, or if possible disarming.

Now on some of these issues obviously I've had experience and am able to make some contribution of my own. On others I'm a layman and don't understand the nuclear scientific issues as well as people who are trained in that discipline, and therefore I have to make a judgment on the basis of what I am told.

Let me therefore start out by saying a word or two about a matter on which I've had a good deal of experience, which is: does this interfere with our negotiations with the Russians?

I believe that it does not. I've had a good deal of negotiation with the Russians. They are not delicate, shy people. They are not frightened by what the other people do. They, themselves, have developed an anti-ballistic missile. They know its function, its purpose. They are quite aware of the fact that this is inherently a defensive weapon. It is to meet something which is aimed at you, as far as we devise it, and destroy that thing. Therefore they are not going to be any less willing to talk, they're going to be more willing to talk if they believe that we are stronger and there's something worth bargaining about.

FROST. At that point we're coming to the end of the first segment, and I know Senator Percy is yearning to come in to answer. Is there a last sentence you want to add to that before we go to a break?

ACHESON. Well, I will save my last sentence to worry Senator Percy.

FROST. All right, very good.

Senator Percy, the floor is yours in a moment's time. We'll be right back.

FROST. Senator Percy, you have the threat of Mr. Acheson's last sentence still hanging over you. But what of all those several points he raised, all of which I want to raise with you, which of those would you choose to answer first?

Senator CHARLES PERCY. Well I'd like first

to indicate that Secretary Acheson and I do not always disagree. We happen to on this one, and I do very strongly. But we agree on many issues, and I have the utmost respect for the tremendous contribution that he has made to this country over the many years that he's served it.

We happen to agree, for instance, that the Europeans ought to be paying today for more of their own defense, and less by the American taxpayer. And we're working together on that.

FROST. What am I supposed to say to that? Is the question.

PERCY. You're a British citizen and you can't say anything on this point. But I'm really going to be talking to the American citizen, but I do think the citizens of the world are watching the debate, which is a tremendously historic moment in the Senate, when one hundred men charged with the responsibility of the security of this country are now debating: how best can we secure our national interests and the interests of the free world.

FROST. Well there's no doubt about—incidentally—the international involvement in this, in the sense that, you know, the decisions here . . .

PERCY. You're saying this on your own time, aren't you?

FROST. I'm not interrupting you, I'm just applauding your point that everybody is watching this debate, tonight.

PERCY. Well I think so too. And I think really what Secretary Acheson has said, where he's given us the historical background of what we've done as the defense—that we've built defenses against the bombers, and against the missiles, is really why we're having this great debate. Because what we've done over a period of years because of this tremendous presumed threat from the Soviet Union, have spent billions and billions and billions of dollars building DEW lines, building NIKE sites. I suppose the cost goes thirty, forty, fifty billion dollars, and much of it is now covered by the Arctic snow, and the wastes, and abandoned. Because it simply didn't develop that way. The world didn't turn out the way those defenses were planned for.

And I just wonder today how different this nation might be, and how different life might be here, if we had not had to spend those billions and billions of dollars in the defense establishment.

I don't for a moment presume that the Department of Defense is anything other than utterly patriotic, and zealous in their attempt to guard us against every conceivable type of threat to us. In fact, they are able to plan, and they have on the books, planning two major wars and one minor war, carrying them on simultaneously, and being able to carry them out any place on earth, against any conceivable kind of threat. And I suppose this is their job.

But it's our job in the Congress to set the priorities. To finally and ultimately decide what is more important. And I have come to the conclusion that the threat is greater from within this country, if we don't do the right things and have the right national priorities, than it is from outside.

Now I don't for a moment, David, presume that we do not have to have a credible deterrent. We must have. No possible enemy of ours should ever feel we'll be weak. And we must be strong. From this standpoint I think, however, we have tremendous strength.

And two points are very important to have a credible deterrent. First you must have the power to strike. And second, you must have the will to use that power if you're ever struck against. I can't imagine the Russians, or anyone, as so naive as to believe we do not have the power. We have incredible power. And I hope they wouldn't be so naive as to assume we wouldn't have

the guts and the will to use it if we were ever attacked.

That's all I think we need. It's sufficiency. And President Nixon used that word. How many times do we have to prove our ability to destroy the whole world? And how many times as we escalate this nuclear arms race now, do we have to? How many pounds, tons, megatons of firepower do we have to have to destroy every human being on earth?

I think we have enough. And I think the time to draw the line is now. And the ABM is a very good place to draw that line.

Actually I'd have to go back. I felt the Sentinel ABM was the time to draw the line. A few of us fought against it, you remember, when President Johnson was in office. We said it was not a good design, it would escalate the nuclear arms race, it would cost far more than they told us it would cost, and it was not a credible defense of our cities.

We've been proven right, oddly enough. The President has now said the very same things. And where are all the people who before were defending the Sentinel system? Not one of them has stood up since the President said it isn't right for this country, it will escalate, it will cost too much, it's not worth it, and you can't really defend the cities, it's not a credible defense of the cities.

Now we have a new name for it, the Safeguard. We have a way of taking these old systems that President Eisenhower, the NIKE-Zeus and the NIKE-X, said we shouldn't go ahead with; and President Kennedy said we shouldn't go ahead—and now we've bundled it into a new sort of package, with the sex appeal of the Sentinel name first, and then that didn't work, and now the Safeguard.

But it's the same old package. And it's the same old weak design, I think. In fact, the Safeguard is even weaker. It was designed for area defense, the defense of our cities, and now we've abandoned that thought. We've moved it back to the bases, to get them out of the cities where people will protest about being saved from a nuclear war by dragging nuclear bombs right into their neighborhood and back yard, and we're tucking them away out in South (sic) Dakota and Montana.

The odd thing is that the design of, say, the eye of the system, the MSR, the missile site radar, a huge structure, costing a hundred and sixty-five million dollars for each installation—the eye is the most vulnerable part of it. It was designed for an entirely different job, area defense. And now we don't need that design for point defense of the silos. And yet we're going to quickly rush into production and deploy a design that today is very weak. And any technician would admit that they don't even need to use the SS-9's that Dean Acheson mentioned. They can knock that out with the SS-11, which is only a megaton. And they take one-eighth of their existing supply of those, never touch the SS-9's and knock out every single one of the MSRs that we build.

Once you knock out the eye of the system, what good are the Sprints, and the Spartans, and the computers? What good's all the programming? And why wouldn't they use that less costly means of knocking out the heart of the system?

This is the defect of it, it's a weak design. It costs much more, too, than the 6.8 billion we've been told, I'd give you all the tea in China that it would not be built for less than twenty billion—that's Nationalist China—be built for less, less than twenty billion dollars. And I do feel when we're on the brink of negotiations, and we will begin negotiations, I feel confident, with the Soviet Union early in August, why, just as we're about to see whether we can't, both of us, find a mutuality of interest in stopping this madness of piling bombs, on bombs, on bombs, increasing the terror, which does not increase my sense of security and safety.

Why don't we sit down sensibly and ra-

tionally, and see, as Secretary Rogers said and President Nixon, whether we both can't go out of the ABM business? In fact, they have said, if they want to go out of the business, we'll go out of the business. And why not just first determine, while we're going ahead and redesigning the eye of the system, the MSR, see whether or not the Soviet Union wouldn't find a mutuality of interest in de-escalating the nuclear arms race?

So for these reasons I think a delay in the deployment of this system would be very wise. It serves our interest, it serves the interest of world peace. I think we'll be more secure that way, rather than rushing into an ABM system which they will retaliate against by increasing their offensive weapons. And they can build those a lot cheaper and faster than we can build this, the most complex, intricate electronic and mechanical system ever devised by mankind—and we have no idea whether it will work. In fact, Secretary Acheson said it may not work. And if it's not workable, at least when we're through with all of this—and he means maybe six to twenty billion dollars—we at least would have the satisfaction of knowing that it's not workable.

That's a pretty expensive thing to try to experiment with, when I can take twenty billion dollars as a Senator, and find a great many places to nation-build here at home with that money, and offer the promise of America to more people, and stop this tremendous flow of rampant inflation, which is distorting every priority we have in this country, and picking the pockets of every single American family.

FROST. We're going to take a break now. We'll be opening it up in one minute's time.

Well, you've heard both of our distinguished speakers explaining this thing about as well—this complex thing about as well as it can be explained. And our audience here in the studio have been listening too. Let me throw it towards them.

Are there any of you who want to speak now, agree or disagree with something that's been said? Can I put a question to one of our distinguished—yes?

MAN. Mr. Acheson, you spoke about the need for deterrents. And deterrents, I believe, is defined as the ability to destroy your enemy if he strikes first. Now Senator Percy indicated that for the foreseeable future, if the Soviets strike first, we will still have the power to destroy them ten or fifteen times over. If we have the ABM in addition, it's true we might be able to destroy them twenty five times or thirty times over. You said, if we don't have the ABM it weakens our deterrent. In a sense it weakens our deterrent because you're weaker if you can destroy them ten times over instead of twenty times over.

But does it make any sense, really, to talk about weakening our deterrent if that is the case? And if that is so, then the main rationale for the ABM, which is the need to protect our deterrent all the way—and there simply remains the point you made about the importance of having a strong position for bargaining with the Soviets.

And for the second part I would ask this—

FROST. Let's stop there.

MAN. Okay, should we leave it? I'm sorry.

FROST. All right, isn't the power to destroy ten times over deterrent or not?—is really the question.

ACHESON. I think the questioner is being deceived by the idea that these figures are absolutes; that you are really saying something which means something, when you say ten times over and twenty times over. Nobody knows that, nobody has tried the idea, nobody has tried to destroy them, there's no proof of this.

The point of deterrents is that the other side should believe that to start a nuclear war is destruction for him.

Now why have the Russians invested a lot of money in the S-99? Why? Because they

think that will reduce our retaliatory power. And if they are permitted to believe that and achieve their end without a response from us, then they will believe that they can take a greater chance than they did before.

FROST. The gentleman over there, yes.

MAN. Senator Percy, in your first rebuttal of Secretary Acheson's talk, you mentioned two ideas why—your major reasons why you're against the ABM. And if I'm not mistaken, one of them was because basically that it's never been tested. And you said that they should take it out in the Pacific Ocean and test it every major way possible to show all kinds of defenses around it.

Now if it was taken out in the ocean and it was tested and it proved to be successful, and that it could defend our country basically better than it's being defended now, would you change your idea, and possibly more—be more affirmative on the program?

PERCY. Well, I'd feel better about going into production on something that costs twenty billion dollars if I thought ahead of time I might have some idea that it would work. But secondly, I wouldn't even feel very good about going into spending that kind of money if I thought I could avoid it. And if we can avoid it by a negotiated agreement with the Soviet Union and they indicate a willingness to want to do it—and our own President has indicated a desire and willingness to want to do it—I'd want to see first whether we can reach an agreement.

Because I think it's silly to spend twenty billion dollars if you don't have to.

ACHESON. I'd like to comment on that reply.

FROST. Yes.

ACHESON. Three years ago Mr. Gilpatrick said, "Wait three years before you deploy an ABM, and then see whether the Russians will do something." We have waited three years, and now the Senator says wait another God knows how long. I think the time for waiting is over, and that they have made their deployment, we must make ours. And then they will be moved to get on with it or not get on with it.

PERCY. Mr. Secretary, those are almost precisely the words the military establishment used to President Eisenhower. "We've been waiting long enough, let's now go into production on the Nike-Zeus, the Nike-X", whatever it was. And Eisenhower rightly said no. And President Kennedy said, rightly, no. And they were absolutely right because the whole system, everyone admits, would have been a twenty to forty billion dollar boondoggle, totally obsolete by present standards now.

FROST. Do you think the system you're advocating is open to the same danger of being an anachronism in a very short time?

ACHESON. I think everything is open to that danger, everything. Science is moving very fast. But you cannot turn over one whole field of development to the opponent with any degree of safety. One must stay with it, Mr. Frost, one has got to stay all the time with it. If you delay and delay and delay, and the other person experiments and develops and develops, you are losing ground.

And the fact that Eisenhower took a chance and got away with it is no reason . . .

FROST. The gentleman in the back row.

MAN. Secretary Acheson, you said that the main purpose of the ABM is that it should be a deterrent and that it doesn't matter if it works or not. Therefore, why don't we just pretend to build one?

ACHESON. If I said what you say I said, I'm a bigger fool than I think I am.

FROST. Someone else put up their hand over there. Yes, the lady there.

WOMAN. Well for twenty-four years now, since 1945 when I was a young girl in school, I've been hearing that the Russians will do this and so, and watch out for the Russians. Now in the twenty-four years that followed we have, according to the people that wanted more and more atom bombs, more and more

hydrogen bombs, and people who want the anti-ballistic missile system to go into effect, we've been hearing that we need all this, and at this particular time and that particular time we were so very vulnerable.

Now if we had been that vulnerable, and we are at this very moment this vulnerable, with this terrific weapon that Russia has, how come they haven't used it? Perhaps it's time that we ought to just end our suspicions. And there is another premise that slipped in, that the hundred sixty-five billion dollars that this reaction weapon—defensive weapon—costs would not necessarily be used for peaceful purposes.

Now I'd like to know, what kind of a premise is that? Where would the hundred sixty-five billion dollars be spent?

FROST. That's a hundred and sixty-five million there, or twenty billion. It's so much money, all the same.

WOMAN. Millions. Well you see the amount is so staggering that I can't even imagine it. You know, like, how much is it per week? But I feel that it's a false premise that it won't be used for peaceful purposes. And I know—may I continue for a moment—that if my little child were in a hassle and were arguing with a lot of children, and I wanted him to stop and do his homework, I wouldn't throw his books out the window and spend my last fifty cents on a little old shield for him so he can defend himself in his fight. I would try to see that he stopped the fight, stopped the arguing, stopped that approach completely, and turned his needs and his attention towards peaceful ends.

FROST. Let me put . . .

Let me put that question to you: Is it a false premise to imagine that the hundred and sixty-five million that's been spent on the eye, or the twenty billion—is it a false premise to suggest that that can't be spent on peaceful means?

ACHESON. I'm sorry, I don't understand—I couldn't hear what the lady said and I don't quite understand what you're saying.

FROST. Well, she was making the point very well. She was disputing your earlier suggestion that Senator Percy was wrong when he suggested the money could be spent on better things. You said . . .

FROST. Or not even spent at all; just let the people spend it and not raise our taxes so much.

FROST. You disputed that. You're on safe ground there. You then disputed that earlier and you said it's not a question that the money could be spent on anything else. And the lady was disputing your point. Now why did you say it's not a question, that the money can't be spent on something else?

ACHESON. Well I still don't understand what the issue is. But I think I do. At any rate, let me answer a question I want to answer.

FROST. I thought you might do that, yes.

ACHESON. Maybe it's this—let's get the proportions here right. What are we talking about? What are the orders of magnitude we're talking about? We're talking about spending over five years, a figure which is eight billion dollars. Or you can call it eleven, if you want to add in development expenses, research expenses, which you must spend anyway.

Now this doesn't make the difference between not paying taxes and paying taxes, or the good life or the bad life, or anything else. It is about one-tenth to one-eighth of the military budget. The whole gross national product of the United States will be a trillion dollars in this period.

The cost, for instance, if you want to stop pollution of the air, is a hundred and fifty billion dollars. We must meet it, and we will meet it. But the order of magnitude of the things that we must do is so infinitely greater than this that they are not comparable.

It reminds me now—if I may end up, and then I'll stop talking—with a recollection of

Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, whom I used to know very well when I was young. He used to say, what I'm sure will shock all of us now, that there is no check that he wrote with greater pleasure than the check to pay his taxes. And he said to himself, "When I sign this paltry check"—you can know how long ago that was—"I buy civilization."

Now I say when we spend this money, which is not paltry but substantial, we buy security. And that is what we're concerned with.

PERCY. Can I just simply—

FROST. The last word from you too, Senator Percy.

PERCY. Well, I'll answer a question that I haven't been asked, but I'll respond to Dean Acheson. I think that this is the least cost-effective system that I could devise. I think the holes that we've punctured in it have shattered the thinking of even some of its most previous ardent defenders.

It's a question now of how—whether we are for defense; we're all for that—it's a question of sufficiency. And I think we conclusively proved that as of the moment, we have a sufficiency.

I don't think the public—not the eleven million people that I serve in Illinois—are impressed with a trillion dollar economy or what percentage this is of the gross national product. They're impressed with the fact that maybe they're a blue collar making ninety-five hundred dollars, more than they ever dreamed of before, but they're spending ten thousand. They're going in debt. They can't seem to keep ahead of the game. Everyone is being harder pressed, higher prices, and they wonder why.

It's because this defense establishment is so big, so out of control almost, that it now involves one out of nine people. We have eight and a half million people working forty hours a week on just military equipment alone in this country. We place billions of dollars, forty-four billion dollars in contracts, fifty-eight per cent of it without even advertising for bids. It's just a negotiated bid. And we are in such a condition that today the Congress wants to try to get hold of it. And that's what this great struggle is about.

We're struggling for the standard of living, and for a sense of priorities and rightness in this country. We want a sufficiency of defense. But we don't want to have the military dominate our lives and wreck our economy with this kind of eighty and eighty-plus billion of spending at the national level. It's that additionality now, on top of everything else, that's causing us this great crunch in our credit markets today.

And what we're trying to do is simply save four, five, six billion dollars, which might take that extra pressure off and enable us to have a more stable, normal economy.

FROST. And there we've got to leave it. Thank you for your last words. To both of you, thank you, Secretary Acheson. Thank you, Senator Percy. And our thanks to our audience for all of their participation and all of their questions. I'm sure, with me, you'd like to thank our speakers and our experts.

COUNTERVAILING DUTIES: TREASURY MUST ENFORCE LAW

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, this year Congress and the Nation are taking a hard look at our national priorities.

With our Nation's growing concern for eliminating hunger and improving nutritional levels, the maintenance of a strong food production capability ranks high in such priorities.

Axiomatically, this involves maintaining a healthy economic climate for food

producers, as well as adequate protection against unfair—and unlawful—competition from foreign countries.

For these reasons, I am deeply concerned about discriminatory practices of U.S. Treasury relating to its failure to impose certain duties on imported dairy products.

Under section 1303 of United States Code 19, duties on imports subsidized by foreign countries are required to be increased by the amount of the subsidy—in addition to the regular duty. This is mandatory—not permissive—law.

Despite protests by the domestic dairy industry, as well as Members of Congress, however, the Treasury is failing to enforce this law in relation to dairy products.

Mr. President, this is a matter of real concern, first, for those interested in maintaining an economically sound and productive dairy industry, and second, for those who believe in essential, just and equitable enforcement of our laws.

Unless expeditious action is taken by the administration to impose the required countervailing duties on dairy products, Congress, I believe, should seriously consider, first, a probe into the Treasury's failure to impose countervailing duties on dairy products; and, second, legislation to create stronger import control laws.

The number of dairy cattle in the United States has been declining steadily since 1945.

In that year we had 27.7 million cows and heifers in the milk herd. This year, we have only 14.1 million. In 1940, there were 4.6 million farmers reporting milk cows. This year, there are 1.1 million farmers milking cows. Due to better breeding and greater efficiency in milk production, per cow, our total output of milk for consumers did not decline with the reduction in herds and the number of producers until 1966. Production peaked at 124 billion pounds of milk in 1965 and has now declined to an estimated 115 billion pounds this year. Unless the economic returns for dairying improve and improve speedily, we confront real problems in relation to adequate supplies of one of our finest foods.

Certainly a law intended to protect these producers from imports subsidized heavily by the exporting countries abroad—a law already on the statute books—should be enforced to protect dairymen from the most unfair sort of competition.

NEW YORK TIMES CALLS FOR RATIFICATION OF THE GENEVA CONVENTION ON CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the least understood and most serious problems of our time, as momentous for the future of world peace as the nuclear arms race itself, is the rapid proliferation of chemical and biological weapons. History records remarkably few instances of the use of these weapons, but their rapid development by an increasing number of nations makes the danger of our losing control over them daily more serious. To those knowledgeable on the sub-

ject, the prospects of heading off this grim occurrence seem bleak indeed.

I invite the attention of the Senate to an editorial published recently in the New York Times. Though I would like to find its cautious optimism encouraging, the progress it describes is slim indeed and far from the amount needed to achieve effective control of these weapons. Much more is needed, and primary among these needed measures is the ratification of the Geneva protocol of 1925 banning the aggressive use of these weapons, a measure called for in the editorial.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE LUNACY OF GERM WARFARE

Dean Swift himself could not do justice to a world which over the centuries and with great skill has eliminated diseases one by one for the sake of humanity, and then systematically bred the germs of those diseases as a possible weapon of war. Yet all the major countries, even those that have the nuclear power to wipe out the earth's population several times over, persist in the solemn lunacy of stockpiling lethal bacteria and poisonous gases in the name of national defense.

Fortunately a few rays of good sense have been penetrating this Kafka-like realm, and it is at least possible that the world may be spared further hazardous progress along a particularly gruesome road. Among the hopeful signs, the first in recent weeks was the vigorous campaign against the chemical and biological warfare program of the Defense Department by Representative Richard D. McCarthy of Buffalo. It was Mr. McCarthy who induced a rare briefing of Congressmen on the subject by hitherto reticent officers of the Pentagon. And it was the same Congressman who almost single-handedly prevented the crosscountry shipment of several hundred freight cars filled with obsolete but deadly gas bombs the Army irresponsibly planned to dump in the Atlantic.

Entering into the questioning spirit, the Senate Armed Services Committee has just voted to cut out of the defense budget all funds for researching offensive measures in the field of chemical-biological warfare. President Nixon himself has shown a marked interest in moves to reduce this whole category of armaments. He has ordered a full-scale review of the program and pledged to the opening session of the Geneva Disarmament Conference that the United States would seek "reliable arms control" for this potential type of warfare, which "arouses horror and revulsion throughout the world."

Perhaps even more significant, the United Nations has just issued a report that should be required reading for responsible government officials around the globe. It documents not only the frightful dangers of chemical and biological warfare but the folly of their contemplated use as well as their total unpredictability, their possible destruction of the environment even where they do not immediately wipe out a whole population, including those who initiate their use; and the easy and frightening proliferation of such weapons among nations that cannot afford nuclear armaments.

In transmitting the work of the fourteen distinguished scientists who drew up the U.N. report, Secretary General U Thant has appealed to all states to accept the Geneva Protocol of 1925, renouncing the use of chemical and biological agents—a declaration ratified by sixty nations but not by the United States—and to eliminate such agents as quickly as possible from their arsenals.

If these steps are taken, such is the irony of the situation, the world would breathe more easily at having to ward off only the threat of nuclear destruction.

AIR FORCE OFFICER STATISTICS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a short while back I placed in the RECORD figures showing the comparison of the number of officers obtained through ROTC with officers obtained from the military academies and Officer Candidate Schools. Unfortunately, at that time the Air Force did not have their figures complete. I ask unanimous consent that the Air Force statistics and a portion of a letter I received from the Secretary of the Air Force be printed in the RECORD.

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

Since the inception of the Air Force in 1947, the AFROTC has continually been the major long-lead procurement source of commissioned officers. We anticipate that it will continue in the foreseeable future.

Unfortunately, we have been unable to locate any statistics that would reveal the percentages of officers who were commissioned through the AFROTC or its earlier counterparts in World War II and the Korean conflict. Records of graduates who served between 1941-1945 are maintained by the Army and we understand that they do not reflect which officers were in the Air Corps/Army Air Forces. The AFROTC was instituted in 1948 following the establishment of the Air Force as a separate service the previous year. Many of the ROTC graduates who were on active duty in the Air Force during Korea had also participated in World War II and the records fail to separate them from officers commissioned from other sources.

The following figures are provided which show the annual total active duty officer strengths and ROTC percentages thereof for the past several fiscal years:

As of—	Total strength	ROTC inventory	Percent
June 30, 1964	133,987	32,483	24.5
June 30, 1965	131,578	33,473	25.4
June 30, 1966	130,724	36,306	27.8
June 30, 1967	135,485	39,742	29.3
June 30, 1968	137,533	42,296	30.8
May 1969	134,364	42,452	31.6

As a matter of historical interest, in 1920 the Army established the first Air Service ROTC units at the University of California in Berkeley, the University of Illinois, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and the Texas Agriculture and Mechanical College. Today, 174 institutions are participating.

We appreciate your continuing interest in this vital program and hope the foregoing information will prove helpful.

THE INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, on July 7, 1969, I placed in the RECORD a number of letters responding to a letter I had written requesting views of businessmen on the repeal of the 7 percent investment tax credit.

I have now received another group of very thoughtful letters on the subject. Eighty-five percent of those responding are opposed to the suspension or repeal of the investment tax credit.

So that the Senators may see another

representative sample of thinking on this subject, I ask unanimous consent to place a number of these responses in the RECORD.

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

ILLINOIS TOOL WORKS, INC.,

Chicago, Ill., July 17, 1969.

Senator CHARLES H. PERCY,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHUCK: The current legislative situation with respect to the 7% investment tax credit is most distressing to industry generally and to ITW in particular. The purpose of this letter is not to urge the retention of the 7% tax credit in its present form, which we recognize to be well-nigh impossible in the light of the current political situation. We do suggest, however, that the United States economy needs some form of recovery for capital outlay if we are to remain competitive with foreign competition. In addition, capital expenditures, although seemingly inflationary in short range view, are actually an anti-inflationary element when considered over the long haul.

Every major industrial nation encourages investment in capital equipment—either through tax incentives or through accelerated depreciation provisions, or both. It was for this reason that the Kennedy Administration suggested the 7% investment tax credit in the first place. Frankly, most businessmen favored alternative approaches at the time the 7% tax credit was enacted, because they recognized that the 7% credit would be forever vulnerable from a political standpoint, as it is now. Some of these alternatives will be discussed further in this letter.

The point is, however, that perfectly understandable political pressures have caused a Republican President and a Democratic Majority in the House to agree on repeal of the 7% investment tax credit, and nothing has been suggested to take its place. The likely result of this action will be a substantial reduction in corporate outlays for needed capital equipment over the next few years and well into the future. This trend is not likely to manifest itself this year (or perhaps even next year), because corporate managers, relying in part on the 7% investment tax credit, have already made plans for purchases of capital equipment for this year. These plans cannot now be changed, even though the tax write-off is likely to be repealed. Therefore, the inevitable downturn in capital outlays will not occur for some time.

Healthy expenditures for capital equipment are vitally necessary to a healthy, non-inflationary economy. They are also necessary in order to protect our markets at home and abroad from foreign intrusion. American wage rates are obviously higher than foreign wage rates, and this is good. But this also means that American industry can remain competitive only if the cost of the final end product of its enterprise is competitive with foreign producers. The only way that this objective can be accomplished is through developing better, less costly methods through newer, more productive machinery. Thus, a national policy of providing incentives to businesses to remain competitive through purchase and renewal of capital equipment (machinery) is essential and should be of high priority. As I said earlier, every other major industrial nation provides such incentives, and for the United States to be without them, while maintaining much higher wage rates than foreign competitors, puts us at a double disadvantage.

In addition, from the standpoint of inflation—one of the best ways to control inflation is to provide for greater productivity. This objective can be accomplished only if there is a continuing capability to im-

prove production volume through newer and better capital equipment (machinery). Thus, stepped up capital expenditures actually operate as a counterinflationary force on the economy because, in the long run, they contribute to better productivity.

For these reasons, we urge you and your colleagues to seek means of encouraging capital investment now that the 7% investment tax credit is to be repealed for political reasons. Here are a number of alternatives:

1. Reduce the 7% investment tax credit to 3½% and liberalize accelerated depreciation rules so that industry can recapture capital outlays at a faster rate and with lower interest payments than is now possible.

2. Couple accelerated depreciation liberalization with a capital allowance equivalent to the 7% investment tax credit (in other words, a capital allowance approaching 14%). Many other industrial nations use this technique as an incentive for capital expenditures. In other words, a company could write off capital depreciation at a depreciation schedule chosen by them at no long range loss of revenue to the Federal government. In addition, they would be given an additional allowance of, let us say 14%. For example, a company making capital expenditures of \$1,000,000 in a single year could depreciate \$1,140,000 over any depreciation period the company (and not the Internal Revenue Service) decided.

Other alternatives are likely to be advanced. We would be interested in discussing them with you from time to time, at your initiative.

I want to make it clear that ITW is not making this presentation to you because we are interested in a tax break. As a matter of fact, our accounting procedures have been such that the 7% investment tax credit and accelerated depreciation are claimed over a longer period than most companies. However, as a producer of capital equipment and as suppliers to other producers, we are concerned with the overall economic and international trade implications of merely repealing the 7% investment tax credit without providing for some other means of encouraging corporate expenditures for capital equipment.

