

SENATE—Friday, July 25, 1969

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Vice President. The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, our need for a wisdom higher than our own drives us daily to come to Thee. Be with those who do pray and hear our prayer for those who ought to pray but do not. In the work of this Chamber give us grace and strength to say what needs to be said and to hear what we ought to hear. Teach us how to differ without being difficult, to disagree without being disagreeable, to contend without being contentious, and in all things to be conciliatory for the higher good. And when the evening comes may we be wiser men, bound more firmly together in comradeship, and with a profounder faith in Thee. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 24, 1969, be dispensed with.

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

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. MONDAY, JULY 28, 1969

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock Monday morning next.

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

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR FONG, MONDAY, JULY 28

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the reading of the Journal on Monday next, the distinguished Senator from Hawaii (Mr. Fong) be recognized for not to exceed 50 minutes.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated, beginning with "New Reports."

U.S. AIR FORCE

The bill clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Air Force.

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

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

U.S. ARMY

The bill clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Army.

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

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

U.S. NAVY

The bill clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Navy.

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

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

Mr. STENNIS subsequently said: Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that the Senate earlier today confirmed three nominations on the Executive Calendar in the military department that are of more than ordinary significance. I wish to say a few words about the men involved: Gen. John P. McConnell, who is retiring as Chief of Staff of the Air Force; Gen. John D. Ryan, who is taking over that position on August 1; and Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, who has been nominated for an additional 2 years as Chief of Naval Operations, which position, of course, would be as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. President, in these days of rather sharp criticism at times and questioning of the ability or capacity of members of the military, I point out that these three men are very exceptional. They are not personal friends of mine. I know them only officially. I have never been in their homes that I can recall, and they have not been in my home. I have shot a few quail with General McConnell, but that is my only personal connection.

General McConnell has been an outstanding member of the Joint Chiefs of

Staff. He was Chief of Staff of the Air Force during a critical time in our history. He is frank, earnest, fearless, courageous, and pointed in his remarks and recommendations. We came to rely on him a great deal and on what he said, and not all that he said was favorable to the Air Force. When he thought the Air Force was subject to criticism, he would be the first one to point out what he thought the facts were. I salute him for his extraordinary career.

I wish to emphasize what a source of strength and satisfaction it is to have men like this going up through the ranks and prepared the hard way for these highly complicated but important positions.

General Ryan comes to the office of Chief of Staff as a man of exceptional ability, and from the school of hard knocks and experience. I shall not relate all his record here, but it includes outstanding leadership and services in the war in Vietnam.

General Ryan has a fine capacity to perform the duties of Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force. He has the same frankness that goes so far in getting to the heart of a problem. I look forward to having him as Chief of Staff.

Admiral Moorer, who is now serving a 2-year term, has rendered an outstanding service. As I see it, we know that he gives us the pros and cons exactly as he sees them. We respect his recommendations. He has an unusual capacity as Chief of Naval Operations. It is a worldwide office. Call it what you will, Mr. President, his responsibilities are worldwide. I was delighted that the President saw fit to extend his time for an additional 2 years to serve the Navy and our Nation in a highly exceptional way.

I am happy to make these comments, Mr. President, in an impersonal and strictly unofficial way.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

The bill clerk read the nomination of William S. Thompson, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions.

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

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK—THE AIR FORCE, THE ARMY, AND THE MARINE CORPS

The bill clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force, the Army, and the Marine Corps which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President

be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. 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.

PRAYER BY SENATOR HATFIELD AT WHITE HOUSE WORSHIP SERVICE

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, last Sunday, at the White House worship service, a distinguished Member of the Senate, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), took part in that service, and at that time he offered a prayer for the safe return of the astronauts and for peace.

Because the prayer bespoke what was in the hearts of many of us at that time, just prior to the landing on the moon, and expressed so adequately and beautifully the desire and wish of all people on earth for peace, I thought it should be placed in the RECORD. I asked Senator HATFIELD if I could place it in the RECORD for him, and he has agreed to it.

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

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

PRAYER GIVEN BY SENATOR MARK O. HATFIELD, FOR THE SAFE RETURN OF THE ASTRONAUTS AND FOR PEACE, WHITE HOUSE WORSHIP SERVICE, JULY 20, 1969, BY REQUEST OF PRESIDENT RICHARD M. NIXON

Our Father, we marvel as three brave space pioneers prepare for landing on the moon. From the depths of our hearts we pray for a safe return of Neil Armstrong, Edwin Aldrin and Michael Collins. Sustain their wives, children and families during these anxious days. We are grateful for the thousands of support personnel who literally are their brothers' keeper. Excite our imagination to transfer this genius of cooperation and spirit of teamwork to our many other needs lest our success on the moon mock our failures on the earth.

Even as our Astronauts go to the moon in the name of peace, our world aches from the pain of wars. We perfect the means for destroying human life and then believe we have found security. May the nations trust not in the power of their arms but in the Prince of Peace, Thy Son.

Oh God, grant us deliverance from the rhetoric of peace when we personally are not willing to do the things which make for peace . . . to love, to forgive, to wisely use all gifts and resources for the good of mankind, and to permit the invasion of the Holy Spirit in the lives of each of us so that it may be reflected in our homes between husbands and wives, between children and parents, and in commerce between management and labor, between citizens and government, and between all races of men.

Oh Lord, keep us mindful that technical success does not necessarily produce wisdom. We pray for wisdom for our President and all who govern this nation. The true wisdom as found in Scripture is described by St. James as:

"The wisdom that comes from God is first utterly pure, then peace-loving, considerate, open to reason, rich in mercy and kindly

actions, with no breath of favoritism or hint of hypocrisy. And the wise are peacemakers who go on quietly sowing for a harvest of righteousness—in other people and in themselves."

We pray for this in the name of Thy Holy Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE MOON LANDING

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, since I have not previously spoken here in the Senate relative to the safe return of the astronauts I take this brief opportunity to do so.

As the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices of the Committee on Appropriations, which has under its jurisdiction the NASA appropriations, I have for 10 years been vitally interested in the development of the entire space program. I have supported research and development in this commitment to the conquest of space. I supported President Kennedy in his request that we make it a national commitment to land and return men safely from the moon during this decade.

I raised questions then about the future of the space program, and I think that one of the vital issues facing us today is the question of where we should go from here now that we have successfully achieved the commitment of landing an American on the moon. I know that the President is deeply cognizant of this question, as is demonstrated by the fact that he has already appointed a special task force, headed by our distinguished Vice President, to advise him with regard to the most appropriate response to the challenging future of our space program.

No one, no ordinary human being, could pay too much tribute to the coolness, the steadiness, and the courage of our three astronauts. I would like to say a special word about Mike Collins, however, because, of the three, he played perhaps a less spectacular but nonetheless vital part in the moon landing.

Mr. President, since we have had time to settle down a little and think through our thoughts about the return of the astronauts, it has come to me forcefully, over and over again, just how much depended upon this one man and how much his two companions depended upon him.

Mike Collins orbited the moon alone for many hours—I think approximately 28 hours—and if anything had gone awry in the ascent stage of the Eagle, it would have been his sole responsibility to effect a rescue. I think we all know in our hearts that he would have gone far beyond the call of duty, and perhaps beyond the limits of safety, in order to effect a rescue if he had to do so. Thank God he did not have to do it. But I do think that in this time, when all three have returned safely, we owe a word or two to Mike Collins, who performed such a heroic and valiant part of this whole endeavor but who was, by the irony of fate, denied the great honor of being one of the first to put his foot on the moon. Nevertheless, he is as much a part of it—and I am sure that in the minds of Aldrin and Armstrong he is as much a part of their feet being placed on the moon—as if he actually had been there himself.

SENATOR MANSFIELD TESTIFIES BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on Wednesday, July 23, I appeared before the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on the Judiciary, of which the distinguished Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) is chairman, to speak in behalf of gun crime legislation, the application of the ammunition aspects to the gun law now in effect, and also to suggest to the subcommittee that it begin hearings as soon as possible on the bills introduced by the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DIRKSEN), and the distinguished Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) having to do with pornography.

I might say that, under the leadership and the sponsorship of the distinguished senior Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), an endeavor is being made to correct an abuse with regard to the ammunition sections of present law. I think they have been grossly misinterpreted.

I would hope that a mandatory sentencing law for gun crimes would be enacted soon. I would hope that the question of registration would be resolved soon; registration imposed under the ammunition provisions of present law which, in my opinion, was adopted arbitrarily by the Internal Revenue Service.

I would hope, too, that legislation would be reported shortly having to do with the question of pornography. It is about time that the responsibility for reporting obscenity is shifted from the recipient—the unwilling and unwitting receiver of pornographic smut—and that penalties would be made applicable as are provided in the bills introduced by the distinguished Senator from Illinois (Mr. DIRKSEN) and the distinguished Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH). I understand that under those measures the sender—and I repeat "sender" and not the recipient—would be the one liable for punishment and have to assume full responsibility for what he does. In that way it would not be necessary for the unwilling and unwitting recipient to have to go to the post office personally and in that way attempt to protect himself from smut.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator think that among the rights of American citizens it would be reasonable to hold that a citizen should have the right to have his home free from receipt through the mails of unwanted, unsolicited, vile, and obscene literature?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I certainly do. I think it is going to a tremendous extreme. I have looked at some of this literature. I receive much mail in the way of complaints from the people of my State, and strangely enough much of those complaints come from doctors of medicine. I think it is unfair. Whether or not it is constitutional is another matter. I am looking at the reality and not the legality of the situation. I think the Government, which has control of the mails, has the right to exercise on its

own responsibility, suzerainty or sovereignty, or whatever one wishes to call it, over the sender of this type literature. The burden should not be on the recipients who have no control. They can only make complaints and perhaps get action that way. It is time for this situation to be corrected.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement I made on these subjects before the Subcommittee on the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

GUN CRIME LEGISLATION

(Statement of Senator MIKE MANSFIELD)

Let me first thank you for your invitation, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate having this opportunity to testify at the beginning of this series of hearings on firearms legislation and especially on my bill, S. 849.

The gun law thus far has asked a sacrifice on the part of the law-abiding gun owner in return for what hopefully will be a measure of control over the inordinate flow of weapons into the hands of the lawless and untrained, the addict, the drunkard, the incompetent and the criminal. Providing such legislation at the Federal level has provoked numerous questions and the debate still rages on.

What is clear so far is that the burden imposed by the present law on the law-abiding gun owner has not been distributed equally. We in Montana, for example, seldom experience the use of guns by the criminal and unfit. At the same time we Montanans pride ourselves in the responsible use of weapons for sport and even for self-defense. Unfortunately, that is not the case elsewhere in the land. Our large metropolitan centers have been wracked by crime and violence perpetrated by hoodlums having no notion of the responsible use of weapons. Yet we in Montana are asked to bear the full measure of the burden of gun legislation. What we stand to benefit from its hoped-for objective—a reduction in gun crime—is greatly disproportionate when viewed solely within the geographical confines of Montana. Nevertheless, may I say that in Montana the sacrifice asked by this law has been made. It has been made by Montanans though to some the whole notion of gun legislation may be repugnant. It has been made simply because Congress recognized that the ease with which guns are made available to the lawless has become not only a state and local problem, but a national problem as well.

And just as Congress recognized that the ease of gun accessibility by the lawless has reached national proportions justifying Congressional action, so does the penalty for the criminal use of guns warrant equally close attention by the Congress. And that is just what my bill, S. 849, aims to do.

Gun crime is a national disgrace. And with this bill I offer another approach to curtailing the gun crime rate—an approach that says to the criminal in terms that are clear and simple that his resort to a gun will be met automatically with punishment that fits such an act of violence. In contrast to the present gun law, no burden is imposed on the law-abiding gun owner. No sacrifice is asked. The burden falls squarely where it belongs—on the criminal and the lawless; on those who roam the streets, gun in hand, ready and willing to perpetrate their acts of violence.

I am no expert in crime control. I am not even a lawyer. But I know there is something wrong when the FBI tells us that while our gun crime rate continues to spiral upward, our prison population shrinks proportion-

ately. I hope this trend is reversed. I would think an assured prison sentence for criminals who choose to resort to firearms would help establish such a reversal or at least stem the tide. That is the purpose of my bill.

Under its provisions, for a first offender the penalty would be 1 to 10 years in prison; for a subsequent offense—a mandatory 25 years. The proposal varies from present Federal law in two major respects. Under no circumstances can the sentence for using a firearm be suspended or assessed concurrently with the sentence for the commission of the crime itself. The criminal gun user will be sentenced solely for his choice to use a gun. Moreover, the subsequent offender will be compelled to serve 25 years for making such a choice. In this regard, it just seems to me that no leeway or discretion is necessary when it is found that a criminal has chosen a second time to use a firearm lawlessly.

I would add that for the most part I agree with gun legislation; especially in its stated objective: to assist Federal, State and local law enforcement agencies in their fight against crime and violence. At the same time I do object when a Federal agency—when any Federal agency—misinterprets or misconstrues the law in the name of enforcement. That is why I joined as a co-sponsor of the bill, S. 845, offered by the distinguished Senator from Utah, Mr. Bennett, to strike down the ammunition regulations issued by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to the Gun Control Act of 1968. In my opinion those regulations fall squarely beyond any authority granted by Congress under the law. Indeed, Congress voted down registration; and registration, in my opinion, is precisely what the Treasury regulations call for.

On February 4, the distinguished senior Senator from Utah (Mr. Bennett) introduced S. 845. It seems to me to indicate that registration by another name is being required by a regulation of the Internal Revenue Service. This regulation covers ammunition for pistols, rifles, shotguns and some components, including primers, propellant powders, cartridge cases, and bullets.

Under sections 992(b)(5) and 923(g) the dealer is required to record the name, age, and address of the buyer of firearms or ammunition, while section 923(g) authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to issue regulations relative to record keeping by dealers. The regulations issued by the Secretary of the Treasury call for far more than sections 922 and 923 require and, in my judgment, go considerably beyond the intent of Congress in passing the Gun Control Act of 1968.

For example, the regulations issued by the Secretary of the Treasury call for the following: Date; manufacturer; caliber, gage, or type of component; quantity; name; address; date of birth; and mode of identification, driver's license, and so forth.

It seems to me that this goes far beyond "the name, age, and address" of the law and covers a good deal more territory which, in effect, amounts to registration.

If there is to be registration, let it be in the open and on the table, and let everyone be aware of it. Congress, in my opinion, opposed registration under the Gun Control Act of 1968, and this regulation, in my judgment, would go far beyond what Congress intended.

This is back-door registration and should be corrected. In my judgment, it is necessary to correct an unnecessary burden and a deceptive form of registration and to bring the regulations in line with the intent of Congress at the time the bill was passed.

With that said, let me again reiterate that I think the objectives sought by the 1968 law are wholly correct. I hope they are met; though it is premature now to make a judgment on that score.

And it is only to complement the objectives of the existing law that I offer my proposal for mandatory jail sentences against

perpetrators of violent gun crimes. The message it brings to the criminal gun user is clear. For ultimately the decision to resort to a firearm is up to him. If he finds the penalty so severe as to deter his use of this deadly weapon, only then can society be protected from the violence it produces. The State of Alaska I understand has already adopted such an approach. Other states are in the process of joining the effort. Mr. Chairman, I urge you and your subcommittee—already so distinguished for your leadership in this area—to steer this proposal through the full Judiciary Committee and on through the Senate.

By offering mandatory jail terms in return for gun violence at the Federal level, the Congress will provide, I believe, a splendid model for all fifty states to follow.

Mr. Chairman, another piece of proposed legislation which I would urge the Judiciary Committee to face up to relates to unsolicited obscene and pornographic literature being sent through the U.S. mails. I have received numerous protests from my constituents in Montana, and I believe the situation has reached such a magnitude that it demands action on the part of the Federal Government.