Sincerely,

JAMES H. MACK,
Manager, Public Affairs.

REYNOLDS METALS CO.,
Richmond, Va., July 18, 1969.

HON. CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHUCK: The new directions which tax policy discussion is taking make it highly desirable to reconsider the relevance and wisdom of the proposed repeal of the investment tax credit to present conditions and needs. The necessity to strengthen the dollar in world markets continues to be of paramount importance to the nation's economic welfare. Repeal of the investment credit would weaken the dollar internationally, insofar as it puts those industries which must compete internationally at a cost disadvantage as against the foreign competitors.

Since repeal of the investment credit was proposed, labor, financing, and other costs have continued to rise here. Foreign manufacturers continue to enjoy some cost advantages, including a wide array of tax incentives and low cost financing. Consequently, now more than ever before, industries which must compete in the world markets need the investment tax credit to prevent their international market position from becoming even weaker. And the less American industry is able to compete overseas, the weaker the dollar would become. A weaker overseas dollar would hurt the domestic economy in many ways, including the efforts to stem inflation.

The repeal of the investment credit would be especially unfair to the domestic aluminum industry. The U.S. industry must compete worldwide more than the vast majority of industries, both for raw materials and markets.

Aluminum is also an advanced technology industry, requiring continuous and substantial investment in better facilities to keep cost and prices as low as possible and yet be able to pay relatively high wages and provide increasing employment. To stay technologically competitive requires advanced planning, as well as large scale financial commitments for inter-related facilities. With world aluminum markets growing, the domestic aluminum industry must either continue to participate in the growth or decline. It cannot stand still. Consequently, Reynolds Metals, as well as its foreign and domestic competitors, are in the midst of large-scale capacity expansion and facility improvement programs. All of our current plant investment programs are designed to provide overdue improvement or "missing links" in our existing facilities. They cannot be abandoned, or even delayed, without seriously damaging the ability of our present facilities to compete effectively and to provide jobs. The failure to take these facts into account with respect to aluminum and similar capital intensive essential industries would both hurt the individual companies and the health of the U.S. economy generally.

If, despite the foregoing, Congress should decide to repeal the investment credit, it should make provision for those basic industries, such as aluminum, where expansion is expensive and requires various types of inter-dependent facilities that take several years to complete. In our company we are in the midst of such a program for which we borrowed several hundred million dollars. Different facilities are at different stages, such as drawing of plans, land purchase, equipment orders, and building construction, and many of these expenditures which must be made in connection with projects already started are not subject to the investment credit under the termination language recently passed by the House. Unless the termination language is amended and its scope enlarged by the Senate, a number of our basic industries will be unable to apply the investment credit to facets of multiple projects already substantially completed.

Sincerely yours,

R. J. REYNOLDS, Jr.,
Chairman of the Board.

ARROW GEAR CO.,
Downers Grove, Ill., June 25, 1969.

Re 7% Investment Credit.
HON. CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PERCY: Thank you for your letter asking for comments on this matter.

We fully agree that this is an inappropriate tool for short-run economic stabilization. The very nature of the problem of purchasing fixed assets for use over a long period of time does not lend itself to tampering with the tax provisions.

In a small business such as ours, we cannot weigh the various factors in an equipment purchase as accurately as can a large corporation. The main elements get all the consideration. Naturally, one of the principle factors is the tax aspects. Should this factor keep changing from time to time, we are put in the position of making major business decisions without the necessary facts.

Investment credit helps us both in the purchasing of machines and the selling of parts which are used by machine tool builders. This, no doubt, contributes to inflationary pressures. It would seem, however, that

we must decide basically what we are trying to do with this investment credit. As you point out, the purpose was to insure plant modernization and purchases of productive equipment in order to place us in a more competitive position in world trade. This is particularly critical in view of the great disparity between the wages paid in this country compared to wages paid in Japan and Europe.

A decision on investment credits should be made on its own merits, without reference to inflation control. Once the legislation is enacted, it should be left alone without being changed periodically.

I appreciate you having asked my views and give permission for printing this in the Congressional Record.

Sincerely,

FRANK E. PIELSTICKER,
President.

R. J. REYNOLDS TOBACCO CO.,
Winston-Salem, N.C., June 27, 1969.

HON. CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PERCY: R. J. Reynolds is opposed to the repeal of the 7% investment tax credit. We believe the investment credit has proved to be a valid tool for stimulating the continuing modernization of the nation's production facilities. Such modernization has reduced total net manufacturing cost. Lower manufacturing cost is a deterrent to inflation and makes it possible for U.S. manufacturers to continue to effectively compete in foreign markets. The foreign countries which have made the most economic progress in the last decade wholeheartedly endorse the investment credit concept.

In our opinion your contention that more realistic and rapid depreciation schedules are needed is indeed correct. Schedules that fully reflect the fact of rapid technological obsolescence would provide some of the funds necessary for American industry to continue to combat rising production costs and to remain competitive in the world market.

We do not believe the investment credit should be expanded to cover all depreciable property, plus additions to inventory and accounts receivable.

Expansion, per se, does not necessarily enable industry to produce at a lower cost, which is the purpose and result of the investment tax credit on production facilities. However, the Government's economic policies should stimulate savings, so that expansion financing can come from individuals and financial institutions.

Thank you for asking our opinion. You have our permission to print this reply in the Congressional Record.

Sincerely,

A. H. GALLOWAY.

TELEGRAPH SAVINGS & LOAN ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., June 27, 1969.

HON. CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PERCY: Thank you for transmitting to me the information on the investment tax credit together with your views.

The 7% investment tax credit is, in my opinion, an inappropriate tool for short run economic stabilization. I am not sure that it should have been enacted in the first place, but contrary to the opinion of many of my fellow Republicans, I believe that the tax credit should be repealed.

Since early 1966, a few respected economists and money managers have been telling us to take steps to cool off the over-heated economy. Mr. Martin from the Federal Reserve was nearly tarred and feathered when he finally, against the wishes of the Admin-

istration, took action in late 1966. Mr. Herbert Prochnow of Chicago, reported in December 1966, upon his return from a visit with the heads of most of the European central banks, that the head of the Italian Bank and German Bank had taken drastic action when they realized that inflation was beginning, their results were effective. As we know, inflation in Germany is slight and their currency strong. We too, here in this country, must be willing to take monetary action when necessary even though such action may be at the time politically unpopular.

It is my impression that the 7% tax credit is better utilized by the largest of our corporations who are able to obtain funds today, whereas the small corporations find no credit available even at high rates.

The major point made by you and other members of my party are important and must also be given much weight. I also believe strongly that our products for export must be competitive in world markets. It is inflation, however, that is the problem not our corporate tax rate.

I usually agree with you, Senator Percy, but am sorry that it can't be 100% this time. Thanks again for asking my opinion.

Very truly yours,

WM. E. STRASSER.

NOTE.—This letter may be used at the discretion of the Senator.

COMMONWEALTH EDISON Co.,
Chicago, Ill., June 30, 1969.

HON. CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR PERCY: We welcome the opportunity to comment on the investment tax credit.

We agree with you that the nation's industry should be encouraged to modernize its productive plant through automation, the purchase of new equipment, and the updating of existing facilities. The investment tax credit is such an encouragement. It has played an important part in making American industry more productive and more competitive in international trade. We also support your view that more realistic tax depreciation schedules would provide important inducements for modernization. In my opinion, these things are vital to create a long-run, healthy economic climate in America. Your advocacy of measures such as these in the Joint Economic Committee and in Congress has our appreciation and complete endorsement.

Checking inflation is certainly of paramount importance and we would support sacrificing the investment tax credit were it to make a material contribution to that end. But we doubt that killing the credit will have the desired effect, in view of the long lead-times characteristic of planning for large-scale plant investment. If, however, the prevailing judgment is different, then we urge suspension rather than repeal. We recognize the arguments against on-again, off-again use of the investment tax credit, but we believe, for the reasons already stated, that its retention as a permanent part of the country's tax structure is desirable, even if it is inapplicable during certain periods.

If the Congress determines that the national interest requires repeal or suspension of the investment tax credit, as the impending vote on the House Ways and Means Committee proposal indicates it may, a serious inequity in that proposal should in any event be cured. The transition rules in the current legislation provide for decreasing the investment tax credit applicable to equipment already ordered but placed in service after December 31, 1970, in a series of steps, with a zero credit applicable to equipment installed after December 31, 1974. Obviously, the proposed reduction in the credit can have no function in checking investment already firmly committed and can,

therefore, serve no significant purpose in checking the current rate of inflation. This discrimination bears especially hard on the utility industry, which must make plant commitments as to major portions of its investment five to seven years in advance and which has made such commitments based on economic parameters including the investment tax credit.

Earlier this year, when the Ways and Means Committee of the House was considering action on the investment tax credit, we wrote to the Committee setting forth the views expressed above in somewhat greater detail, and also pointing out the importance of avoiding a discriminatory withdrawal of the credit by denying it to certain industries—in particular electric utilities—while allowing it to others. A copy of our communication to the Ways and Means Committee is enclosed.

You have our permission to print this letter and the enclosure in the Congressional Record.

Sincerely yours,

GORDON R. COREY,
Chairman, Finance Committee.

COMMONWEALTH EDISON Co.,
Chicago, Ill., May 21, 1969.

Mr. JOHN M. MARTIN, Jr.,
Chief Counsel, Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MARTIN: This letter is submitted in connection with the Committee on Ways and Means hearing on the repeal of the investment tax credit.

We feel strongly that any action taken with respect to the investment tax credit should be applied across the board. It has been occasionally argued that electric power company investments are governed by consumer requirements and are, therefore, not responsive to a special investment tax credit. This is not true because the plant modernization programs of the electric power industry are especially sensitive to changes in taxes and other capital costs. Consequently, we especially urge that electric power industry not be singled out for repeal of the credit.

As to the broader questions of repeal or retention, repeal or suspension, and possible retention of special credits for anti-pollution facilities and the like, we feel that the Ways and Means Committee itself is best able to weigh the broad fiscal consequences which must govern these decisions. On balance we favor suspension over outright repeal because we believe that over the long pull the investment credit is a desirable antidote for the "drag" on plant modernization produced by the corporate federal income tax.

A more detailed statement of the reasons for our position on these matters is attached hereto. We respectfully request the inclusion of this letter and the attached statement in the printed record of the hearings.

Respectfully submitted,

GORDON R. COREY,
Chairman, Finance Committee.

HOUSEHOLD FINANCE CORP.,
Chicago, Ill., June 26, 1969.

HON. CHARLES H. PERCY,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: It is a pleasure to respond to your recent letter regarding the proposal to repeal the 7% investment tax credit. We concur wholeheartedly that "the very nature of the 7-percent investment tax credit makes it an inappropriate tool for short-run economic stabilization." Therefore, its suspension at this time as a part of the proposal to extend the surtax on corporate and personal incomes is unsound and should be opposed.

We feel strongly that the Administration

should take every reasonable step to stem the tide of inflation. The continuance of the surtax and the excise and other taxes which would otherwise expire are a wholly appropriate method of doing so. This is necessary to complement appropriate stems by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to retard the increase in total monetary credit. At this juncture, it is also imperative that Federal expenditures—both in the defense and non-defense areas—be held to the lowest possible level. It is particularly important to restrain the growth of non-defense expenditures until the termination or deceleration of hostilities in Viet Nam makes possible a substantial reduction in defense expenditures.

We believe that realistic depreciation schedules should become a part of the tax modernization program being considered currently by the House Ways and Means Committee, and in due course by the Senate and its appropriate committees. We hope that realistic depreciation allowances and other measures to improve the long-range competitive position of American industry vis-a-vis the rest of the world, will have your most serious consideration and study. Such thorough study may disclose preferable alternatives to the investment tax credit. However, whatever provisions are enacted should be permanent and should not be utilized as a tool for short-run stabilization of the economy.

We have no objection to your insertion of this reply in the Congressional Record.

Respectfully,

W. D. HENDRY.

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY'S LETTER OF MAY 21, 1969

1. *The electric power industry should not be singled out for repeal or suspension of the investment tax credit.*

Critics of the investment tax credit as it applies to electric power companies have argued that investments by these companies are largely governed by consumer requirements and are subject to regulated service charges designed to provide a prescribed after-tax rate of return on investment and, therefore, would not be especially responsive to an investment tax credit.

In reality, the investment tax credit probably has a greater incentive value to the electric power industry than to most other businesses. Technological changes in the electric power business have been among the most dramatic in industry. For example, Commonwealth Edison alone has committed over \$900 million to nuclear power plant construction and fuel. Furthermore, the electric power business is among the most capital intensive in American industry. An electric power company must invest at least \$4 in plant and equipment to produce \$1 of annual revenue. In contrast, in many other businesses, \$1 invested in plant and equipment will produce as much as from \$4 to \$8 of annual revenue. Thus, the investment tax credit has been a significant factor in enabling electric power companies to build modern and efficient facilities earlier than they would otherwise be built.

In addition, the investment tax credit, like any other tax reduction, has a direct effect upon the level of electric rates. It reduces either rate base (in jurisdictions like ours) or current operating costs (in some other jurisdictions), thus in either case directly reducing charges to customers.

2. *Suspension of the credit is preferable to repeal.*

When the investment tax credit became law in 1962, it clearly was intended to be a permanent part of our tax system. When first proposed by President Kennedy, he stated "I believe this investment tax credit will become a useful and continuous part of our tax structure." This position was reiterated

by Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon in hearings before the Senate Committee on Finance in 1962 when he stated: "The arguments I have made for the credit clearly reveal that such legislation must be a permanent part of our tax code if we are to meet foreign competition. . . ."

Since its adoption, the investment tax credit has been effective in improving the investment climate, has increased cash flow and cut the cost of capital for American industry. In doing so, it has enabled industry to offset rising costs by encouraging the modernization of old inefficient facilities and the development of new products, processes and services. All of this has led to increased national productivity and an increasing capability to compete effectively in world markets.

In short, to repeal rather than suspend an effective and important tool in assuring a long-run healthy economic climate for our nation would be a serious mistake."

3. Special problems of the electric power business.

The cost of capital for electric power companies and their needs for capital are both rising very rapidly. Tight money, higher and higher tax burdens, and the increasing demands for reducing the impact of operations on air, water and the landscape are exerting unprecedented cost pressures on the electric power companies.

Despite these special problems, electric power companies in general over the years have been successful in holding down the cost of their services. In fact, the cost of electricity is less today than it was during the depression days of the thirties. Thus, the electric power industry has made significant contributions in helping check inflation in the nation's economy.

Repeal or suspension of the investment tax credit, without some offsetting tax relief such as reduction or elimination of efforts to continue this record in the future.

REGENSTEINER PUBLISHING ENTERPRISES, INC.,

June 27, 1969.

Subject: Investment Credit.

HON. CHARLES H. PERCY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PERCY: I have seen your letter of June 16 on this subject and I can tell you as Treasurer of Regensteiner Publishing Enterprises I am very much concerned about plans in Congress to terminate the 7% Investment Credit.

The basic idea under which this form of business incentive was implemented hasn't changed. The credit is given to industry not only to avoid recession and to make sure that the manufacturing of capital goods will be continued but also to help manufacturers to modernize their equipment without burdening the consumer with the full cost of this modernization.

Today's dynamic economy and evolution of all sorts of equipment in utilizing the latest developments of science and technology require consistent changes and replacement of equipment. Without this, American industry will fall behind our foreign competition and the updating of production tools is the most efficient way the American manufacturer will be able to compensate for the permanent increase of wages. Therefore the improvement of equipment in the long run will be helpful in stopping inflation.

Proponents of the termination of the Investment Credit emphasize their belief that the reduction of capital spending will be a factor in stopping inflation. This is not true. Reducing the manufacturing of capital goods may reduce the work force but will not prevent those earning more than they had previously spent from going into additional purchases and buying more than industry,

with antiquated machinery, can produce, and thus inflation will not be stopped but fostered.

To stop inflation and to keep industry growing and competitive, it is necessary to maintain the investment credit and I shall appreciate everything you, dear Senator Percy, will do to maintain this tax benefit and help the struggling American industry to maintain the level of efficiency and quality that made our country great.

Certainly you are free to use this letter in any way you deem fit.

Assuring you of my full appreciation for the support you are giving Illinois industry, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

ERICH KEET,
Treasurer.

GREYHOUND LEASING & FINANCIAL CORP.,
Chicago, Ill., July 2, 1969.

HON. CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We appreciate receiving your letter of June 16, 1969 in which you discussed the proposed repeal of the Investment Tax Credit and requested our advice regarding said repeal.

Greyhound Leasing & Financial Corporation (Greyhound Leasing) and its subsidiary Greyhound Computer Corporation (Greyhound Computer) fully endorse the views expressed in your letter and those contained in the policy statement of the Republican members of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress. Greyhound Leasing and Greyhound Computer have purchased and leased to their respective customers an aggregate of over \$550,000,000 worth of new capital equipment since the inception of the Investment Tax Credit in 1962. Greyhound Leasing and Greyhound Computer have passed the benefits of the Investment Tax Credit earned on the aforementioned investment through to mostly small and medium size businesses in the form of lower rentals and have thereby enabled such businesses which could not otherwise have modernized their plants and facilities to do so and thereby remain or become competitive with larger domestic and foreign industries. In this manner, the Investment Tax Credit has been beneficial by stimulating competition which contributes to the stable growth of the Nation's economy. If the Investment Tax Credit is repealed not only will small and medium sized businesses be hampered in their ability to compete with larger domestic businesses, but all of United States industry and commerce will suffer in its competition with other countries in the world market.

As the United States' negative Balance of Payments continues it becomes all too clear that, in the long run, the only way United States industry can continue to compete in the world market is to keep its plants and equipment as modern and efficient as is humanly possible. If the Investment Tax Credit is repealed, it is our opinion that the Nation's ability to compete in the world market will be clearly diminished. In such a case, Congress could elect to protect United States industry from foreign competition by resorting to increased import tariffs and more rigid import quotas. To our way of thinking, however, such tariffs and quotas are an artificial means of treating this long term problem and will ultimately fail because they treat the symptom and not the disease. It is our feeling that within a short period of time after the repeal of the Investment Tax Credit, Congress will not only be asked to reinstate the Credit but may also be asked to increase the size and scope of the Credit.

It has been our experience that the short term cyclical fluctuations in the United States economy can best be controlled by temporary changes in income tax rates and by the exercise of the powers granted to the

monetary authorities. The Investment Tax Credit was designed to solve a long term problem, i.e., the maintenance of modern plants and equipment capable of competing favorably in the world market. As such, we feel the Investment Tax Credit is not an appropriate tool for use in controlling the short term problem of the inflation now being suffered by the United States and in fact should not be so used.

It should be pointed out here that we have no objection to the Investment Tax Credit also being used as a tool to channel capital funds to areas of social need and in fact we would support such a plan. However, such a plan should not be adopted in lieu of the present Investment Tax Credit, for ultimately any permanent social improvement in the United States will have to depend on the stability and growth of the United States economy and its ability to compete in the world market.

Thank you for inviting us to express our views on this subject. We hope that our views may be of some use to you and your colleagues in your attempt to reach a correct decision with regard to the Investment Tax Credit. Your decision will undoubtedly have a serious and long range effect on the economy of our Country. If you deem it appropriate, you may feel free to print this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Very truly yours,

W. CARROLL BUMPERS,
President.

KENNECOTT COPPER CORP.,
New York, N.Y., July 3, 1969.

HON. CHARLES H. PERCY,
Senator from Illinois,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PERCY: Your thoughtful letter of June 16 affords a most welcome opportunity to express Kennecott Copper Corporation's point of view on the proposal to repeal the investment tax credit.

We, of course, share your concern over the inflationary trends evident in the national economy today. And we agree that governmental action is a vital part of any broad-based solution to the problem.

For a number of reasons, however, we also concur with your stand that repeal of the investment credit is not an appropriate anti-inflationary device.

1. As it affects much of the mining industry, repeal of the tax credit would actually have an inflationary effect. As we told Kennecott shareholders at our May annual meeting:

"The investment tax credit has provided the industry an incentive to invest in mining plant and equipment, with resultant additional production of minerals and metals. Shortages of needed minerals and metals are a basic reason for price inflation in the minerals industry today. Additional, not reduced, investment incentives are needed to fight inflation under these conditions."

2. When the investment credit was first enacted in 1962 to help make our depreciation system more competitive with liberal practices overseas, American industry was assured that the credit was to be a permanent feature. In early 1962, former Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon said:

"I consider our program of depreciation reform—including the investment credit—a central part of our economic policy . . . The achievement of this objective . . . requires both the investment tax credit and the faster write-offs that would be permitted under depreciation policies, which, in broader recognition of the increasing importance of obsolescence in the postwar world, would permit American firms to assume shorter tax lives for depreciable property."

3. Careful study should be given to the events of 1966 when the Administration was successful in achieving a temporary suspension of the tax credit. The original plan called

for withholding the credit for a period of 16 months. But after 5 months when other forces were causing a slowdown in the economy, the credit was not only reinstated, but liberalized. The result of this ill-advised experiment was to burden business and government with expensive and unproductive record-keeping and auditing problems.

Repeal of the tax credit will result in a deceleration of industrial expansion only after a considerable period of time in view of the long-range spending plans of business, at which time it may be necessary again to stimulate the economy and it is probable that the credit will be proposed again as such a stimulant with the burdensome results as set forth above. This lag in effectiveness clearly illustrates that the credit is highly unsuitable as a contracyclical device.

4. Perhaps most importantly, we are concerned about the impact repeal of the tax credit would have on the future ability of the American mining industry to meet the nation's steadily growing demand for minerals. By the year 2000, requirements for copper in the United States are expected to quadruple; iron and coal demand to double; and aluminum demand to be almost six times what it is today. Assistant Secretary of the Interior Hollis M. Dole recently acknowledged that meeting such demands "will require billions of dollars in investment and development." And he warned that "if due significance isn't given to the real value of our mineral industry today, the mineral shortages of the future could well become a social problem."

Since the mining industry is unusually capital intensive, repeal of the tax credit will severely restrict the industry's ability to accomplish its mission in support of the nation's burgeoning economy.

5. The same point must be considered in the broader context of America's total industrial productive facilities. As Joel Barlow emphasizes in his May 23, 1969, letter (copy attached) to House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Wilbur Mills, statutory changes are required in the tax law to provide the desirable growth, modernization and competitiveness of U.S. productive capability. Until such changes are accomplished, maintenance of the investment tax credit is essential.

6. Linkage of the tax credit repeal proposal with eventual removal of the income tax surcharge may be good politics, but it is neither good arithmetic nor good economics. Treasury officials estimate that the revenue loss from reduction of the surcharge would amount to \$1.9 billion in the fiscal year 1970. The revenue gain from repeal of the investment credit would be \$1.8 billion . . . almost balancing out the loss.

We believe that extension of the surcharge would be a more effective restraint to inflation. Repeal of the investment tax credit may well serve to accomplish just the opposite.

If, in your judgment, this statement may be of assistance, please feel free to insert it in the Congressional Record.

Very truly yours,

FRANK MILLIKEN.

LETTER TO HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE ON THE ADMINISTRATION'S PROPOSAL TO REPEAL THE 7 PERCENT INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT, BY JOEL BARLOW, WASHINGTON, D.C., ATTORNEY (OFFICIAL TEXT)

MAY 23, 1969.

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: My position on the 7% investment credit and on tax credits generally is set out at some length in my

testimony before this Committee in 1961¹ and 1966² and in my testimony before the Senate Finance Committee in 1966³ and 1967.⁴ In this statement I shall consider only certain general aspects of President Nixon's proposal to repeal the 7% credit.

It is my view that tax credits for investment and other business expenditures can be justified, if at all, only as emergency and transitional measures to correct deficiencies in the tax structure on a temporary basis. For example, in another war requiring expansion of facilities, a tax credit might well serve as a substitute for the 60-month amortization allowed in World War II and during the Korean War. The deficiencies in the depreciation tax structure in 1961 were ample justification for the enactment of the 7% credit as a temporary, transitional measure. Its continuance today has the same justification.

I am entirely in accord with the views you and Mr. Byrnes have heretofore expressed that as a general rule tax credits should not be grafted on the tax structure with the principal purpose of bringing about social and economic change; and that acceptance and adoption of the tax credit device as a matter of policy will inevitably lead to a proliferation of tax credit and an unwarranted and unnecessary erosion of the tax base.

You will understand then that I am opposing the proposed repeal of the 7% investment credit at this time only because the Treasury has suggested no alternatives, and this particular credit has proved to be necessary on a transitional basis to compensate partially at least for the obvious deficiencies in our depreciation tax structure. This structure, which is largely written into regulations and not the Code, is so full of uncertainties and unreasonable restrictions such as the reserve ratio test that it is wholly inadequate to provide the assurance needed for the modernization, replacement and expansion of productive facilities.

It is so inferior to the capital recovery tax structures of other industrial nations that United States industry, already burdened with the highest labor costs in the world, is at a great disadvantage in trying to maintain its world markets and a favorable balance of trade and international payments.

We can label the 7% credit a tax "subsidy," as Mr. Nixon has done in his tax message urging repeal, and we can, as Americans, be opposed to all subsidies on principle; but we must not forget that the United States is no longer the self-contained and self-sufficient economic unit it once was, and if other nations subsidize investment to compete with us, we have little choice but to provide equivalents.

In 1934, President Roosevelt arbitrarily reduced capital recovery tax allowances to increase tax revenues⁵ just as President

¹ Hearings on the President's 1961 Tax Recommendations before the Committee on Ways and Means, May 12, 1961, Volume 2, pp. 983-1006.

² Hearings on the President's Proposal on Suspension of the Investment Credit before the Committee on Ways and Means (H.R. 17607), September 14, 1966, pp. 208-231.

³ Hearings on Suspension of Investment Credit before the Senate Finance Committee (H.R. 17607), October 5, 1966, pp. 106-139.

⁴ Hearings on Incentives for Investment in Urban Poverty Areas before the Senate Finance Committee (S. 2088 and S. 2100), September 14, 1967.

⁵ T.D. 4422, XIII-1 Cum. Bull. 58 (February 28, 1934); Mim. 4170, XIII-1 Cum. Bull. 59 (April 4, 1934). President Roosevelt effected this reduction by lengthening the depreciable lives of facilities through the issuance of

Nixon now proposes to do in 1969 by repealing the investment credit.

So far reaching were President Roosevelt's 1934 disallowances that the industrial plant of the United States has not yet fully recovered from the obsolescence and higher cost production that resulted from the unwise and unrealistic depreciation policies and practices the Government required and business adopted after 1934.

Even at this late date, the United States has the highest percentage of overage, obsolescent production facilities of any of the leading industrial nations of the world.⁶

Despite the beneficial effects of the 7% credit, the liberalized Depreciation Guidelines, the 1954 accelerated depreciation methods, and the 60-month amortization allowances of the 1940's and the 1950's, the United States has not been able to do more than slowly narrow the gap. These remedial provisions have generally been too temporary and uncertain, or too hedged in with restrictions in both language and administration, to insure the modernization and replacement of productive facilities that is so sorely needed.

It is clear that the United States will not be able to close the obsolescence gap until it adopts a permanent, integrated capital recovery tax structure that is as liberal and realistic as the tax structures of the other principal industrial nations. One searches in vain the language of President Nixon's tax message and the recent testimony of Treasury officials to find any recognition of the need for this high priority legislation.

At a time when the United States' balance of trade is increasingly threatened, and we are faced with a critical and continuing imbalance in international payments, one would almost be certain that the new Administration would assign a high priority to the task of making our tax depreciation structure comparable to that of other nations, instead of giving it a low priority and further restricting it as Mr. Nixon proposes to do in repealing the 7% credit.

The Treasury recently has promised a further survey and study of depreciation, presumably to plant the thought that it may ultimately change course, and also, perhaps, to soften the blow of threatened repeal. But there is no assurance under the depreciation concepts that the Treasury has traditionally espoused, or under the present depreciation statute as interpreted by the courts, that such a survey will not lead to further restrictions.

In the past year Treasury officials have repeatedly stated that the survey material before them would seem to indicate that instead of proceeding to eliminate restrictions, such as the reserve ratio test, the Treasury should extend the depreciable lives of the Guidelines, and, in addition, make the accelerated depreciation methods available only to those corporations that are willing to use them for financial reporting purposes.

The prospects then for some permanent change and improvement in the tax structure simply as a kind of quid pro quo for the loss of the investment credit are not very encouraging, to say the least, unless the tax-writing committees of Congress intervene. Thus, to keep any semblance of a competitive capital recovery tax structure, industry must, until such intervention comes, cling to the credit on a transitional basis.

Treasury Decision 4422 and the controversial Bulletin F schedule of much longer depreciable lives. President Kennedy supplanted Bulletin F with the Depreciation Guidelines in 1962 which substantially shortened depreciable lives and liberalized depreciation allowances.

⁶ 1969 Survey of McGraw-Hill, Inc.

After two proposals in the last three years to suspend and repeal the credit, it should finally be clear to industry, however, that the investment credit can be regarded as nothing more than a temporary transitional measure. It is really nothing more than an interim expedient to tide over capital-intensive industry to the day when the Government will recognize (1) that competitive and adequate investment allowances are not necessarily subsidies, and (2) that different kinds of income have to be taxed in different ways at different times depending on the risks and the national interest that may be involved.

Of course, industry's endorsement of the 7% credit in 1961 as a permanent solution was understandable. President Kennedy had made it clear that none of the alternatives suggested at the time by industry would be considered; and Treasury officials, with the best of intentions, had promised that the credit would be permanent. Industry's defense of the credit today is also understandable simply because the Administration has given no assurance that there will be any permanent improvement of any kind, such as the elimination of the reserve ratio test.

It has become increasingly clear from the rigid position taken by the Nixon Administration that just so long as business persists in its unrealistic view of the 7% credit as a long-range permanent measure, and shuts its eyes to the vulnerability of the credit to political and economic change, just so long will the enactment of an adequate capital recovery tax structure be postponed.

The Nixon Administration has now reiterated all the arguments for proposing repeal in 1969 that the Johnson Administration advanced in proposing suspension in 1966. And all of these arguments, such as the alleged inflationary impact of the credit, have been rebutted in 1969, just as they were in 1966. Nevertheless, the credit is almost certain to be repealed in 1969 without regard to the merits, just as it was suspended in 1966.

This would seem to be proof positive that in its present form at least the credit stands directly in the way of the kind of permanent allowances that are needed to keep American industry competitive. If it were not for the dire economic consequences that are certain to result from repeal, elimination of the credit might be considered a blessing.

When the investment credit was originally proposed in 1961, I opposed it in testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means, principally on the ground that both as a contracyclical device and a politically vulnerable tax subsidy, it would be turned off and on; and that, accordingly, it lacked the permanence required to shore up our tax structure and encourage long-range industrial planning for modernization, replacement and expansion.

I purposely did not testify before the Senate Finance Committee in 1961 to oppose the tax credit there because President Kennedy and the Congressional leaders had made it very clear after the House hearings that none of the alternatives I had recommended to this Committee would be adopted; that it was either the investment credit or nothing.

Also, the original draft of the credit provision as submitted by the Treasury had been greatly improved and, among other changes, the progressive rates and the complicated, inequitable tie-in with depreciation allowances had been eliminated. In addition, the Treasury had responded to my earlier criticism in my testimony before this Committee by giving repeated assurances that the credit was not to be considered just a contracyclical measure or manipulative device, but instead a permanent part of our tax depreciation structure. We had the Treasury's word on that in 1961 and again in 1966 and 1967.

The Treasury said that the credit was not a spigot, as I had described it, to be turned

off and on with every shift in the political and economic winds.

Actually, these were assurances that the Treasury could not give, but they did suggest that the credit might enjoy some longevity. However, as we all know, four years after the credit was enacted, it was suspended in 1966 as a contracyclical measure. In 1967 it was hastily reinstated to counter the unintended consequences of the 1966 suspension. And now, two years later, a Republican administration proposes to repeal this Democratic measure as a contracyclical move, and also to get rid of what Mr. Nixon has described in his tax message as an unwarranted and unneeded tax subsidy to business with a relatively low priority in terms of revenue needs.

No thoughtful person will disagree with the high tax priorities that must be given to the demands of the Vietnam War, inflation and the pressing needs of our cities. But it seems very clear that the Administration handicaps itself in trying to meet these demands by giving no priority or any recognition to tax changes that are urgently required to keep the United States competitive in world markets, improve our critical balance of trade and international payments and maintain a sound dollar.

Quite understandably, depreciation and other technical tax allowances for business investment seldom if ever enjoy a very high priority in the public mind or in the world of politics. It is only when the President or the Committee on Ways and Means, or both, provide the necessary leadership to educate the public and the Congress, as they did in 1961 and 1964, that major improvements can be made in the tax depreciation structure.

At a time when the public is somewhat understandably emotional about tax reform, it is easy to discredit business investment allowances in the public mind, no matter how essential they may be to the nation's economic health, by labeling them tax subsidies, tax preferences and tax loopholes.

The much more difficult task that is so essential at the moment is to make the public and the Congress understand that it is not in the national interest in this competitive world to put further restrictions on investment in industrial facilities, or to postpone any longer the enactment of an improved and realistic depreciation tax structure.

What are some of the changes that are so urgently needed?

1. Revision of Section 167(a) of the Internal Revenue Code to permit the elimination of the reserve ratio test from the Depreciation Guidelines. This test is so restrictive and so complex that it has discouraged many taxpayers, particularly small taxpayers, from using the Depreciation Guidelines. If the test is not eliminated, its application will give rise once again to the wasteful and needless controversies in which Revenue agents use hindsight to try to lengthen depreciable lives.

2. Enactment into law of the Depreciation Guidelines (minus the reserve ratio test) on the model of the Canadian system. At the present time too large a part of our depreciation tax structure is embodied only in regulations of uncertain tenure. Statutory permanence is required to provide assurance for long-range planning for modernization, replacement and expansion of facilities.

3. Revision of Section 1245 of the Code to tax fully the gain on the disposition of real property as well as personal property at normal and surtax rates subject only to the exceptions and limitations of Section 1245(b).

4. Elimination of the present requirement that salvage value be established. After amendment of Section 1245 as proposed, the salvage value requirement will no longer be essential or even important to minimize tax avoidance. Needless controversies with Reve-

nue agents over salvage value will come to an end.

5. Revision of Section 179 of the Code to eliminate the dollar limitation on the additional first-year depreciation allowance, and to increase the rate of the allowance to 15% upon the repeal of the 7% investment credit.

6. Retention of the 7% investment credit until such time as the changes in items 1 through 5, *supra*, have been adopted or until the effective tax rates on corporations and individuals are reduced below 50%. Repeal of the 7% investment credit when it takes place should not be on a selective basis.

Respectfully,

JOEL BARLOW.

CORPORATE SERVICES DIVISION,
H. D. HUDSON MANUFACTURING CO.,
Chicago, Ill., June 27, 1969.

Senator CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for your letter of June 16, 1969, requesting an expression of opinion regarding the proposed repeal of the 7% Investment Tax Credit, presently extended to U.S.A. Industry.

I would consider such a repeal definitely detrimental to the development and progress of American Industry. With the numerous direct and indirect taxes which industry must pay, it is essential that project planning be done well in advance of actual execution. Planning based on a cost factor reflecting this investment tax credit becomes immediately obsolete, and furthermore, executing of these plans being more expensive, will eventually have to be reflected in higher unit prices, contributing rather than restraining inflationary tendencies. Plans for expansion and improvement of industrial facilities are a constant task, not one that can be turned on or off, at the inclination of a group of individuals.

You state so correctly that "unit cost must be held down in order for U.S. Industry to better compete with industries in other Nations."

The tendency prevails that industry, rightly or wrongly, is held responsible for an unfavorable balance of payment. Yet, as a person who has been active in international trade for approximately 4 decades, it is still difficult for me to understand why the exporting fraternity receives so little consideration in the form of tax incentives, or other tangible help, which other governments do extend to their export industries, either directly or indirectly.

These, in a few words, are my basic feelings, and it must be understood that I speak only for myself and not for anyone else in the company, or for the company itself, which employs me. I have no objection to having this reply printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely,

G. M. RAFFICH,
Staff Manager, International Operations.

AUTO DRIVEAWAY CO.,
Chicago, Ill., June 26, 1969.

Re investment tax credit.
Hon. CHARLES H. PERCY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PERCY: I have received your form letter relative to the investment tax credit. Personally I believe that it is a very good thing for business, and it serves a good purpose. I think, however, that it should be repealed at the present time, because of the hectic situation we are in, the inflationary spiral, and the huge overseas deficit we are running.

If you members of the Senate would cut federal spending so the budget would show a reasonably large excess each year; and if you members of the Senate would cut out

overseas expenditures such as Foreign Aid, then I believe we could afford to have the investment tax credit given to industry.

I am a small business man and there have been a few occasions where we have been able to take advantage of the investment tax credit, therefore, we would like to see it remain on the books, but I am first of all an American, and we believe that the over-riding considerations today have to be a surplus in our Federal Budget, the elimination of the huge inflationary spiral, and a favorable balance payment in our international accounts.

I don't like to be so blunt, but I honestly feel that the trouble on the above could be laid at the doorstep of the Senate, who have repeatedly voted larger expenditures than the House, and I honestly feel that the Senate should start to cut back on expenditures so the investment tax credit can be reinstated at a future date.

You have asked if we would give permission to print this reply in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have no objections. This is not meant to be a critical letter, it reflects my honest thinking and I appreciate the opportunity to express my views.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. SOHL,
President.

DVORAK BUICK CO.,
Cicero, Ill., June 26, 1969.

HON. CHARLES H. PERCY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PERCY: Your letter of June 16th and the statement of the Republican views contain strong and realistic facts supporting the retention of the 7% investment tax credit.

The small businessman who operates on a small profit (as per cent of sales) needs this tax credit. This year especially profits for small businesses are under great pressure. Real Estate, Personal Property, and Social Taxes are higher and are climbing. Demands from hard to replace employees are beyond the employers ability to pay. Every item of expense is up sharply.

In order to purchase expensive pieces of equipment the small operator must deplete his cash or borrow at these high rates. To the small business the 7% investment tax credit is a substantial help. Equipment is being replaced constantly. The small business needs the 7% tax credit in order to continue to employ people.

I would like to see you and your colleagues adhere to the Republican views and work against the repeal of the 7% investment tax credit. You have my permission to print this reply in the Congressional Record.

Yours very truly,

JERRY W. DVORAK,
President.

MARCOR,
Chicago, Ill., June 26, 1969.

HON. CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PERCY: I have your letter of June 16 in which you ask for advice on the investment tax credit. The following statements are made as an individual businessman and not as a representative of company opinion.

I have always believed that the 7 percent investment tax credit should never have been instituted in the first place. To me it represents a subsidy to business which corporations should avoid with a vengeance. We cannot, in effect, talk out of both sides of our mouths.

American industry always has and should continue to be ingenious enough to improve its capital investments without requiring a special subsidy.

It is maintained that the 7 percent investment credit contributed to the improved efficiency of American business by encouragement of investment in modern equipment. I personally question this assumption. However, I strongly recommend that Congress give consideration to more realistic and rapid depreciation schedules and much attention ought to be given to this factor even to the extent of eliminating all restrictions on depreciation. This suggestion has far reaching implications I realize, however, from the standpoint of cash flow, it would contribute greatly to industry in the area of replacement of obsolete equipment sooner than present depreciation restrictions permit.

I have no objection to your printing my reply in the Congressional Record.

Cordially,

CARL BLUMENSCHNEIN.

DICKS VENDING SERVICE,
Aurora, Ill., June 27, 1969.

HON. CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PERCY: I certainly appreciate your interest in this vital matter of investment credit.

As a small businessman I am feeling the ever increasing pressure of price and wage increases. In our particular type of business it is extremely difficult to pass price increases on to our customers. As a result, in order to expand our business in a sound and profitable manner we are heavily dependent on investment credit to assist us in making a profit.

The repeal of the investment credit would be of such great significance to our company, we could be forced to a decision of liquidating our company to one of the nationally operating companies that continually try to acquire companies of our type.

I urge you to support our position to maintain the investment credit.

Thank you for our continued efforts on our behalf.

Respectfully,

RICHARD A. BAKALA,
President.

P.S.—You have my permission to print this reply in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE EDUCATION OF CONGRESS AND OF THE AIR FORCE

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, from time to time, either by direct statements or indirect reference, Members of this and the other body of Congress have insinuated that the officers of our armed services are not particularly well educated. This, I believe, is all a part of the antimilitary posture of those who see dire evil in the so-called military-industrial complex. I have been interested in these remarks because when I served as a Reserve officer in the Personnel Headquarters of the Air Force I was in constant touch with the continuing efforts of the Air Force to upgrade education, not only in the officer forces, but in the enlisted forces, as well.

I have investigated the educational record of Members of the Senate and the House, and I have also obtained figures from the Air Force relative to the percentage of Air Force officers having college degrees. I offer the figure in statistical form below. I believe a reading of them by any Member of Congress should cause him to think twice before comparing the record of Congress in education with that of the Air Force or any other branch of the military.

While engaged in research on Congress, I thought it might be interesting to discover the percentage of law degrees held by Members of both bodies. I find 295 law degrees, or 58.9 percent of the total membership.

I ask unanimous consent that a breakdown on these figures and an interesting statement by Thomas Jefferson be printed in the RECORD. By inserting Jefferson's statement, I by no means indicate that I share his feelings; I merely point out that thought had been given to this subject long ago.

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

	Republicans	Democrats	Total	Percentage
Senate: Law degrees:				
LL.B.....	23	37	60	60.0
LL.M.....	1	1	2	1.0
J.D.....	1	5	6	6.0
Total.....	25	42	67	67.0
House: Law degrees:				
LL.B.....	78	129	207	48.0
LL.M.....	1	1	2	0.5
J.D.....	13	1	14	3.0
Total.....	91	131	228	53.0
Grand total, law degrees for both Houses.....			295	58.9

	Republicans	Democrats	Total	Percent
Senate:				
No college record.....	0	0	0	0
College, no degree.....	7	4	11	11
B.A. or B.S.....	8	6	14	14
M.A. or M.S.....	3	3	6	6
Ph. D.....	0	2	2	2
House:				
No college record.....	17	28	45	8.4
College, no degree.....	12	9	21	4.8
B.A. or B.S.....	49	53	102	23.6
M.A. or M.S.....	10	13	23	5.33
M.D.....	2	1	3	.7
B.D.....	2	0	2	.4
Ph. D.....	4	3	7	1.6

Percentage of Air Force officers with college degrees as of Nov. 21, 1968

BS	60
MS	12.6
Ph. D.....	5.5
No degree.....	21.9

NOTE.—These figures were supplied by the Air Force on Tuesday, July 22, and represent the latest figures available. Another report will be available in November, showing similar information on a more current basis.

THOMAS JEFFERSON. I served with General Washington in the legislature of Virginia, before the Revolution, and, during it, with Doctor Franklin in Congress. I never heard either of them speak ten minutes at a time, nor to any but the main point, which was to decide the question. They laid their shoulders to the great points, knowing that the little ones would follow of themselves. If the present Congress errs in too much talking, how can it be otherwise, in a body to which the people send one hundred and fifty lawyers, whose trade it is to question everything, yield nothing, and talk by the hour? That one hundred and fifty lawyers should do business together ought not to be expected.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING ASSISTANCE FOR VETERANS

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, on July 18 I introduced for myself and other

Senators S. 2668, a bill to amend chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, to provide additional education and training assistance to veterans and to provide for a predischARGE education program. This bill would establish a broad range of educational and training assistance benefits for preveterans preparatory to their undertaking education and training under the regular GI bill program after their discharge. Thus, we refer generally to this bill as the "Prep" bill.

As I indicated in my remarks on the 18th in explaining the provisions of the bill, my staff has been preparing a comprehensive table showing by States the

location of all major military installations in the United States; the number of military personnel assigned there; the Department of Defense transition program contact on those bases participating in that program; the nearest city to the base; the average monthly separations at those bases participating in the transition program; and the nearest college—including junior colleges—university, or technical school to each base.

I indicated in my previous statement that such schools are located within an hour's drive of more than 91 percent of the bases listed. Upon completion of the table, I find that the actual figure is 98.8

percent; that is, as far as we can determine, there is an educational institution in the vicinity of all but five of the 423 bases listed. I think that these figures and the rest of the data in the table make abundantly clear the enormous potential that the prep program has for providing predischarged education to our servicemen in the last year of their active duty.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD.

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

MAJOR DOMESTIC MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

[*Indicates those presently participating in transition program]

Installation	Service branch	Number of military personnel as of June 30, 1968	Transition program contact	Nearest city	Monthly average separations as of April 1969 for transition program sites	Nearest college, university, or technical school
ALABAMA						
Anniston Army Depot	Army	28		Anniston		Harry M. Ayers State Technical Trade School.
*Fort McClellan	do	6,910	Malcolm S. Croker	do	137	Do.
*Redstone Arsenal	do	5,122	Paul R. Fisher	Huntsville	80	Oakwood College, University of Alabama in Huntsville, J. F. Drake Technical Trade School.
*Fort Rucker	do	11,555	William W. Smith	Dothan	427	Enterprise Junior College, Alabama Institute of Aviation Technology.
*Brookley Air Force Base	Air Force	465		Mobile		Carver State Technical School.
*Craig Air Force Base	do	2,220		Selma	19	William R. King State Technical Trade School
*Gunter Air Force Base	do	1,088		Montgomery		Alabama State College, Huntingdon College.
*Maxwell Air Force Base	do	3,179		do	30	Patterson State Technical Trade School.
ALASKA (entire State served by University of Alaska extension)						
Fort Richardson	Army	6,507		Anchorage		Alaska Methodist University.
Fort Wainwright	do	5,237		Fairbanks		University of Alaska.
Fort Greeley	do	848		do		Do.
Adak Naval Station	Navy	1,772		Adak		University of Alaska extension.
Adak Naval Communications Station	do	171		do		Do.
Kodiak Naval Station	do	1,016		Kodiak		Kodiak Community College.
Kodiak Naval Communications Station	do	229		do		Do.
Eielson Air Force Base	Air Force	2,802		Fairbanks		University of Alaska.
Elmendorf Air Force Base	do	8,310		Anchorage		Anchorage Methodist University.
ARIZONA						
*Fort Huachuca	Army	9,154	James W. Lewis	Tucson	150	University of Arizona Extension Center.
Navajo Army Depot	do	9		Flagstaff		Northern Arizona University.
*Yuma Proving Ground	do	2,269	Harold R. Loftus	Yuma		Arizona Western College.
Yuma Marine Corps Station	Air Force	8,083		Tucson	65	University of Arizona.
*Davis Monthan Air Force Base	do	5,730		Glendale	37	Glendale Community College.
*Luke Air Force Base	do	2,946		do	16	Do.
*Williams Air Force Base	do	2,946		Chandler	16	Mesa Community College.
ARKANSAS						
Pine Bluff Arsenal	Army	85		Pine Bluff		Agricultural, Mechanical & Normal College.
*Blytheville Air Force Base	Air Force	2,703		Blytheville	158	Arkansas State University extension.
*Little Rock Air Force Base	do	6,168		Jacksonville	58	Little Rock University, Philander Smith College.
CALIFORNIA						
Fort Baker	Army	197		San Francisco		Numerous colleges, universities, and technical schools in the San Francisco area.
*Fort Irwin	do	2,157	Harold R. Hall	San Bernardino	77	San Bernardino Junior College.
*Fort MacArthur	do	1,220	Robert G. Rutt	San Pedro		California State College at Long Beach, Long Beach Junior College.
*Fort Ord	do	29,830	Frank D. Barnes	Monterey	1,161	Monterey Junior College.
Presidio of Monterey	do	1,115		do		Do.
Sacramento Army Depot	do	53		Sacramento		Sacramento Junior College, Sacramento State College, University of California at Davis.
*Presidio of San Francisco	do	4,648	Joseph W. Burke, Edwin Kelley	San Francisco	140	San Francisco area.
*Sharpe Army Depot	do	217	Joseph E. Cain, Jr.	Lathrop	28	University of the Pacific, Stockton Junior College, Humphreys College.
Sierra Army Depot	do	158		Herlong		Susanville Junior College.
*Letterman Army Hospital	do	2,088	Bernadine Plamondon	San Francisco	82	San Francisco area.
*Oakland Army Terminal	do	7,041	Edward W. Rader	Oakland	230	Do.
Tracy Depot—Defense Supply Agency	do	30		Tracy		University of the Pacific, Stockton Junior College, Humphreys College.
Barstow Marine Corps Supply Center	Marines	1,128		Barstow		Barstow Junior College.
*Camp Pendleton (including hospital)	do	37,976	Lt. Col. C. C. Hossli	Oceanside	1,000	Oceanside Junior College.
China Lake Weapons Center	Navy	794		San Rafael		College of Marin.
El Centro Naval Air Facility	do	459		El Centro		Imperial Junior College.
Lemoore Naval Air Station	do	4,114		Lemoore		Visalia Junior College.
Moffett Field Naval Air Station	do	1,347		Mountain View		Stanford University, San Jose State College, San Jose City College.
Corona Weapons Laboratory	do	7		Corona		University of California at Riverside.
*El Toro Marine Corps Air Station	Marines	10,051	Maj. R. E. Loughridge	Santa Ana		Santa Ana Junior College.
*Long Beach Naval Station (including hospital, shipyard, and supply center).	Navy	1,848	Lt. Comdr. Harry J. Nelson	Long Beach	600	California State College at Long Beach National Technical Schools.

See footnote at end of table.

MAJOR DOMESTIC MILITARY INSTALLATIONS—Continued

[*Indicates those presently participating in transition program]

Installation	Service branch	Number of military personnel as of June 30, 1968	Transition program contact	Nearest city	Monthly average separations as of April 1969 for transition program sites	Nearest college, university, or technical school
CALIFORNIA—Continued						
Los Alamitos Naval Air Station.....	Navy.....	972		Los Alamitos.....		Do.
San Pedro Fuel Depot.....	do.....	245		San Pedro.....		California State College at Long Beach, National Technical Schools, Long Beach Junior College.
Monterey Graduate School.....	do.....	2,051		Monterey.....		Monterey Junior College.
Point Huememe Construction Center.....	do.....	3,685		Oxnard.....		Ventura Junior College.
Point Mugu Missile Range.....	do.....	1,004		do.....		Do.
*San Diego Naval Station (all units, including Marine Corps Recruiting Depot, Ream Field Air Station, Coronado Amphibious Base, Training Center, Hospital, North Island Air Station).....	do.....	49,396	Lt. Albert H. Bengé.....	San Diego.....	750	University of California at San Diego, University of San Diego, San Diego State College, San Diego City College.
Alameda Naval Air Station.....	do.....	2,102		Alameda.....		San Francisco area.
Concord Weapons Station.....	do.....	154		Concord.....		Diablo Valley College.
Mare Island Naval Shipyard.....	do.....	3,921		Oakland.....		San Francisco area.
Oak Knoll Naval Hospital.....	do.....	1,254		do.....		Do.
San Francisco Naval Shipyard.....	do.....	333		San Francisco.....		Do.
*Treasure Island Naval Station and Marine Barracks.....	{ Navy..... Marines..... }	6,145	Lt. Comdr. Rhodell L. Holderby, Capt. W. L. Eberhardt, Jr.....	do.....	{ 1,500 450 }	San Francisco area.
Oakland Supply Center.....	Navy.....	174		Oakland.....		San Francisco area.
Skaggs Naval Naval Security Station.....	do.....	375		Sonoma.....		Sonoma State College.
Stockton Naval Communications Station.....	do.....	495		Stockton.....		University of the Pacific, Humphreys College, Stockton Junior College.
Twenty-Nine Palms Marine Corps Base.....	Marines.....	1,982		Twenty-Nine Palms.....		
*Beale Air Force Base.....	Air Force.....	6,307		Marysville.....	54	Marysville Junior College.
*Castle Air Force Base.....	do.....	5,459		Merced.....		Merced Junior College.
*Edwards Air Force Base.....	do.....	3,756		Edwards.....	45	Lancaster Junior College.
*George Air Force Base.....	do.....	5,666		Victorville.....	82	Victorville Junior College.
*Hamilton Air Force Base.....	do.....	4,467		Novato.....	78	College of Marin.
*Los Angeles Air Force Station.....	do.....	1,368		Los Angeles.....	9	Numerous colleges, universities, and technical schools in Los Angeles area.
*March Air Force Base.....	do.....	6,016		Riverside.....	59	University of California at Riverside.
*Mather Air Force Base.....	do.....	5,743		Sacramento.....	42	Sacramento State College, University of California at Davis, Sacramento City College.
*McClellan Air Force Base.....	do.....	5,605		do.....	86	Sacramento City College, Sacramento State College.
*Norton Air Force Base.....	do.....	6,305		San Bernardino.....	54	San Bernardino Junior College.
*Oxnard Air Force Base.....	do.....	1,233		Oxnard.....	15	Ventura Junior College.
*Travis Air Force Base.....	do.....	12,623		Fairfield.....	197	Vallejo Junior College.
*Vandenberg Air Force Base.....	do.....	8,417		Lompoc.....	79	Santa Maria Junior College.
COLORADO						
*Fort Carson.....	Army.....	25,074	James M. Tolstrup.....	Colorado Springs.....	1,160	Colorado College, Western Technical College
*Fitzsimons Army Hospital.....	do.....	3,080	John Holt.....	Denver.....	177	University of Denver.
Pueblo Army Depot.....	do.....	24		Pueblo.....		Southern Colorado State College.
Rocky Mountain Arsenal.....	do.....	139		Denver.....		University of Denver.
*Air Force Accounting and Finance Center.....	Air Force.....	409		do.....		Do.
*Ent Air Force Base.....	do.....	4,275		Colorado Springs.....	51	Colorado College.
*Lowry Air Force Base.....	do.....	11,174		Denver.....	36	University of Denver.
Peterson Air Force Base.....	do.....	1,084		Colorado Springs.....		Colorado College.
CONNECTICUT						
Groton Submarine Base.....	Navy.....	3,835		New London.....		Mitchell, College, University of Connecticut.
New London Underwater Sound Laboratory.....	do.....	65		do.....		Do.
DELAWARE						
*Dover Air Force Base.....	Air Force.....	9,085		Dover.....	164	Delaware State College.
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA						
Army Map Service.....	Army.....	141				
Harry Diamond Laboratory.....	do.....	23				
Fort Lesley J. McNair.....	do.....	546				
*Military District of Washington, Headquarters.....	do.....		Miss Dorothy Martin.....			
*Walter Reed Army Medical Center.....	do.....	2,200	Robert E. Hynes.....			
*Naval installations (including Washington Naval Station, Naval Security Station, Naval Research Lab, etc.).....	Navy.....	1,423	Lt. Hercules Michas.....	Washington, D.C.....	248 * 115	Numerous colleges, universities, and technical schools in Washington, D.C., area.
*Bolling Air Force Base.....	Air Force.....	2,065			49	
*1005th Special Investigation Group.....	do.....	476			15	
*1035th USAF Field Activities Group.....	do.....	601			9	
*1070th Medical Service Group.....	do.....	16			4	
*U.S. Marine Corps Headquarters.....	Marines.....		S. Sgt. J. L. Crumbacker.....		90	
FLORIDA						
*Jacksonville Air Station.....	Navy.....	5,641	Lt. Comdr. F. W. Reynolds.....	Jacksonville.....	90	Jacksonville University, Jacksonville School of Technology.
Cecil Field.....	do.....	3,785		do.....		Jacksonville University.
*Key West area naval installations (including Naval Station, Naval Air Station, Fleet Sonar School, and hospital).....	do.....	5,614	Lt. Comdr. E. E. Wigginton.....	Key West.....	* 110	Florida Keys Junior College.
*Pensacola Air Station.....	do.....	8,153	Lt. Comdr. M. F. Caetano.....	Pensacola.....	125	University of West Florida, Pensacola Junior College.
Sauflay Field.....	do.....	507		do.....		University of West Florida.
Communications Training Center.....	do.....	1,971		do.....		Do.
Mayport Naval Station.....	do.....	551		Jacksonville.....		Jacksonville University.
Panama City Mine Defense Laboratory.....	do.....	165		Panama City.....		Gulf Coast Junior College.
Sanford Naval Air Station.....	do.....	991		Sanford.....		Seminole Junior College.
Whiting Field.....	do.....	2,306		Pensacola.....		Junior Colleges.
Ellyson Auxiliary Air Station.....	do.....	1,492		do.....		University of West Florida.
*Eglin Air Force Base.....	Air Force.....	14,368		Valparaiso.....	198	Okaloosa-Walton Junior College.
*Homestead Air Force Base.....	do.....	5,811		Homestead.....	83	University of Miami.

Footnotes at end of table.