First of all, it is important to protect children against this kind of traffic in smut. Furthermore, I see no reason why the average citizen should have to put up with this kind of unsolicited material sent through the mail. The responsibility for keeping this material out of the mail should be placed on the sender, not the unsuspecting boxholder as is now the case.

It would be my hope, Mr. Chairman, that very shortly hearings on S. 2073 and S. 2074, introduced by the minority leader (Mr. Dirksen) and other Senators, and S. 2057, introduced by the Senator from Indiana (Mr. Bayh) and other Senators, will be held, and the bills given the immediate and considered judgment which they deserve.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 141— INTRODUCTION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION PROPOSING CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO LOWER THE VOTING AGE TO 18

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment to lower the voting age to 18.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 141) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older, introduced by Mr. GORE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, over the years, I have watched with pride the growing enthusiasm, interest, and spirit the young men and women of our country have shown in politics and government. Each political season finds them ringing doorbells and writing letters, taking surveys and distributing literature, making speeches and discussing issues with a dedication exceeding that of many of their elders. Yet, for all their involvement, we have failed to involve them in that most precious of democratic privileges—the right to vote. It is time we acted to correct this omission.

There may be some who feel that the 18-, 19-, and 20-year-olds are not ready for the franchise, that our young people

are too emotional, that they are too naive to be able to make wise electoral decisions. Yet I fear that these critics confuse emotionalism with spirit and zeal. Perhaps these pessimists mistake idealism and concern for a lack of social grace and traditional political conventionality.

Today's young adults are a new breed. They are not the products of the isolated one-room schoolhouse and the old swimming hole; the farm and the small country hamlet. They have come out of a highly sophisticated school system. Our education system, as never before, is preparing students to enter society as informed, alert individuals. Schools are realizing, on a scale never before achieved, a primary function, that is, the production of the critical thinker, the student capable of analyzing problems and arriving at appropriate decisions. The American political system has need of this infusion of new blood.

Our young people are also the heirs of another great learning medium—the communications system. Young Americans have been brought up on Presidential news conferences and national conventions. They have been nurtured by the evening news at supertime and national question-and-answer programs with Sunday dinner. Their perspectives are not limited to national occurrences alone, for they learn instantly what is happening in Cairo and Singapore, Saigon and London. They are being informed more fully and educated more broadly. It is now time to serve them and ourselves more completely by granting to them what they have earned—a place in the electoral system of their country.

As I see it, we can do no less than give them the right to vote. To deny them this privilege would symbolize a failure on our part to act consistently with what we demand from them. Every 6 years we ask our young adults to serve us. We trust them to campaign, yet we do not trust them to vote.

At the age of 18 we call on our young men to defend our country, and if necessary, to die for it. Yet we are not willing to let them decide for what they will die.

We tell our young adults, "You are the hope of tomorrow," yet we fail to allow them to help shape their destinies today.

These are times of challenge. The idealism of youth, expressed at the ballot box, will enable us more successfully to meet the challenge.

THE ABM SYSTEM

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes in the morning hour.

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

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, during the debate on the anti-ballistic-missile system, particularly the very valuable discussions on this floor yesterday and from comments from my own State by mail and by editorial comment, a strong theme has been evident in the presentation of arguments for the immediate deployment of the Safeguard system. This is the theme that beneath all of the technical, strategic, military, and foreign policy consideration that there is one com-

elling reason for deployment—that is "You must support the President."

Two points have been advanced in support of this idea. The first is that the President has greater knowledge and greater wisdom than anyone else on national security matters by virtue of his constitutional position as Commander in Chief of the armed services. Yet the President is only one man and he must rely for advice in this area on the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the CIA, and the Secretary of Defense. While no one doubts, Mr. President, their dedication to the Nation or to the truth, these valuable public servants are all agents of the Military Establishment and they focus their recommendations, and justly so, in line with their military responsibilities.

Mr. President, the essential facts, reports, and evaluations which are necessary to make a judgment on this matter, classified and unclassified, are all available to the Members of the Senate. Moreover, let me say that while I think the President in the first days of his administration had ample opportunity and devoted the necessary time to make a decision on the ABM, it should be noted that this is an issue and a matter which has been before the Congress for years. There are Senators on both sides of the aisle and on both sides of this issue who have devoted literally years of study to this matter.

It is the Congress then which has the responsibility to make an independent judgment, and it is the Congress that can broaden the considerations of national security policy beyond the immediate concerns of the military agencies.

A second point associated with the idea, "You must support the President," is the partisan argument that appeals to simply party loyalty. This is a frightening concept for two reasons. It means that all issues, whether they be economic, social, legal national security issues, or foreign policy decisions should be decided along political party lines. This would reduce the Government to the status of a continuous political campaign, to the harm of the American people and to the Nation. It would also mean labelism would take the place of debate on the real questions. Instead of discussing and resorting to reason as to how to maintain our national security, for instance, we would only be dealing with labels such as "liberal" and "conservative" without coming to grips with the real problems, which would substitute the slogan for thought and the false label for the serious goal.

A U.S. Senator must use his own judgment. His oath requires it. He cannot abrogate his responsibility, he cannot turn over to the President his own duty for a reasoned decision. To do so would undermine the separation of powers in our system of Government and destroy the concept of shared responsibility between the executive and legislative branches.

The consequences of leaving these decisions to the President is that a Senator simply becomes a duplicating machine. He is not elected to play this role and no man in good conscience, can choose such a role simply to avoid controversy.

It will not surprise the Members of this body, Mr. President, to be reminded that in many cases those who urge a Senator to support the President on ABM are equally as convinced that that Senator should oppose the President on the surtax. And yet the argument that the President has superior knowledge and information can be made on the surtax issue. He has as his special sources of advice the Council of Economic Advisers, the Secretary of the Treasury, and, if he desires, the Federal Reserve Board, not to mention the opportunity to counsel with fiscal and monetary authorities throughout the private sector.

The meaning of this apparent contradiction is, of course, that a U.S. Senator, to act responsibly, must study an issue and make a decision on its merits. Thus to take a position on the surtax one must study its effect on inflation, on the taxpayer, on economic growth, and the balance of payments; just as in taking a position on ABM one must study its effect on our national security, our relations with the other nuclear powers, and the effect on the arms race.

With specific reference to ABM, those who ask that a Senator always support the President disregard the fact that Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson during the first part of his term rejected the concept of the ABM as a defensive weapons system. If we accept the proposition that the President is always right in national security matters, we must then ask which President, and we must also ask why does one President propose one ABM system with one purpose, and another President another system for yet another purpose.

Of course, the easiest way out of the controversy on the ABM is simply to let the President do it all. Yet the President himself has expressed to me his own feeling that this is not the proper way. I know he understands that some may have a judgment and conviction which leads to the opposition of the ABM and I further know that those who oppose the Safeguard system will be working with him in the future on many important issues.

Only this week it was my privilege and conviction to speak in support of the President in his efforts to find a solution to the war in Vietnam. I took the opportunity to emphasize that the stalemate in Paris must be broken and that Hanoi and the Vietcong should not mistake our desire for peace and our attempt to negotiate for weakness or lack of will and determination. This was done in response to an indirect suggestion by the White House, but it was also done as a matter of conviction which leads me to support the President in his decision not to seek a military victory and his determination to find a peaceful solution.

All of this is finally to say, Mr. President, for one in the Senate to make a contribution to the solution to the difficult problems affecting our national security such as ABM and Vietnam each Senator must exercise his own best judgment in accordance with the quiet turning of his own conscience. Not only is this the responsible role for a Senator but it is also the one by which public

policy can be defined and understood in our democratic process.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as long as we have such a good attendance on the other side of the aisle—I wish we had as many on this side—I ask unanimous consent at this time that I may proceed for not to exceed 7 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Montana is recognized for 7 minutes.

THE SURTAX AND TAX REFORM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my intention to speak on the surtax and tax reform.

The sole purpose of the majority policy committee at this point is to try to assure a disposition of both tax reform and the extension of the surtax for 1 year. The question is procedural—scheduling—and its consideration is well within the purview of the responsibilities of that committee. There is no desire nor intent nor inclination to disturb in any way the substantive functions of the Finance Committee, or, for that matter, any other legislative committee.

The policy committee is well aware of the administration's view that the extension of the surtax is necessary to fight inflation. It is also aware of a gathering public view that the surtax has been an inequitable and ineffective way to fight inflation and a public demand for changes in the present tax structure in the direction of greater equity.

To date, the surtax may well have served to intensify the resentment against the inequities in the tax system.

Although the surtax has been in effect since last year, the Nation has seen no relief from rising inflationary pressures. Indeed, during the past 7 months inflation has been the greatest in many decades. Interest rates are at their highest point in modern times. Yet it was precisely as a weapon against inflation that the surtax was offered to the people of the Nation. It was offered, I should add—and I am frank to admit it—by a Democratic administration. It was adopted by a Democratic-controlled Congress. I say that to lay at rest the partisan implications which, regrettably, have been raised in this situation. This side of the aisle must carry its full share of blame for the surtax just as it must for Vietnam.

The administration and some Members of the Senate have been urging quick

passage of the surtax with tax reform remaining on the back burner. So far as we can see, with this approach, what may come after in the way of reform would be based strictly on a hope and a prayer. In my judgment, that is not sufficient to satisfy the demands of the people of the Nation for greater equity in the sharing of the tax burden. It was not sufficient a month ago. It is not sufficient today. Tax reform is no less urgent than continuance of the level of tax burdens which now falls heaviest on the wage earners and salaried employees of the Nation.

Nevertheless, the policy committee assembled yesterday with the Democratic members of the Finance Committee in an effort to reach an accommodation with the administration. I can tell the Senate on the basis of that meeting—and the Senate should believe me—that enthusiasm for a year's extension of the surtax in any circumstances is rapidly diminishing. Indeed, if it is to pass at all, it may well have to be accompanied by assurances of very substantial tax reform.

I hope nobody considers that a threat. In my opinion, it is a fact based on conversations which I have had with my colleagues representing all spectrums of the Democratic Party and all sections of the country.

It was with this awareness that the Democrats of the policy committee and the Finance Committee acted, in my judgment, in a most responsible fashion when they proposed unanimously yesterday to follow a new course of action, provided the suggestion was acceptable on all sides. Their joint proposal would extend the surtax for 5 months—thus giving the administration what it has described as an anti-inflationary device. The final 7 months of the requested extension, moreover, can still be enacted together with a tax reform package prior to November 30, 1969. Even Senators who are on record as opposed to the year's surtax extension agreed that a 5-month extension in this context would be appropriate.

It is our considered judgment that this offer of yesterday is responsive to the wishes of the administration and to the realities of the issue of the surtax as it confronts the Senate at this time.

Mr. President, on yesterday I had intended to go down personally to see the distinguished minority leader and give to him by hand the results of the meeting held jointly by the Democratic members of the Finance Committee and the policy committee; but unfortunately, the press of the press was so great outside the door that I would have been taking my life in my hands had I tried to undertake what would have been a most pleasant journey on the basis of personal friendship. So I called the distinguished minority leader on the phone, he put his secretary on, and he copied the statement down. So I did the best I could to get it to the minority leader. I wanted him to know of that. I am sure he did. I wanted the Senate to know of the procedure which was followed, because I believe in courtesy and comity between the two parties and the two Houses.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous

consent that the statement of the Democratic policy committee and the Democratic members of the Finance Committee be printed in the RECORD at this point, with footnotes to the effect that the investment credit repeal is, in effect, permanent law; that the extension of the excise taxes remain in effect until December 31, 1969; and that the change of the standard deduction, the so-called help-to-the-poor amendment, would not, under any circumstances, go into effect until January 1, 1970.

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

The Democratic Policy Committee and the Democratic members of the Finance Committee have agreed upon the following understanding:

1. Support an extension of the surtax until November 30, 1969. This will be accomplished by attaching this temporary extension to a separate House-passed bill. The House-passed surtax extension containing the investment credit repeal,¹ the extension of the excise taxes,² and the change of the standard deduction³ will remain on the Senate Calendar until the tax reform bill is reported by the Senate Finance Committee.

2. The Chairman of the Finance Committee and the Democratic members of that Committee have given their assurance that the tax reform package will be reported to the full Senate not later than October 31, 1969.

3. The Democratic Policy Committee has endorsed the position of the Finance Committee that the date of the investment tax credit repeal will be identical to that date in the House-passed bill (April 18, 1969). The endorsement was at the specific request of the Democratic Finance Committee members to assure all that the investment credit repeal is endorsed and the date is specified as contained in the bill on the Senate Calendar.

Pursuit of this understanding in the Senate is contingent upon its acceptance by the Administration and the Republican leadership which has been pressing in the Finance Committee and on the Senate floor for the extension of the surtax. May I say that many of the members present today went along with this understanding notwithstanding grave reservations about the usefulness of the continuance of the surtax as an anti-inflationary measure. The approach is offered as an accommodation to the Administration. If it is not acceptable, the Majority Policy Committee is compelled to stand on its previous resolution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I was fully aware of the dilemma in which the majority leader found himself last night, and I thought it was indeed generous on his part to phone me and make it possible for the secretary to take down the statement he subsequently made to the press, which disclosed the import and the general attitude of the majority policy committee.

I took it upon myself to convene the minority members of the Committee on Finance at my office at 5 o'clock. I also asked the Secretary of the Treasury to join us in that informal seminar. I had hoped that the Chairman of the Board of the Federal Reserve System might be available, but he was away from the city at the time.

¹ Permanent law.

² Remain in effect until Dec. 31, 1969.

³ Scheduled to begin Jan. 1, 1970.

We discussed the statement at considerable length, and subsequently I rang the Press Gallery, and they were kind enough to come down so that I could make a statement. The Secretary of the Treasury joined in that statement, and it was corroborative of what I have to say.

My remarks, in essence, were about like this:

I said, first, that the proposal that was made to extend until November 30 the surtax simply was not enough, because it still leaves it up in the air; and who shall say what will eventuate before or after that time? A similar proposal was more or less rebuffed in the Senate Finance Committee, and I appeal to the distinguished Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS) to corroborate what I say, because he was there.

A somewhat comparable proposal, not quite so long, measured in terms of time, was rejected by the House of Representatives. That only adds uncertainty and confusion to this whole picture.

Now, when I say that to run this until the 30th of November is not enough, I say it for a reason. I think of all those business activities in the country which have to go into the markets and buy, from time to time, for a long period. They have to contract for supplies, for goods of all kinds, and of course they will have to do so at the market price that obtains now. But what will the situation be down the road, when this uncertainty persists? They ought to know what they can depend on.

I tried to illustrate the point to the press out of my own experience. In those days when I was in the wholesale bakery business, you did not buy one car of flour, and you did not buy two or three. You estimated what your needs were going to be, and then, when a flour salesman came, you would say, "Give me a quotation on 50 or 60 carloads of flour, delivered this way, over a period of time."

Well, he would say, "I cannot do it, because we cannot look down the road that far, and we cannot tell what the price of wheat is going to be; and it is the price of wheat that is going to determine what we are going to have to get for flour. Now, if it were not for Federal intrusions," including what was then the Federal Farm Board, "I could tell you, but I cannot tell you now."

These are the uncertainties that hang over the whole business community of the country, and that is why they are so concerned; and we are concerned with them.

I might elaborate even further on this matter, but I think this is sufficient for all purposes. Our hope was to resolve the state of confusion, so that those who handle enterprise in this country may know the conditions under which they are expected to do business.

I said one other thing. I said from the standpoint of inflation, it simply did not go far enough. I would say to my good friend, the distinguished majority leader, that a surtax, standing by itself as a single weapon, is not the whole answer to inflation.

Think of the credit binge that the country is on at the present time, and the great surge of demand for

credit that finally compelled the banks to raise their prime rates. I cannot imagine that there is any bank of consequence, from the biggest bank in New York or San Francisco or Chicago on down, that would want to raise interest rates unless they were compelled to do so. And what is the compulsion under which they operate? They want to maintain liquidity in the country. But here is this demand for credit. How do you shut it off? How do you ration it? They have no legal weapon by which to ration it. They can only say, "This much credit we can extend. Here is five times that amount in credit demands. All we can do is put up the rates to discourage them."

It is as simple as that. And, of course, it develops all sorts of complicated consequences. Those who cannot get the credit here will go in the market, if they can, and shop for Eurodollars. The rate, 10 percent, 11 percent, 12 percent. They are determined to get it if they can. So there has to be a weapon in the credit field as well as a surtax in this field to siphon off disposable income that would otherwise move into the bloodstream of consumer goods. It is that simple.

Now we have got that gold imbalance to contend with, and we have a trade deficit to contend with. In every one of these fields, something has to be done, and this was a start. Now it is proposed that it be chopped off, and then we will wait and see what happens after the 30th of November.

I had no choice, therefore, Mr. President, except to say that I did not think it was acceptable. In the memorandum which the distinguished majority leader so kindly made available by telephone while he was a captive in his own office for the moment, because of the surge of people from the press on the outside, I noticed, of course, two things.

He stated, "This should be acceptable to the administration" and "the minority leadership should indicate whether it is acceptable."

I find myself in a difficult position. I am sure that the majority leader will not close that door, if we think, and if we can persuade him and his associates who have made this move, that we are right, and that there ought to be an additional or another approach. So I am content neither to say that I accept it or that I reject it. I rather like to feel that it is a matter that it open for negotiation; and I find it so pleasant, even when we do not always agree, to sit down with the majority leader and place all the cards face up on the table, because we have never played otherwise, and I think out of that and out of the rule of reason, we may yet find the answer to this problem.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted that the distinguished minority leader has indicated that his door is open, as always, because the only information I had relative to our most pleasant exchange of yesterday was what I read in the newspapers and heard over the radio. While I have great faith in the printed as well as the spoken word, I do not have unbounded faith in what they say, because they do delve into the area of speculation all too often, and their speculations are not always correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I think there is one angle to the surtax and increased interest rate situation which we should consider thoroughly.

I was talking with the president of a fair-sized corporation the other day. It was about a \$50 million-a-year corporation. It was not one of the big ones.

I said, "You don't get 6-percent money anymore."

He said, "No. But that does not bother us in the least. We charge it off as a production expense."

In other words, the price of the product goes up.

I said, "What about the young family that is trying to buy a home? Can they buy a home, and is this high-interest rate any advantage to them?"

We all know the answer to that. I think the same thing is true with a surtax. The surtax on the profits of a big corporation is charged off as a production item and is added to the price of the goods they sell. The accelerating inflation of today is largely chargeable to high-interest rates and the surtax.

Millions of young families are trying to buy homes and educate their children. This means higher prices to them.

I point out that prosperity does not originate with the big corporations and the big banks, because without the millions and millions of families in the lower income brackets from \$5,000 to \$15,000 that buy their goods and borrow money, the big fellows would just wither on the vine.

In my opinion we should consider tax reform and the extension of the surtax without delay.

It is high time that tax evaders and profiteers were brought to account.

COMMENDATION ON SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF APOLLO 11 MISSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished minority leader and me, I send to the desk a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution, as follows:

S. RES. 224

Whereas Apollo 11 having successfully completed its mission to land men on the moon thus ending this Nation's first decade of achievements in space; and

Whereas these achievements have been obtained and the role of this Nation preserved as a leader in space science and technology for peaceful purposes with international cooperation; and

Whereas the successful completion of the mission of Apollo 11, providing an appropriate occasion for expressing public appreciation and the appreciation of the United States Senate for these outstanding achievements: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States commends the magnificent effort of the men and women throughout the United States and the world at large, in government, industry, and education whose contributions were so vitally necessary to the success of these achievements; and be it further.

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States expresses its gratitude on behalf of itself and of all the American people for the

dedication, devotion, courage and effort of all associated with the Apollo program and with the Apollo 11 mission.

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

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

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I know I speak for millions of people in congratulating and commending the astronauts who have returned from a safe trip to the moon.

It was my privilege to be at Cape Kennedy and see the launching of Apollo 11, that gigantic satellite that was as tall as a 36-story building. It was a sight to behold.

I do not minimize for 1 second the bravery, the courage, the skill, the knowledge of science, and the many other fine characteristics possessed by the three astronauts who made this trip. However, I pay tribute to all the ground crew and the countless people in Government and private industry and elsewhere who participated in this endeavor. I am told that 400,000 people were necessary to make this shot.

We cannot measure the benefit derived from this exploit any more than we could have anticipated what would be disclosed from Benjamin Franklin's flying his kite or from the invention of the radio or the television.

It is apparent that the vast resources of the universe are about to be used for the benefit of man and to help man solve his problems on earth.

I also commend these astronauts and the entire supporting crew for one other benefit that is flowing and will continue to flow from this historic accomplishment. Because of what they have done and what their supporters have enabled them to do, billions of people around the world are not going to think of America, at least for some little time, as a place of riots and bloodshed and crime. Emphasis will not be placed upon our problems.

The exploit of the astronauts establishes the United States as the leader of the world and as a country upon which the peoples of the world can pin their hopes, plans, and reliance.

I did not want the resolution to pass without raising my voice in praise of what has been accomplished. I think it is very important and timely that the President of the United States should make a world trip at this time. He could not have chosen a better moment in history to make his trip. Everywhere he goes, the image of Uncle Sam will be high. People can rely upon our country, its goodness, its technical know-how, its industrial might, and its academic and scientific leadership.

I congratulate all parties. I wish for the President that same degree of success in dealing with some of the very troublesome problems here on earth that these wonderful Americans, the astronauts, have accomplished not only for us but also for all mankind through their historic flight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 224) was unanimously agreed to.

JOINT MEETING OF CONGRESS TO WELCOME THE ASTRONAUTS OF APOLLO 11

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what the distinguished Senator from Nebraska has just said represents the feelings of every Member of the Senate.

I congratulate and commend the Senator for his remarks. I know also that if the distinguished minority leader and I had taken the time to do so, there would have been 100 sponsors of the resolution just agreed to. I think it can be accepted that the resolution does represent the thinking of 100 U.S. Senators.

I think I should announce also, as long as the distinguished minority leader is in the Chamber, that he and I have been in touch with the Speaker of the House and that we have agreed with the Speaker that, as a mark of signal honor to the three astronauts, there will be a joint meeting of Congress sometime after we return from our August recess and after the astronauts get out of their quarantine.

I wish to make the announcement, because the Speaker called the distinguished minority leader and me, and we did agree that this would be a way of showing our appreciation.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader for his statement. I wholeheartedly endorse what has been done in the way of arranging a joint meeting of Congress for the astronauts.

I share with the distinguished majority leader the definite feeling that the resolution which has just been agreed to represents what 100 Senators agree upon.

There are cynics who say, "What good is all this?"

We could make many speeches for many days on this matter. However, the very fact that billions of people were able to view this happening over the television as a man stepped down on the moon was made possible by a product of the space program, satellite communication. And we could go on and on and on.

The time will arrive, and it will continue to arrive, when great scientific achievement and knowledge that had to be accumulated to make it possible will affect the lives of men in every area of their activities.

S. 2701—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO ESTABLISH A COMMISSION ON POPULATION GROWTH AND THE AMERICAN FUTURE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN), I introduce a bill to carry out the desires of the Nixon administration in connection with its recent statement on population growth.

The purpose of this bill is to create a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future. The duties of the Commission shall be primarily threefold; the Commission shall conduct an inquiry into the following aspects of population growth in the United States and its foreseeable social consequences:

First. The probable course of population growth, internal migration, and

related demographic developments between now and the year 2000.

Second. The resources in the public sector of the economy that will be required to deal with the anticipated growth in population.

Third. The ways in which population growth may affect the activities of Federal, State, and local government.

Mr. President, I add to that only the fact that the Senate has twice—in the last Congress and again in this one—passed a measure designed to study and assist with the problems of the economic imbalance existing in this country between urban and rural development. That bill, which I was privileged to introduce, is now before the House of Representatives.

It seems to me that these two approaches complement each other very definitely—one related to the existing imbalance between rural and urban development and population trends and opportunity, and the other to study the impact of the population explosion in this country generally; and it, of course, will be related as well to the existing problems with which we grapple.

So I trust that our committee will act promptly in connection with this measure. I think it is important that the Commission recommended by the Nixon administration be established, so that we can get on with the important business of planning for the future in connection with the problems of populations which are expanding, which are concentrating in areas where they find themselves unable to achieve adequate economic opportunity, and to create a better balance in this country of the utilization of our population resources.

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

The bill (S. 2701) to establish a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, introduced by Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. McCLELLAN), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

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

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM MONDAY, JULY 28, 1969, TO 11 A.M. TUESDAY, JULY 29, 1969

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business on Monday next, it stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. on Tuesday next.

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

**NOMINATION OF CARL J. GILBERT—
ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF
SENATOR COTTON ON TUESDAY
NEXT**

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on Tuesday morning there will be a discussion of the nomination of Carl J. Gilbert to be Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, with the rank of Ambassador.

It is my understanding that the able Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. Cotton) and the equally able Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Hollings) will engage in some discussion of the nomination, possibly extending over a period of 2½ hours.

Following that discussion, there is a strong likelihood that there will be a rollcall vote on the confirmation of the nomination.

Mr. President, I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the prayer and after disposition of the reading of the Journal on Tuesday next, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. Cotton) be recognized for not to exceed 2½ hours, with the understanding that the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Hollings) will also be given ample time during that 2½-hour period.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for not to exceed 15 minutes.

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

**THE ANTI-BALLISTIC-MISSILE
SYSTEM**

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, it was not inappropriate timing, I believe, that "Dr. Strangelove" was on the Sunday night movie on television recently. This amusing yet penetrating and sobering motion picture brought to light so well the seriousness of the strategic arms race. It portrayed the horror of human and mechanical breakdown; of madness and errors in judgment which led to nuclear war. Although humorous in its portrayal, the point was made nevertheless that nuclear war is not a laughing matter.

We are engaged in debate over whether we should deploy a new addition to the family of nuclear weapons. And as we debate the technical and strategic points I think it important that we not forget the big picture—the specter of nuclear holocaust. I intend to discuss the technical and strategic points as best I can, but let us not lose sight of just what the consequences may be of our decision in Congress this year. The more we stack nuclear weapons on top of nuclear weapons, the more complicated our systems become, the more computers are substituted for human beings, the more the likelihood of error is increased, and the

closer we will be to the total devastation with which "Dr. Strangelove" so convincingly acquainted us.

"Dr. Strangelove," Mr. President, depicted the horrifying results of a world in which the major powers always erred on the side of security. If we erred on the side of security as those who propose more and more weapons would have us do, then it is inevitable that the unthinkable will occur. As Senator Brooke has said, this debate is really a choice of risks. The choice is this: Do we risk entering into a new round of the arms race or do we take a reasonable and responsible risk for peace by choosing not to deploy an ABM system this year. We should choose this time, Mr. President, to err on the side of sanity—to make just one more effort to negotiate with the Soviet Union before we ordain a new round of the arms race. It may be a risk but, in my opinion, it is a far more cautious risk than to add more and more weapons to the world's nuclear arsenal.

Even though I do not want to become involved in an overly technical discussion of the Safeguard system, because certainly I am no expert, it does seem important to reiterate a few points which have been recently raised. The first is the contention by Secretary Laird that the Soviet Union is seeking to achieve a first-strike capability by the mid-1970's. Dr. Ralph Lapp, a foremost expert in this whole field, addressed himself to this question in a recent article in the *New Republic*. Dr. Lapp points out in great detail the extremely unlikely possibility that the Soviets could achieve a successful first strike against our land-based intercontinental missiles. He uses all the figures and assumptions supplied by Secretary Laird and Dr. Foster and still totally rebuts the contention that a successful first strike is likely or even contemplated at this time. However, even if the Soviets were gearing up for a first strike against our land-based ICBM's, to achieve a true first strike within the traditional meaning, they would have to simultaneously knock out our undersea missiles, Polaris and Poseidon, our B-52 strategic bombers dispersed at bases all over the world, and our nuclear-carrying aircraft in Europe and aboard our aircraft carriers, again all over the world. In addition, all this would have to be done rapidly and simultaneously because once we received a hint of attack on any of our retaliatory capability, we would certainly unleash our remaining force and hail destruction upon the Soviet Union. For example, Lapp asserts in regard to an attack on our land-based ICBM's, and I agree:

Surely, once the first flight [of Soviet missiles] starts impacting, the United States would begin responding. The Soviets would then be targeting "empty holes."

And, as I have pointed out, all this discussion is postulated upon the assumption that the Russians want a first-strike capability for the mid-1970's. We all agree that they do not have such a capability now. To presume that they will try to achieve such a capability by the mid-1970's is to continue the spiraling arms race by always assuming the very worst intentions on the part of the other side. Our primary intelligence-gathering

agency, the CIA, seems unwilling to make such an assumption, therefore, I wonder why the Defense Department insists upon doing so. No one can say for sure what the intentions of the Russians are—not Secretary Laird and certainly not I. Even as I cannot say for certain that the Soviets are not preparing for a first strike, he cannot say that they are. In truth, this matter will entirely be determined by events during the coming years.

We have a chance to determine the course of these events by entering into a period of responsible negotiations with the Soviet Union at the upcoming strategic arms limitations talks. The Russians have indicated their willingness to proceed with these talks. This should not surprise us. No one wins in a nuclear exchange and the Soviets should be, and I believe are, just as interested as we are in limiting the possibility of such a war. Both these great nations yearn for the opportunity to divert more of their resources to crying domestic needs.

Discounting all I have just said about the mutual interest of the Soviet Union and ourselves in establishing some sort of detente in the nuclear arms race, let us assume for a moment that the Russians are indeed seeking to obtain a first-strike capability. Is deployment of an ABM system our best response? The most compelling scientific evidence indicates this is not the best way to defend against the contingency of a Russian first strike: There are at least three other responses which seem to make more sense. One would be to wait for the first-strike threat to actually begin to materialize in relation to buildups. And then to increase our Minuteman or Polaris and Poseidon force. This would take far less time than deploying an ABM system and would give us the precious time we need to see if some arms limitation agreements can be reached. The other alternatives is to superharden our present ICBM silos. This, scientific evidence indicates, would be more effective than ABM deployment even if Soviet accuracies improve to one-sixth mile.

A third possible solution would be to improve our detection devices. During the course of this debate I have heard many of my colleagues indicate great faith that the Safeguard system will be technically sound. Yet most of this group has not evidenced such faith in our equipment designed to detect an attack in advance. The proponents of Safeguard have continually asserted that no President would be willing to release our ICBM force against the Soviet Union solely upon the basis of radar detection of incoming Russian missiles. They have reiterated our policy of riding out an attack before we retaliate. I agree that since our detection is now based on radar along that launching such an attack would be unwise due to the possibility of mistaken images on our radar screens. But what if our detection devices were improved? What of the possibility mentioned often recently that we are experimenting with satellite detection of exhaust fumes which would relay to us immediately the message that a Soviet ICBM attack had been launched? Our perimeter radars would be useful in con-

fining the original judgment of the satellites thus giving us confirmation of an attack.

This kind of confirmation of attack would certainly tell us what our nuclear response should be rather than depending upon the even more complicated device of attempting to destroy incoming missiles with our ABM's.