MAJOR DOMESTIC MILITARY INSTALLATIONS—Continued

[*Indicates those presently participating in transition program]

Installation	Service branch	Number of military personnel as of June 30, 1968	Transition program contact	Nearest city	Monthly average separations as of April 1969 for transition program sites	Nearest college, university, or technical school
FLORIDA—Continued						
*MacDill Air Force Base	Air Force	7,570		Tampa	86	University of Tampa.
*McCoy Air Force Base	do	4,624		Orlando	43	Orlando Junior College.
*Orlando Air Force Base	do	433		do		Do.
*Patrick Air Force Base	do	3,656		Cocoa Beach	33	Brevard Junior College.
*Tyndall Air Force Base	do	4,365		Panama City		Gulf Coast Junior College.
GEORGIA						
Army General Depot	Army	102		Atlanta		Atlanta University Center.
*Fort Benning	do	44,439	Leonard S. Ozley	Columbus	1,280	Columbus College.
*Fort Gordon	do	31,157	John T. Pollock	Augusta	332	Augusta College.
*Fort McPherson	do	2,723	Rosswell F. Phelps and Charles C. McDaniel.	Atlanta	34	Atlanta University Center, Career Academy Schools, Southern Business University.
*Fort Stewart	do	110,827	William H. Cannady	Savannah	1,889	Savannah State College.
Marine Corps Supply Center	Marines	1,795		Albany		Albany Junior College.
Albany Naval Air Station	Navy	692		do		Do.
Athens Naval Supply School	do	675		Athens		University of Georgia.
Atlanta Naval Air Station	do	704		Atlanta		Atlanta University Center, Career Academy Schools, Southern Business University.
Glynco Naval Air Station	do	2,463		Brunswick		Junior College.
Dobbins Air Force Base	Air Force	1,259		Marietta		Kennesaw Junior College.
*Moody Air Force Base	do	2,317		Valdosta	13	Valdosta State College.
*Robins Air Force Base	do	6,271		Macon		Mercer University.
HAWAII						
Note: All military installations in Hawaii are located on the island of Oahu. Army units are Fort Shafter, Schofield Barracks, and Tripler Hospital. Air Force units are Hickam and Wheeler Air Force Bases. Kaneohe Marine Base and Pearl Harbor are largest Navy units.	Army	5,669				University of Hawaii, Electronics Institute of Hawaii, Mid-Pacific Technical Institute.
	Navy	11,756				
	Air Force	10,687		Note: All military installations in Hawaii are within commuting distance of Honolulu.		
IDAHO						
*Mountain Home Air Force Base	do	3,059		Mountain Home		
ILLINOIS						
*Fort Sheridan	Army	3,578	W. J. Overocker, Gilbert L. Stewart.	Chicago	317	Numerous colleges, universities, and technical schools in Chicago area.
Granite City Army Depot	do	180		East St. Louis		University of Missouri at St. Louis.
Joliet Arsenal	do	100		Chicago		Chicago area.
Rock Island Arsenal	do	128		Devanport, Iowa		Augustana College Institute of Drafting and Technology.
Savanna Army Depot	do	241		Savanna		Shimer College.
Forest Park Ordnance Station	Navy	37		Chicago		Chicago area.
Glenview Naval Air Station	do	1,252		do		Northwestern University.
*Great Lakes Naval Training Center, hospital, and electronics supply office.	do	31,722	Lt. Comdr. Francis D. Kelly	do	200	Chicago area.
*Chanute Air Force Base	Air Force	10,749		Rantoul	78	University of Illinois.
Chicago, O'Hare International Airport	do	18		Chicago		Chicago area.
*Scott Air Force Base	do	6,581		Belleville	28	University of Missouri at St. Louis.
INDIANA						
*Fort Benjamin Harrison	Army	2,715	George E. Maynard	Indianapolis	174	Butler University.
Jefferson Proving Ground	do	4		Louisville		University of Louisville.
Crane Naval Ammunition Depot	Navy	67		Bloomington		Indiana University.
Indianapolis Avionics Facility	do	178		Indianapolis		Butler University.
Bakalar Air Force Base	Air Force	25		Columbus		Indiana University extension.
*Grissom Air Force Base	do	3,729		Peru	33	Indiana University at Kokomo.
IOWA						
*Sioux City Air Base	do	1,233		Sioux City		Morningside College.
KANSAS						
*Fort Leavenworth	Army	2,706	Loren L. Hughes	Kansas City	107	University of Kansas at Lawrence.
*Fort Riley	do	13,533	Roger H. Heylin	Junction City	679	Washburn University.
Olathe Naval Air Station	Navy	1,084		Kansas City		University of Missouri at Kansas City.
*Forbes Air Force Base	Air Force	4,488		Topeka	74	Washburn University, Northeast Kansas Area Vocational-Technical School.
*McConnell Air Force Base	do	8,253		Wichita	74	Wichita State University, Friends University, Wichita Area Vocational-Technical School.
KENTUCKY						
Blue Grass Army Depot	Army	10		Lexington		University of Kentucky.
*Fort Campbell	do	26,640	Melvin H. Wagner	Clarksville, Tenn.	1,444	Austin Peay State College.
*Fort Knox	do	34,821	James A. Jones	Louisville	1,020	University of Louisville.
Louisville Naval Ordnance Plant	Navy	140		do		Do.
LOUISIANA						
*Fort Polk	Army	29,304	Donald O. Thompson	Alexandria	375	Louisiana State University at Alexandria.
New Orleans Naval Air Station	Navy	1,047		New Orleans		Tulane University, Delgado College.
*Barksdale Air Force Base	Air Force	6,825		Shreveport	67	Louisiana State University at Shreveport, Shreveport Trade School, Centenary College.
*England Air Force Base	do	3,246		Alexandria	47	Louisiana State University at Alexandria.

Footnotes at end of table.

MAJOR DOMESTIC MILITARY INSTALLATIONS—Continued

[*Indicates those presently participating in transition program]

Installation	Service branch	Number of military personnel as of June 30, 1968	Transition program contact	Nearest city	Monthly average separations as of April 1969 for transition program sites	Nearest college, university, or technical school	
MAINE							
Brunswick Naval Air Station	Navy	669		Brunswick		Bowdoin College.	
Cuttler Naval Radio Station	do.	112		Bangor		Ricker College.	
Winter Harbor Naval Security	do.	316		do.		University of Maine at Orono.	
*Dow Air Force Base	Air Force	1,184		do.		Husson College, University of Maine in Orono.	
*Loring Air Force Base	do.	4,077		Limestone	20	Presque Isle State Teachers College.	
*Topsham Air Force Station	do.	38		Topsham	7	Bowdoin College.	
MARYLAND							
*Aberdeen Proving Ground	Army	8,104	John J. Lichi	Baltimore	183	Note: All military installations in Maryland are within commuting distance of 1 of the numerous universities, colleges, or trade schools in the Baltimore, Washington, Salisbury, Annapolis, or Hagerstown areas.	
Fort Detrick	do.	810		Frederick			
Edgewood Arsenal	do.	1,753		Baltimore			
Fort Holabird	do.	2,508		do.			
*Fort George G. Meade	do.	17,394	Gustaf E. Berglund, David C. Berry, Stanley M. Kupp	do.	600		
*Fort Ritchie	do.	706		do.	30		
Naval Ship R. & D., Carderock	Navy	38		Carderock			
Bethesda Medical Center	do.	2,156		Washington, D.C.			
Annapolis Area Installations (all)	do.	6,855		Annapolis			
Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent	do.	3,275		Washington, D.C.			
Cheltenham Naval Communications Station	do.	1,250		do.			
White Oak Naval Ordnance Laboratory	do.	72		do.			
Indian Head Naval Ordnance Station	do.	288		do.			
Bainbridge Naval Training Center	do.	3,891		Baltimore			
*Andrews Air Force Base	Air Force	8,799		Washington, D.C.	64		
*6970th Support Group, Fort Meade	do.	1,385		do.	24		
MASSACHUSETTS							
Boston Army Base	Army	80		Boston		Note: All military installations in Massachusetts are within commuting distance of one of the numerous colleges, universities, and technical schools located throughout the State.	
*Fort Devens	do.	9,125	William P. Hynes	Worcester	375		
Watertown Army Research	do.	142		Boston			
Natick Laboratories	do.	211		do.			
All Naval Installations	Navy	1,773		Boston area			
*L. G. Hanscom Field	Air Force	1,894		Bedford	25		
*Otis Air Force Base	do.	4,120		Falmouth	25		
*Westover Air Force Base	do.	6,638		Chicopee Falls	79		
MICHIGAN							
Army Tank Auto Command	Army	143		Detroit			University of Detroit, Wayne State University.
Grosse Isle Naval Air Station	Navy	543		do.		Do.	
*Custer Air Force Station	Air Force	41		Battle Creek	36	Grand Valley College.	
*K. I. Sawyer Air Force Base	do.	3,465		Gwinn	56	Northern Michigan University.	
*Kincheloe Air Force Base	do.	3,651		Kinross	39	Lake Superior State College.	
*Selfridge Air Force Base	do.	2,861		Mount Clemens	24	University of Detroit.	
*Wurtsmith Air Force Base	do.	3,236		Ascoda	48	Alpena Community College.	
MINNESOTA							
Twin Cities Naval Air Station	Navy	611		Minneapolis-St. Paul		University of Minnesota.	
*Duluth International Airport	Air Force	2,125		Duluth	36	University of Minnesota, at Duluth.	
Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport	do.	77		Minneapolis-St. Paul		University of Minnesota, Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Northwestern Electronics Institute.	
MISSISSIPPI							
Waterways Exp. Station	Army	43					
Meridian Naval Auxiliary Air Station	Navy	1,824		Meridian		Meridian Junior College.	
Gulfport Construction Battalion Center	do.	1,173		Gulfport		Perkinston Junior College.	
*Columbus Air Force Base	Air Force	1,849		Columbus	16	Mississippi State University.	
*Keesler Air Force Base	do.	16,875		Biloxi	120	Perkinston Junior College.	
MISSOURI							
*Fort Leonard Wood	Army	29,680	George W. Farror	Rolla	578	Lincoln University.	
*Aeronautical Chart Center	Air Force	139		St. Louis		University of Missouri at St. Louis.	
*Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base	do.	2,802		Kansas City	44	University of Missouri at Kansas City.	
*Whiteman Air Force Base	do.	3,119		Knob Noster		Central Missouri State College.	
MONTANA							
*Glasgow Air Force Base	do.	1,166		Glasgow			
*Malmstrom Air Force Base	do.	5,094		Great Falls	54	College of Great Falls.	
NEBRASKA							
*Offutt Air Force Base	do.	11,013		Omaha	92	University of Nebraska at Omaha.	
NEVADA							
Hawthorne Navy Ammunition Depot	Navy	149		Reno		University of Nevada.	
Fallon Naval Auxiliary Air Station	do.	530		do.		Do.	
Indian Springs Air Force Base	Air Force	250		Las Vegas		Nevada Southern University.	
*Nellis Air Force Base	do.	7,058		do.		Do.	
NEW HAMPSHIRE							
Naval units in Portsmouth area (Disciplinary Command, hospital, and shipyard)	Navy	1,867		Portsmouth area		New Hampshire Vocational Institute.	
*Pease Air Force Base	Air Force	2,411		Portsmouth	30	Do.	
NEW JERSEY							
*Fort Dix	Army	38,090	Victor D. Matt	Trenton	352	Rider College, Trenton Junior College.	
*Fort Monmouth	do.	9,908	Kenneth K. Huhn	do.	139	Do.	
Picatinny Arsenal	do.	203		New York City		Numerous colleges, universities, and technical schools in New York City area.	

Footnotes at end of table.

MAJOR DOMESTIC MILITARY INSTALLATIONS—Continued

[*Indicates those presently participating in transition program]

Installation	Service branch	Number of military personnel as of June 30, 1968	Transition program contact	Nearest city	Monthly average separations as of April 1969 for transition program sites	Nearest college, university, or technical school
NEW JERSEY—Continued						
Bayonne Naval Supply Center	Navy	11		New York City		New York City area.
Earle Naval Ammunition Depot	do	379		Trenton		Rider College, Trenton Junior College.
Lakehurst Naval Air Station	do	1,880		do		Do.
Trenton Air Turbine Test Center	do	36		do		Do.
*McGuire Air Force Base	Air Force	8,321		Wrightstown	109	Rider College, Trenton Junior College.
NEW MEXICO						
*Sandia Base	do	1,863		Albuquerque	9	University of New Mexico.
*White Sands Missile Range	Army	1,989	William D. Black	do	50	Do.
Wingate Army Depot	do	8		Gallup		
*Cannon Air Force Base	Air Force	3,758		Clovis	28	Eastern New Mexico University.
*Holloman Air Force Base	do	2,800		Alamogordo	28	New Mexico State University.
*Kirtland Air Force Base	do	3,262		Albuquerque	35	University of New Mexico.
NEW YORK						
Army Pictorial Center	Army	139		Long Island		Numerous colleges, universities, and technical schools in New York City area.
Camp Drum	do	159		Watertown		
*Fort Hamilton	do	2,607	Christopher McHoney	Brooklyn	280	
Seneca Army Depot	do	173		Ithaca		Cornell University.
Watervliet Arsenal	do	13		Albany		State University of New York.
Brooklyn Naval Air Station	Navy	739		Brooklyn		New York City area.
Brooklyn Naval Station	do	1,761		do		Do.
St. Albans Naval Hospital	do	859		New York City		Do.
*Griffiss Air Force Base	Air Force	3,502		Rome	85	Utica College, Utica School of Automation.
*LaSalle Station and Niagara Falls International Airport	do	* 1,242	George O. Caviness	Niagara Falls	15	Niagara University.
Plattsburgh Air Force Base	do	3,180		Plattsburgh	19	State Teachers College in Plattsburgh.
*Stewart Air Force Base	do	3,654		Newburgh	35	State University of New York at New Paltz.
*Suffolk County Air Force Base	do	1,721		New York City	23	New York City area.
NORTH CAROLINA						
Fort Bragg	Army	50,844	Andy Edmondson	Fayetteville	1,954	Methodist College, Fayetteville State College, Fayetteville Technical Institute.
Sunny Point Terminal	do	15		Wilmington		Wilmington College, Cape Fear Technical Institute.
Camp Lejeune	Marine	30,431	Maj. J. Laws	Jacksonville	1,000	East Carolina University at Camp Lejeune.
Cherry Point Marine Corps Air Station	do	9,301		Kingston		East Carolina University at Cherry Point.
New River Marine Corps Airfield	do	3,125		Wilmington		East Carolina University at Camp Lejeune.
*Pope Air Force Base	Air Force	4,019		Fayetteville		Fayetteville State College, Fayetteville Technical Institute.
*Seymour Johnson Air Force Base	do	5,805		Goldsboro		Wayne Community College.
NORTH DAKOTA						
Grand Forks Air Force Base	do	5,464		Grand Forks	73	University of North Dakota.
*Minot Air Force Base	do	5,902		Minot	64	Minot State Teachers College.
OHIO						
Columbus Construction Supply Center		25		Columbus		Ohio State University, Career Academy Schools, Ohio Technica College.
*Lockbourne Air Force Base	Air Force	6,668		do	63	Do.
*Wright-Patterson Air Force Base	do	10,716		Dayton	73	University of Dayton.
Clinton County Air Force Base	do	233		Wilmington		Wilmington College.
Dayton Electronics Center	do	30		Dayton		University of Dayton.
OKLAHOMA						
*Fort Sill	Army	29,701	Russell F. Crooch	Lawton	978	Cameron College.
McAlester Naval Ammunition Depot	Navy	162		McAlester		Eastern Oklahoma College at Wilburton.
*Altus Air Force Base	Air Force	2,537		Altus	36	Altus Junior College.
*Clinton Sherman Air Force Base	do	1,692		Burns Flat	27	Southwestern State College at Weatherford
*Oklahoma City Air Force Station	do	376		Oklahoma City		University of Oklahoma.
*Tinker Air Force Base	do	4,578		do	63	Do.
*Vance Air Force Base	do	1,277		Enid	3	Phillips University.
OREGON						
Umatilla Army Depot	Army	7		Pendleton		Eastern Oregon College.
*Adair Air Force Station	Air Force			Corvallis	31	Oregon State University.
*Kingsley Field	do	1,319		Klamath Falls	10	Oregon Technical Institute.
Portland International Airport	do	48		Portland		Numerous colleges, universities, and technical schools in Portland area.
PENNSYLVANIA						
Carlisle	Army	464		Harrisburg		Harrisburg Area Community College.
Frankford Arsenal	do	55		Philadelphia		Numerous schools in Philadelphia area.
Indiantown Gap Military Reservation	do	342		Harrisburg		Harrisburg Area Community College.
Letterkenny Ordnance Depot	do	70		do		Do.
New Cumberland Army Depot	do	195		do		Do.
Tobyhanna Army Depot	do	155		Scranton		Lackawanna Junior College.
*Valley Forge General Hospital	do	2,508	Thomas J. Rollo	Philadelphia	160	Numerous schools in Philadelphia area.
Johnsville Air Development Center	Navy	472		do		Philadelphia area.
Mechanicsburg Supply Depot	do	143		Harrisburg		Harrisburg Area Community College.
Naval installations in Philadelphia area (*naval station).	do	5,923	Lt. Richard W. Bates (naval station only).	Philadelphia	* 500	Philadelphia area.
Willow Grove Naval Air Station	do	831		do		Do.
Greater Pittsburgh Airport	Air Force	737		Pittsburgh		University of Pittsburgh.
Philadelphia Ind. Supply Center	do	50		Philadelphia		Philadelphia area.
RHODE ISLAND						
Davisville Construction Battalion Center	Navy	585		Providence		Brown University, Providence College.
Quonset Point Naval Air Station	do	1,409		do		Do.
Naval installations in Newport area (*naval station).	do	5,659	Lt. Comdr. Harry H. Misakian (naval station only).	Newport area	* 400	Do.

Footnotes at end of table.

MAJOR DOMESTIC MILITARY INSTALLATIONS—Continued

[* Indicates those presently participating in transition program]

Installation	Service branch	Number of military personnel as of June 30, 1968	Transition program contact	Nearest city	Monthly average separations as of April 1969 for transition program sites	Nearest college, university, or technical school
SOUTH CAROLINA						
Charleston Army Depot	Army	12		Charleston		College of Charleston.
*Fort Jackson	do	26,982	Phil H. Sawyer	Columbia	179	University of South Carolina.
Beaufort Naval Hospital	Navy	204		Charleston		College of Charleston.
Beaufort Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station	do	5,343		do		Do.
*Parris Island Marine Corps Recruiting Depot	Marine	13,252	1st Lt. M. F. Brueckner	Beaufort	160	Do.
Naval installations in Charleston area (*Naval Station)	Navy	3,049	Lt. Cmdr. Richard D. Canter (Naval Station only)	Charleston	260	Do.
*Myrtle Beach Air Force Base	Air Force	3,285		Myrtle Beach		University of South Carolina at Myrtle Beach.
*Shaw Air Force Base	do	6,331		Sumter		University of South Carolina at Columbia.
*Charleston Air Force Base	do	7,963		Charleston	90	College of Charleston.
SOUTH DAKOTA						
Ellsworth Air Force Base	do	4,718		Rapid City	36	South Dakota School of Mines and Technology.
TENNESSEE						
Memphis Naval Hospital	Navy	344		Memphis		Memphis State University.
Memphis Naval Air Station	do	14,096		do		Do.
Arnold Engineering Development Center	Air Force	121		Tullahoma		University of Tennessee Extension.
Sewart Air Force Base	do	4,049		Nashville		Vanderbilt University.
Memphis Ind. Plant Equipment Center		25		Memphis		Memphis State University.
TEXAS						
*Fort Bliss	Army	29,075	Miss Lois M. Godfrey	El Paso	719	University of Texas at El Paso.
*Fort Hood	do	31,870	James Gillon	Killeen	1,833	Temple Junior College, Central Texas State College.
*Fort Sam Houston	do	15,529	Corles N. Goff, Tolmer S. McKinley	San Antonio	690	Trinity University.
*Fort Wolters	do	4,391	Henry B. Walker	Fort Worth	77	Texas Western University, Texas Christian University.
Red River Depot	do	41		Texarkana		Texarkana College.
*Corpus Christi Naval Air Station	Navy	4,140	Lt. Robert N. McKinley	Corpus Christi	200	Delmar College.
Dallas Naval Air Station	do	863		Dallas		Southern Methodist University.
Kingsville Naval Air Station	do	2,474		Corpus Christi		Texas College of Arts and Industries.
Chase Field Naval Air Station	do	2,247		do		Delmar College.
Corpus Christi Naval Hospital	do	237		do		Do.
*Amarillo Air Force Base	Air Force	6,800		Amarillo		West Texas State University.
*Bergstrom Air Force Base	do	4,424		Austin	50	University of Texas.
*Brooks Air Force Base	do	1,312		San Antonio	14	Trinity University.
*Carswell Air Force Base	do	3,814		Fort Worth	44	Texas Western University, Texas Christian University.
*Dyess Air Force Base	do	4,761		Abilene	43	Hardin Simmons University, Abilene Christian College.
*Ellington Air Force Base	do	457		Houston	6	University of Houston, St. Thomas University, Rice University.
*Goodfellow Air Force Base	do	3,086		San Angelo	28	Angelo State College.
*James Connally Air Force Base	do	429		Waco		Baylor University.
*Kelly Air Force Base	do	7,203		San Antonio	85	Trinity University.
*Lackland Air Force Base	do	23,470		do	49	Do.
*Laredo Air Force Base	do	2,293		Laredo	16	Laredo Junior College.
*Laughlin Air Force Base	do	2,675		Del Rio	20	Uvalde Junior College.
*Perrin Air Force Base	do	2,777		Sherman	28	Austin College.
*Randolph Air Force Base	do	5,406		San Antonio	20	Trinity University.
*Reese Air Force Base	do	2,543		Lubbock	15	Texas Technological College.
*Sheppard Air Force Base	do	13,924		Wichita Falls	88	Midwestern University.
*Webb Air Force Base	do	2,682		Big Spring	12	Howard County Junior College.
UTAH						
*Dugway Proving Ground	Army	440	Dale P. King	Salt Lake City	20	} Several universities, colleges, and technical schools in Salt Lake City area.
Fort Douglas	do	181		do		
*Tooele Army Depot	do	183	William V. Christiansen	Tooele		
*Hill Air Force Base	Air Force	3,613		Ogden	40	Weber State College.
Ogden Supply Depot		35		do		Do.
VIRGINIA						
*Fort Belvoir	Army	15,432	Dr. E. A. Eber	Washington, D.C.	314	District of Columbia area.
*Fort Lee	do	15,758	Lee Slaydon	Richmond	492	University of Richmond, Richmond Professional Institute.
*Fort Eustis	do	11,808	John W. Williams	Norfolk	486	College of William and Mary
*Fort Monroe	do	1,778	Henry Stone	do	57	Do.
Fort Story	do	1,482		do		Hampton Institute.
*Fort Myer	do	9,090	Margaret A. Lockwood	Washington, D.C.	275	District of Columbia area.
Gravelly Point	do	556		do		Do.
*Vint Hill Farms Station	do	1,243	Coralis E. Thomas	Warrenton	49	District of Columbia area.
Cheatham Annex Supply Center	Navy	196		Richmond		University of Richmond.
Dahlgren Weapons Laboratory	do	145		Washington, D.C.		District of Columbia area.
Naval installations in Norfolk-Portsmouth area (*Naval Station)	do	19,336	Lt. Comdr. Rex H. Harris (Naval Station only)	Norfolk-Portsmouth	500	Hampton Institute, Old Dominion College.
*Quantico Marine Base	Marines	8,705	Lt. Col. Frank Marcus	Quantico	250	District of Columbia area.
Yorktown Weapons Station	Navy	515		Yorktown		College of William and Mary.
*Langley Air Force Base	Air Force	8,893		Hampton	106	George Washington University extension program.
*33d Air Division, Fort Lee	do	42		Petersburg	11	University of Richmond.
*1127th U.S. Air Force Activities Group, Fort Belvoir	do	153		Washington, D.C.	4	District of Columbia area.
Richmond General Supply Center		575		Richmond		University of Richmond.
Cameron Supply Station		225		Washington, D.C.		District of Columbia area.
The Pentagon		13,501		do		Do.
WASHINGTON						
Fort Lawton	Army	897		Seattle		University of Washington, Automation Institute of Seattle.
*Fort Lewis	do	40,961		Tacoma		University of Puget Sound.
*Madigan General Hospital	do		Mrs. Rose Sowa	do	65	Do.

Footnotes at end of table.

MAJOR DOMESTIC MILITARY INSTALLATIONS—Continued

[* Indicates those presently participating in transition program]

Installation	Service branch	Number of military personnel as of June 30, 1968	Transition program contact	Nearest city	Monthly average separations as of April 1969 for transition program sites	Nearest college, university, or technical school
WASHINGTON—Continued						
Bangor Ammunition Depot	Navy	189		Seattle		University of Washington.
Keyport Torpedo Station	do	248		do		Do.
Bremerton Naval Hospital	do	273		do		Do.
Puget Sound Shipyard	do	554		Tacoma		University of Puget Sound.
*Puget Sound Naval Supply Center	do		Lt. Comdr. W. E. Carroll	Seattle	330	University of Washington.
Bremerton Naval Supply Center	do	596		do		Do.
Jim Creek Radio Station	do	40		do		Do.
Oak Harbor Naval Air Station	do	2,658		do		Do.
Pacific Beach Naval Facility	do	128		Tacoma		University of Puget Sound.
Seattle Naval Air Station	do	1,078		Seattle		University of Washington.
*Fairchild Air Force Base	Air Force	2,980		Spokane	67	Whitworth College.
*McChord Air Force Base	do	7,440		Tacoma	165	University of Puget Sound.
*Paine Field	do	1,233		Everett		University of Washington.
WISCONSIN						
Camp McCoy	Army	74		Sparta		River Falls State University.
General Mitchell Field	Air Force	10		Milwaukee		University of Wisconsin, Marquette University, Milwaukee Institute of Technology.
*Truax Field	do	281		Madison		University of Wisconsin.
WYOMING						
*F. E. Warren Air Force Base	do	3,457		Cheyenne	21	University of Wyoming extension courses in Cheyenne.

¹ Including Hunter Army Airfield.² From training center only.³ Airport only.⁴ From naval station only.

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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Idaho (Mr. JORDAN) is now recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I intend to support President Nixon's request for deployment of phase I of the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system. No issue of recent years has been more vigorously debated than the deployment of an anti-ballistic-missile system. Advocates both pro and con have no disagreement on objectives. Both want a lasting peace but they differ in how best to achieve it. Because the stakes are so high, one must not jump to hasty conclusions. It makes no difference whether one considers himself an expert or a novice like most of us.

I do not intend to get into the numbers game of relative strength of the superpower nations in the matter of either offensive or defensive capability. That is a job for the experts and there are plenty

of them around even though they do not always agree.

It is enough for me to accept the proposition that either side could incinerate the other but with varying degrees of effectiveness. Because 70 percent of our people live on 1 percent of the land, it is quite likely that an equal exchange of nuclear missiles delivered to the most strategic targets in each of the superpower countries would do more damage to us because our population is much more concentrated. One expert claims that we would have to deliver six times as many missiles to achieve a comparable destruction. All of us recognize the sheer folly of a nuclear arms race. It is important to get the superpowers to the bargaining table. We await word from Soviet leaders and we have waited for some time. But in the meantime what should we do—deploy or not deploy the Safeguard system which President Nixon has requested.

Without going into the statistics of comparable capability, I shall deal only with a few points that seem important to me. Frequently, we hear the argument that ABM will require vast sums that could better be used in higher priority items in our domestic budget. It is true that deployment of ABM would require some expenditures that could very well be used elsewhere to meet urgent needs, but insofar as priorities go in this uncertain period, none can be higher than survival.

It is well to keep this issue in proper perspective. In no sense does the bill that is before us commit us to an irrevocable course of action from which there is no return. Compared to the defense budget, this is a very modest request. Let us look at some cost figures.

The budget request for fiscal year 1970

is \$759.1 million to continue development, test and radar deployment. Of this, \$400.9 million is for development and test, which does not appear to be controversial; and of the remainder, \$345.5 million is for procurement of radars, computers, and ground equipment; and \$12.7 million for Kwajalein operations. The only amount in the bill for missile parts is \$600,000. No Sprint or Spartan missiles will be deployed without congressional approval. The amount in contention is about equal to the cost of 4 days of the war in Vietnam. Each successive step must have congressional approval. Favorable progress at the bargaining table could freeze the program at any stage.