I repeat that the proponents of Safeguard seem to have great faith in the technical perfectability of Safeguard. My question is, Why do they not have great faith in the technical perfectability of our detection devices? I suggest that we make an all out attempt to improve our ability to detect. If we poured as much of our resources into this as we will be spending on Safeguard, I am confident that meaningful and reliable detection could be developed.

A good detection system might perform two great services it could:

First, provide early warning of a Soviet ICBM attack thus giving us time to evaluate and respond with ICBM's or any other part of our retaliatory force; and

Second, greatly improve our already existing satellite inspection system which is a vital prerequisite to any meaningful arms limitation agreement.

If we must accept the Russian first-strike thesis, one of these steps would seem to be preferable. Admittedly, Drs. Rathgens, Wiesner, and Weinberg have a bias on the ABM issue, but they have raised another important criticism of the Safeguard program to which I have as yet not heard an effective rebuttal. They contend that even if Safeguard works perfectly, which is highly questionable, the offense could, by striking first at our radars, keep the number of Minutemans saved by the full Safeguard system with all phases deployed down to 20 to 80. And this defense could be entirely offset by an increase in the Soviet's SS-9 force from the 420 figure projected by Secretary Laird to less than 465 missiles.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an additional 5 minutes be allotted to the Senator from Kentucky.

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

Mr. COOK. I thank the Senator.

If this is true, and I repeat I have heard no effective rebuttal to this contention, then I question the soundness of the judgment to deploy the Safeguard system on these grounds also.

The dynamics of the arms race, the action-reaction phenomenon, as it has been described, simply must be abated. The difference between pronouncements and actions of the major powers during the nuclear era is similar to the situation before Hiroshima and Nagasaki, when Sir Norman Angell wrote:

Generally speaking it would be true to say that no one believes that war pays and nearly everyone believes that policies which lead inevitably to war do pay. Every nation sincerely desires peace; and all nations pursue courses which if persisted in must make peace impossible.

Within the conventional warfare context, such a luxury was possible, but it is no longer. The stakes are too high. The threat of total devastation rules out

this kind of inconsistency and demands rational action.

It is no longer sufficient to say let us go ahead and deploy an ABM now and hope we can reach an agreement next year. For the first time since the madness of the nuclear arms race began, let our objective be to make our policies consistent with our pronouncements. I support the Cooper-Hart amendment to the military procurement authorization bill because I believe it represents one of the few remaining opportunities to achieve this goal.

The Cooper-Hart amendment represents an opportunity to make our policies consistent with our pronouncements. It will say to the Soviet Union and the rest of the world that we plan to continue our research and development, testing, and evaluation of an ABM system, but that we will delay deployment for a year, thus demonstrating, before SALT talks begin, our interest in controlling the arms race. The world knows that a nation which can put a man on the moon can ultimately develop an anti-ballistic-missile system. Even though I think there are better responses to an alleged Soviet buildup than deploying an ABM, I also believe we can ultimately build a functional ABM. But this is not the question. The question is whether a great nation in 1969, a year in which it set forth upon another world, will act with restraint to make its own world a safer place for all mankind.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have 3 minutes.

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

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am very glad I have heard the speech of my colleague from Kentucky (Mr. Cook). I do not speak solely because we happen to be on the same side on this question, but I speak of the decision he has made as an index of his character and of his great ability.

I did not know him intimately in Kentucky, but I had the opportunity to watch his work as a member of the Kentucky Legislature, in the House of Representatives, and then as a judge in the county of Jefferson, having the largest population in our State, over half a million people. Though a young man in both of those important positions, he demonstrated not only independence but great ability. He was innovative and I note today innovations in his speech.

The Senator notes that there may be methods which have not yet been considered very seriously, if at all, which would provide greater protection to the security of our country and its people, and that, with our great capacities, we could improve our capabilities to detect earlier and more certainly any incoming enemy missiles, and to provide the early intelligence which would be so sorely needed.

It is quite interesting that I have received a letter from Dr. Ruina, who is one of this country's outstanding radar experts, in response to an inquiry I had addressed to him about the radars that are now being considered for the Safeguard system. Outstanding scientists have testified the MSR would be vulnerable to attack, and its destruction would render valueless the whole Safeguard system.

In response to the inquiry, it is interesting that he stated a belief that the radars could be possibly used to provide a more effective early warning system.

Senator Cook has not yet seen that letter, but in his speech, the Senator has suggested this possibility, in the tradition of innovation, so often demonstrated in his career.

What I want to say now, however, is that the Senator from Kentucky has emphasized the chief thrust and purpose of those who oppose the deployment of an ABM system at this time; that we seek in what is the Senator has described this hour in history, this minute in history, when for the first time the Soviet Union has indicated a willingness to discuss control of offensive and defensive nuclear weapons, to determine whether the awesome arms race can be terminated, or whether it will go on inexorably toward disaster, toward fear, toward uncertainty, toward the futility of life, and, lead to nuclear war.

My colleague has raised the debate to a high level.

I have noted in the debate that those who have come into the Senate this year—the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), who is presiding, the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. SAXBE), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES), and other Senators—have brought to it great quality. They have emphasized the importance of attempting to stop the nuclear arms race. My colleague is one of those Senators who have given the Senate and the country good advice. They have come immediately from the people. They are not frozen into attitudes, that can develop in the Senate. They come directly from the people. They know how the people are thinking, the young and the old.

I congratulate my colleague.

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. COOK. All during this debate, we have heard it discussed that the Russians will build and will have, by the mid-1970's, some 420 SS-9's. I think this is something that the people of this country should be very much aware of; while the Russians, in the mid-1970's, may have 420 SS-9's, the United States, as of the day that we are standing here, now, has some 1,054 ICBM's. If we were to MRV those 1,054, we would then have 3,162 nuclear warheads, and if we MIRV them to as many as 10 nuclear warheads each, we could have as many as 10,540 warheads. At the same time, if by the mid-1970's the Russians MRV their 420 SS-9's, they would have 1,260; and if they put 10 nuclear warheads in each one of them, they would have 4,200, to our 10,540.

I think this attitude that some of the American people have got, that somehow some other nation is going to immediately overtake this Nation, should be countered by the reminder that this Nation has overwhelming nuclear power in relation to any other nation in this world, and that the idea we are about to be overtaken is simply not true.

Mr. COOPER. It is not true. I do not think anyone has questioned the fact that today the United States possesses at

least two and perhaps three times the nuclear capacity of the Soviet Union. I do not doubt that if the Soviet Union continues its present pace of development of nuclear weapons, by the mid-1970's it could have 420 SS-9's and perhaps more, and they could MRV them or MIRV them; and if we did nothing in that period, they might surpass us in number of warheads.

But that assumes, if such a threat develops, that we will do nothing next year and the years after.

Of course, we would protect our country, and if the threat should develop, who could doubt the capability of the United States to preserve its retaliatory strength? As the Senator has said, a country and a people who can put a man on the moon, have the capabilities to increase the number of weapons we already know how to produce.

In fact, in this very bill, money is provided to arm the Minuteman III, with MRV or MIRV. There is money in this bill, though we do not hear talk about it, to continue the program of refitting 31 of our Polaris submarines with Poseidons, which, when completed, would add a factor of three or five or 10 to the warheads we could deliver on the Soviet Union from our submarine forces.

There has been a great deal of talk about the threat to our Polaris submarine. Any affirmation to that effect was contradicted by Admiral White, who has command of the Polaris Fleet, in testimony before the Senate. Not long ago, the Secretary of the Navy maintained the same positions. It is not in the record, but when I heard such a statement made in the hearings when I heard Secretary Laird testify, although I was in bed in the hospital, I was so concerned that I called Dr. Foster on the telephone and asked him about the testimony.

He said in substance, "We have ways to meet such a threat." The Senator is correct; to use an illustration which has been used often, but I think it correct, the United States and the Soviet Union each have sufficient nuclear power to deposit the equivalent of 15 tons of TNT on the head of every person in the two countries. We ought to try to stop the race, and it is what the Senator has proposed.

I have the impression, from the debates, that those who propose to deploy the ABM show greater fear of the Soviet Union and actually less confidence in our capacity to meet any threat than those who oppose its deployment this year.

Mr. COOK. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I simply wish to thank the able junior Senator from Kentucky for the statement he has made today. Unfortunately, I was delayed in getting to the floor of the Senate, and hence not able to hear it in full. But over these many months since the beginning of this session of Congress, as the ABM debate has developed, those of us who, a year ago, cautioned against deploying the ABM, then labeled Sentinel, have been heartened to see that those who have joined us since January of this year are now cautioning against the deployment of the ABM now labeled Safeguard.

One of the problems of human nature—and it is not removed when one is permitted to serve in the Senate—is that once you have said yes or no to a question, even when the question is rephrased, you are apt to feel that you have to say no again, if that is what you said first, or yes if you said yes first, even though you are less sure of your position the second time around.

Senator COOK is not stuck with a yes or no from last year. He comes here, as does the present occupant of the chair (Mr. CRANSTON), free of that inevitable restraint that attaches to human nature, "Last year I thought one way or the other; I guess I had better stay with it." The junior Senator from Kentucky and the junior Senator from California, now in the chair, are free to take a look at this ABM, now called Safeguard, without thinking back to how they voted on the ABM labeled Sentinel last year; and it is very encouraging to those of us who thought it was unwise to deploy it last year to see these two able Senators come in here this year and look at it, starting from scratch, and rise to say it is unwise at this time to deploy the ABM, labeled Safeguard.

Mr. COOK. I thank the Senator.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS OF EMERGENCY SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT, OFFICE OF CIVIL DEFENSE

A letter from the Director of Civil Defense, reporting, pursuant to law, on property acquisitions of emergency supplies and equipment for the quarter ended June 30, 1969; to the Committee on Armed Services.

COMMISSION ON POPULATION GROWTH AND THE AMERICAN FUTURE

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future; to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the City Commission of Miami, Fla., praying for a reconsideration by the President on the sums of money planned to be spent in the anti-ballistics-missile plan, in light of the needs of urban areas; ordered to lie on the table.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the third time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. McCLELLAN):

S. 2701. A bill to establish a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 2702. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rose

May Fang-Yen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

S. 2703. A bill for the relief of Antonia Galicia Rodriguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 2704. A bill to provide incentive for devotion of nonresidential reuse project land to low- or moderate-income housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. GORE:

S.J. Res. 141. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 2704—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL RELATING TO SITES FOR LOW-INCOME HOUSING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the critical problems in building housing for low- and moderate-income families is the lack of suitable sites. The unavailability of land in our large central cities makes it extremely difficult to build housing for the poor. When land is available, developers are frequently forced to resort to monolithic high-rise structures in order to bring the rents within the reach of low-income families.

One excellent source of land for low-income housing is the urban renewal program. The Douglas commission on urban problems has pointed out that over one-half of the land on urban renewal sites is vacant. It would be a simple matter to use some of this land for low- and moderate-income housing sites.

The problem with this approach is that much of this land is classified for eventual commercial reuse. The resale value of the land is, of course, higher when the reuse is classified as commercial as opposed to residential. Therefore, if cities were to reclassify the land on the existing urban renewal sites from commercial to residential, land values would drop and net project costs would increase.

In order to remove this barrier and provide our cities with an incentive to use more urban renewal land for low- and moderate-income housing sites, I am introducing a bill to amend the Urban Renewal Act. The bill would make it possible for the Federal Government to reimburse cities for any added cost entailed by reclassifying urban renewal land so as to provide for more low- and moderate-income housing sites.

HUD has already shifted its urban renewal priorities from commercial projects toward building residential housing, particularly for low- and moderate-income families. The bill I have introduced would effect a similar reordering of priorities for urban renewal projects already in the pipeline. The bill is entirely in keeping with the goals set forth in the 1968 Housing Act of solving our housing problems within the next decade.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately re-

ferred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2704) to provide incentive for devotion of nonresidential reuse project land to low- or moderate-income housing, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2704

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Section 103 of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, for any urban renewal project under contract for capital grant on the date of enactment of this subsection, involving real property which is to be devoted to non-residential use pursuant to the applicable urban renewal plan existing on the date of this subsection's enactment, and which, by urban renewal plan changes adopted after this subsection's enactment, is to be devoted to residential use, the Secretary is authorized to increase the capital grant otherwise payable by an amount equal to one-third (or one-fourth in the case of an urban renewal project on a three-fourths capital grant basis) of the difference between the disposition proceeds of any such real property sold or leased pursuant to section 107(a) and the estimated fair value, as determined by the Secretary, of such real property as of the date of this subsection's enactment.

"The local public agency shall not be required to provide any additional local grant-in-aid due to the increase in capital grant authorized by this subsection."

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

S. 2667

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK) I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT) be added as a cosponsor of S. 2667, to provide additional penalties for the use of firearms in the commission of certain crimes of violence.

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

S. 2691

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG) be added as a cosponsor of S. 2691, to amend Public Law 87-849, approved October 23, 1962, to strengthen provisions relating to disqualification of former Federal officers and employees in matters connected with former duties and official responsibilities, and for other purposes.

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

SENATE RESOLUTION 224—RESOLUTION COMMENDING THE APOLLO 11 ASTRONAUTS ON THEIR SUCCESSFUL LUNAR EXPEDITION

Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN) submitted a resolution (S. R. s.

224) commending the Apollo 11 astronauts on their successful lunar expedition, which was considered and agreed to.

(The remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD, when he submitted the resolution, appear earlier in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

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. 107

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators CASE, COOK, YOUNG of Ohio, and MONDALE, I submit today a disclosure amendment, intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to the pending military procurement bill, which would affect three classes of persons. Specific annual disclosure statements would be required from former high-ranking military officers and all former military procurement officers who go to work for major defense contractors.

The amendment would also apply to former high-ranking civilian officers and all former civilian procurement officers who work for the major contractors.

Finally, it would apply to former employees of defense contractors who come to work for the Pentagon.

Let me outline the major provisions.

RETIRED MILITARY OFFICERS

The amendment would require retired officers of the rank of colonel or Navy captain and above and procurement officers and former military plant representatives of lesser rank who work for companies doing more than \$10 million a year business with the Pentagon, to disclose certain facts to the Secretary of Defense, by March 1 of each year. This would include their name, the title and description of their work during the 3 years prior to retirement, the date of their retirement, the date of employment with the contractor, and the title and description of their work with the contractor. In addition the amendment would require a declaration of any work on planning, research, or decisionmaking on any product, contract, weapon system or component in which the officer was involved while at the Pentagon and in which his employer has a substantial interest.

Mr. President, much of the information this amendment seeks from former officers is now submitted by retired officers under a statement of employment—Defense Department form 1357. What this amendment does is to require additional information about the nature of their work while they were at the Pentagon with special reference to the details of any procurement work they were involved in in which their civilian employer has a substantial interest.

Of course this requirement would apply only to those high ranking officers and procurement officers of lower ranks who go to work for defense contractors.

FORMER CIVILIAN OFFICIALS

The amendment calls for disclosure of the same information from former civilian employees of the Pentagon of grade 15 or above. It also calls for disclosure by former civilian officials of whatever rank who were involved in procurement and who work for or represent companies doing more than \$10 million a year business with the Pentagon. The amendment would apply not only to former high ranking civilians who work directly for the contractors, but also to those who "represent" them in any transaction for services or materials. Its intention is to require disclosure by lawyers and others who are involved in procurement.

If a former Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, Army, or Navy left the Pentagon and went into private law practice he could be required to report under this amendment.

If he represented the contractor on an income tax or a bond issue matter, he would not have to report. But if he was retained to represent, or did represent, the contractor on a matter involving a weapons system or services or materials to the Pentagon, he would be required to report.

The test is whether he is retained by and represents the contractor in a transaction.

If a contractor retains him and he makes a phone call to the Pentagon or takes an admiral to lunch or plays golf at Burning Tree Country Club on behalf of his client contractor, the former high ranking official would have to file an annual disclosure statement so long as his services were retained.

I think such a requirement is long overdue. And in fairness to former high ranking military officers, it is just as important if not more so to require disclosure from former high ranking civilians.

FORMER CONTRACTOR'S EMPLOYEES

The amendment calls for similar disclosure by present Pentagon civilian employees who previously worked for a contractor doing more than \$10 million in business with the Pentagon. It requires disclosure by them of any work by them on specific products, research, weapon systems or components in which his previous employer had a substantial interest, in order that conflicts may not develop.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

The amendment requires that the information be open to inspection by the press and public at the Pentagon.

The amendment also calls for the Secretary to make an annual report to Congress by May 1 of each year giving the information in an organized and tabulated form. While the reporting requirement in the bill has been written in general terms, in order to avoid requiring an excessive amount of data, it is nonetheless the intent of this provision that the pertinent information be provided or summarized.

SUNLIGHT IS A GREAT DISINFECTANT

Mr. President, while I believe that it is extremely important that the very weak conflict of interest laws now on the books should be strengthened, I also believe that disclosure can be of great help.

There is an old saying that sunlight is a great disinfectant.

Furthermore, this amendment is appropriate to this bill while the proposal I made yesterday for tightening the conflict of interest laws would apply to the Government as a whole and should properly have hearings to consider them before they are passed.

Basically what my amendment does is to require more detailed information from high ranking officers and all former procurement officers and plant representatives who go to work for the big companies than is now required. As I have said, much but not all of the information is now in the hands of the Pentagon.

But the major change is to require the same detailed data from the former civilian employees. This, I think, is a very proper requirement and is long overdue.

But more important is the fact that the amendment requires the Pentagon to make the data open to inspection by the press and the public, which they have formerly refused to do. In addition, it requires that an annual report be made to the Congress. This, I believe, will make it possible for Congress and the public to gain an overall view of the situation.

REGULAR FLOW OF INFORMATION

Mr. President, what my amendment would do is to make information available on an annual basis which, in the past has been available only when insisted upon by Members of Congress.

In 1969 I asked for and received from the Pentagon a list of high ranking former military officers now employed by the 100 largest defense contractors. The list given to me totaled 2,124 former officers in the employ of the 100 largest contractors. Ten companies alone employed 1,065 or over half of them.

It has been 10 years since similar information has been made public. In 1959, during the hearings on the Renegotiation Act, former Senator Paul H. Douglas asked for and received similar details. In that year there were 721 former high ranking officers employed by the top 100 companies—88 out of 100 reporting.

In the meantime, efforts by the press and public to get such information from the Pentagon failed even though the Pentagon had such information available from the data from the statement of employment it requires each retired officer to make and to keep up to date.

My amendment will regularize what I think is a proper disclosure practice. In addition, it will extend disclosure requirements to civilian as well as former military officers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF AMENDMENT NO. 101

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) be added as a cosponsor of the pending amendment (No. 101).

Through inadvertence, his name was omitted both from the initial and the

modified amendments when they were submitted.

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

NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the Committee on Government Operations has scheduled a hearing on S. 1707, a bill to establish a Commission on Government Procurement, for July 31, 1969. The hearing will begin at 10 a.m. in room 3302, New Senate Office Building.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony from the Comptroller General and officials of the executive branch with respect to the bill. Statements from other interested parties will be received for inclusion in the hearing record.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

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

David A. Brock, of New Hampshire, to be U.S. attorney for the district of New Hampshire for the term of 4 years, vice Louis M. Janelle.

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 Friday, August 1, 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.

ONE GIANT LEAP FOR MANKIND—NOT ONE BACKWARD STEP

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, more than 100 years ago, the celebrated science fiction writer, Jules Verne, wrote a book entitled "From the Earth to the Moon." In it, he had three intrepid explorers take a trip in a capsule to the moon. Although some of his facts were wrong, this Frenchman unhesitatingly selected America as the country that would undertake such a mission. That was the image America had 100 years ago: Vital. Growing. Enterprising. Building. Willing to undertake new things. Restless to explore new horizons.

Jules Verne was right. Americans have gone to the moon. But the question is: "What does America do now?"

Here is what Jules Verne said:

The American people will never rest quietly until they have pushed to its last result and to every logical consequence the astounding step so daringly conceived and so wonderfully carried out.

Well, I hope he will be right about that too, but I am not so sure. Our courageous astronauts had hardly set foot on the moon before some people were saying, "Well, that's it. We've done it. We can stop our space program now, and we can turn our attention to other things."

Mr. President, I hope that that is not the sentiment of the Members of this

body. Apollo 11 is the beginning of an age, not the end of a program. There is no turning back, and I think we would be foolish if we tried.

Meeting President Kennedy's goal has shown what we as a Nation can do. And many people are saying, "If we can put a man on the moon, why can we not eliminate poverty, eradicate our slums, rebuild our cities, unclog our airways, make our air and water clean, and so forth?" Well, the answer is that we can. This Nation can accomplish these and many other tasks if we have the will to do it. But for the life of me I cannot understand why we should cripple the space program in order to meet these other needs. In fact, it would seem to me that the examples set by the space program—the pride of achievement, the spirit of moving ahead—go-aheadiveness," Jules Verne called it—require that we continue with our space exploration if we have any hope of solving our other problems. The space program has already been cut almost one-third from its peak and now accounts for less than one-half of 1 percent of our gross national product. If we consciously choose to hurt ourselves by reducing this program further, we will begin to lose those qualities which have characterized this country up until now. And if we lose this vitality, this sense of enterprise and "go-aheadiveness," not only will we not solve our economic and social problems, but it is also unlikely that we long maintain a position of leadership in the world of tomorrow.

When Neil Armstrong set foot upon the moon he said it was "one giant leap for mankind."

Let us not dishonor him and his brave colleagues and 200 million Americans by taking a backward step.

NINETIETH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF EDWIN OWEN LEWIS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Honorable Edwin Owen Lewis recently observed his 90th birthday.

His long and distinguished service included 33 years as a judge of the court of common pleas in Philadelphia, the long-time presidency of the Independence Hall Association, and the receipt of Philadelphia's Bok Award, our city's highest honor for civic service.

As his nephew and one-time law associate, I am proud to have benefited from his wise counsel over the years.

Judge Lewis was the originator of the plan to create the Independence Hall National Park. At his insistence, former Representative Hardie Scott and I introduced the bill to create the Park which became law about 1947.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter of congratulations from President Nixon to Judge Lewis be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 8, 1969.

DEAR JUDGE LEWIS: I am delighted to join all of your devoted friends in sending congratulations and very best wishes on your 90th birthday. You have achieved a milestone in a dedicated professional career, and in a life dedicated to public service. It is

always a pleasure and a source of pride to commend an American who has served humanity and country with such distinction.

I especially commend the inspiration and leadership you have given to the Independence Hall Association, the Philadelphia National Shrines Commission and the Independence National Historical Park Advisory Commission in the rehabilitation and restoration of Independence Hall and the historic landmarks of Philadelphia. For these and all your life achievements, you have my admiration and the gratitude of all your fellow Americans.

May you have a particularly happy birthday, and may God bless you always.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

COMDR. NEIL ARMSTRONG A PURDUE GRADUATE

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, every aspect of the Apollo 11 flight has been a brilliant success. Millions of people across the world share the sense of amazed wonder at such a perfectly executed feat. The landing at Base Tranquillity on July 20, followed by the subsequent historic moon walk and safe return, represent more than an incredible aeronautical achievement; they will endure forever as unforgettable events in the history of human aspirations and endeavors.

During the entire epic voyage the three astronauts demonstrated superb skills, unmatched courage, great calm and an imperturbable faculty for decisionmaking. Each of these brave men equally deserves the accolades and credit which has been bestowed on them so generously by the President and by Americans from every segment of our society. In the weeks ahead, after they have emerged from protective quarantine, the Nation is eagerly anticipating the opportunity to extend congratulations to them in a more personal and meaningful way.

Although the commander of Apollo 11, Neil A. Armstrong, is a native of Ohio, because of my Hoosier pride I cannot help but point out that he received his formal aeronautical engineering training at Purdue University in West Lafayette, Ind. While in college Commander Armstrong not only was a competent student but also participated actively in a variety of extracurricular activities. It is interesting to note that in addition to being president of the Aero Club and a member of the American Rocket Society, Neil played in the Purdue Military Band and wrote the lyrics for a varsity variety show. By coincidence, it happened that I was an undergraduate at Purdue during some of the years Commander Armstrong was there, and I am proud to be a fellow Boilermaker.

Recently there came to my attention a very interesting article describing Neil Armstrong's early background, especially his days at Purdue University. In order that others may read this tribute to him, I ask unanimous consent that this article, which was written by Jep Cadou and appeared in the Indianapolis Star on July 15, be printed in the RECORD.

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

COMDR. NEIL ARMSTRONG A PURDUE GRADUATE

(By Jep Cadou)

CAPE KENNEDY, FLA.—It will be nine rungs down an aluminum alloy ladder and then a step into immortality for Neil Armstrong of Purdue University.

On or about 2:17 a.m. (Indianapolis time) next Monday, Armstrong will back out of a 32-inch square front door of the Apollo-11 lunar module on his hands and knees.

He will hop down the ladder with his two feet together, two rungs at a time, facing the ladder.

His last backward hop, probably his fifth, will land him on the silvery, dish-shaped footpad of the landing craft's front ledge.

Then, facing the ladder and grasping it for support, with his right boot set firm on the footpad, he will swing his left leg out and step backward into history.

He will make one of the most significant footprints in the history of mankind when he plants on lunar soil his size 9½-B left foot encased in a white space overshoe 13 inches long and 6 inches wide with a quarter-inch-thick sole and a zig zag tread.

The Boilermaker and his "helper"—Edwin E. (Buzz) Aldrin Jr. will be the stars of one of the best-watched live television dramas in history as an estimated one-half the population of the United States either gets up or stays up for the epoch-making treat and millions of others around the world join them.

What manner of man is this that America has chosen as its first moon man?

Probably most significant, Armstrong is a civilian. Whether this is by accident or design has never been made quite clear but the latter is much more probable: Few things are left to accident by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

It is probable the directors of our space program believe it more fitting to send a civilian—a man of peace—rather than an Air Force, Army or Navy officer—men of war—onto the moon first.

Neil Armstrong also is a solid Midwestern American, a white, Anglo-Saxon Protestant, an Eagle Scout, from a Republican family.

Armstrong's one great interest was aviation almost from the moment he saw his first airplane.

Neil and his brother, Dean, and sister, June, grew up in the atmosphere of thrift born of the Great Depression.

(Dean now is a night supervisor for the General Motors Corporation at Anderson, Ind. and is down here for the moon-shot.)

Neil acquired his first job at 9 or 10, mowing a cemetery lawn for 10 cents an hour. Then, he progressed to a better job in a bakery, washing the bread mixer.

The family settled in 1944 in Wapakoneta, Ohio. Its population was 6,756 according to the last United States census. It was an ideal place for the young Armstrong to grow up and learn the great virtues of our society.

Young Armstrong, trustworthy and loyal, made Eagle Scout at Troop No. 2 of St. Paul Evangelical and Reformed Church. His dad was the Scoutmaster.

Neil played the baritone horn in the band at Blume Senior High School and was also part of a quartette known as the "Mississippi Moonshiners." (They played it, they didn't distill it.)

He also worked for 40 cents an hour as a stockboy at a drugstore where he managed to spend a major portion of his time reading all the flying and science magazines.

He took a healthy interest in the Cincinnati Reds baseball team and, on one cold opening day, he and "the gang" traveled 100 miles south to sit in the upper deck.

Young Armstrong saved most of his money for college but he could not resist spending part of it for flight lessons at \$9 an hour. On his 16th birthday, he earned his pilot's license. He rode his bike home from the airport; he hadn't learned to drive a car yet.

The Retrospect, Neil's high school year-book, said of young Armstrong: "He thinks, he acts, 'tis done."

One of the great disappointments of Armstrong's life came when he was rejected by Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

But MIT's loss was Purdue's gain, and Neil's.

He enrolled at the West Lafayette school in 1947 under the naval air cadet program as a student of aeronautical engineering. His scholarship called for two years in college, four years of active duty, then two more years of college.

Armstrong quickly developed the highest respect for Purdue. He later insisted that his brother go there.

While at Purdue, Neil wrote the lyrics and score for a Purdue varsity variety show titled "Egelloc" (college spelled backward). He also was a member of the Student Chapter of the American Rocket Society, president of the Aero Club, student flying organization, a member of the Purdue Military Band and of Phi Delta Theta fraternity.

His extracurricular activities included a trip with his Phi Delta frat brothers down to the sands Fort Lauderdale.

During the two years of service duty which interrupted his Purdue career, Armstrong flew 78 combat missions, as a Navy pilot in the Korean War. He gained a reputation as a "hot pilot" but doesn't like to talk about his service experiences.

One of his former Purdue professors, George Palmer, recalls: "He was a good student, not outstanding, but quite good, very thorough. I know I made a notation in my grade book: 'completes work when others do not.'"

While at Purdue, Neil met a girl swimmer, Janet Shearon, a member of Chi Omega sorority and a beauty queen. She has been Mrs. Armstrong since 1956 and now lives in El Lago, Tex., with two sons, Eric, 12, and Mark, 6.

The big tragedy of Armstrong's life was the death of their daughter, Karen, 2, of a brain tumor.

When Armstrong left Purdue, he fulfilled his ambition by becoming a test pilot. He flew the F-100, F-101, F-102, F-104, FSD, B-47 and X-1, to X-15 rocket planes. He flew the X-15 to 200,000 feet and 4,000 miles an hour. As a spare-time pastime, he took up soaring in gliders.

In September, 1962, Armstrong became America's first civilian astronaut.

He commanded the Gemini-8 when it made history's first space docking in March, 1966, joining nose-to-nose with an unmanned Agena target vehicle.

When an electrical short circuit caused a thruster to malfunction, Armstrong and his crewmate, David Scott, demonstrated their "cool" and exceptional piloting skill in overcoming the problem and bringing their spacecraft to an emergency splashdown.

That performance undoubtedly influenced NASA officials in picking Armstrong for the big job, which undeniably is risky.

Armstrong knows it.

"I'd be silly to say we won't think of the dangers because that's what we do all the time," he has said. "But we don't really think about it from a personal point of view."

TYDINGS ON CBW

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate and the country to a speech entitled, "The Perils of Chemical and Biological Warfare" made by my able colleague from Maryland, Senator TYDINGS, in Northwood, Md., on June 12. Senator TYDINGS gives an extraordinarily lucid and alarming account of the proliferation of these deadly agents and weapons, both in the United States and abroad. I can only

add my strong support for placing at the top of our national agenda the detailed consideration of the hardheaded measures for immediate action in this area that the Senator proposes at the end of his remarks.

An alarming danger to world peace is posed by the proliferation of chemical and biological weapons. The need to re-examine our stand on ratifying the Geneva Protocol of 1925 which bans the aggressive use of these weapons is an urgent necessity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the speech of the Senator from Maryland, who has given leadership to the Nation in this most serious question, be inserted in the RECORD.

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

THE PERILS OF CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE

(Excerpts from speech by Senator TYDINGS)

Revolutionary developments in chemistry and biology in this century have provided medicine with miraculous new weapons to combat disease and save human lives. However, these same developments also possess the potential to destroy all life on this planet if not adequately controlled.

At least 13 nations—including the United States—currently are devoting hundreds of millions of dollars a year to the development and production of weapons to wage chemical and biological warfare.

The U.S. Army operates six full-time chemical and biological warfare installations—2 of which are located here in Maryland—employing 14,000 men at a cost of more than \$500 million a year.