Personally, I do not regard the \$80 billion Defense budget as a sacred cow. In my opinion, it contains several items of lower priority than Safeguard. The committee has done a good job in trimming this budget, but I believe there is more work to be done here.

Phase I of this deployment is limited to the location of Safeguard components at two Minuteman wings. Deployment at these two sites provides an opportunity to find and remove those technical and operational bugs which are not likely to show up in research and development efforts.

Total cost of Safeguard is estimated at \$8 billion, subject to annual review, but an important point to remember is that the Safeguard program can be terminated at any time the Russians will negotiate a deescalation of the nuclear arms race.

This aspect of the President's decision to deploy the Safeguard system has not received the attention which I believe it deserves, and this has led to misunderstanding. The Safeguard plan has been

approved in principle, but insofar as execution is concerned only two installations have been recommended to Congress for authorization—one at Malmstrom Air Force Base in Montana and one at Grand Forks Air Force Base in North Dakota. Before further deployments are approved, the intelligence estimates on which the potential threats described here are based, will be updated and reviewed and at the highest levels of Government. If those estimates reveal a change in the development of the threat as we now see it, the Safeguard deployment will be modified accordingly. The progress of deployment will also be governed by the status of any arms control discussions we may be having with the Soviets. In short, Safeguard will be deployed only as the threat, against which it is designed to protect, develops and only if it is not inconsistent with any progress we might be making in arms control talks. Moreover the Congress retains absolute control through the authorization and appropriation functions for each successive phase of Safeguard.

Some opponents of Safeguard claim it will not work and they present a long list of scientists to attempt to prove it. This is not the first time that the scientific community has been divided. Back at the turn of the century some of the skeptics were sure that the Wright brothers were tinkering with a heavier-than-air machine that could not possibly defy the law of gravity in sustained flight.

Mr. President, a few days ago, I clipped from the *New York Times* an article which I think is revealing and bears on this same subject. It reads:

TIMES CORRECTS A 1920 ERROR

NEW YORK, July 17.—The *New York Times* ran a correction today on an error made in 1920 about the future of rockets.

The *Times*, on Jan. 13, 1920, scoffed at Professor Robert H. Goddard, the father of space exploration, for believing a rocket could function in a vacuum. "He only seems to lack the knowledge ladled out daily in high schools," the *Times* wrote.

With the Apollo 11 headed for the moon today, the *Times* decided:

"It is now definitely established that a rocket can function in a vacuum.

"The *Times* regrets the error."

Mr. President, then there are other opponents of Safeguard who not only claim it will not work but that its deployment would be provocative—that somehow it will escalate the arms race. I find a lack of consistency here—obviously if it will not work—and I am sure the Russians would know it if we did—it could not provoke escalation. Our potential adversaries should be pleased to find us dedicating our talent and dissipating our energies and resources on a system that was doomed to fail.

So the experts disagree on how well the system might work. Each of us is entitled to his own opinion, but with our scientists now able to send men to the moon and bring them back, I do not feel competent, as a nonscientist, to challenge the technical feasibility of the system.

Admittedly, it is a new round of weaponry, but Safeguard is wholly a defensive system. Like all nuclear weapons

systems, we hope it need never be used. Unlike other systems, it is a method of deterrence which will save lives and not destroy them. It seems to me that Safeguard is no more provocative than a parachute in a fighter plane, a life preserver on a sail boat, or a seat belt in an automobile. All are designed for the same purpose, and that is to save lives. Moreover, it is more consistent with the moral objectives of the United States for this country to provide more effective ways of protecting people than it is to base our deterrent power wholly upon our ability to kill people in other countries or to "accept" heavy casualties here at home.

Briefly stated, the main purpose of Safeguard will have been accomplished if its deployment discourages others from attacking us.

Of equal importance, it seems to me, is the function of a deployed Safeguard system to intercept and destroy a missile or missiles that others may fire at us through mistake or accident. We have no way of knowing what safety precautions any of our enemies employ against the unintentional release of ICBM's with nuclear warheads that are now deployed ready, and aimed at U.S. targets. Would it not be better to intercept and destroy such incoming missiles than to do nothing and accept the strike or to unleash a salvo of retaliatory missiles?

I shall not presume to interpret the intent of the Russians, but as to their capability there is little disagreement. Those who profess to vouch for the peaceful intentions of the Kremlin leaders leave me unconvinced. If Russia truly wishes world peace, let them come to the peace table with serious intent. The United States must never be maneuvered into a position where nuclear blackmail becomes tempting.

All of us recall, with pain and anguish, the immediate event that thrust us into World War II. Pearl Harbor is still very vivid in my memory. In 1941, our Nation had been lulled into a feeling of complacency by the constant repetition of such comforting statements as "Japan would never be so utterly reckless as to attack a nation so rich and powerful as the United States." Except among a few alarmists, our feeling of security was universal. On that fatal Sunday morning our leadership was so completely duped that almost the entire Pacific Fleet was anchored at Pearl Harbor while everyone responsible enjoyed a good sleep. Because of our utter contempt for the ability and our ignorance of the intentions of the enemy to strike, we discarded every defensive precaution that could and should have been taken.

I hope we do not again misread the signs and lower our defenses in a euphoria of misplaced trust.

At the same time that President Nixon asked for the ABM he stressed our desire to negotiate with the Soviet Union and end the strategic nuclear arms race. The President said:

I have taken cognizance of the view that beginning construction of a U.S. ballistic missile defense would complicate an agreement on strategic arms with the Soviet Union.

I do not believe that the evidence of the recent past bears out this contention. The Soviet interest in strategic talks was not deterred by the decision of the previous administration to deploy the Sentinel ABM system—in fact, it was formally announced shortly afterwards. I believe that the modifications we have made in the previous program will give the Soviet Union even less reason to view our defense effort as an obstacle to talks. Moreover, I wish to emphasize that in any arms limitation talks with the Soviet Union, the United States will be fully prepared to discuss limitations on defensive as well as offensive weapons systems.

In summary, the President has decided that we should take this minimum step consistent with both preserving our security and at the same time enhancing the chances for meaningful negotiation with the Soviet Union. Failure to take the step could not only endanger our security by the mid-seventies, but also weaken our negotiation position in the immediate future.

The most compelling need of the present times is to stop this devastating nuclear arms race. This is a long, hard road—but like any long journey, it must start with a single first step. That first step is serious negotiation by the principals at the bargaining table. Whether steps to deploy a Safeguard ABM system would advance or retard negotiations is again a matter about which the experts disagree. Frankly, I do not know. The President thinks we need the start that this bill gives us and he thinks we need it now. He thinks we are protecting valuable leadtime should negotiations fail. Personally, I might be willing to take that "risk for peace" which proponents endorse. The President cannot take that risk. I shall support the President. If I am to err in judgment, let it be on the side of oversecurity rather than undersecurity for the Nation.

Each Senator will vote the dictates of his own conscience. When I vote to sustain the President in his awesome responsibility of planning and committing our resources in the most effective manner possible in order to achieve a lasting peace, I shall be at peace with my conscience.

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

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Yes; I yield to the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to commend the distinguished Senator from Idaho for a very brilliant, logical, and persuasive presentation of his reasons for supporting the President on the ABM issue. I believe he particularly did an outstanding job in explaining why and how the Safeguard ABM system is a defensive system which in no way should be provocative.

My thoughts particularly focus on the one paragraph in which he says:

It seems to me that Safeguard is no more provocative than a parachute in a fighter plane, a life preserver on a sail boat, or a seat belt in an automobile.

I believe those are very excellent comparisons which drive home in a very

persuasive way what we are talking about in this particular issue.

How anyone could say or suggest that this is a provocative move on the part of the United States, in light of that comparison, is difficult to understand.

Earlier, before the Senator from Idaho spoke, the senior Senator from Maryland spoke and articulated the power of Congress, on an issue such as the ABM, to refuse to go along with the President. I agreed with what the Senator from Maryland had to say. I note in his remarks that the Senator from Idaho essentially agrees that Congress does have the constitutional power to disagree with the President of the United States. In fact, the Senator from Idaho has pointed out that, at every stage of actual deployment, and on an annual basis, Congress will be carefully reviewing this decision and program; and at any stage when the intelligence estimates are different or justify a different decision, Congress could at that point depart from its previous course and disagree with the President of the United States. But at this point in history, it seems to me the question is not so much whether the Senate or the Congress has the power to do that; the question is whether it is the wise thing for the Senate and the Congress to do.

I am very conscious of the fact that in many respects the President of the United States today is much like a negotiator about to sit down at the negotiating table, as we sometimes see in labor-management negotiations. In a sense, perhaps, the President is like the chief negotiator for the union bargaining team. I am conscious of the fact, and I know the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY), who is present on the floor and who has had much experience in labor-management affairs, would agree with me, that it would be unheard of for union members, just as their negotiators are about to sit down at the negotiating table, to pull the rug out from under the chief negotiator, particularly in a situation where the arguments pro and con are close.

The very most one could say for the proponents in this particular case is that they present some persuasive arguments which make a close case. But even where the case is close, it seems to me, as in a situation like this, you give the chief negotiator the benefit of the doubt, and you do not pull the rug out from under him as he is about to sit down at the bargaining table, if you expect him to reach an agreement.

I think all Americans wish and hope that we may reach a meaningful arms control agreement with the Soviet Union; and the really crucial question, it seems to me, is how we can best achieve that result. I am persuaded, with the Senator from Idaho, that the better and wiser course, if we really want to achieve such an agreement, is to support the President, at least at this crucial point in history.

So again I say, I believe the Senator from Idaho has made an excellent contribution to the dialog on this issue, and I commend him for his scholarship.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. I thank my distinguished colleague, whose judgment I value so highly. I am glad that he

agrees with me that this is not an irrevocable commitment. It is a first step, and it can be brought to a conclusion at any time that the Soviets show an inclination to want to bargain meaningfully.

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

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. I yield to my distinguished friend from California.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I, too, congratulate my friend on the thoughtful and concise exposition he has made today of this problem.

Sometimes our discussions seem to go far afield. I have noted that in some of the dialog we have been bogged down discussing what the Secretary of Defense said one day, as compared to what some other officer in the Government said another day, and we get into a mixture of semantics and political philosophy from time to time. I am glad that my distinguished colleague has kept his argument on a practical, simple, straightforward basis. Earlier today I made a presentation based on almost exactly the same approach.

I believe there can be no question about the fact that the system will work. The great preponderance of the evidence is on the side that it will. If at first it does not, there is no one who can tell me that a group of scientists, engineers, and industrialists who can do what we have seen done on the moon cannot put this system together and make it work. I am sure they can.

Will it upset the Russians? No. The Russians themselves have said so. As a matter of fact, when we started with it, they immediately said, "Let us sit down and talk." Sometimes they react that way. They are realists.

Can we afford it? Of course we can afford it. The only thing we are talking about, the actual difference, the hang up, is less than \$400 million. That is the difference between the cost of research and development and the cost of actual construction and deployment.

So there can be no question, I believe, if we approach the problem reasonably.

Some of our colleagues have said, "Well, let us make another gesture." Mr. President, for many years our gestures have not been productive. I do not think the Soviets would understand, and I am certain the Chinese would not understand further gestures. I think we ought to be realists, for a change, and give our President every implement, every tool, every card in his hand that we can before he goes to that negotiating table.

I congratulate the distinguished Senator for the position that he has taken, and for the clear and concise way that he has explained this problem today.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. I thank my distinguished friend from California for his comments. He stressed the point that I have tried to make, and that I know he made earlier in his own speech, that there is no difference among the Members of the Senate, as I see it, concerning the need for research and development, which constitutes more than half of the authorization requested for Safeguard in this 1970 budget.

But there comes a time when we must go a little bit further than research and

development. We must start putting the pieces together on a site, so that we can get the bugs out of it.

Does the Senator agree that the difference that divides the Senate is a matter of something less than \$400 million?

Mr. MURPHY. I do exactly. I should like to point out that the other night I had the great privilege of spending about 3 hours with General Schriever, who was the man charged with the initiation, at the beginning, of the entire space program. He stated that it started in a little old church out in Los Angeles, not too far from the airport. He got together a team; I think there were 30 or 35 men in the team, and they began working out this first step into space.

As he explained to me, the most important decision was the decision to begin. After you begin, then, from time to time, as the state of the art changes, as the capabilities change, as the necessities change, and as world conditions change, you change with them; and you do only what is necessary in the interests of national security.

Mr. President, we are not talking about some sort of Fourth of July exhibition. We are not talking about any sort of scientific or industrial flexing of muscles to impress some other nation. Not at all. We are talking about building a defense for this country.

The one thing that appeals to me in the President's request is the fact that it provides for 1 year at a time; and at the end of each year, you look at it, reassess it, study it, and find out whether you need it; and if you do not, you cut it out.

But if you need it, how best can you continue it? If it needs improvement, your research is continuing all the time. So it is truly a most practical approach.

In our discussions, sometimes we hear the word "deployment." Deployment means to sort of spread around. Actually, I think that word may have been ill-advised, because to fulfill the requirements of research and development, you must also have construction. You have to build your test models.

We decided, to be very practical, to ask for two; and, in building them, to put them in locations where they would be actively on duty the minute they are completed to protect our hard points, so that if some nation was tempted to attack us, they would have to think twice or perhaps three times, and hopefully would decide never to attack us at all, so that the system would never be needed.

These are the considerations that have not only appealed to me, but have made it crystal clear, as I have listened with an open mind to all the witnesses in both the closed sessions of the Armed Services Committee and in the public hearings, and to the debates here on the floor. The more I have listened, the more I have studied, the more convinced I am that this is a proper and badly needed program, and that is why I am so pleased that my colleague has taken the floor today to speak for it.

My distinguished friend from Michigan joins in this statement, incidentally.

It is inconceivable to me that anyone would consider for a moment, for what-

ever reason, that we have the right to deny America this protection.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. I thank the Senator from California, who has served with great distinction on the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. I join in the comments of the Senator from Michigan and those of the Senator from California, in commending the Senator from Idaho and point out one further thing that may be of interest.

It may be the feeling of some that the Senate is divided down the middle on the issue of preservation of our national security. It may be the opinion of some that 50 Senators, or 45, wish to do nothing insofar as the ABM is concerned.

Such an impression, if it exists, has probably been created by the press and the media unintentionally. As the Senator pointed out, there are strong proponents and strong opponents of the ABM system, but I know of no Senator who wants to do nothing.

Some say, "Let us spend more billions on research." Some say, "Let us beef up the Polaris system or have a new offensive weapons system."

I feel that sometimes the American public is misled by what is said here and what is reported.

As a junior Member of the Senate, I discern in the arguments for and against the system that no Senator indicates nothing should be done.

We all are concerned with the preservation of our security and our role as a leader in the free world.

I agree with the Senator from Idaho. I believe that the proposed ABM system is a flexible system, that the President has used discretion, and that we would do him a disservice if we were to pull the rug out from under him.

I imagine that 80 or 90 percent of the American people would find the choice easy if asked whether we should do as President Nixon proposes or do nothing.

I join the Senator and believe as he does that we should give the President the same strong bipartisan support given President Johnson when the issue was before Congress last year.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kansas who may be a junior Senator, but who comes here with very high credentials after many years of service in the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled, "How Important Is Missile Defense?" written by R. B. Pitkin and Gerald L. Steibel, and published in the American Legion magazine of August 1969.

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

HOW IMPORTANT IS MISSILE DEFENSE?

(By R. B. Pitkin and Gerald L. Steibel)

As these words are written, a remarkable debate is coming to a head in Congress. The argument is: Should we have a system of missiles that can destroy enemy missiles in flight if they should be launched against us?

Such missiles are called ABMs in the current news jargon. That stands for "anti-ballistic missiles." They are also called BMDs (for ballistic missile defense). Whatever you call them, their function is not attack, but defense against enemy missiles.

A lot of laymen thought we had such missiles standing by a long time ago. But we do not. You may recall that Congress did approve a "thin" system of ABMs to ring some of our cities during President Johnson's last years in office. They were supposed to protect us from "Chinese" destructive missiles. However, not one of them exists or is apt to. There were at least two major problems with Johnson's "Sentinel" system, and what has been debated this year is President Nixon's "Safeguard" system, which should overcome the two main weaknesses of the older proposal. Yet, while Johnson's proposal was approved for one year, as we write these words not enough votes have been assured in the Senate to OK funds for 1969-70 to get going on Nixon's. Unless the Senate vote is delayed, you may know its outcome by the time you read this. If the vote is "no," then for at least another year we will be making no progress toward putting some clothes on our nakedness in the face of a missile attack against us. If it's "yes," then for at least the next year we'll be making headway.

A lot of the debate about ABM's is based on guesses about what the Soviets will do or can do. In fact, the most rational arguments against our having any ABMs stand almost entirely on such guesses. If the guesses are right, the arguments are reasonable up to a point (if you think it is reasonable for us to gamble our lives on guesses about the Soviets).

Other arguments against ABMs are not so respectable. One is that they won't work and can't be made to work. That is simply untrue. The Soviets tested one against a missile in flight in 1962, showed one off at a parade in Moscow in 1964 and since 1966 have been installing a whole system of them.

ABMs, as proposed by the Nixon Administration, are related to three possible levels of missile warfare—a small attack on us, a large attack on us or no attack on us.

The first level deals with what happens if a lone missile or two or three were fired at us. This could conceivably happen if one of those "fail safe" things occurred. Say an overeager Russian officer fires one or two at us in some crisis before his superiors can stop him. Or a small country gets its hands on a few, as Cuba almost did, and sends one at us out of sheer recklessness.

What happens then? The way we are set up now we have 1,054 intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) in hardened land-based silos, and more than 650 submarine-based Polaris missiles—all weapons of destruction against people and cities. We can let loose destruction at the source of a lone missile and hope our counterblow gets through, but we can't knock that incoming missile down. Even if the hot line got to us in seconds and somehow persuaded us that a lone missile wasn't the start of the Big War, we'd still have to take that missile. If it were well aimed, we'd lose at least a whole city. We have nothing to destroy it in flight. Only an ABM can do that.

The second level is the other extreme. Another nation launches an all-out nuclear war against us. If we have by then (and it takes time) a good system of ABMs, what good would they be? Nobody has challenged the 1967 testimony of former Defense Secretary Robert McNamara that they might save from 80 million to 110 million lives—depending on how much we want to spend—if the projected loss of life without them is 120 million. This, of course, is a guess, but the only fault that has been found with it is that the ABMs couldn't provide an "impenetrable shield," as McNamara put it, and save us from any damage at all. In fact, the rather loosely banded claim that ABMs "won't

work" is really based on the common knowledge that they couldn't make us immune to all damage. In honesty to our people it should be fairly stated that "won't work" could mean saving 80 million or more lives in the most intolerable of situations. Mr. McNamara, it should be noted, was not arguing for ABMs, but against them, based on his belief in 1967 that we should increase our offensive strength to discourage an all-out nuclear attack.

But he changed his position later, as did President Johnson and McNamara's immediate successor, Clark Clifford. And for good reason. By late 1967, the Russians had moved rapidly to cancel out the peacemaking power of our weapons as they were—and still are.

This brings us to the third level of nuclear possibilities, the level of so preparing ourselves that we need not fear an attack by anyone but a madman. (Though the ABMs might take care of the madman, too.) Our actual policy has long been based on having enough nuclear missile strength so that even if we were hit by surprise, we'd have enough undamaged missiles left to strike our attacker a mortal blow. That being so, he wouldn't dare strike the first blow, and there would never be a nuclear war.

Some years ago we halted the expansion of our land-based missiles at their present 1,054. Any more, it was adjudged, would just provide "overkill"—that is, the ability to do far more destruction to an attacker than would ever be needed to stay his hand.

If we genuinely do have "overkill" power, then, of course, it is senseless to keep on adding to our attack power. And (except for defense against an irrational attack) we have little need for ABMs because nobody is ever going to launch any missiles against us, or try to blackmail us with threats of having superior power. But do we still have assured "overkill" power?

Not everything that alarmed President Johnson, and then President Nixon, into seeking ABMs in a hurry, from 1967 on, is necessarily known. Dr. Edward Teller, the hydrogen-bomb expert, recently urged Congress to get an ABM program going on a year-to-year basis at least. He noted that time was running out to get a defense against launched missiles under way (it could take years), and he said in effect that Congress cannot safely keep postponing all action, in view of what is and is not known.

What is known? Chiefly that the Soviets have taken three major steps to offset the peacekeeping power of our attack missiles. Each step either gives them more offensive power, or tends to neutralize the threat of our weapons to deter them, or both.

First, they are greatly expanding the number and power of their missiles of attack. The London Institute for Strategic Studies estimates that the Soviets now have about 200 more land-based missiles than we do, and are on the way to installing about 2,500 of them in all (more than double ours in number). Some opponents of our ABM have tended to kiss this off as more "overkill"—that is, no matter how many they might build, the Russians still wouldn't dare launch them and couldn't threaten us with them. What our fewer missiles could do in retaliation is still enough to scare them out of starting anything.

If the number of the projected Soviet missiles seems like foolish "overkill" the enormous power of some of their individual warheads can easily be portrayed in the same way. Both the Soviet Union and the United States have been depending chiefly on one megaton warheads, which is 50 times the power of those we used in WW2 and more than enough to wipe out a city. Yet the Soviets are building from 400 to 500 SS-9 triple warheads, with from five to 25 megatons each—and Soviet warheads of 50 and 100 megatons appear to be on the way.

It is extremely costly for the Soviets to set up such great numbers of tremendously pow-

erful missile-borne warheads, so it is dangerous for us to base our policy on a belief that they are just being stupid in creating so much more strength than they could possibly ever need. The expense they are going to argue that they have a clear purpose in mind.

Nixon's Secretary of Defense, Melvin Laird, gave the Senate Foreign Relations Committee his view of the meaning of all this. The numbers and the power of the Soviet missiles make no sense if undefended American cities are their targets. They are just waste power for any such mission. But they make sense if they are to be used in a first strike to annihilate our retaliatory missiles in their silos.

The great power of the SS-9s makes good sense if it is to be aimed at our Minutemen and our few Titans. Both sides bury their attack missiles in concrete-hardened clusters, in underground sites, where it almost takes a direct hit to knock them out of action. But as you step up the power of a warhead, you can be farther and farther off target from a direct hit and still destroy your foe's missiles in their silos—or wreck a whole cluster with one hit.

Laird's point was clear enough. If the Russians are building a flight of special weapons of enormous power to annihilate our strike-back power within the first few minutes of an attack, their respect for our missiles approaches zero as their confidence in wrecking them on the ground approaches 100. Meanwhile, in the absence of any American ABM system, only Russian error could keep all their SS-9s from getting through. Thus they are the sole judges of their chances of success, and our own power to deter them by owning undefended missiles becomes ever more imaginary.

Senate Foreign Relations Chairman J. William Fulbright (Ark.) said that he was sure the Soviets still feared our missiles enough to stay their hand, and he told Laird that Laird was just trying to scare Congress to death with his description of the SS-9s so that it would vote money for ABMs. This hardly seems fair to either Laird or the American people. If the Soviets are building superbombs capable of wrecking our retaliatory missiles on a previously impossible scale, it's Laird's duty as Defense Secretary to tell Congress and the people, and not hold back because the news is unpleasant.

Just what those SS-9s could do to wreck our missiles on the ground is, of course, guesswork. Nuclear physicist Ralph Lapp, who is a consultant to Nuclear Science Service in Washington, has been campaigning mightily against our setting up an ABM system. He contends that from half to three-fourths of our Minutemen would survive any blow that the Soviets could level at us by the mid-1970s, and about half of them would be able to hit back effectively. He means without any ABMs. That's enough to deter an attack on us, he suggests. Even if he's right, which is doubtful, his guess doesn't extend beyond seven or eight years from now. That's about when we could have a full ABM system operational if we start now. And that's when the Soviets could have over 400 SS-9s, at their present rate of installation.

Lapp's opposition to ABMs as a scientist is often hard to follow. Writing in the New York Times Magazine he took the position of a spokesman for the American people, which he simply is not. He professed that the people were up in arms against the ABM, though a Harris Poll that week showed 47% for ABMs, 26% against and 27% not sure.

The people were bound to be against the ABM, he said, because they were "wearing of the war in Vietnam, dismayed and disturbed by the North Korean capture of the intelligence ship *Pueblo* and resentful of the continued diversion of dollars from the domestic front to defense."

Since it wasn't really the people, but Lapp, who was talking, this is an excellent insight

into the mind of one of several distinguished scientists who have diluted opposition to ABMs with emotional, irrelevant, non-scientific reasons. The *Pueblo*, the Vietnam war, hatred of the military or a desire to divert the funds to other causes hardly have a place in a discussion of whether we now need ABMs if we are to continue to maintain a stance that will prevent nuclear war.

If Lapp thinks most of our missiles would survive anything the Soviets could throw at them for some years hence without any more protection than earth and concrete, what do our responsible officials believe? Defense Department research chief John Foster contends that only a tenth—or about 100—of our land-based missiles would survive a Soviet attack by the SS-9s. Ordinary people have no way of judging who is right, or why there is that wide a gap between the thinking of two highly qualified men.

Foster has the responsibility, and, in the end, so does President Nixon, who plainly goes with Foster.

If Foster is right, the Soviets can expect us to launch 100 missiles if they attack first. Laird fears that 425 SS-9s might destroy all but 50 or so of our Minutemen in one strike. But in any case it is not up to Laird, Foster or Lapp, it is only up to the Soviets to decide at what stage they can destroy enough of our stuff on the ground if we leave it all defenseless.

They are building to destroy our strikeback power. Whether it takes 100 or 1,000 SS-9s, so long as they don't have to risk guessing how many we can knock down, the initiative is theirs. At some point, without any worry about our defenses so long as we lack ABMs, they can decide they have enough to cut our retaliatory launchings back to some figure like 100 or 70 or you name it.

Whatever they decide, it would be a "safe" figure for them in view of the second thing the Soviets have been pushing ahead since 1966—their own ABM system. It's now seven years since the Soviets test-fired their first ABM against a missile in flight and we've never launched one and have none in operation. In view of McNamara's estimate that we could whittle away as much as 90% of the damage of a full-scale attack on us with our own ABMs, it would be tempting fate to suppose that the Soviet ABM system could not whittle 100 or so American missiles down to only a few while still in flight.

This offers us an uncomfortable equation—the possibility that by the mid-1970s the Soviet Union could launch 2,000 or more missiles against us with the expectation that they'd all get through, while no more than a handful of ours might be expected to weather destruction on the ground here or interception by the Soviets in flight.

Meanwhile, the Soviets are proceeding with steps, some of which are ominous, to save themselves as much as possible from the effects of any American missiles that might get through. They are training their people in civil defense, almost from the cradle to the grave. It begins in the lower grades and never stops. They are developing energetic and elaborate steps, in fine detail, to save their population from the effects of an attack. The subways in many of their larger cities have been designed to serve as deep shelters, too.

While all of this further reduces the potential effectiveness of any American retaliation to a Soviet attack on us, Princeton's Prof. Eugene Wigner finds another Soviet civil defense program to be "frightening." They have "elaborate plans for the evacuation of their cities . . . in the minutest detail," he reports. Professor Wigner, holder of four of the highest honors that can go to an American scientist, ranks near the top of American experts on Soviet civil defense. Among such experts, plans to evacuate cities are menacing. It's generally conceded that there's no time to evacuate a city once enemy missiles are on the way. Only a nation that

plans to strike the first blow—hence knows the day, hour and minute—can have the time to profit from detailed plans to empty their cities. But "evacuation is . . . now at the center of the Soviet program," Professor Wigner reports.

What we have said to this point goes to the guts of why first Johnson, then Nixon, wanted us to get started pronto on an ABM system.

The rapid growth of Soviet attack power, and the Russian steps to neutralize the peacemaking power of our own missiles so alarmed both of them that they laid their prestige and their influence with Congress on the line to front for ABMs—but fast.

Both were shrewd enough politically to know that they would be subjected to the very attacks in Congress, in the press and on TV that have in fact resulted. But they pushed ahead anyway.

If the reader wonders why they knew that they'd meet intense resistance to a proposal better to safeguard the nation, the opposition to ABMs has not even pretended to be subtle about it.

At the bottom level of resistance we have seen "protest demonstrators" toting placards says "Down with ABM," while ABM has become a prime dirty word to American Communists, be they of the Chinese, Cuban or Soviet school. This is the enemy talking, of course, and needs no further elaboration.