In plants near Denver, Colorado, Newport, Indiana, and Baltimore, Maryland, the Army is producing massive quantities of toxic nerve agents. Though the Pentagon claims we have only a limited offensive chemical capacity, it has reportedly stockpiled more than 100 million lethal doses of nerve gas—a poison which causes its victims to literally strangle in their own vital organs.

At Fort Detrich, near Frederick, Maryland, hundreds of scientists are at work developing exotic strains of virulent diseases. Included are anthrax—which kills up to 99 percent of its victims—tularemia, yellow fever, encephalitis, and plague—the “black death” which destroyed almost a quarter of the population of Europe in the fourteenth century.

Large stocks of these diseases have been accumulated, and it is estimated that the Army can convert them into weapons systems—complete with germ-filled missiles and bombs—in a period of 4 to 6 weeks.

Chemical and biological weapons now constitute a threat to man's survival no less serious or alarming than that posed by nuclear arms. During World War II, U.S. scientists isolated a botulism so virulent that 500 grams of it—slightly more than one pound—was considered enough to destroy the world's population.

The international community has recognized the dangers inherent in nuclear weapons. The nuclear test ban treaty and the nuclear non-proliferation treaty represent the first steps in a campaign to bring the use and availability of nuclear arms under strict international control.

No such safeguards now exist with regard to the testing and proliferation of gas and germ weapons. No serious attempts have been made to negotiate the elimination of these deadly agents from the arsenals of the world.

I realize there are formidable scientific obstacles to detection of the gas and germ warfare capabilities of any nation. And such effective detection would be essential to any treaty. But, in view of the threat these weap-

ons pose to our nation and the rest of mankind, we dare not fail to develop these means of detection and control. The stakes are too high.

In addition, the testing, storage, and transportation of chemical and biological agents in this country create a serious health hazard.

Last year at the Dugway proving grounds—the Army's chemical and biological testing station in Skull Valley, Utah—a large quantity of nerve gas was accidentally discharged in the atmosphere. As a result, 6,400 sheep located 47 miles east of the discharge point were killed.

However, more disturbing was the fact that only 35 miles to the north of the discharge point runs U.S. 40, a heavily traveled interstate highway. In other words, had the wind been blowing north instead of east the fatality figures might have been calculated in terms of people instead of animals.

Therefore, in light of the international and domestic dangers created by the unlimited development and production of chemical and biological weapons, I am making the following specific recommendations for action to the Congress and the President:

First, that this Nation significantly increase the funding and manpower of the arms control and disarmament agency to develop the detection equipment necessary to enforce any treaty on chemical and biological warfare.

Second, that we seek to make the limitation of atmospheric testing and non-proliferation of germ and gas weaponry a high priority item on the agenda of the Geneva disarmament talks.

Third, that this Nation pursue, with every means at its disposal, the development and implementation of a workable, safeguarded treaty to limit development, testing, production, stockpiling, and deployment of chemical and bacterial weapons by the nations which now possess them.

Fourth, that a thorough review be undertaken of the health hazards involved in testing, producing, storing and transporting these weapons and of current safety procedures.

Fifth, that in anticipation of effective control of chemical and biological weapons, we begin exploring the possibility of employing personnel and facilities presently devoted to CBW activities in the fight to conquer diseases such as cancer and stroke.

It is not too late to begin these steps. But if by accident or design germs or gas warfare should break out and escalate, it will not only be too late for these steps, it will be too late for all mankind. . . .

THE TOY SAFETY ACT OF 1969

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am extremely pleased that the Senate has acted favorably on S. 1689, the Toy Safety Act of 1969. As a cosponsor of this important legislation to protect children from toys and other articles intended for use by children which are hazardous due to the presence of electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazards, I want to add my hope for prompt enactment.

Of considerable importance to me, and to the many Pennsylvanians who derive their livelihoods from the sales of toys and children's articles, is the matter of liability. Should a toy dealer with a warehouse full of federally banned products be required to absorb this enormous loss? I think not. This obvious imperfection in the original bill was notably corrected by the able and talented junior Senator from Vermont, WINSTON PROUTY. His amendment, as accepted by the Senate Commerce Committee on which I have the pleasure of serving with him, places

the liability for economic loss because of recall of an unsafe toy upon the manufacturer of the toy. This amendment benefits both toy dealers and toy manufacturers. On the one hand, toy dealers are not forced to take a loss on defective products purchased prior to the enactment of the new law. And on the other hand, because toy dealers will not now have the same recourse when purchasing from foreign distributors, they are encouraged to do business with domestic firms.

Mr. President, I believe that this legislation is a welcome addition to the already growing list of consumer protection measures I have been proud to have played a role in enacting.

CONGRATULATIONS TO SHARON SITES ADAMS, THE FIRST WOMAN TO SAIL THE PACIFIC ALONE

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I have sent the following telegram to my fellow Californian, Sharon Sites Adams, on her outstanding achievement:

America has always taken pride in the adventurous spirit of her people. This week we are again presented with two prime examples of this unique spirit. Yesterday, the Apollo 11 crew returned from a voyage to the Moon—a feat undreamed of a few decades ago. And today, you have returned from a remarkable voyage of your own—a voyage of six thousand miles and seventy-three days, to become the first woman to sail alone across the Pacific Ocean.

Like the Apollo astronauts, you have conquered the unknown with courage and success. Your vessel, the *Seasharp*, like the Apollo craft, *Eagle*, has now become a proud part of America's adventurous heritage.

Congratulations on a most successful journey.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, at this time of year, when we are commemorating Captive Nations Week, it is well for the American people to examine the role they have played in providing a haven for those battered by the storms of history.

The United States has always opened its shores to those who could no longer take the oppression and tyranny that were their lot at home. We have always provided a welcome for these people, from the very outset of our history as a country.

It must be recalled that the very first settlers in New England, the Pilgrims, landed at Plymouth because of religious persecution at home. The great State of Pennsylvania was founded by a man leading his people from religious persecution and into freedom.

Our whole history has been the story of a people welcoming as friends those who were oppressed, downtrodden, persecuted. It might be well, too, to remember that many of the millions who have immigrated to the United States did so because of military conscription at home, primarily in the middle and southern European countries.

MELTING POT

These waves of immigration to the United States from all parts of the world have created within this country what we proudly label a “melting pot.” If one

walks down the street in almost any American city he is bound to run into people whose ancestors came to this country from Scandinavia, from the British Isles, from the European continent, from Asia, and from Africa.

Nowhere else in the world does such a situation pertain. And let it be noted that at no other time in all the history of mankind has any nation ever so freely and for so long a time opened its borders to all who sought and seek refuge. This makes the United States and the people of the United States unique.

The rights of minorities have sometimes been thwarted or ignored. Likewise, the rights of the majority have also been sometimes ignored or set aside.

All of this is true. It is a confession which Americans must make if they are to be honest with themselves.

But—and I must emphasize this—notwithstanding our shortcomings and our failures, we have tried, and we are still trying. And we have achieved a measure of success that is both heartening and a challenge.

SOME SUCCESS

Nowhere else on earth do so many people from so many lands and so many backgrounds live as closely and harmoniously together as in the United States. Men and women from Poland and Czechoslovakia, from Russia and Hungary, from France and Italy, from Germany and Sweden, from Finland and Bulgaria, from Greece and Japan, from China and all the lands of Africa, live side by side.

Not always is their life calm, but always men from every racial and religious background have attempted to work out their differences in peace.

Nowhere in the world have so many people from so many varying backgrounds attempted to adjust themselves to life together as part of a single great nation.

That this degree of harmony exists is heartening to all of us. It is also a challenge to us to meet the new demands placed on our Nation.

Our success to date is not an accomplished end in itself, but merely the basis for further efforts to resolve the great differences that still divide us.

In the growing, changing, developing land that is the United States of America today there is no time to congratulate ourselves on what we have become. We must be too busy about the business of becoming ever more a refuge to all who are oppressed and whose souls cry out for freedom.

That is our goal. If we achieve it, that shall be our place in history. That in all the long and tragic career of mankind there was one place on the road and one time in history that all men could find themselves.

Our past record is but a challenge to the present. Our present is but a stepping stone to a great and noble future.

AJAX PRESSES CELEBRATES 40 YEARS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, a highly successful and important company in

Salt Lake City celebrates its 40th anniversary this month. The firm, Ajax Presses, began with a few employees and now claims some 500 persons on the payroll.

Founded by Louis N. Strike in 1929, Ajax Presses today produces more than half the laundry presses on the American market, and exports 15 to 35 percent of the U.S. production annually.

The firm has been awarded the President's "E" flag for its efforts in the Nation's export expansion program. The foreign and domestic successes of Ajax Presses have resulted in excellent annual growth rates, reaching as high as 22 percent.

Ajax Presses is to be congratulated on four decades of public service in producing a much-needed product and in adding significantly to the economy of Utah while boosting the U.S. balance of payments through its exports.

An article from the Salt Lake Tribune of July 20 details the growth of Ajax Presses. I ask that it be printed following these remarks.

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

AJAX PRESSES CELEBRATES 40 YEARS

The phrase "Find a need and fill it" has been responsible for many success stories.

And as Ajax Presses, 1055 W. North Temple, celebrates its 40th anniversary this month, a variation of that theme is credited with much of the company's success.

Louis N. Strike founded the firm in 1929 on the premise that one should "Find out what the marketplace needs and build it."

He did, and in its 40th year the Salt Lake firm produces more than half the laundry presses on the American market and exports 15 to 35 percent of the U.S. production annually.

OPERATION GROWS

From a small shop with a few employees Mr. Strike's Western Laundry Press Co. has grown into the 184,000 sq. ft. manufacturing, research and office complex it is now, employing some 500 persons.

In 1956 Ajax Presses was acquired by American Laundry Machine Co., a division of McGraw-Edison Co.

But Ajax still controls its own product design, marketing and operation functions.

In the early 1950s the founder's sons were taken into the business and a new dealership sales organization was established.

Through the new sales department the company has negotiated license arrangements with foreign producers. The latest is a licensee in Mexico. Arrangements are being negotiated in Britain and Japan.

GAINS NATIONAL AWARD

Because of its export program, Ajax has been awarded the President's "E" flag for contributions to America's export expansion program.

These domestic and foreign successes have resulted in high annual growth rates for the company, ranging as high as 22 percent.

Nicholas Strike, Ajax general manager and a vice president of American Laundry, has his own variation on his father's motto.

"Our principal asset is our ability to remain sensitive to market needs and our ability to design and build for those needs."

THE PESTICIDE PERIL—XXXII

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, more and more concerned people are convinced of

the threat to our environment and possibly even to human health from the continued use of persistent pesticides.

People in California, where a law was recently passed banning the use of DDT for home and garden use after January 1, are already puzzling over how to dispose of surplus pesticides and empty pesticide containers without contaminating the surrounding environment. It is regrettable that the U.S. Department of Agriculture has not considered it necessary to update their 1964 bulletin on safe pesticide disposal.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from last week's Milwaukee Journal of Wisconsin reporting on the disposal problem in California, and also a copy of the 1964 Department of Agriculture bulletin entitled, "Safe Disposal of Empty Pesticide Containers and Surplus Pesticides," be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal,
July 16, 1969]

CALIFORNIANS EAGER TO DISPOSE OF DDT

Now that California has passed a law banning the use of DDT for home and garden use after Jan. 1, an unusual problem has arisen:

Many householders, alarmed by reports of the DDT threat to the environment, want to get rid of it immediately.

"Some think it's like a poisonous snake," said Van P. Entwistle, chief of the division of field crop and agricultural chemicals.

Two Stanford university scientists, who favor a bill still before the legislature to ban all DDT provided some unwanted advice: Set up a system of turning unwanted DDT over to the state.

"We don't want it," Entwistle protested. "It would be a big problem for us to get rid of it."

BURIAL SUGGESTED

Instead, he suggested the continued use of DDT.

This will create a smaller problem than if DDT is dumped in concentrated quantities, he said.

He also suggested burying unwanted DDT. It adheres tightly to soil particles and will eventually decompose, Entwistle explained.

California is the latest state to move against DDT. The law banning house and garden use covers the only unregulated use. Farmers are required to get permits from county agriculture commissioners to use it.

USE MAY DROP 15 PERCENT

California will also halt the use of DDT dust on Jan. 1. The move is aimed at controlling the problem of DDT drifting across fields.

The new laws may cut the use of DDT in California 10% to 15%. Two million pounds are now used annually.

Although Wisconsin has not banned DDT, the state is considering it.

A team of state experts studied the problem of DDT as a pollutant and set up voluntary guidelines. Some of the recommendations went into the solid waste disposal rules drawn up by the natural resources department. Many communities have balked at adopting the recommendations because it would be expensive.

Michigan recently banned the use of DDT, but amended the ban to allow its use to control bats, mice and body lice. The exterminator industry claimed that there was no good alternative.

Arizona has banned the agricultural use of DDT for a year on a trial basis.

[From the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service, August 1964]

SAFE DISPOSAL OF EMPTY PESTICIDE CONTAINERS AND SURPLUS PESTICIDES

(Recommendations for: Farmers; commercial pesticide applicators; city, State, and Federal pest control officials; others who use large quantities of pesticides)

The careful disposal of empty pesticide containers and surplus pesticides is an important part of safe pesticide use. Following safe disposal procedures is vital for those who use pesticides extensively because their errors could lead to serious hazards to themselves and others and to serious contamination of the environment.

"Empty" containers can be a hazard to children and pets. Barrels and drums converted into livestock feed troughs, water storage tanks, or raft floats become sources of contamination of feed and water. If discarded in the line of water runoff, these containers can pollute ponds and streams.

Your responsibility as a pesticide user continues until any empty pesticide containers and any surplus pesticides are disposed of safely and properly.

GOOD STORAGE PLACE NECESSARY

Keep pesticides and pesticide containers in a separate building or room or in an enclosure. Use this storage area exclusively for pesticides and empty pesticide containers. Buildings or rooms used for this purpose should be dry, ventilated, and under lock and key. Outside storage areas should be fenced in to protect children and animals and to discourage pilferage.

(Caution: Do not store weedkillers, herbicides or defoliants in the same room with insecticides. Volatile materials such as 2,4-D and its derivatives can contaminate other pesticides. Chlorate salts can create a fire or explosion hazard.)

Remove only the amount of pesticides needed for one day's operation and be sure to return empty containers—and any unused pesticide—to the storage area at the end of each day.

DISPOSING OF PESTICIDE CONTAINERS

Disposal methods and necessary precautions will depend upon the type of container and facilities available. Regardless of the disposal plan you follow, however, you can lessen the amount of hazard by:

Draining any pesticide remaining in the container into a pit dug in sandy soil.

Rinsing glass and smaller metal containers several times with the diluent being used and including the rinse in your spray.

Keeping lids and bungs tightened at all times when containers are not being used.

Keeping all empty containers in a secure storage area until they can be disposed of safely.

Large metal drums can be disposed of most safely and easily by returning them to the supplier or selling them to a cooperage firm equipped to handle toxic materials. Pesticide containers also can be safely disposed of locally at public dumps, incinerators, or private disposal sites.

Public dump or incinerator

Notify the operator of the dump or incinerator of the nature of the material so that he will be able to take any necessary precautions. Before leaving the disposal site, remove lids and bungs, break glass containers with a sharpened pickax. Breaking and puncturing containers will make it less likely that an unauthorized person will remove them from the dump and attempt to convert them to other uses. Containers should be buried at public dumps.

Private disposal sites

If suitable public disposal facilities are not available and containers cannot be returned to a supplier or sold to a cooperage firm, select a disposal site that will be used only for surplus pesticide and pesticide containers. It should not be an area that might later be returned to cropland or some other use. It should be away from homes, wells, streams, and crops and livestock. Level ground is best because it will let the residue be absorbed through the soil and lessen the chance that it will be carried away in water runoff. Do not locate the site on the watershed of a public water supply or where livestock have access to it.

Combustible Containers: Paper bags, cardboard boxes, and plastic containers should be burned after making sure that smoke will not drift over nearby homes, people, livestock, and the person doing the burning. Pouring used crankcase oil over the containers before lighting them will aid combustion.

(Caution: Some municipalities have restrictions against burning. Consult local authorities before burning containers.)

Non-Combustible Containers: Where economical sources of fuel are available, metal and glass containers can also be decontaminated by burning. After removing lids, use a sharpened pickax to chop holes in the top, bottom, and sides of metal containers. Build a heap of scrap wood, dry brush, old automobile tires, or anything else that will make a hot fire. Then place containers on the pile and start the fire.

Heat containers until they are red hot and hold them at that temperature (800° to 1200° F.) for at least 5 minutes.

You can construct your own incinerator for burning small containers from a 55-gallon drum. Remove one end from the drum and punch holes in the sides, leaving room at the bottom of the drum to hold the fuel. Fuel oil or used crankcase oil will provide complete combustion yet is safe to use if handled carefully.

But do not burn weedkiller containers

Do not burn containers which have held weedkillers such as 2,4-D and its derivatives. When these herbicides volatilize, the resulting vapor may damage nearby plants, crops, and shrubbery. Also, herbicides or defoliants containing chlorates may explode when heated.

Dispose of these containers in this manner: Break glass containers and chop holes in the top, bottom, and sides of metal containers so they cannot be re-used or collect water. A sharpened pickax is best for this purpose.

Bury all weedkiller containers to a depth of 18 inches at a safe disposal site or take them to a dump where they will be covered with soil.

Rinsing Procedure: If burning is not possible, a thorough rinsing procedure will eliminate much of the pesticide residue and hazard. Here is the recommended rinsing procedure:

1. Carefully rinse empty container with water and detergent. (See table below.) Allow water and detergent to remain in the container for 15 minutes with intermittent agitation. Pour rinse solution into a pit dug in sandy soil.

2. Re-rinse container for another 15 minutes with the same amount of water and detergent. Again pour rinse solution into the pit, invert container and let it drain for 15 minutes into the pit.

3. Flush drum thoroughly with clean water. Caution: *Although they may appear to be completely free of residue, these containers should not be used for storing human or animal food or water!*

RINSING SOLUTION FOR VARIOUS CONTAINERS

| Container size (gallons) | Water (gallons) | Detergent |
|--------------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| 5..... | 1/2 | 2 tablespoons. |
| 30..... | 3 | 3/4 cup. |
| 55..... | 5 | 1 cup. |

SUPPLIER OR COOPERAGE FIRM

If you plan to turn containers over to the supplier or cooperage firm, tighten the bungs, rinse the drums off with water, and keep them in the storage area until they are picked up. Many of these drums rust rapidly and lose their value after more than one season. So make sure they are collected by the cooperage firm as soon as possible. Growers can contact their pesticide dealers or formulators for the names and locations of established cooperage firms.

DISPOSING OF SURPLUS PESTICIDES

Surplus pesticides should be kept in the original containers in the storage area until they can be disposed of safely. If surplus pesticides cannot be given to a responsible person in need of such material, they should be poured into a hole dug in the ground and covered with dirt to a depth of at least 18 inches. Observe all precautions recommended for private disposal sites. Do not take surplus pesticides to a public dump or incinerator. Leftover spray mixture should be poured into a pit dug in sandy soil.

Use Pesticides Safely—Read the Label.

Caution: If pesticides are handled or applied improperly, or if unused parts are disposed of improperly, they may be injurious to humans, domestic animals, desirable plants, pollinating insects, fish or other wildlife, and may contaminate water supplies. Use pesticides only when needed and handle them with care. Follow the directions and heed all precautions on the container labels.

THE STRUCTURAL REVOLUTION IN AGRICULTURE

Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. President, when Secretary of Agriculture Clifford M. Hardin held his "grass roots" conference with farm people at Lincoln, Nebr., on April 12, he heard an impressive short statement by Mrs. Gordon McKeown, of Bushnell, S. Dak., a director of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference. Mrs. McKeown challenged the desirability of the revolution occurring in American agriculture, and questioned the wisdom of this Nation continuing to allow the displacement of farm families in the name of production efficiency.

Mrs. McKeown followed her brief oral presentation at Lincoln with a documented study, which she has now submitted to Secretary Hardin.

Mrs. McKeown questions policies based on production economics under which more than half of all farm families have already been moved off the land. Some believe that another 2 million will be displaced, leaving a million or less farm units in a Nation which once had 6.8 million.

The study is somewhat longer than documents normally appearing in the RECORD, but it deals with such an important national policy problem, and contains so much information on that problem, that I feel strongly that it should be made available to agricultural policymakers—including all of us in

Congress who will be voting on farm bills this year and for many years to come. I consequently ask unanimous consent that Mrs. McKeown's paper be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE STRUCTURAL REVOLUTION IN AGRICULTURE: A CHALLENGE TO PRODUCTION ECONOMICS POLICYMAKING; RECOMMENDATIONS FOR EFFECTIVE REFORM

(Study prepared by Mrs. Gordon McKeown, Bushnell, S. Dak.)¹

Thank you, Dr. Hardin, your staff, and the personnel of the University of Nebraska, in providing this public forum which has been a true forum, open to all for free and frank discussion. By now you must be weary. For us, too, this has been a long journey.

My name is Mrs. Gordon McKeown, farm wife from South Dakota, a member of the board of directors of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference.

UNDERSTANDING A REVOLUTION

The issue with which we should concern ourselves here today is the revolution of a socio-economic structure—the "family farm." This revolution is scarcely visible on the American scene. It is a very quiet revolution, but it is a structural revolution.

Dr. Tom Stout, Professor of Economics, Ohio State University, said it well:

"I believe we are on the threshold of revolutionary change in agriculture. I mean revolutionary in the literal sense that revolutions leave earlier forms unrecognizable and cause persistence in customary patterns of thought and action to be untenable."²

Two points in my remarks must be inserted here. Point one: My challenges to the power of production economics research in agricultural policy making and many of the suggestions for effective reform follow the guidelines of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference's policy statement, *Toward a Sound Family Farm Policy*, adopted at their national convention in Manhattan, Kansas, 1966.³

Point two: My sticks are directed to the social scientists, particularly economists who insist that "they wear several hats", but in reality wear only the hat of the technician. My carrots go to the many, many wonderful economists who have tried to educate, to inform me in the labyrinths of modern knowledge. Their patience has been incredible. So let it be clearly understood that these challenges are not a blanket indictment of social scientists per se, but only an insistence that our educators begin to assume a proper role in their various disciplines of learning.

Let us face the real questions—the "gut" issues in the revolution. You educators and we farmers share more problems and have more in common than either of us know or would care to admit. We are both splintered, fragmented. Really we are both in a sorry state. Neither of us has done our homework. Both the legitimacy of the discipline of economics and the family's right to the ownership of productive property, the land, are being challenged.

On what grounds?

In the case of economics, Kenneth Boulding, who I think we would agree is an economist's economist, presented penetrating insights in his paper, *The Legitimacy of Economics*. I recommend that you all run, not walk, to read the entire paper. The following are just scatterings; I have tried very hard not to present them out of context:

Page 11: "Economists have always prided themselves on being the defenders of the long run and have criticized politicians and political processes for throwing up short solutions. . . . Economists themselves, how-

ever are open to the criticism that their long run propositions are very hard to test, and indeed most of them are untested."

Page 12: "This is particularly true of propositions relating to economic development and long run change. Economics starts with an equilibrium system which assumes certain technological coefficients to be constant. . . . An institution which does not rely on sacrifice, mystery, ritual, age or even primarily on alliances with other legitimacies, can only derive legitimacy ultimately from its positive payoffs. (economic profit-dollar payoff—my comment)"

Page 13: "We learn, however, not by success but by failure and the very success of economics as a profession may present it with hidden dangers. . . . If the training of the economist leads to his neglecting certain important aspects of the world around him, *once he is in a position to give advice, and to have this advice taken*, disasters might easily ensue." (Italic mine.)

Page 14: "When one is giving advice, therefore, about a system which involves the total society, it is extremely dangerous to be overtrained in a certain abstract element of the total process. If we run into enough of this, we may find indeed a wide-spread reaction against economics and a withdrawal of legitimacy from it. It is my own view frankly, at this point, that we must move towards a more integrated and perhaps even a rearranged social science, that the existing departmental and disciplinary lines often mask real problems and that *economics may even have to lose its life in order to save it.*" (Italic mine.)

Page 15: "Certainly, if economists maintain the haughty and superior attitude which many of them have towards the other social scientists, they may be heading for some rude shocks."⁴

Dr. Stout, in the paper I mentioned previously, in discussing requested new public attitudes asked:

"Namely, what is the role of the agricultural college, the agricultural experiment station the agricultural extension service, the Department of Agriculture—if the agriculture it serves wishes to be known as a big boy; independent, capable, self-reliant? It is not satisfactory to say that the same old demands for information will remain. That may be. But the same old excuse for providing it will not remain. It is probably not unreasonable to speculate that perhaps the modal group of agricultural economists in domestic public service has already been trained."⁵

There are many other fine minds in the discipline of economics pondering these questions. There's only one trouble. They are talking to each other in their cool white ivory towers. They say marvelous things to each other, but they don't say them to the very people they are supposed to be educating—farmers. In the above quotation, Dr. Stout was speaking to a distinguished group of big businessmen, corporate luminaries of John Deere, W. R. Grace and others. If farmers were present at this Farm Foundation-sponsored meeting, it was not noted.

The old "Eyes of the Farmer" routine with information trickling down from the top through Extension specialists is dead. *It should be buried*. Thousands and more farmers are saying "Extension is irrelevant to us. They don't know our needs. They don't even know our questions let alone answers to them."

Gentlemen, farmers should not expect whatever economists solve their problems; we do have a legitimate right to honest answers to honest questions.

What are farmers still receiving from their educators? You know as well as we. The same old wearisome inventory is hauled out, a change here and there, but the speakers, and the bulletins and the public service programming on TV and radio and the field day program directors and the dozens of farm-ori-

ented periodicals dance merrily 'round the mulberry bush chanting their litany of technological efficiency.

We have six month forecasts for whatever you want, soybeans or hogs; inventory statistics palmed off as available market supplies; new developments in confinement feeding, including refinements in deodorizing so we will remain good neighbors to suburbia. And through the litany we will all find our salvation in more effective competition with each other, in more specialization, in more acres, in more and bigger tractors, in more fertilizer, in more herbicides, and let's not forget that good old management know-how. But we farmers know that even the early adaptors find their position a tenuous and temporary one (i.e. broiler producers), and we are really only busy eliminating each other in an economic jungle.

And such prestige we have in this production efficiency bit, Dr. Briggs, our state university president, "lent his presence to a day-long tour for farmers to see current work in low-cost long span fencing. . . . toured were the station's 80 pastures and more than 22 miles of experimental fencing. . . . Special guests were U.S. Steel Corporation representatives B. A. Kinne and P. G. Strom, Pittsburgh, who developed a special fencing machine displayed at the field day."⁶

Could we farmers be permitted to observe that this performance could show all the signs of a selling campaign. If this could be so, I could resent the fact that Dr. Briggs had to demean the dignity of his office to justify research support. More pertinently I could suggest that Dr. Briggs' valuable time be spent on much more important problems. Couldn't the selling of the corporate technology be left to the corporations?

I am wandering. Forgive me, there's a lot of territory to wander over. Let us now turn our attention to the legitimacy of the family farm's right to exist as a viable socio-economic unit feeding the nation its basic foods. My understanding of a family farm is not gross production. It is not a captive broiler producer. It does not rule out family corporations. Family farms must fill three requirements: control decision-making (management), supply labor (1/2), and control the capital investment.

The family on the land is being written off on grounds of technological inefficiency and only on those grounds. There has been a technological revolution, America is told. The human input in agriculture—people—too many people—Ah! That is the problem. Dr. Hendrick Houthakker is quite frank. Dr. Houthakker gets right to the point with the use of the word "superfluous". His study is typical of specialists concerned primarily with economic growth. He considers the farm sector not a particularly important one in the American economy. The farm problem he considers primarily a problem of economic growth. He suggests if economic growth requires a movement of labor out of agriculture, then in a free economy, this can be achieved only if per capita farm income is low relative to per capita nonfarm income. He says inefficient farmers should be helped to get out of farming, considers price supports wasteful, and recommends a program of diminishing supports until such time as those who are left can compete in a free market. His contribution to future policy is to have some sort of government corporation to maintain price stability in grains by "hedging futures." Useful perhaps is the following direct quotation from Dr. Houthakker's study:

"Since all farm legislation has to be approved by the committee on agriculture, it is difficult indeed to get economically rational farm legislation enacted. The narrow outlook of the leadership of these committees may be illustrated from an incident that took place after the defeat of the administration's farm bill in June 1962. The Committee for Economic Development, and orga-

Footnotes at end of article.

nization of public-spirited businessmen, chose this moment to publish a report entitled "An Adaptive Program for Agriculture." This report contained a good analysis of the farm problem, with emphasis on the need for an outflow of resources from the farm sector. It also contained various positive proposals, with one of which we shall be concerned later on. We do not have to agree with everything the CED said to recognize that its distinguished members performed a service which the House Agriculture Committee had conspicuously failed to provide, namely to present an abject picture of the farm problem. The CED's timing may have been poor, but its intentions were admirable. Unfortunately its only reward was a systematic campaign of misrepresentation and personal abuse."

Dr. Houthakker's footnote on the next page is illuminating:

"In many respects the Food and Fiber report of 1967 vindicates the CED report of 1962, the adverse reaction to which was discussed earlier in this chapter."

Now I do not know if the good Dr. Houthakker has read the particular hearings to which he referred. I did spend a full day reading the transcript, and photostating statements. I did not find blind abuse, but I did find challenge.

I cannot speak to you in mathematical formulas. Will this homely illustration suffice? If we can afford the cost, we women know that we can stave off the ravages of time, over-maturity, and outright decay of the aging process with face-liftings, and other expensive techniques which obviously I am not familiar with. But as a woman ages, it becomes more and more expensive, more painfully difficult, and she finds she must face the ultimate truth, and if she is rational—to accept age gracefully, and wisely. For Dr. Houthakker to dismiss the challenges of those hearings as abuse is a case in point, I believe, of the irrationality of making policy conclusions from the narrow abstract of *economic growth*, as irrational as the woman who goes from clinic to clinic in a belief that skin, muscles, tissues can forever generate growth (youth). Surely, a free society, and particularly the legislative process, must be concerned with considerations other than *economic growth*. A proposal must be probed, inquired into and then a decision is supposed to be made in the interest of the public good.

In this vein, it is important to look back at those hearings.

The CED people represented at the hearings were Theodore O. Yntema, vice president and chairman, finance committee, Ford Motor Co. and chairman of the Research and Policy Committee, CED; Harold Brenton, President, Brenton Cos., Des Moines, Iowa; Professor Theodore W. Schultz, Department of Economics, U. of Chicago; Lamar Fleming, former chairman of board, Anderson & Clayton, Houston, Texas; and others, such as Mr. Alfred C. Neal, president of CED.

Mr. Yntema began by identifying the purposes and policy of the CED. All quotes will be identified by page number and general footnote will be listed at end. "The Committee consists of a board of trustees of about 200 people, mainly business executives with a small minority of college and university presidents. Our basic purposes are research and education in national economic policy." (page 2) I think we may fairly say that we were one of the early sponsors of the ideas which found reflection in the Employment Act of 1946 . . . in the forefront of those who in the postwar period advocated active use of Government's fiscal and monetary policies to achieve a high, stable level of employment . . ." Page 3.