A more important level of resistance is found right in Congress among those who openly say that they'd like to appropriate more of the Defense budget for more popular programs here at home. They particularly like to equate Defense spending with such things as the anti-poverty program, as if national defense and welfare-like programs were interchangeable. Irrelevant as it is, this is a potent political argument. If all other things were equal, a politician would rather show his constituents how he appropriated money to satisfy their immediate desires, rather than for hardware for their future safety that will work best if it is never used.

President Johnson had enough respect for the raw political appeal of this kind of opposition to emphasize that he only wanted a "thin" ABM system (i.e.: to play down the cost). Since he proposed to protect cities, a "thin" system couldn't easily be explained as a worthwhile one against the Soviet power to attack cities. So he said he wanted it to protect us from "Chinese" missiles. They might be ready in small numbers about the time we could have ABMs operational if we'd gone ahead with them last year.

Nobody was deceived by this. Americans and Soviets alike understood that he was after the beginnings of something to knock down Soviet missiles, and nobody supposed that, once his Sentinels had been installed, those in control would inquire into the nationality of an approaching missile before knocking it down.

Since Johnson's language made his proposal politically palatable, and the majority of Congress was of his party, his Sentinel ABM program was approved.

It ran into trouble when hardly any city wanted it, each one being morally certain that having ABMs around it would make it Target #1 in a Soviet attack. Only two Sentinel sites were started, one near Pittsburgh and one near Boston. (Both have been, in effect, ploughed under.) Meanwhile, there was no answer to the objection that to defend each city adequately against Soviet attack would require a perfectly enormous setup of ABMs, and the real concern was over the great Soviet menace and not the limited Chinese one.

When President Nixon took office, he proposed the more sensible and forthright Safeguard system. Let's defend our land-based missiles and our command centers with ABMs, not our cities, he proposed. This is feasible, though it is still offered as a "thin"

system. There are less than 20 sites to protect. No city becomes more of a prime target, thereby. If we protect our attack missiles the Soviets will have lost their assurance that SS-9s or warheads of any power can get through in time to stop us from retaliating against an attack. Hence we'd have moved back toward the peacemaking balance of power that has been our true policy all along.

Another kind of opposition to our having defensive missiles helps explain the mystery of the intense opposition to Nixon's plan, when it overcomes the major objections to Johnson's. This is the widespread, well-publicized, emotional and irrational opposition which has chosen to make the defeat of the ABM a convenient club for various political, personal and ideological grievances. Even some Senators have minced no words in opposing the ABM as a way of "punishing" the military, or the so-called "military-industrial complex."

This is highly attractive reasoning to some extremely vocal minorities. Draft-card burners, Vietnam war protesters, the various "militants" for this and that who are mad at The Establishment readily follow such leadership. A club to beat The Establishment with is what they want. We have already seen so outstanding a nuclear expert as Lapp making the *Pueblo* incident a reason to oppose the ABM, and a recent two-page ad by a major book publisher in the New York Times summoned opposition to ABM's in huge black letters on the basis that we never had to use the bomb shelters that some people built some years back.

What these approaches lack in good reasoning they more than make up for in emotional wallop and in their appeal to headline writers. They have gotten far more publicity than the detailed, painstaking exposition of the hard military facts by defense experts.

Whenever public debate is based on irrelevant hostility, it can frustrate all attempts of intelligent discussion. Consider this dilemma of Professor Wigner in a debate with Cornell's Prof. Hans Bethe about ABMs. Professor Wigner is the Princeton scientist whom we have already quoted on Soviet civil defense and city evacuation plans. Bethe is almost as distinguished. Both men are Nobel Prize winners in the sciences. A year and more ago, Bethe was bringing his scientific reputation to bear against President Johnson's Sentinel ABM system. This year he was opposing Nixon's Safeguard system, while Professor Wigner was arguing for the Nixon proposal as an urgent national necessity.

The two men met in a panel debate on ABMs before The American Physical Society last April 29. Professor Wigner pointed out that when the Johnson system was being considered by Congress, Professor Bethe had testified against it, and had volunteered, instead, the very system Nixon switched to. Said Professor Wigner: "At the end of his Congressional testimony, Professor Bethe said, 'A completely different concept of ABM (from Johnson's city defenses) is to deploy it around Minutemen silos and at command and control centers. This application has gone in and out of Defense Department planning. I am in favor of such a scheme.'"

Professor Wigner wanted to know why, when Nixon adopted the plan that Professor Bethe had recommended, Professor Bethe then came out against it.

The ABM actually offers us one of several weapons choices in a rapidly changing shift in the international balance of nuclear power toward Soviet—and soon Chinese—might. It has almost nothing to do with most of the best publicized public debate about it. When the Soviet power increase had become obvious by 1967, McNamara wanted us to increase our retaliatory power to offset it. His argument, as interpreted by D. G. Brennan in a recent issue of *Foreign Affairs*, was highly complex in its details, since it involved comparative costs and their effect on both sides. But it added up to something like this:

If we install defenses, the Soviet will increase their attack power even more to offset them. Then both sides will be put to pushing their attack power even farther than if we just balance destructive power against destructive power, without any defenses. As Brennan put it, McNamara wanted us to do whatever was necessary to maintain an ability after suffering the first blow to destroy 50 million Russians, because *that* would forever stay their hand from hitting us first.

Perhaps the Johnson Administration realized finally that we could never be sure of our striking power, in the face of Soviet developments, and we'd have to have defenses of our own if they were to continue to respect our posture. At any rate, it switched from seeking more destructive power to an urgent request for ABMs. Of course there were other factors, perhaps the chief of which was the overwhelming evidence that the Soviets were escalating both the offensive and defensive aspects of nuclear power as fast as they could, without our doing anything new to force them into an arms race.

This touches on an interesting part of this year's American debate over ABMs. One of the sternest warnings of the opponents of our ABMs is that they would "escalate the arms race"—it would provoke the Soviets if we should set up weapons to knock theirs down.

This drove Washington's Sen. Henry Jackson to distraction because, on the record, they have been racing as hard as they can without any new provocation from us. In a speech this March 20, he listed what he called "five myths" about our "aggressive provocation" and the "peaceful intentions" of the Soviets. His comments on "Myth Number Three" are worth quoting in full:

Myth Number Three is the idea that it is the United States that is responsible for heating up the arms buildup.

The evidence decisively refutes this notion. The Soviets acted first to test-fire an ABM against an incoming nuclear-armed missile (in 1962) and they are the only nation to have done this.

The Soviets acted first to develop and test a 60-megaton bomb—and they are the only nation to possess anything like that size bomb.

The Soviets acted first to develop and deploy a fractional orbital bombardment system (FOBS), a first-strike oriented weapon—and they are the only nation to have developed or deployed such a system.

The Soviets acted first to deploy an ABM setup and they have been testing, improving and updating the system ever since. Today, they have over 60 anti-ballistic missiles deployed on launch pads. We, on the other hand, have not yet deployed an ABM setup of any shape or form.

The current campaigners against the ABM say that when the United States acts to deploy an ABM we are "escalating the arms race." I have never heard one of those people say that because the Soviets were first to deploy an ABM, they were the ones that escalated the arms race.

Fortunately, the American people, if they get the facts, are able to recognize this obvious double standard—crudely biased against their own country.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that Soviet Premier Kosygin has explicitly rejected the proposition that deployment of a defensive missile system heats up the arms race or is "destabilizing."

At a London press conference on February 9, 1967, Premier Kosygin was asked:

"Do you not share the opinion that the development of the Soviet anti-missile system is a new step in the arms race?"

Premier Kosygin replied: "Which weapons should be regarded as a tension-factor—offensive or defensive weapons? I think that a defensive system which prevents attack is not a cause of the arms race but represents a factor preventing the death of people."

No weapons system, of course, is or will

be perfect. Our offensive weapons aren't perfect, and our defensive arrangements won't be either. But that doesn't mean we refuse to deploy them when we believe they can perform a useful and important task well enough to make a substantial contribution to the overall deterrent.

I commend President Nixon for his determination to proceed with the phased deployment of a thin ABM system, and I believe all Americans should now support their President in his statesmanlike decision. It would make no sense to leave this country altogether "naked" to enemy missile attack. And it is important to steady and fortify our President's hand in this very unsteady world. I am a Democrat. But I am proud that over the years I have supported my President—whether he was a Democrat or a Republican—in the critical decisions to safeguard the national defense and to protect the future of individual liberty.

It is interesting to note that even Soviet Premier Kosygin sees what many of us ought to see, too. He also told one reporter in London. "Maybe an antimissile system is more expensive than an offensive system, but it is designed not to kill people but to preserve human lives." Professor Wigner, in his debate with Bethe, said, "I quite agree with Kosygin and do not consider the defense of the people to be objectionable, or, as it is often put when our own defense measures are considered, provocative."

If both sides could some day develop even a fairly "impenetrable shield," there is at least a faint promise of an eventual end to the matching of destructive power with more destructive power, "overkill" with "overkill."

The Soviets ignored the approaches of President Johnson to discuss nuclear arms control so long as they erected defenses and we did not. Congress had hardly approved the now-dead Sentinel plan when the Russians offered to sit down and discuss the whole subject. Without pretending to read their minds, or trust them farther than you can spit, it is entirely possible that they recognized that if the other side has ABMs you can never risk an attack on him. Whether his ABMs would work well or not, you'd never know without taking too great a risk. In this view, and it makes sense, the Soviets may have long seen that the basic condition for seriously discussing nuclear arms reduction is that both sides have defenses. But if they had defenses and we didn't it would be preposterous for them to bargain with us, because they'd have the upper hand beyond all bargaining. At least they made a prompt offer to talk the moment the Senate OK'd Johnson's ABM plan.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, during these days of debate on the military procurement bill, I have repeatedly raised the question of this Nation's treaty commitments around the world and just what they could mean to us in terms of military operations that may become necessary in the future.

We are here debating a bill that eventually will authorize in the neighborhood of \$77 or \$78 billion for military purposes. And we are being bombarded from all sides with demands for retrenchment, economy, and across the board reduction of expenditures for defense purposes.

My point is, Mr. President, that we must have an accurate picture of just what our total commitments might call for before we go in for any wholesale

cutting back on our present level of defense expenditures. By this I do not mean that we should ease off in our efforts to cut back and eliminate as much waste and inefficiency as we possibly can in the area of military procurement. Instead, I am speaking of efforts to eliminate or cut down on entire programs and systems which may be needed in the future.

There is a concerted effort within this body and in the intellectual and academic communities to pull back from our international commitments. President Nixon has referred to this as a form of neoisolationism and I believe that that is an accurate description. For if I understand correctly the opponents of the ABM and the critics of the military-industrial complex, they would like to see this Nation turn away from its foreign entanglements, go back on its foreign commitments and forego the possibility of coming to the defense of any nations where freedom is threatened or where there is a threat of Communist aggression.

I believe there is no doubt that this desire for a resumption of isolationism stems in large part from a great yearning to be rid of the prolonged and irksome war in Vietnam. Mr. President, I yield to no man anywhere in my concern over the great cost to this country in lives and money that is being extracted in Southeast Asia. I can understand thoroughly the desire of the American people to rid themselves of this burden and the desire of public officials to find an easy way out of the dilemma. But I also know that if we cut and run in Vietnam and signify our intentions to avoiding any comparable conflicts in the future, we will—in the eyes of the world—be defaulting on our obligations as leader of the free world.

By the same token, I realize that we have on the domestic front many requirements for public expenditures. We need better housing, we need better hospitals, we need better schools, we need a vast variety of urban renewal programs, and all of these cost money.

I realize, too, that it is popular to point at defense expenditures and regard them as wasteful in their very nature. And there can be no denying the fact that money spent on missile systems, naval vessels and military hardware of any kind is nonproductive in the accepted sense.

But it has a purpose to serve and that purpose is the defense of the American people and the cause of freedom. There is no way you can place a monetary or material value on the type of yield which we obtain from military hardware. But I believe we must understand that in today's world we are required to make expenditures, and very heavy expenditures, in the name of defense.

It would be a marvelous thing if all the nations of the world were to decide once and for all that war and the implements of war and defense and the implements of defense are wasteful and unnecessary and that the money spent for these implements could be put to better uses for the good of humanity. Unfortunately, the nations of the world are not about to reach any such level of

trust. And because of this, we must regard all recommendations for unrealistic reductions of military expenditures in the light of wishful and dangerous thinking. Just saying that a reduction in arms by the United States would lessen the chance of war does not make it true. But I do believe the chances for an outbreak of hostilities on the scale that the world knew in World War I and World War II are increasing rapidly with the expansion of Russian military might and our seeming interest in relinquishing our world leadership and its responsibilities.

And this has a direct bearing on the treaties which we now are a party to. I think there are a total of 44 such agreements and in at least 15 of them we are committed to armed intervention if the other nations party to the treaties are attacked.

The connection appears obvious. The Russians, by expending the reach of their military operations through the development of a large navy and air force are enlarging the area of a possible world involvement. The Soviet Union, heretofore, has always been defensive in nature—content to confine its military defenses to its own homeland. Thus the development of a powerful navy represents a significant departure from Russia's historic and traditional attitude.

The determined drive of the Soviet Union to become all powerful in all areas of military endeavor—nuclear, naval, space, and the conventional sphere—is bound to produce a new level of worldwide tension. We may as well acknowledge the fact that the Soviet Union shows every sign of making preparations on all fronts to move into any power vacuums which might be created through withdrawal of American influence, such as now is being urged for Southeast Asia, Germany, and other areas. The theory is that the masters of the Kremlin believe that American "doves" will prevail and that this Nation will retreat from its position of world leadership in order to devote a preponderance of its attention and its money to domestic problems. As right as this might seem, it would be wrong.

The Russians have already made their move in the Middle East. When the United States more or less declared a hands-off policy in that tense area where the world sealanes cross and four continents touch, the Soviet Union moved in quickly to arm the Arab nations with the sinews of war. Our default of responsibility and the Soviet Union's aggressive intent have already caused one vicious all-out war between Israel and the Arab nations. Israel, of course, won the war of June 1967, hands down and captured much of the Russian supply equipment. However, all of it has since been replaced and the Middle East remains one of the foremost tinderboxes of the world.

By the same token, the Soviets are obviously waiting for us to turn tail and withdraw from Vietnam so that its Communist counterparts can take over Vietnam and finally all of Southeast Asia. They also are waiting hopefully for us to withdraw from Berlin and other areas of Western Europe.

It is obvious that the U.S.S.R. is reaching for a position which would enable it to exert undisputed world leadership.

The whole question of world power balance is now undergoing a very subtle but a very vital change as the Russians move into a position of nuclear parity with the United States.

Professor Brzezinski of Columbia University has dealt expertly with this subject in an article entitled "Peace and Power" which was published in *Encounter* magazine.

He points out that as the power of the two superstates begins to overlap on a global basis, the competition between the United States and the U.S.S.R. could easily become more intense and less stable.

He wrote:

Both powers may be drawn into hostile confrontations even though they may not actually desire them. The termination of the Vietnam war, far from ushering in a new era of detente between Washington and Moscow, might be followed by a more complicated phase in international politics . . .

A domestic crisis in America, and especially a panicky disengagement for world affairs because of frustration spread by the Vietnamese war, would have a catastrophic effect on world stability. It would probably result in a wave of upheaval that could not but stimulate a dangerously erratic sense of optimism in Moscow, conceivably precipitating the Soviet Union into courses of action that so far Moscow has been careful to eschew.

Professor Brzezinski points out that until now deterrence has always been unbalanced in favor of the United States. He says the United States never has had to face a crisis with the Soviet Union in the setting of parity and wonders what might have happened in the Cuban missile crisis if an equality of deterrence had then existed.

Mr. President, President Nixon has told us that his purpose in the area of military strength is to make sure that we have a "sufficiency" of power to guarantee our national strategic interests. I believe that we do not now have a sufficiency in the area of missile defense. We certainly are far short of "parity" with the Soviet Union, because we are only now debating the deployment of an ABM system while the Russians have been in the process of deploying their ABM system for 5 years.

I believe, Mr. President, that it is vital to our position in the world that our defense against missile attack be strengthened and that our military expenditures be kept equal to the tasks that confront us today and may confront us in the future in our role as leader of the free world.

In conclusion I would suggest—particularly to the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations—that before they join any concerted effort to cut our military procurement below the level regarded as adequate by the Defense Department and the President, they thoroughly examine the treaties to which we are a party and whose provisions might require us to go to war at some time in the future. I believe that if we are to withdraw into a shell of neoisolationism, it is incumbent upon the Committee on Foreign Relations to make recommendations which would make our treaty commitments conform to a new reduced stature in international affairs. If we are not to have the arms sufficient to guarantee the provisions of these treaties, we

should not be bound by them, we should not be a party to them.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. I should like to ask my distinguished colleague about one aspect of the entire international situation which I am sure has occurred to him, as it has to me, which sometimes gets lost in the discussions.

We talk about treaties. We are told about an entirely new approach, a new spirit, with regard to the Russians. I wonder whether the Senator would explain to me under what rules the Russians are still threatening to try our prisoners of war as war criminals. Is the Senator aware of this statement?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes, I am aware of that statement.

Under the treaty at Geneva, the international rules of law established for the treatment of prisoners, this has been outlawed, in my opinion; and they would be operating, as they often have operated, against the law of the world, one might say.

Mr. MURPHY. Would it not be a most important consideration for the President, in his negotiations, to put this high on the list, for example, with respect to the Air Force officers who have been prisoners—that there be some message, some news, about their condition, some word as to their manner of treatment?

These are some of the things that the Soviet Union and the Communists of North Vietnam might see to before we proceed with a complete area of trust in matters of international strength.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think that would be a perfectly natural request for the President of the United States to make, even though I am not sure that this type of information is required to be given by the Geneva agreements. I am not aware that such information is required, although I am aware that in World War II getting information relative to prisoners was not an impossible task—on either side, I should say.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 101

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I think it was indicated, when the order was entered permitting me to obtain the floor at this time, that it was for the purpose of calling up an amendment that the able Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER), I, and others had filed.

I send to the desk an amendment which modifies, more in language than in substance, the earlier amendment. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed and that the reading be waived.

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

The modified amendment is as follows:

SEC. 402. Funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or any other Act for the acquisition of an antiballistic missile system may be used only for research, development, testing, evaluation and normal procurement incident thereto, and may not be used for such purposes at any proposed antiballistic missile site; further, such funds may not be used for the deployment of an anti-

ballistic missile system or any part or component thereof or for the acquisition of any site or preparation of any site for the deployment of any such system.

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

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I make this statement on behalf of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) and myself.

On July 11, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services (Mr. STENNIS), asked a series of questions concerning the purpose of the amendment that has been offered on the part of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), myself, and a number of other Senators who oppose deployment of the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system in this coming fiscal year.

The amendment offered on July 9 read as follows:

Funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or any other Act for the acquisition of an antiballistic missile system may be used only for research, development, testing, evaluation and normal procurement incident thereto, and may not be used for the deployment of an antiballistic missile system or any part or component thereof or for the acquisition of any site or preparation of any site for the deployment of any such system.

The amendment as now modified, which was just sent to the desk by the Senator from Michigan, reads as follows:

Funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or any other Act for the acquisition of an antiballistic missile system may be used only for research, development, testing, evaluation and normal procurement incident thereto, and may not be used for such purposes at any proposed antiballistic missile site; further, such funds may not be used for the deployment of an antiballistic missile system or any part or component thereof or for the acquisition of any site or preparation of any site for the deployment of any such system.

The amendment as modified does not alter its central purpose—to prohibit the deployment of any component or element of the Safeguard system on any proposed site in fiscal year 1970.

The amendment does not strike any funds that may be available in this bill or under past acts of the Congress. It does require that all funds may be used only for research, development, testing, and evaluation with one exception: "Funds may be used for normal procurement incident thereto," concerning research, development, testing, and evaluation.

The Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) referred to page 25 of the committee report and correctly outlined the proposed uses of \$759.1 million requested by the administration in fiscal year 1970:

(a) The Authorization for the procurement of elements in the Safeguard missile program is in the amount of \$345.5 million. To this amount of new obligational authority would be added \$15 million of funds previously appropriated but not reflected in the request of \$345.5 million.

(b) The request for an authorization for funds for research and development for the Safeguard system in the amount of \$400.9 million.

(c) The request for an authorization for the construction of missile test facilities at Kwajalein for the Safeguard system totaling \$12.7 million.

Our amendment accepts items (b) and (c) as approved by the committee as they are concerned with research, development, testing, and evaluation only. The amendment we offer does not delete the \$345.5 million which the administration requests for deployment. It would, however, restrict the use of such funds and any other funds carried over from previous acts similarly to research, development, testing, and evaluation, with the exception of the procurement of items normal to research, development, testing, and evaluation processes. Our amendment leaves to the administration authority to determine whether action, including procurement, is in the category of research, development, testing, and evaluation.

If the administration chooses to use any of the \$345.5 million originally earmarked for deployment for research, development, testing, and evaluation purposes at any testing sites such as Kwajalein, our amendment would permit it to do so.

Secretary Laird stated that phase 1 of the Safeguard system cannot be completed until 1974 and phase 2 until 1976. The state of development of the components of the Safeguard system as described by administration witnesses indicates that no significant part of the Safeguard ABM system could, in fact, be emplaced during fiscal year 1970 at the proposed deployment sites.

Outstanding nuclear weapons scientists have given testimony that the Safeguard ABM, as proposed and assuming it is workable, would require a minimum expenditure of \$40 billion, as compared to the administration's estimate of \$10.3 billion. It is agreed by most nuclear weapons scientists that effective missile site defense can be designed, but that the Safeguard system cannot in its present form fulfill that purpose. The redesign required could provide a more effective defense at a lesser cost. In order to facilitate this necessary research and development, our amendment has left available the \$345.5 million originally earmarked for procurement, with the view that the administration could use the funds to carry on required additional research and development efforts, to design and test an effective system should it prove necessary in the future to deploy one. In any case, any system should be tested fully as a unit before a deployment decision. At present this can be best done at recognized testing sites such as exists at Kwajalein.

None of the funds could be used for the deployment of any component or element of the proposed Safeguard system at any proposed deployment site. Again, we emphasize that the central purpose of the amendment is to prohibit in the coming year a premature commitment to deployment.

The energies, the purpose of our Government should be directed toward negotiations with the Soviet Union in an effort to arrest the nuclear arms race—an objective upon which all are agreed. We should not make a decision now to deploy nuclear weapons systems which negotiations seek to control.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kentucky very much. I know that the Senator from Mississippi

has been advised of our clarifying statement, and he will have an opportunity to study it.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. Will the Senator be good enough to explain the difference in modification? I have read it several times, and any substantial difference escapes me.

Mr. HART. The language change makes clear, we believe, the purpose of the amendment; namely, that the moneys authorized be available for research, development, testing, and evaluation and the normal procurement incident thereto, but that the moneys may not be used for such purposes at any proposed deployment site.

Basically, the objective of this amendment is to insure that there be a full funding of any undertakings necessary for research and development of an anti-ballistic-missile system, but insuring that that activity shall not occur at any of the 12 proposed anti-ballistic-missile sites. This has been the position of Senator COOPER and those of us who have offered this amendment from the outset. It was suggested to us that the new language might make more plain and more consistent this purpose.

Mr. TOWER. If I correctly understand, the Senator is saying that the change is not substantive; it is merely for the purpose of clarification.

Mr. HART. The Senator from Texas is correct.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, on July 11, I set forth my reasons for opposing the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART). In the process of explaining what I believe would be the unfortunate effects of this amendment, I stated that there are thousands of valuable personnel now employed on this project who probably would have to be discharged if this amendment were to be adopted. I now have more complete figures regarding these personnel and I should like to share them with my colleagues at this time.

In addition, I would like to point out that the language change in the Cooper-Hart amendment presented today does not cure the basic fault of the amendment. The distinguished Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) was kind enough to clarify the modification for me a moment ago, and he did state that it did not provide for a substantive change. That basic fault is that adoption of the amendment would delay deployment of the Safeguard system for 2 years. Since one of the reasons for this delay is the difficulty we would face in attempting to reassemble the technical and production personnel now prepared to begin work on phase I of Safeguard, I think that this fact sheet which I have had prepared is highly relevant.

There are presently approximately 6,000 personnel employed in preproduction and production tasks for the Safeguard deployment at the prime and principal subcontractor offices and

plants. If the deployment were halted, all of these personnel would cease their work on Safeguard. Some of these personnel (but only something less than 1,000) would be retained by their present employers on other tasks and might be available at a later date for work on re-instituted ABM deployment. Therefore, it is estimated that about 5,000 trained civilian employees would be discharged or otherwise lost from the prime and principal subcontractor roles as a result of discontinuance of the deployment.

A breakout of this estimate by contractor and location is as follows:

Western Electric, Greensboro/Burlington, N.C.	2,240
McDonnell-Douglas Aircraft, Santa Monica, Calif.	632
Raytheon, Boston, Mass.	1,268
General Electric, Syracuse, N.Y.	496
Martin-Marietta, Orlando, Fla.	378
Total	5,014

The corporations above include prime and first tier subcontractors only; therefore, the personnel loss estimate does not take into account losses that would surely occur in other numerous enterprises involved with the supply of essential material, minor hardware components and other essential services. These numbers cannot be estimated and hence are not included.

Production losses above would be mainly clerical and administrative and assembly workers and junior technical and supervisory personnel.

In addition, there would be some 500 trained personnel from architectural engineering firms engaged in construction engineering work which would be terminated. Of this number, it is estimated that about 435 would be discharged or otherwise lost by discontinuance of the deployment.

A breakout of the loss estimate by company and location is as follows:

Ammann & Whitney, New York, N.Y.	150
Bechtel, Los Angeles, Calif.	45
Parsons, Vernon, Calif.	150
Black & Veatch, Kansas City, Mo.	45
Sperry-Rand, Huntsville, Ala.	45
Total	435

Construction engineering losses would be primarily technical and professional engineer personnel such as design and construction engineers, mathematicians, and computer specialists.

There are, of course, a sizable number of Government employees engaged in planning and supervision of Safeguard PEMA and MCA activities. These also have not been included in the above loss estimates. An attempt would be made to find employment elsewhere in the Government for these trained people, should deployment be discontinued, and to obtain their services again if deployment were subsequently approved.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I do not take lightly the task of outlining the full dimension of the debate on which we are now embarked.

The debate involves differences of philosophy as well as differences of judgment.

The questions range from narrow technical considerations to broad policy decisions and, yes, perhaps even to sur-

vival of a world threatened by an ever-escalating nuclear arms race.

The issues involve not only the proper role of the Congress in setting national policies and priorities, but also whether a free society has the will and wisdom to debate such broad concepts and to recognize which threats are the greatest to the national security.

Clearly, this is an historic debate, and as we begin I should like to recall some words of Abraham Lincoln which are pertinent today:

If there ever could be a proper time for mere arguments, that time surely is not now. In times like the present, men should utter nothing for which they would not willingly be responsible through time and in eternity.

It is important that we conduct this debate with those words in mind not only because the effects of the decision we make may well last through time, but also because there are those in our Nation who, questioning the decisionmaking process of our Government, may use the conduct of this debate as a test of the validity of our system.

Therefore, before turning to an attempt to outline the case against immediate deployment of the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system, I would first like to make two points about the nature of the debate:

First, this is not a partisan debate, nor should it ever become that.

A Cooper-Hart amendment seeking a cutback in an ABM system was first introduced more than a year ago when a Democrat was in the White House.

In all, we worked together on three amendments designed to delay deployment of the Sentinel ABM system.

While those amendments all failed, it is interesting to note that the proposal to which we objected last year is today acknowledged and rejected as unworkable by some of those who proposed it.

Some of them are now among those who tell us that Safeguard will work, despite the fact that it is, for all intents and purposes, the same system renamed with a new mission.

On July 9, we introduced another amendment dealing with an ABM system, and there is a Republican in the White House.

Our concern is people, not politics; sanity in a nuclear age, not partisan gain or political embarrassment.

Second, it is important to keep in mind that in opposing the Safeguard proposal, we do not seek to paint our defense planners, civilian or military, as over-aggressive, single-minded proponents of destruction. Rather we seek to determine if the defense policies we have asked these planners to carry out are realistic and responsive to conditions at home and abroad. This, I submit, is a proper concern of Congress, a concern to which Congress has paid too little attention in recent years.

Having attempted to set the tone of the debate as I see it, let me attempt to structure the substance of the discussion, again, as I see it.

The debate might be divided into three parts: hardware, the arms race, and national priorities.

In turn, each of these parts involves a series of questions.

HARDWARE

Under the heading of hardware considerations, we must ask:

At this point in time, do we really need to provide additional defense for our Minutemen ICBM deterrent force?

If so, will the proposed Safeguard work and provide a credible defense?

At the risk of oversimplification, I will attempt to provide some brief answers to these and other questions which I will pose subsequently.

Our deterrent rests where? So far as tools and weapons are concerned, our deterrent rests with ICBM Minutemen missiles, nuclear submarines, strategic bombers, and a vast array of tactical nuclear weapons located abroad.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield at that point?

Mr. HART. I am glad to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. Those are all offensive weapons, are they not?

Mr. HART. They are.

Mr. MURPHY. In the ABM, we are talking about purely defensive weapons, is that not true?

Mr. HART. That is the label that is given to it.

Mr. MURPHY. I see. So that technologically at the present time the ABM could become an offensive weapon.

Mr. HART. No, indeed. I question whether the technology would suggest that the ABM presently proposed is an effective defensive weapon.

Mr. MURPHY. Well, there are some differences of opinion about that. I will say that it is a matter of choice—

Mr. HART. The choice that confronts us is one which we imprudently made last year, and which I hope we will correct this year.

Mr. MURPHY. If the Senator will permit me, I thank him for responding to my questions. I shall be interested in the continuation of his presentation.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, only by accepting as fact a series of highly improbable assumptions about Russian missile and antisubmarine developments can a case be made that we need additional defense to preserve our ICBM deterrent. I, for one, am not persuaded that the effectiveness of our deterrent is or will be threatened in the near future.

However, if one draws a different conclusion on the nature of the threat to our deterrent, he must still ask whether Safeguard will counter that threat.

Again in brief, there is a large body of scientists and technicians who believe that the computer which will direct the Safeguard missiles cannot work with the reliability required to provide a credible defense.

There is considerable doubt within the scientific community—particularly that not attached to the Pentagon—that the system will significantly increase our defense posture because the radar which tracks incoming missiles is easier to destroy than the Minutemen missiles themselves.

And finally, persons experienced with developing sophisticated weapons sys-

tems point out that such systems have almost always required rigorous and realistic field testing and sometimes actual use to iron out all the bugs, and I think it is safe to say that Safeguard is one of the most sophisticated weapons systems ever proposed.

Perhaps the strongest technical argument against Safeguard assumes that the radar and computers will work, but the system still will not provide a credible defense.

That argument is:

Even if the system works with a degree of reliability, it can be overcome easily by merely increasing the number of missiles launched against it.

One study estimated that in 3 months Russia could build the additional missiles needed to exhaust an ABM system which will take us more than 4 years to install.

A group of University of Michigan scientists have concluded that even if Safeguard works, it would have to be greatly expanded to provide a credible defense—an expansion which, in their estimate, would increase the price tag to the \$40 billion range.

Without pretending to know the exact figures, for they are classified, it would appear as if the ABM is a multibillion dollar defense system which at best might afford some hardpoint protection against, say—these are by no means precise figures because, again, they are classified, but to illustrate the point of the argument—450 Russian missiles, but not against 500 Russian missiles; might provide some area defense against 25 Chinese missiles, but almost none against 50 or 75 Chinese missiles.

The figures are merely illustrative. The gap between protection and nonprotection may be broader or narrower, but the best information we have is that the gap can be bridged with addition to an enemy missile arsenal.

THE ARMS RACE

If one is persuaded that despite the probability the system will not work, despite its cost, and despite its limited effectiveness, we ought nevertheless to deploy Safeguard—he still must consider the effect deployment will have on the arms race.

Here two questions come immediately to mind.

First, will ABM deployment cause the other side to increase its number of missiles in order to protect the effectiveness of its deterrent force?

And second, will deployment of ABM strengthen our hand in any talks with Moscow on limiting the arms race?

The answer to the first seems clear.

In response to information that Russia was working on an ABM system, this country developed and is deploying multithreaded missiles and began development of multiple-independently-targeted-reentry missiles—MIRV.

There is no reason to believe that Moscow will not react the same way to deployment on our part.

Equally important, it is quite possible and rational to interpret deployment of an ABM system as part of building a first-strike capability. If Russia makes that interpretation, then, indeed, the

hands of the nuclear time clock will have been moved closer to that ultimate midnight.

It has been argued that the decision to deploy Safeguard will enable the U.S. to lead from a position of strength in arms talks with Moscow.

If indeed an ABM system, with all its technical shortcomings, could be a factor in arms limitation talks, would it not be more effective as a lever which has not yet been pulled rather than one that has?

Not deployed, but under continuing research and development to improve it, an ABM system becomes a more effective bargaining card.

I think there is a suggestion and indication that proponents of deployment argue their case both ways.

On the one hand they argue that deployment will have no effect on the arms race, that Moscow understands defense and will not be alarmed by an addition to our defensive system.

On the other hand, they argue that the President needs Safeguard ABM to strengthen his position in arms talks.

Frankly, I fail to understand how Safeguard can at once be an effective bargaining card and a card our opponents consider to be of no real threat.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES

All of which brings us to the broadest and most important questions involved in this debate which has its roots in computers and radar.

The questions here are awesome indeed:

Is a defense policy which strives to meet all contingencies, no matter how remote, realistic, and responsive to the Nation's needs?

In the face of growing and pressing domestic problems, problems which run the gauntlet from urban rot to inflation, can we afford such a defense policy?

Does such a defense policy actually add to the national security?

Can the world survive a continuation of an arms race that matches escalation with escalation—replaces old contingencies with new—a race that siphons resources of nations away from the needs of people in order to simply stay even?

Why not call a halt now to the race that nobody can win? Yes, one side can gain a lead at some point in time, but what will one do with a lead which is certain to evaporate?

Mr. President, these, then, are the ultimate questions we debate these days in the Senate.

In opposing immediate deployment of Safeguard, we seek to start a discussion leading to some sensible world policy on nuclear armaments. We seek to replace what might be described as a condition of nuclear anarchy among the superpowers with policies of nuclear responsibility.

We ask that the national commitment be focused on the prompt start of arms talks with Russia.

We ask that nothing be done further to complicate those talks which represent man's best chance of ending a competition which benefits no nation and threatens civilization.

In opposing immediate deployment of Safeguard, we seek to reexamine our all-

contingency defense policy which is used to justify huge expenditures for defense systems to meet offensive threats existing only on paper and only then if highly improbable assumptions are accepted as fact. It is used to justify systems adding only marginally and for a limited time to our defense posture.

In opposing immediate deployment of Safeguard, we seek to reorder national spending priorities toward domestic problems which pose clear and present dangers to the Nation's security.

I do not pretend that I read Toynbee at night all the time. I must confess I read this last night. My prepared notes say that I note the observation of historian Arnold Toynbee who, after studying the demise of great civilizations, said:

In all the cases reviewed the most that an alien enemy has achieved has been to give an expiring suicide his coup de grace.

I think we ought to roll that one a second time.

Yes, arms talks may fail. And, yes, the other side may escalate the arms race. But let history not say of us that when the opportunity beckoned, we were not wise enough, thoughtful, courageous enough, or willing enough to explore that opportunity to the fullest.

Let history not say of us that we did not strive to replace nuclear anarchy with nuclear responsibility.

Let it not be said of us that we were unable to recognize what are, in fact, the greatest dangers to national security.

For all of these reasons, I urge approval and adoption of the amendment introduced July 9 by the able Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER), myself, and others, as now modified.

The amendment has been modified, without change in substance, by the amendment which we called up a few minutes ago. I ask unanimous consent that the names of all the Senators who cosponsored the July 9 Cooper-Hart amendment be added as cosponsors of the amendment just called up and now pending.

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

MR. HART. In addition, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the able Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE) be added as a cosponsor.

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

MR. HART. Mr. President, this amendment reflects what has been our position during the more than 1 year we have been debating deployment of an ABM system. That position has been to delay deployment and to continue research and development.

We say, let us continue research in the interval, to insure that if the day for deployment comes, we will deploy something more effective and more efficient.

This amendment will allow:

First, a pause in the arms race while seeking agreement with Moscow to end this expensive and wasteful competition.

Second, continued study to learn if we can develop an effective ABM system in the event we ever need one.

Mr. President, as to the question of how much this system is going to cost when it is all built, you can grab any

handful of billions of dollars you choose, but if the arms agreement can be reached, it will save whatever that billion-dollar handful is, if we delay deployment now.

If continued research and development indicate the ABM system now envisioned cannot provide a credible defense at an acceptable cost, as I believe is the case, additional R. & D. will have proved the hardware portion of our position and saved us whatever number of billions of dollars Senators wish to suggest as the ultimate price tag.

Our amendment also is written to give the Senate a meaningful and clear cut vote on the issue.

The amendment bars deployment of any component of any ABM system at any of the proposed Safeguard sites, but allows the administration to continue R. & D. at test sites, such as at our facilities in the Pacific.

This approach, we believe, accomplishes two things: It insures the adequacy of continued R. & D., and it establishes the credibility of our decision not to deploy.

To deploy components of Safeguard at the proposed Safeguard sites in the name of research and development would not only be wasteful in terms of meaningful testing, but would certainly raise doubts about the credibility of our decision not to deploy while seeking an arms limitation agreement.

I think it rather certain that we can test better in the Pacific than we can in Montana and in North Dakota; and deployment by any other name can be interpreted as deployment.

And finally, our amendment keeps the issue clear by avoiding a debate over the amount of money authorized by the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Let me explain briefly why we have not recommended a cutback in funds.

The bill authorizes \$400.9 million for research and development, \$345.5 million for deployment at Safeguard sites in Montana and North Dakota, and \$12.7 million for test facilities at Kwajalein.

Conceivably the Department of Defense may make a case for additional research and development funds on the grounds that adjustment in its R. & D. program would be required in the light of the amendment. As far as I know, we have heard no testimony on how much, if any, additional R. & D. funds might be needed if our amendment is adopted.

It would be my assumption that in the event the Senate approves our amendment, and the amendment becomes law, the Senate Appropriations Committee will question closely the Department of Defense officials to determine how much if any sum in excess of the \$400.9 million and the \$12.7 million would be required for an adequate R. & D. effort. I would hope the answer would be none, but that question is for a future vote. To debate figures today would be to engage in a number's game at the risk of confusing, or at least blurring, the far more important and clearer question of whether to deploy ABM.

I think the intent of our amendment is clear.

No one can question the adequacy or

credibility of testing permitted by this amendment.

Test adequately and fully; do not deploy. Test under circumstances which make clear it is not deployment in disguise.

We believe that this amendment offers the Senate the course of wisdom, prudence, and responsibility.

MR. TOWER. Mr. President, I believe that the amendment, if adopted, would have the effect of gutting the ABM program. It has been said we can test as well at Kwajalein as in Montana, or better; but the fact is that the men who would have to deploy the system feel that the testing and evaluation would be better on the deployment site.

The effect of the amendment would be virtually to eliminate predeployment activities, so that we would lose valuable leadtime while we assemble the personnel and facilities necessary for deployment.

We must reject out of hand the argument that the deployment of such a facility would make us the provocateur in the arms race. We have never been any such thing, and we are not now. Going back into history, following World War II it was the United States that demobilized. We felt then that, if we disbanded our vast Army, Navy, and Air Corps, the rest of the world, tired of fighting, would do the same. But they did not. The Soviets proceeded to improve on their military capabilities, proceeded to assert their military control over all of Eastern Europe, and proceeded to overcome the government of Chiang Kai-Shek and to aid the Chinese under Mao Tse-tung.

I think the Soviets know that we have no designs on them. There was a day when we had nuclear weaponry and they did not. They provoked us, and we acted with great restraint, and did not initiate war against them. They must know that we have no aggressive designs on the rest of the world, or we certainly could have fulfilled those designs in that period immediately following World War II when we were the only country in the world powerful enough to do so.

I reject the notion that the deployment of an ABM system is going to fuel the arms race. We did not start the arms race. The Soviet Union started the arms race. It is the Soviets who are trying to achieve vast military superiority, to the extent that they can accomplish their designs on the rest of the world; and they are not going to be stopped by anything that we do or fail to do.

The Senator from Arizona pointed out the other day that we have leveled off, but there has been no similar leveling off so far as the Soviets are concerned. They are going ahead. It has been pointed out that we have not developed a new air superiority weapon since 1955, but the Soviets have developed eight. The Senator cannot convince me that if we will just slow down and quit, the Soviets will do the same.

MR. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

MR. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from California.

MR. MURPHY. Is it not true that during the nuclear treaty talks, while those talks to find means of stopping all testing

in the atmosphere were in process, the Soviets prepared and tested weapons in the atmosphere while they were meeting with our negotiators, and gained tremendous advantages in scientific know-how and experience, that have given them advantages right now that we do not have?

Mr. TOWER. What the Senator has said is quite correct; and they only agreed to a test ban treaty—they only concurred with it—at such time as they knew they were ahead of us in certain areas of nuclear testing and we would be irrevocably behind them.

Of course, we know the typical Communist technique of negotiate-and-fight, negotiate-and-arm, and that is precisely what they are going to be throughout any arms negotiations.

Mr. MURPHY. Is it not true, if the Senator will permit me another question, that at the present time the speed with which the Soviets are building their military force—their striking force, if you will—has even far exceeded the projections made by all of our information agencies and all of our military?

Mr. TOWER. Our intelligence estimates have always been on the underside. I am not criticizing our intelligence community; I think they are doing the best possible job that they can, but it has always been on the underside, because obviously they are a closed society and we are an open society.

It is easier for them to gather intelligence on us than it is for us to gather intelligence on them. They have so much more expanse of land than we have that they are able to conceal things. They might have an airplane, and we not know it until it is suddenly displayed at the Paris air show or somewhere else.

We have to accept the projections based on what they will be in the mid-70's and then add a few percentage points and say that this is where they might be by that time.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator comment about the condition that exists at present under which we found to our surprise a few years ago that the Soviets had placed missiles in Cuba. This fact was suddenly disclosed to the President, and he immediately did what was necessary to get those missiles out of Cuba and remove that threat from an area 90 miles from our coast.

To go back 5 or 10 years in history, this would have been unthinkable. However, is it not true that at the present time a Soviet flotilla is anchored in Cuban waters?

Mr. TOWER. The Senator is correct. I understand that they paused long enough to watch our successful moon shot and then moved on.

Mr. MURPHY. The flotilla is made up of two new-type missile-launch cruisers, and I am told that there are other elements of tremendous firepower. Is it not also true that this is the first time in history that the Soviets have had a fleet this close to the United States?

Mr. TOWER. It is the largest fleet of surface vessels this close to the United States in recent times.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, is it not also true that the Soviets have moved

into the Mediterranean fleets that used to remain in the Black Sea?

Mr. TOWER. At the present time the Soviets will, I think, pretty well balance out our seapower in the Mediterranean in a very short period of time.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, would the distinguished Senator comment on what our intelligence tells us with regard to the number and the power of the new Soviet intercontinental ballistic missile, the SS-9?

Mr. TOWER. The total number of hard sites they have now is estimated to be very close to 1,100. We have 1,054 at the present rate, and we estimate that they have about 1,100. They have surpassed us in terms of fixed sites.

Mr. MURPHY. Is it not also true that at least some of these missiles presently have, or in the near future will have, the multiple reentry vehicle?

Mr. TOWER. The SS-9 would be capable of carrying a multiple reentry vehicle. Of course, we have to multiply it by whatever number of warheads they choose to use and multiply that by the number of missile sites they have. That tells us what they can shoot.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, is it not also true that over a period of the last 5 years, to our knowledge, the Soviets have been preparing and have been in truth deploying an ABM system around Moscow?

Mr. TOWER. They have been. They have a system around various populated areas of the Soviet Union. They have a defense system in other parts of the Soviet Union.

Their whole disposition suggests to me a doctrine that I think we must be prepared to defend against. I do not want to go too far in this point because we would relate to classified material. This has all been covered. So I do not want to get too far into it.

Mr. MURPHY. I appreciate the reluctance of the Senator with regard to getting into the classified area. I assure the Senator that I will respect his reluctance.

I merely ask the question to make certain that Senators will understand that the balance we talk about is the same balance we hope to achieve.

Something has been said to the effect that we should have kept the preponderance of power that we had a few years ago; not to worry anyone or to make war or for any imperialistic reason, but merely to guarantee the peace. That balance may have already been disturbed.

All the evidence I have been able to gather would indicate that the Soviet Union is already escalating the arms race on their own to a degree that has even surpassed all of our estimates.

Mr. TOWER. I think the Senator is correct. I believe we are in a perilous position now; and if the pending bill is gutted by agreement to this amendment, we will be in a more perilous position.

We must understand that we do not have a first-strike policy. We are not going to initiate a nuclear war. We do not have a first-strike policy.

We must then proceed on the assumption, I think, to be safe that the Soviet Union does have a first strike policy and that at such time as the Soviets deter-

mine they can safely do so, they might implement that first-strike policy. I think, then, that we must be prepared to defend the system that will deter the first strike.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for pointing out that fact. There is one other matter I wish to cover.

There seems to be complete agreement that there should be full speed research and development. In other words, the logical conclusion is that since there is that agreement, we do need a defensive weapon.

Mr. TOWER. The rationale is to go ahead and do a lot of research and development on it, to research the dickens out of it, but not to put it together because to do so would supposedly have some sort of massive affect on the arms race and make it spiral upward or dampen any possibility for negotiations on armaments.

I remember that Admiral Rickover said, "You can do so much research and development, but ultimately, to find out whether the thing works, you have to make one."

That is what we will have to do in this instance if we get an instrument that will defend our country with a retaliatory force against a first-strike capability.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, is it not correct that the system suggested by the President and by the experts responsible for planning in the Department of Defense is to be made up of component parts, many of which have been tested, or most of which have been tested?

Mr. TOWER. It is a matter of assembling them. The opponents argue and say, "You do not know whether it will work as an integrated system. Maybe you have tested the components, but have you tested them in an integrated system?"

We have not done so. However, the engine and the vehicle that lifted the astronauts off the moon had never been tested, either.

Mr. MURPHY. The Senator is correct. There is only one way in which we can be certain that we have a practical, effective, and viable system. That is to build one.

Mr. TOWER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MURPHY. And that is what the President has proposed.

Mr. TOWER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MURPHY. The President asks that we build one and that we do it in a practical manner so that we do not build it at Kwajalein where it would be more expensive.

Mr. TOWER. It would cost more money to build it at Kwajalein and then decide in the final analysis that we should deploy it here.

Mr. MURPHY. We can build it here, test it, and assemble it at a location where it can be useful. The money would not then be wasted, as so much has been in the past in research. However, if we need it, it will be there, and it will have been constructed. We will know whether it works.

I disagree with the distinguished Senator from Michigan. I think that the preponderance of the scientists with whom

I have talked certainly think that the chances of it working are much better than of it failing. All of the components have been tested. They do work, and it is safe to assume that they can put it there.

Is it not better to do this at the sites the President has suggested and under conditions where each year we take another look, we reevaluate and reassess, depending upon whether we need it or not. If the arms talks are successful and it is safe, we can stop the deployment, stop the manufacture.

Does this not make a great deal more sense than to hold it up 1 year, whereby we will lose I do not know how many years in case we should go into it?

Mr. TOWER. It certainly does.

Let me reiterate the point that I think we have all made so many times that we are blue in the face, and that is that there is no provision for deployment in the present proposal, but there is provision for certain predeployment, things that must go on now, or we lose valuable leadtime. There is not going to be any operational deployment this year or even next year, for that matter. It is going to take more time than that.

Mr. MURPHY. Is it not true that the amount of money we are talking about in this bill—

Mr. TOWER. Is \$759.1 million.

Mr. MURPHY. Period.

Mr. TOWER. Not \$40 billion or \$10 billion or any of these other big figures.

Mr. MURPHY. And there can be no further expenditure unless it is so decided and decreed at some future date in this body.

Mr. TOWER. They have to come to the Hill, with hat in hand, next year, and ask for more money, if they get more.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that there are no funds in the bill and no intention to deploy any component of the system during fiscal year 1970?

Mr. TOWER. I said "operational deployment." There is not going to be any operational deployment. There will be site preparation, yes.

Mr. COOPER. I believe we are in agreement. We argue, through our amendment, and contend that there should be no deployment in fiscal year 1970. The bill only is concerned with fiscal year 1970.

Mr. TOWER. The Senator's amendment would prevent any kind of pre-deployment activity.

Mr. COOPER. That is correct.

Mr. TOWER. So we agree on that.

Mr. COOPER. I ask the Senator this question: Is there any element, any component, of the anti-ballistic-missile system which can be actually emplaced on any anti-ballistic-missile site in fiscal year 1970?

Mr. TOWER. I cannot say with certainty, because I am not sure of all that is technically involved with site preparations, but I think it is probable that there could be.

Mr. COOPER. My information is that there is no element of a component and

certainly no component which could be in place on any missile site in fiscal year 1970. It is my information that the sites could be acquired, access roads might be built, and there might be some digging on the sites.

We are proposing, through our amendment, that there be no deployment on these sites in fiscal year 1970; and, if I have heard correctly, the Senator has agreed with me that actually there cannot be any physical deployment in this year.

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

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. I do not recall that there has been any guarantee in any of the hearings, open or closed, that I have attended that there would be no procurement of the site, preparation of the site, building what might be later part of the system. I think we are hung up a little in semantics.

I believe that the men in charge of the construction of the system, the assembly of the system—the building of the system, if you will—should be the ones to decide this. I have confidence that the Secretary of Defense and the President of the United States, who have the responsibility, in the final analysis, for the policy, have gone over this very carefully and that they have decided that to restrict them in any way, to restrict them for a period of 6 months or a year, would set back the final construction—the final deployment, if you will—of the system, in the event that we need it, by 2 years. Every year we wait, we lose 2 years. We lose more than that.

As we have just seen in some of the aircraft construction, where great leadtime is necessary, where there is an assemblage of talents from different areas of industry, the leadtimes never seem to diminish; they always seem to increase. And I know that my distinguished colleague is just as conscious of the cost as I am.

Mr. TOWER. Do not forget the money.

Mr. MURPHY. The cost always seems to increase. We have had a talk of the overruns in the Air Force in connection with this bill, and they increase.

I can only say, first, that those who have the final responsibility have gone over this quite carefully, and they have talked to an endless number of experts; and they have decided that this is needed for the best interests of the security of the United States.

Second, the President, who has certainly had as much experience as almost any other man in dealing with the Soviets in the past—and, may I say, he has had one of the most successful experiences that I can recall; and I call to mind the "kitchen meeting" with former Premier Khrushchev—has an instinct in these matters which seems to be very good. President Nixon has said and continues to say that he would like to have this program the way the committee—a majority of the Committee on Armed Services—reported it and put it in this bill. We did not do it lightly. We did not do it overnight. We did not do it just to have something to put in the bill. We did it after great thought, great study,

and after we had examined carefully all the things that had been discussed on the floor of the Senate.

At the last moment, before he left on his around-the-world tour in quest of permanent peace, the President assured us that he would like to have this; he would like to have it to safeguard our security; he would like to have it to strengthen his bargaining position.

If my distinguished colleague will be patient with me for a moment, I said this morning, on the floor of the Senate, that I recall vividly Mr. Chamberlain going to Munich, and all the jokes that were made of poor Chamberlain with his umbrella—a very ineffective weapon. Well, that is all he had; and he had to take what Hitler chose to give him, because the British Government had decided that they did not need to remain strong. At that moment, the once powerful British Empire began to diminish as a No. 1 world power, because they had misjudged the intent of the adversary.

I say that we in this body cannot take that chance. If we are going to make a mistake, we have to make it in favor of the United States. If we are going to talk about the expenditure of less than \$400 million, which is the difference between research and development and the construction that the President has asked, I say it is a very, very small amount to pay for the safety of this country, for the deterrent effect that it must have upon the Russians. I say that we enthusiastically should say this might be the finest investment we could ever make. God help us if we make a mistake in our judgment in this condition.

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

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I do not think I can add anything to the very comprehensive speech of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) which brought the debate to a higher level than we have recently experienced. In a very brief way, I wish to try to bring the debate today into focus.

We are talking about a bill which deals with fiscal year 1970. Our amendment would prohibit the deployment of any component in 1970. I believe the distinguished Senator from Texas has admitted that no component could be deployed on any missile site.

Mr. TOWER. I not only admitted it, but I have been trying to make the point with my distinguished friend.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TOWER. I would like to emphasize that.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, from the testimony of officials of the administration this program for fiscal year 1970 would be, in effect, a research and development program. I believe that I heard the Senator from California say a while ago that all of these components had been tested. I may not have heard him correctly but that is what I thought he said. As a matter of fact, the bill only requests money for testing the Sprint and Spartan and some long leadtime times for the missiles amounting to \$600,000.

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

Mr. COOPER. No; I do not yield at this time. I wish to finish my remarks. The Senator from Texas yielded to me.

Mr. President, the administration does not request and the bill does not provide any funds for procurement of Spartan and Sprint except for testing. The committee report admits it is a research and development program as far as the missiles are concerned.

A prototype MSR with two faces is being tested in Kwajalein. Testimony before the Committee on Armed Services was to the effect that the MSR prototype could not be used in test for guidance of Sprint and Spartan until 1970; Spartan and Sprint have never made any intercepts, and those tests of intercepts will follow later in 1970 and 1971.

PAR construction has not even started. A prototype does not exist. Secretary Laird testified that its configuration and design had been agreed upon. Construction had not yet commenced.

The data processors used with the radars, I understand, are being developed in New Jersey by the Bell Co. The software has not been developed. In fact, testing of some data processing elements are scheduled for Kwajalein. Essentially, the Department of Defense program in this fiscal year is one of research, development and testing. Our amendment would not in any way inhibit these activities and would provide funds for them, as the Senator from Michigan has said. Many believe that a better, more effective system can be constructed. The amendment which was introduced by the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) would provide ample latitude for developing and testing a better system.

I wish to make one other comment on the remarks of the Senator from Texas and the Senator from California. There is a great deal of truth in what they said about Soviet action since World War II. I am as familiar with the record as they are. However, we have reached a point in history where for the first time there is a prospect for negotiations on the control of nuclear arms. The Senator from Michigan correctly said they may fail. I share the caution that they may fail, but if we follow, always the argument that has been made again and again in this Chamber since World War II, that there is no possibility of any agreement—the same argument made against the nuclear test ban treaty, the nonproliferation treaty—there never will be any hope of stopping the arms race. Our amendment proposes that we make the supreme effort in this year.

No premature decision to deploy in this fiscal year, and no decision to deploy in future fiscal years should be made at this time—when our purpose is to stop, not accelerate the arms race. That is all we propose. We think it is very reasonable.

I wish to say frankly that I will not lower the line of debate, of what we hope to achieve, and what I believe the country hopes to achieve, by references to Munich. I merely say that I do not think that such argument elevates the debate in the Senate. All of us have had some experience in the service of our country, in the Senate, and in other occupations, including the armed services.

Mr. President, I will stop with that final comment.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I shall be very brief.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me briefly?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I wanted to interrupt my distinguished colleague to present some good news. As of the eighth inning the National League is ahead by a score of 9 to 3 in the All Star game. I think in the heat of these great debates we should not lose sight of what has been for many, many years a great American custom that is extremely important to the background and ability of our great Nation.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the Senator. With such a great ball club as the Houston Astros being represented, the National League cannot help but be ahead.

Mr. President, I shall be very brief. I must reiterate the argument that although there is not going to be any deployment, there are predeployment activities that must be funded by this bill. If that is not done in this bill—and if we adopt the pending amendment the money would not be available—almost 5,500 people are going to be thrown out of their present jobs. These are highly skilled people and they would not lose employment permanently, but they would go some place else. However, we would have to start over at a later date.

Although we are authorizing a process leading to deployment, if there is no deployment there is a considerable period of time in which we could come back and decide whether to go on with deployment, if we make the decision we are going to deploy. That does not mean we cannot change our minds. We could come back next week and make that decision and there would not be any loss.

However, getting back to the argument about the arms race, we did not start the arms race. Any time we level off we see no commensurate leveling off by the Soviet Union. We worry about our doing something provocative. The Soviets know we do not have aggressive designs on the world and that we do not have a first strike policy. I think we should recognize that they have been the provocateurs. For us to say that even though they provoke us, let us not do anything because it might make them angry, is like a criminal shooting at a policeman but the policeman does not shoot back because it might make the criminal angry.

I think the reason we have this problem in trying to carry out the wishes of the President and the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is the fear that somehow this is going to fuel the arms race, that somehow this is provocative, and that if we do not do it the Soviets will realize we are good fellows and the rest of the world will bring pressure on them to sit down and negotiate, and that they will beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks. I think it will not happen.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I want to react to one point which is by no means a major one, but one which I would hope we would put away; namely, that

if we do not deploy this weapons system, 5,450 jobs will be lost; that between 5,000 and 6,000 jobs hinge on this proposal.

We have never regarded the Defense Establishment as an auxiliary WPA—

Mr. TOWER. May I clarify that?

Mr. HART. Let me explain first why I rose—

Mr. TOWER. I did not mean that they would be out of work, because they would go elsewhere. They are skillful employees, and they will still be able to get jobs elsewhere. I was not trying to play upon the popular emotion of losing a job.

Mr. HART. That was the impression I got. What is the point, then?

Mr. TOWER. The point is, we do not want to lose the team. We would have to reassemble all these people once they were dispersed.

Mr. HART. All right. I think, in any fashion or form—

Mr. TOWER. If we broke up General Motors, I am sure most of its employees would get jobs somewhere else.

Mr. HART. This is an aspect of the debate and the whole defense deployment problem that we would be wisely advised to handle with some understanding. Why do I say that? Well, the Senator and I tell each other that the United States can be trusted to keep the peace. Yes, we are in the Mediterranean and we have been there a long time. We have ringed Russia, but at invitation. We are, nonetheless, the peace force of the world.

It is wrong for the Russians to get a fleet to Cuba, someone says, and it is disturbing that they are now in the Mediterranean, "crowding" us in the Mediterranean.

I do not know what the arithmetic is as to their proximity in the Mediterranean and to Cuba but the whole point is that there are people in this world who are sometimes attracted to the anti-American argument that America is the country that cannot be trusted to keep peace. Why? Because we cannot afford it, because we cannot afford to disarm.

I thought the Senator was saying that we had better not shelve this missile system because 5,500 fellows will be out of work. We tell each other that we can be trusted to keep the peace but we will be more credible if we do not measure weapons systems proposals in terms of payrolls. I know, and so does the Senator from Texas, that any time a weapons system is phased out, if the principal employer in some town in our State is the provider of that weapons system, that town does not like disarmament and they are down here on our backs saying, "Do not let them do it."

Mr. TOWER. If the distinguished Senator would yield on that point, so that I can clarify what I said, I was not making an emotional appeal for the jobs of these people, because they will have no difficulty getting work elsewhere. They are highly trained and skilled people. That does not bother me, the fact that they might lose their jobs. They will be snapped up by other companies very quickly. What I am talking about is breaking up the team, the fact that it

will have to be reassembled all over again.

Mr. HART. That gets to the business of momentum. Once we begin to turn it on, we cannot turn it off because look what will happen. Fortunately, the people of this country rescued us from the mistake we made last year. We have not gone full blast with the system. "We have 5,500 fellows we have to worry about." That is part of the thing that now bears the label of caution. Weapons systems have their own momentum, and part of it is, "Do not break up the team."

Before we get that team any larger, let us have it clearly understood that they are engaged in research and we are not getting this stuff on the ground. Happily, we have a second chance. We took this position last year and we were beaten. I repeat, the people have sort of given us a chance to correct it. After we started site acquisition, the people of America woke up and did not like it. Now that proposal has been shelved and we are not going to have Sentinel which was advertised last year as saving 20 million to 30 million Americans. No, we are not going to have that. Why? Because it would not work.

We who oppose ABM deployment are saying the same thing this year with respect to this one.

I hope that this time we will be more persuasive.

Mr. TOWER. The Senator from Michigan has underscored what motivates the opponents of the ABM system, that they do not want any arms system to have any momentum. They feel that by stopping the momentum of development of our arms system we will, somehow, end the arms race.

I say, I do not think we can do that.

Mr. MURPHY. I can appreciate that point of view very much. I am sure that I will join most enthusiastically if I could believe that the international situation were such, in present days, that it would be safe, that it would be practical.

Mr. President, I made reference earlier to Europe. I am sorry that my distinguished colleague from Kentucky apparently felt something personal in my remarks on that. That was not intended. I merely wished to remind the Senate of the historic occasions that took place and the circumstances under which a great nation had to take what they were given by a madman simply because they had nothing to go to the bargaining table with. They were bargaining from a position of weakness. The people in their government, I am sure, in the very best of faith, had done what they thought was good and right, but it turned out that the decision was an unfortunate one.

I merely remind Senators of this, because it occurs to me. I am sure that the President feels as the proponents of the system feel—I am sure that he has thought of it—that he would rather go to that bargaining table and be able to enter the discussions from the standpoint of strength rather than weakness.

Over the years of my memory, we have done many things to prove that we are not an imperialistic nation, that we do not want territory. When we talk about

this particular weapons system, I remind my colleagues that they want a weapons system in the pure sense of the usual understanding of the word; namely, as a defensive shield. It is not going to destroy anything except incoming missiles which have been launched to destroy us. It is not going to create fallout over our cities, as I have seen depicted in some cartoons—cartoons very cleverly put together, I must say, but very misleading—because so far as I can find out, there will be no fallout.

It seems to me that the men responsible have urged us to permit them to go forward with the amount of money asked for—not billions of dollars, but the difference between research and development and building two sites, assembling and putting the machine together to see whether it will work, and if it will not work, then to make the changes necessary, which will amount to less than \$400 million.

I hope that people understand that. I hope that is understood by those who are concerned that it might cost \$10 billion, or \$50 billion, as I have heard.

I agree with my colleague that sometimes these things get started, as is possible and as is so often the case with too many Government projects and it is difficult to stop them. It is difficult to say, "Wait a minute. We do not need this," or, "This is not working. This is not practical. There is a better way to do it."

When that day comes—and I hope it will come soon—when we can say we do not need it, I will join enthusiastically with my distinguished friend from Michigan. When that day comes when we can say there is a better and a cheaper way to do it, I will join him enthusiastically.

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

Mr. MURPHY. May I finish?

I hope the day will come, but at the present time, with all respect, that under the existing conditions, under the conditions laid down by the President, who at long last has the responsibility, by the Chiefs of Staff, by the Secretary of Defense, whose job it is to do these things, I just cannot see why or where or for what reason we should put a restriction on them that they have asked us to avoid. Therefore, I will have to continue, as long as this debate continues, to speak against and oppose in any way I can this proposal, which, in my judgment, as my colleague from Texas has suggested, would gut the entire bill, and put off the construction which is so necessary for at least 2 years of precious time that we may not have.

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

Mr. MURPHY. I yield.

Mr. HART. The Senator said that if the day ever came when we could afford not to do these things, he would join us.

Mr. MURPHY. I shall be glad to.

Mr. HART. The Senator was very enthusiastic last year. He did not join us last year. He wanted to deploy a different system last year.

Mr. MURPHY. If I may reply to the distinguished Senator, in my humble opinion conditions last year did not present conditions that I thought would make it safe for us not to deploy.

Mr. HART. Was the Senator right or wrong?

Mr. MURPHY. I think I was right.

Mr. HART. Why does the Senator propose we do it now?

Mr. MURPHY. Do what?

Mr. HART. They have abandoned the system of last year.

Mr. MURPHY. I have done so on the advice of experts who have far better experience than I do.

Mr. HART. They are the same experts who counseled the Senator last year; are they not?

Mr. MURPHY. No; we have a new man in charge this year. We have a new man in the White House.

Mr. HART. I hope the Senate will take charge this year.

Mr. MURPHY. Well, I am not certain that it is the exact job of the Senate to take charge. I do not presume to explain government to a Senator who knows much more than I do about it, but I take it, under our system, which is our system until we change it, it is the duty and the responsibility of the President. It is the duty of the Senate to advise and consent and to provide the funds in these matters, which is the purpose of the bill before us at this time.

As I pointed out before, the Armed Services Committee met at various meetings. It is a bipartisan committee. As a matter of fact, the distinguished Senator from Michigan is a member of the party which is the majority party. A majority of that committee joined on the side with which I agree, that we need this system and that its authorization should be a part of the bill.

So in view of those considerations, the request of the President, the best judgment of the top experts, the decision of having to take prior responsibility, as I said earlier—and I hope I am not redundant—if the decision is this close, please God that, in the best interests of the United States of America, we do not make a mistake in our judgment.

Mr. HART. Of course, I share the fervent hope of the Senator from California that we do not make a mistake.

Mr. MURPHY. I know that.

Mr. HART. I think the Senate made a mistake last year. I hope we do not repeat it this year.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I have enjoyed listening to this desultory but enlightening debate on the part of Senators on the floor concerned with the subject. I must say I congratulate the Senators from Michigan and Kentucky on the reasonable and sensible approach that they have taken.

I recognize, as do they, that the merits of these questions are not all black or all white. As in many problems that come before the Senate, they are more various shades of gray. They have decided that, on balance, it would be best to postpone actual deployment for the next 11 months, although in no way slowing down research and development. That is the net effect of their proposal. I must say I find myself in agreement with it.

I am struck by one point that the Senator from Michigan made, which is in connection with the ships and the movements of our own ships and the

Soviet ships. I am struck by the fact of the movement of Soviet ships to the Caribbean at the present time. Speaking as a Senator from Rhode Island, I do not like to see Soviet fishing vessels, or vessels of any kind, too close to our shores, but I think we must bear in mind how the situation looks from their standpoint. From the viewpoint of the Soviets, our naval vessels made 11 visits to the Black Sea, which is as much a Soviet lake as the Caribbean is an American lake.

When we look at the map, while we know we are good guys and will not make the first strike, I am not sure that conviction is shared by other nations around the world, although I believe we are doing the best we can to get our point across.

In connection with the system itself, I am struck by the fact that we are fitting the enemy to the system. Last year the enemy about whom we were told was China. We were persuaded that it would be a good system in case we had a strike from them. Now it is to protect us against the possibility of a Soviet strike against our weapons system.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5833) to continue until the close of June 30, 1972, the existing suspension of duty on certain copying shoe lathes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 12781) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 12781) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

DEATH OF MOISE TSHOMBE, FORMER PREMIER, REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, it seems just a short time ago that I made a statement in this Chamber deploring the continued confinement in Algeria of Mr. Moise Tshombe, the former Premier of the Republic of the Congo. Now I must speak with deep regret about his death in captivity, which occurred at the end of last month.

This is one of those occasions to which the old saying applies that one speaks more in sorrow than in anger. Indeed, no anger is called for in this situation, even if one were an admirer and supporter of the ex-Premier of the Congo—which is not a description which has any application to me. Yet I can feel the full-

est measure of sorrow on at least three distinct counts.

First, no matter whether one agreed or disagreed with Mr. Tshombe, there can be no question that he was a man of singular capacities and energy, capable of arousing the deepest loyalty among his followers. The loss of any man of his abilities is a matter of regret, and one must sympathize wholeheartedly with his relatives and his friends.

The second count on which I must express sorrow is the sheer waste of talent involved in keeping in captivity and incommunicado a man who had a definite contribution to make in whatever peaceful pursuits he might follow. To a certain extent, Mr. Tshombe destroyed some of his own effectiveness and his ability to help his country in its early years of independence. Nevertheless, it was entirely possible that under the right circumstances and with the cooperation of his countrymen, Moise Tshombe might well have made a further and far better contribution to the future of his native land.

The third reason for my sorrow on the occasion of Mr. Tshombe's death relates to the position and stature of the Government of Algeria. That Government, by calling in almost a dozen doctors, sought to assure world opinion that Tshombe's death was not attributable to foul play; his body was also turned over to his family for burial in Belgium. I, for one, have no reason to believe that Mr. Tshombe did not die of a heart attack as announced by the Algerian Government. Nevertheless, I regret the fact that by its behavior the Government of Algeria has opened itself to the kind of suspicion which it sought to ward off by taking such unusual measures. How much better it would have been for everyone concerned if that Government had displayed a merciful and generous attitude toward returning Mr. Tshombe to European soil after the hijacking of his plane 2 years ago.

Mr. President, just as with individuals, the fact is that no government or country can claim to have a record entirely without blemish. And it is not really up to me to make judgments about the Government of Algeria. I cannot help but feel, however, that it is a matter of sorrow for all of us that the relatively new government of a relatively new country should have invited such a dingy spot on its record. Speaking as one who would like to see improved relations between our country and Algeria, I can only express the hope that something profitable has been learned from the tragic fate of Moise Tshombe.

FISH FLOUR—ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARING BY SELECT COMMITTEE ON NUTRITION AND HUMAN NEEDS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, at a time when all eyes are focused on the heavens and the accomplishments of our space explorers, it is easy for us to forget the importance of area which was also once the reason for adventurous explorers leaving the security of their homelands for a trip into the unknown. Although long since explored, the oceans have yet

to be adequately developed as a natural resource. The funds that we expend for research and development in space programs is many times larger than the funds we invest in the exploration of the seas.

The importance of foods from the sea, such as fish protein concentrate, as means for improving the nutritional condition of the country was recently emphasized by the Providence Evening Bulletin in an editorial entitled "Fish Flour," published on July 19, 1969. I ask unanimous consent to have that editorial printed in today's RECORD.

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

FISH FLOUR

The concern expressed by Dr. Thomas L. Meade of the University of Rhode Island's department of fisheries and marine technology, over the slow progress of U.S. fish flour production for the world's underfed peoples deserves sharp notice. For several years, Rhode Island has had an interest in the processing of fish protein concentrate (FPC), an almost odorless and tasteless light grey flour made from whole fish. Two years ago the state narrowly missed having a "pilot" FPC plant located here. But the possibility of Rhode Island's participation in improving the diet of distant peoples still exists, especially if there is any new federal interest in the program.

After federal food and drug investigators, and scientists determined that fish flour was safe and wholesome for human consumption, spokesmen for the starving or poorly fed peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America took heart. However, as months passed one congressman after another criticized the delays in constructing processing plants, and the "bureaucratic footdragging" by the federal food and drug administration.

Dr. Meade's major point is that the government is overly restrictive on the varieties of fish allowed in the fish flour concentrate, and that the fish catch must be broadened to include abundant stocks of under-utilized fish. Broadening the catch plainly would quicken the incentive for American processors to boost production.

With sophisticated technology taking us to the moon's surface, Americans can and should perform a similarly distinguished feat in satisfying the dietary needs of people right here on earth. As Dr. Meade suggests, all manner of fish protein concentrates should be available in various forms, and the U.S. fish processing industry should not be required to fumble a request from a hungry nation whose people might have—to American tastes—a peculiar diet.

Further, America's research and development budgets have soared during recent decades, principally for defense and space exploration. But it's time that something more than comparatively niggardly spending were applied to developing and producing for hungry people some high protein products from our marine resources.

Mr. PELL. I also wish to mention that there will be a hearing of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs on July 31, which will explore the potential uses of food from the seas as a means for improving the nutritional status of our country's citizens.

EXPERIMENT AT 2 WHELAN ROAD

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to an article published in the June 1969 issue of College Management magazine. It is en-

titled "The Campus at 2 Whelan Road" and focuses upon a unique educational experiment currently being conducted in a public housing project in Providence, R.I., by Roger Williams College.

Briefly stated, the college has established a satellite campus in an abandoned housing project where students of urban sociology live, study, get to know the people of Hartford Park and their problems, and hopefully find a way to make 2 Whelan Road livable again.

The president of Roger Williams College, Dr. Ralph E. Gauvey, summarized the main objective of the experiment as "a magnificent opportunity for a college to convert its ideals of community service into action."

An institution of higher learning cannot suddenly be implanted into a grim housing project without serious repercussions. Eleven months ago, at the project's inception, the 28 students and three resident instructors were separated from the Hartford Park community—86 percent white, 14 percent black—by far more than the "scarred wooden doors, always locked, that separates the enclave from the outside world." Neighborhood resistance was based on two fears: First, that the people in the project were to become guinea pigs, and, that the college students were no improvement over the worst of project youth. Nevertheless, the project has grown from the locked enclave into the community itself and the people's confidence has been gained. The students take part in their community's activities by acting as Scout troop leaders, big buddies to neighborhood kids, or as organizers of a local baseball team.

The results of these efforts are encouraging. Daniel E. Mellor, director of the project and a former intern in my Washington office, succinctly put forth the beneficial effects of the project for the community:

College students provide different models for the kids. The kids begin to see college as something feasible. The idea of higher education is no longer frightening. I think our presence changes their perception of themselves. All of a sudden, it's not just a lousy low income neighborhood. It's a neighborhood with an institution of higher learning.

This energetic project deserves recognition and praise because it is a strong effort by an urban college to unite itself with the community, to participate in it, and to do meaningful things. Roger Williams College is moving to directly assume a responsibility in the community by employing its facilities for the amelioration of a disadvantaged community while furnishing its students with a realistic, meaningful educational experience.

I salute the school for its efforts and hope that other institutions of higher learning will follow the lead of Roger Williams College.

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 CAMPUS AT 2 WHELAN ROAD

Roger Williams College has established a satellite campus—or perhaps a beachhead—in an abandoned building of a housing proj-

ect. The results in terms of community, students and learning—along with the difficulties and defeats that have been sustained—can provide important insights to any institution interested in establishing its presence in the city.

It's called a "satellite campus," but to the impartial observer it looks like a monstrous obscenity in reinforced concrete, a cruel joke of a dwelling that ought to be ground back into the urban grit.

The 11-story building at 2 Whelan Road in the Hartford Park public housing project, Providence, R.I., is very likely the last place you'd choose to call home.

Scores of low-income families have fled the place. Two years ago, when the last of them finally gave up the battle and moved out, the Providence Housing Authority boarded in the lower windows of 2 Whelan Road and tried to forget it was there.

As if they could. Vandals had made the building notorious. They had smashed windows and scrawled vulgarities, decommissioned the elevator and turned the hallways into urinals. Nothing was secure. Family life was virtually impossible—as the fleeing families testified.

To the leadership of Roger Williams College, then a junior college centered in and around a YMCA three and a half miles distant, the vandalized structure at 2 Whelan Road represented a unique opportunity.

Dr. Ralph E. Gauvey, the president of Roger Williams, proposed that 2 Whelan Road become an extension of the college—a satellite—where students of urban sociology would live, study, get to know the people of Hartford Park and their problems, and hopefully find a way to make 2 Whelan Road livable again.

Here was "a magnificent opportunity," Dr. Gauvey said, for a college to convert its ideals of community service into action.

The Providence Housing Authority agreed to give Roger Williams use of the 11-story building rent-free. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development approved a \$50,000 grant. Daniel E. Mellor, director of special projects for Roger Williams, took charge of community relations and last September, 28 students and three resident instructors moved into 2 Whelan Road—to see what their ideals were made of.

To date the satellite campus has produced no studies or conclusions. The tensions of living at close quarters in a grim housing project (86% white, 14% black) have taken their toll on students and staff. The future of the program is not clear. Yet Roger Williams is having an impact on the neighborhood; that much is certain. The institution's ideals seem to be holding up under fire.

Much of the credit for this success must go to Mellor, the ruddy-faced, mustachioed director who calls his students "troops" and barks at them like a sergeant first class. Neighborhood kids in Hartford Park call him "The Bear." Mellor describes himself to a visitor as "the father figure" of the satellite campus.

Moving into 2 Whelan Road was something like winning a beachhead. Neighborhood resistance fed on two fears: one, that Hartford Park people were going to become guinea pigs; and two, that college-type young people were no improvement over the worst of Hartford Park youth—and who needed more of that kind?

"All they saw was long hair," Mellor says, "bearded kids high on dope, probably sexually promiscuous, drunk half the time. And I said, 'For God's sake, give them a chance.'"

The guinea pig fear cropped up time and time again as Mellor began to make contacts with neighborhood leaders. He spent most of one year sounding out local opinion, modifying the hostile parts of it when he could. His training as a political scientist helped. His natural skill at politics was probably more useful.

At first he tried to avoid the guinea pig

question because he felt that no satisfactory answer was possible until the community had developed some trust in its college neighbors.

"These people have been sold everything from Bibles to fresh eggs to Encyclopedia Britannica to diaper service. And I think that I was trying to sell them something at the beginning.

"So I finally said: 'Look, we're not coming in here to do anything to you. I want to establish a learning environment for my students. That's the major thing I'm interested in. Now if, as a result good things happen to you, well, that's fine. I hope they will and I think they will. But that's not what I'm here for.'"

A neighborhood committee of Hartford Park voted 36-14 to give the Roger Williams Satellite Campus a chance. Most project residents now seem glad that the college has moved in. And college students and staff seem happy to be there—much of the time, at least.

Anxiety remains.

Mellor's original plan was to integrate students, staff, and low-income families in 2 Whelan Road. But \$300,000 of renovation funds never came through and the families had to be excluded. Consequently 2 Whelan Road has become a college enclave.

The point of highest tension at the satellite campus is the scarred wooden door that separates the enclave from the world outside. The door is kept locked—always. It cannot be opened from either side without a key and only students and staff have keys. Neighborhood visitors must be met at the door—locked in and locked out.

At one level the door is a simple security precaution—a safeguard against theft and nuisance. But at another level the door is a powerful symbol of Roger Williams' program in Hartford Park. And as a locked door it may seem to be a contradiction to much of the program.

Students sensed this and a few months ago petitioned Mellor and his staff to unlock the door, at least for a few hours each day. No other building in the project is locked, the students pointed out. Locking 2 Whelan Road is an assault on the integrity of project residents. How will they trust us if we don't trust them?

The staff consented: students could unlock the door from 3 to 6 p.m. every day, provided they took charge of building security during that period.

But the students rejected that risk and the door has remained locked, plain evidence that Roger Williams, though in the neighborhood, is not of the neighborhood.

Despite the locked door, many good things have happened in Hartford Park because of the college's presence. Once a new student musters the courage to leave the enclave, there are countless ways for him to join community life. The satellite campus was barely days old when Progress for Providence, a community action agency, asked students if they wanted to be Big Buddies to neighborhood kids. Twenty-two students acquired little buddies in the housing project.

And . . .

One student works in the local Progress for Providence office.

Five ran for Neighborhood Advisory Council board elections—and one won.

Two work in a nearby boys' club.

Four open and supervise a school gym two nights a week.

Two are Scout troop leaders.

One has organized a basketball team.

Most are tutors to at least one boy or girl.

Four escort elderly persons to the neighborhood health center.

That's the sort of summary that annual reports are made of. Other effects of Roger Williams' presence resist such neat packaging and are practically impossible to document. They are things like images and mod-

els, and they may be the most important effect of all, Mellor believes.

"The neighborhood kids see a burly six-footer who can whip his weight in wildcats walking around with a book of poetry. He's an admirable thing. He means that you don't have to carry a gun or a jackknife or have been in the school for wayward boys to be an admirable figure."

The satellite campus has become a neighborhood hangout, one fairly reliable index of rapport.

"They hang out with a vengeance," Mellor says. And he thinks that's good. "College students provide different models for the kids who live in Hartford Park. I think that some of them start to see college as a feasible thing.

"We don't frighten them anymore, I think," says Mellor. "Higher education isn't frightening. College professor isn't frightening. I think our presence changes their perception of themselves. All of a sudden they are not just a lousy low-income neighborhood. They're a neighborhood where there's an institution of higher learning, and that makes a difference, though I'm not sure that I can define it exactly."

Jim Frasier, an Antioch graduate and Peace Corps veteran, is the "supervisor" of community involvement, as much as it can be supervised. Frasier is also assistant director of the program and one of the three staff members who live at 2 Whelan Road. He talks about the spontaneous—even unconscious—student-community relationships as the important ones.

An example is the large gap in age distribution at Hartford Park—the rarity of people in their 20's—that students are filling without even thinking about it.

"We have large families here, many without fathers. Mothers have four or five, seven or eight kids—young boys on the run. There is kind of a felt need, not openly expressed, for relationships between the project kids and the college student," Frasier says, "and some very close relationships have developed."

For most Roger Williams students who have stayed with the program, Frazier adds, "the emotional attachment and love of involvement is tremendous."

"I don't think you could drive them out of here," Mellor interjects.

"We've got activist students here," Frazier continues. "Not SDS-type activist, not the radical or militant, but students who are really involved."

"Yet these kids give you the same arguments as the SDS," Mellor adds. "There has to be a change," they say. There has to be all kinds of change. The thing I like about these kids is that they're really out looking for things."

The 28 students—seven women and 21 men—who moved into 2 Whelan Road last September were generally apprehensive at first about their strange new learning environment, and their reaction was appropriate.

Neil Ross, the resident deputy director of the satellite campus, instructor in sociology, and another Peace Corps veteran, comments:

"Initially we made a conscious effort not to involve ourselves formally. We wanted to avoid having our students come in as missionaries. We felt it was necessary to get to know the community, each student doing it on his own, going out and meeting people as human beings. From that point we could begin our research."

"This point is very important," Mellor adds, "not coming in and generating high levels of expectancy."

By the end of first semester 10 students had quit the program for a variety of reasons, mostly personal. Three students left because of the Hartford Park environment. It wasn't easy, as these student journal entries indicate:

"A boy threw a rock through our living room window tonight. Went up to tell the project director and saw the same boy and another boy throwing rocks at cars traveling along Harvard Avenue. Called the police. They never came."

"When I left my apartment about 11 p.m. I looked down into the parking lot and saw a boy standing with a rifle. He lifted the rifle and took a shot at me. Luckily it was only a BB gun—and he missed. I didn't know what to say to the kid so I just kept walking."

"Last night there was a fire at the project. A Molotov cocktail was thrown in the window of a house. It was awful to see. Six kids were left homeless . . . they were lucky to get out alive."

Spring semester enrollment was 26 resident students, including eight women, at 2 Whelan Road, and five commuters, for 31 total.

Their curriculum is evolving along two broad guidelines. One is that course work take advantage of the unique laboratory situation in Hartford Park. In other words, nothing should be taught at the satellite campus that could be done just as well at the main campus. The other guideline is that course work, in Mellor's words, "meet the legitimate educational wants and needs of the students" while satisfying obligations to the research sponsors, the Providence Housing Authority and the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Resident students at 2 Whelan Road take a three-course load each semester for nine credits. They also have two classes at the Roger Williams downtown campus for six additional credits. The spring semester called for research, a seminar in some aspect of sociology and supervised community involvement.

Research is the academic keystone. By the end of the term, Roger Williams students will have designed survey questionnaires under faculty guidance, conducted family and individual interviews in Hartford Park and prepared information for computer sorting. The first beneficiary of their findings will be the funding agencies.

But just what is the point of another study? Couldn't an astute urban-ologist answer all of Hartford Park's problems from the scores of old studies on delinquency, fatherless homes and low-income urban family folkways?

"I suspect so," Mellor admits. "I could say that a delinquency problem exists without even walking through Hartford Park. But I couldn't postulate much past that generalization without an in-depth investigation.

"Allegedly the building was closed because of teenage vandalism, terrorism and so on. Well I suspect at this stage of the game, after we have lived here nine months, that that is not the whole truth. The truth seems to be that people were moving out of this building before vandalism became a problem. It looks as if the condition for vandalism—a vacating building—came before the vandals."

Then what really caused families at 2 Whelan Road to desert the place? Students at the satellite campus may find the answer.

If the Hartford Park campus were only a social science laboratory for Roger Williams students, closing it when the study is done would have little effect on the neighborhood. But the college's immediate importance to the neighborhood has nothing to do with social science research. When the studies are finished—or when the funding runs out—will the Roger Williams program leave anything of value besides a research report?

Mellor does not have much of an answer now, though he can suggest some possibilities. One is that the building be converted into a community center of social and educational services to carry on and expand the work that Roger Williams students have started. Another is that the building be returned to public housing—provided the

neighborhood has learned how to make life tolerable in 2 Whelan Road.

A third possibility is that Roger Williams maintain its 2 Whelan Road campus as a permanent part of the college.

"We feel strongly that an urban college has to get out into the community. This is our first attempt to show that a small college, and certainly not a wealthy one, can participate in the community and do useful and meaningful things. That's not to say that I know what everything is that we can do yet. I don't. This is a new experience. It's only 10 months old.

"But I think it's good that we have had the willingness to do it—and have shown an ability to do it. If little Roger Williams can do it, other places can, too."

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PERCY TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I ask unanimous consent that, at the close of morning business tomorrow, the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) be recognized for not to exceed 40 minutes.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 24, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 23, 1969:

U.S. ATTORNEY

Stanley G. Pitkin, of Washington, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Washington for the term of 4 years, vice Eugene G. Cushing.

U.S. MARSHAL

Selbert W. Lockman, of North Carolina, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of North Carolina for the term of 4 years, vice J. Paul Teal, Jr.

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

Philip J. Farley, of Virginia, to be Deputy Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, vice Adrian S. Fisher, resigned.

CENSUS BUREAU

George Hay Brown, of Michigan, to be Director of the Census.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 23, 1969:

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Roderic L. O'Connor, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Agency for International Development.

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

Spurgeon M. Keeny, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.