Mr. Yntema said the CED's continuing concern was "individual freedom as the goal", that "The key to the problem of agriculture, as we see it, is to provide opportunities for

the employment of the resources now in agriculture in their most productive uses." (Page 3.)

Mr. Yntema stressed the use of outstanding economists from universities "to indicate the nature of the advice we sought." He commented "We do not think that we regard ourselves as experts in agriculture. . . . Our purpose in doing this is an *educational one*." (Page 4.)

Next came Mr. Brenton. He assured the Committee that the CED's concern was to have farmers earn a comparable income with nonfarmers. "The key is the free choice of well-informed farmers. We shall reach our objective when every farmer is a farmer because he prefers to be one—not because he happened to be born on a farm, and didn't know anything else to do . . . (page 5.) And the incomes of those who remain in agriculture have been helped by the movement of others."

Now let us turn ahead to some of the actual exchange between the Chairman and Dr. Yntema. (Harold Cooley was the committee chairman.)

The CHAIRMAN. How many times have any of you appeared before the Agriculture Committees of the Congress concerning the problems of agriculture?

Mr. STEIN. Our committee has not appeared before the Agricultural committees before. (Page 12.)

The CHAIRMAN. Was this statement (CED's policy statement), referred to by Mr. Brenton, of which you did not even send us a copy, published?

Mr. YNTEMA. We do not send copies in general unless they are requested. We are not a lobbying organization. We are a research organization.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not what?

Mr. YNTEMA. We are *not a lobbying organization*.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the purpose of your existence?

Mr. YNTEMA. To find the truth.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the truth?

Mr. YNTEMA. Well, we hope that the truth will make us free. (Page 13.)

Mr. YNTEMA. I think that we have contributed a great deal to the advancement of knowledge. *We are not, however, sponsors of legislation*. This is not our job. We are contributing to education.

I will submit here that Mr. Yntema's statements, which I have italicized, are to put it charitably, inaccurate, if not completely false. Please see Note I in the Appendix at the end of this paper.

Continuing the hearing:

Mr. YNTEMA. I think we have helped to educate the professors of economics who have sat with us and have talked with us about these problems. I think we have made a very important contribution to policy.

The CHAIRMAN. You have educated the professors; is that what you said?

Mr. YNTEMA. I think that we have educated the businessman and professors, and we have educated the schools.

The CHAIRMAN. Why have you remained away from this committee?

Mr. YNTEMA. Our policy statements are materials that are used very widely in the schools and the colleges of the country, and I think we are entitled to the respect that we do have on the part of those who are interested in this and *are competent to judge*. (Page 14) (Underlining mine.)

Mr. Cooley asked each of the witnesses their connection with agriculture. Mr. Brenton, Des Moines banker, to Mr. Cooley's query on taking two million farmers out of agriculture:

It seemed like that is the number that is in excess.

When asked why it seemed like, Mr. Brenton answered:

Well, our studies and our advisers felt that about one-third of the farmers should be removed, and that about two-thirds that remain could produce the crops that we

need. . . . This process (off farm migration) has been going on, but it does not go on rapidly enough, because they do not know where to go. . . . Those that live within driving range of Des Moines might seek jobs in industry there. There are little businesses starting up in towns all over the State. So the farmers as they leave, if that opportunity arises, they move and take jobs in those little businesses that are established.

To Mr. Cooley's statement that there were already 4,500,000 people walking the streets unemployed, Mr. Brenton's answer was:

"This process of migration is going on. And it *will eventually, if it continues, solve itself*, but it would take too long. The process can be stepped up." (Italics mine.)

"Too many farmers do not have enough work to do on the farm. I mean that there are too many people that are working only a portion of their time. They are unemployed . . . We do not propose to take him (the farmer) off the farm. We propose to make it possible for him to move if he wants to move." (Page 15.)

Dr. Schultz then entered the fray.

"Let me identify myself. You make quite a bit of whether one has or has not had experience in agriculture. Bear with me. I grew up in South Dakota on a farm . . . I was on a 540-acre farm. We then full-time employed five brothers and my dad. That farm today is operated by my youngest brother with the equivalent of one and one-half persons . . . and produces 50 percent more than we were able to produce when I was a kid . . . I never had a day of high school . . . had to pitch in on the farm . . . My wife and I bought a farm south of Ames when on the faculty, and we remained in that connection close to agriculture. Therefore, I plead with you, Mr. Chairman, that I think I know a great deal about agriculture, having spent my whole professional life concentrating on it and other problems . . . the CED proposals aim to make it easier for these people (2,000,000 farmers) to get into the non-farm labor force."

Mr. BRENTON. We propose under certain conditions which would be carefully established to help them in moving, to loan them money for moving. (Page 17.)

The CHAIRMAN. You want to repeal all price supports, and give the farmer freedom. Would you go a step further and abolish the land-grant colleges, the extension services, and all of those agencies?

Mr. BRENTON. Oh, no. Those are very important. We want them.

The CHAIRMAN. Why?

Mr. BRENTON. They continue increasing the productivity of the farms. *That is what we wish to see*. (Italic mine.)

The CHAIRMAN. The farmers of America have mastered the techniques of production and they have been penalized.

Mr. BRENTON. I do not understand your question, Mr. Chairman. . . . Farmers will increase their productivity greatly in the future . . . farmers, because they cannot obtain sufficiently large farms, are only working a portion of their time. They do not know where to get a job to work the rest of their time . . . *Farmers want to work more time*. (Page 19.)

Then followed what apparently must have been quite a spirited exchange between Mr. Cooley and Mr. Yntema. Mr. Cooley said Ford Motor Company could sell more cars if it produced more and reduced prices. He implied that Ford should then practice full production if that was what the CED recommended for agriculture. He suggested the car industry administered prices. Mr. Yntema admitted that the Ford Company controlled production and that "Some farmers do control their production. They go to work for the Ford Motor Co. That is one way of controlling their production."

A Committee member, Mr. Lester Johnson of Wisconsin then asked Mr. Yntema "The Ford Motor Co. does not cut the price and make the sacrifice; is that not right?"

Mr. Yntema's answer was "I did not get that, I'm sorry—I did not get the first point." To Mr. Johnson's suggestion that local dealers took the cut from list price Mr. Yntema countered "The local dealers are doing pretty well." (Page 24.)

To Mr. Yntema's statement that Soil Banking was an integral part of the CED recommendations for the transition period, Mr. W. R. Poage, vice-chairman of the Committee remarked: "I am not trying to find fault with that, but I do find fault with any dogmatic statement that we should not believe in any subsidy—that we should not believe in any controls—because you do not have much Government without controls or without subsidies." (Page 26.)

The above statements are not out of context. One wishes they could have shown quick brilliance on the part of the CED spokesmen. Below are excerpts from some of the other "abusive" statements. First Mr. Homer Young, President of the Consumers Cooperative Assoc., Kansas City, Mo. (now Farmland Industries):

"Farmers had better get acquainted with this program. They are going to hear more about it. An organization whose membership is sprinkled with presidents and board chairmen of big national corporations carries weight. . . . I happen not to like the idea of businessmen trying to grab the spotlight in the search of solutions to farm problems. But businessmen have done it in this case, and, unless farmers can find some way to offset it, the voice of business is going to influence public opinion and congressional opinion. The result could be disastrous for farmers.

"The CED calls its plan 'An Adaptive Program for Agriculture.' The whole thing is presented in a handsome brochure—a copy of which probably went to the desk of every Member of Congress. However since writing this I find it didn't. . . . In running through the CED report, one observes the frequent reference to the 'excess of resources' in agriculture. I think I know why the word 'resources' is used. The writers just don't like to admit that in talking about agricultural 'resources' they are talking about people—real people. . . . I do not question the good intentions of any member of the CED. I do think, however, that many men in industry are inclined to look upon agriculture as a source of raw materials and to forget all other aspects of the agricultural way of life. The CED report is heavy on charts and graphs and light on its explanation of what these mean in terms of flesh-and-blood people.

"Of all the 200 men who make up the trustee list of CED, not a single one speaks from the standpoint of a working resident farmer. . . . from the standpoint even of a sociologist. . . . In contrast to industry's bitterly defended right to keep prices above cost of production, the CED proposal is that farm prices be allowed to drop to the point of ruin. . . . This is a plan to take the planning out of agriculture, by means of national planning. *And farmers have had no part in the planning.* What inconsistency. . . . If the formula is good for agriculture, why is it not good for the steel industry. . . . Steel plants are operating at about 50 percent of capacity. . . . these men talk about a 'free market' for agriculture. But many of them have succeeded in businesses that do not operate in a free market in the pure sense of that term." (Pp. 275-276.)

"There is a point at which reduction in the number of farms would bring powerful corporate ownership of farm production into the picture. There are already signs of that. . . . In the end, a concentration of ownership of farmlands in a few hands could create a whole new set of problems, greater in their scope than any we have now. . . .

The farm surplus situation has been magnified beyond its proper proportions. . . . We have about an 8-percent excess capacity in agriculture. How many industries have less?

"Excess stockpiling of certain industrial products by our Government is a matter of public knowledge, but it has failed to become a matter of public concern in the way that any irregularity in agriculture does. Does the difference mean that we have come to believe that industry can do no wrong and agriculture must be watched at every turn?

"We need a better definition of just what surpluses are. . . . Certainly the entire population should share some of the cost of maintaining a safe margin of food as well as military supplies. Food storage is not always surplus. . . . the fact that farmers themselves are not getting together on basic national policy opens the way of course, for nonfarm groups to start speaking up. . . . What farmers need in times such as these is a unified voice. They need a "CED" of their own, if for no other reason than to let the world know that those who speak for business and industry do not put the interests of the farmer ahead of their own."

On page 279, Mr. Albert Quie, Committee member from Minnesota inserted an interesting item. He discussed his trying to get a new Commission on Country Life established in the 86th Congress, but "it didn't get anywhere." He compared his effort to the Commission on Country Life under President Theodore Roosevelt in 1908. "They had the same difficulty then. They had to get the Chamber of Commerce of Seattle, Wash., to print the report. The Congress would not print it.

On pages 303-305 it was Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman's turn:

"The Committee on Economic Development's 5-year plan to end farm programs threatens to alter the basic character of American agriculture. . . . We have already illustrations of how vertical integration and contract farming take away from the farmer some or all of his managerial independence—even, in some instances, relegating him to little more than a piecework laborer's role. . . . The real threat to the independent family farm is not, in most cases, the giant factory-scale, corporation-owned farm employing labor in large crews. Rather, it is through the imposition of a pattern of controls by centralized private authority over the existing family-farming pattern. . . . It is a pattern, the outlines of which are already clear, by which the farmer might remain on the farm, but would take orders from large business enterprise. . . . Thus, "laissez faire" could result in agriculture as it has in other areas, in the development of a system of pricing as well as production that would be administered by a powerful few."

When Secretary Freeman finished his testimony, Mr. Cooley thanked him:

"I do want to thank you, Mr. Secretary, for your statement. I think that this is a devastating answer to the CED proposal. . . . The CED report has been given wide publication by the press, with very little attention given to opposition to it."

One of the most interesting presentations was made by F. H. Heidelberg, executive Vice President, N. C. Cotton Promotion Association, beginning on page 187:

"It should cause grave concern in this committee that the CED proposal in effect would move our Nation in the direction of monopolistic control of land and its resources. . . . and, this is being done while high-level leaders of our Nation are urging neighboring nations to move in the opposite direction to avoid internal social upheaval.

"A review of the eminent ACADEMICIANS WHO MADE UP THE RESEARCH ADVISORY BOARD TO THE CED IN DRAFTING THE ADAPTIVE PROGRAM FOR AGRICULTURE LEAVES ONE WITH THE LONGING TO SOME DAY SEE A PROPOSAL FOR AGRICULTURE DRAFTED BY ACADEMICIANS

EQUALLY AS EMINENT IN THE FIELD OF SOCIOLOGY AND POLITICAL SCIENCE, AND EACH WITH A GOOD GRASP OF HISTORY." (Caps. mine.)

Even more interesting was Mr. Heidelberg's insertion in the record the fact that "January 1, 1962, Governor Brown of California signed a contract for his State with the Federal Government for construction of \$433 million San Luis water project, a 102-mile canal to be built by the Federal Bureau of Reclamation." He went on to state that California got quite a bargain in water resources at the taxpayer's expense, that the old Cotton Belt area stretching from south central Texas to North Carolina had no such comparable help in its movement toward efficient cotton production.

He also inserted a paper by G. S. Tolley, Dept. of Agriculture Economics of North Carolina State showing how land use adjustment, with spending of huge sums of tax money influences regional transfers of production. On pages 173-175 is a listing of cotton processing facilities subsidized in California, Arizona, New Mexico and West Texas in 1951 and 1952. . . . "The Korean war scare provided the arguments for the revival of fast tax amortization of industrial facilities, including those for cotton. This money was a sizable windfall of resources for cotton's agriculture in the general area which the CED singles out as having exceptional advantages for the production of cotton at their recommended adjustment price of 22 cents per pound. This is because to a large degree these tax-amortized facilities were built by producers of cotton. . . . One thing, is for sure, if the same competitive inequalities existed as a result of public policy in car making, papermaking, or any other industrial field represented on the CED, the protestations would be heard from Tucumcari to the Tombigbee. They would reverberate loudly in the halls of Congress too." . . .

James B. Dyess, Executive vice president of the National Association of Wheat Growers on page 215:

"Under this plan, much of the Plains area would revert from a productive agricultural area, using millions of dollars worth of farm machinery, chemicals, fertilizers, fuel, and so forth, every year, to a region of tremendous cattle ranches using relatively little of the production of our great industrial centers. . . ."

Finally, two additional comments: First the hearings contained a lot of testimony from State Vocational Education heads accusing the CED of distorting the funding of vocational training and also accusing them still funding vo-ag education—but in reality training people for industry.

It is also in order to comment that although every major farm organization, and most of the Commodity groups presented testimony before the committee, the American Farm Bureau Federation presented no testimony before Committee either favorable or unfavorable to the suggested program of the CED.

Enough of the actual testimony of the CED hearings, but I feel that knowing what happened is essential to the understanding of our agricultural revolution.

While Dr. Houthakker's study for the ABI was not as widely publicized as those of the CED and the National Commission on Food and Fiber, his main approach, that of surplus human resources, economic growth, technical efficiency, was practically identical to other high-prestige findings. Like the CED and the makeup of the NCFE, the personnel was the business interests of the nation as shown in the Institute's makeup of directors, advisers, and personnel.

The above studies and reports are admittedly done to influence agricultural policy. In a free society business interests and their associations certainly have an unchallenged right to do this. They do not, however, have an unchallenged right to influence education

or legislation using narrow concepts without granting the right of countervailing groups in society to challenge. For Dr. Yntema to plausibly maintain that they in the CED's sole purpose was to search for truth was then relinquishing his claim to the role of a scientist. He could not claim the neutrality of science and simultaneously influence national policy.

President Rudolph A. Peterson of the Bank of America, the world's largest, urged a little more gently last December "for a program which will enable the small farmer (uneconomic) . . . to take his land out of production with dignity."⁹

George S. Moore, President of the First National City Bank of New York, wrote in the staunch defender of "free enterprise" *Human Events*, that he considered the CED Adaptive Program for Agriculture the only solution.¹⁰

Now we laymen are accused of being subjective, and most of the time, gentlemen, you are right, so by all means let us be rational and objective.

Economics is a discipline directed to the efficient production, exchange, and distribution of goods and services over the face of the Creator's earth. Wouldn't we further agree then that agricultural economics should then consist of more than applied research in production problems. Applied technological research is not science. It is technology. There is a big difference here. *Science is a search for truth*. The physical scientists, the physicists, the chemists, the astronomers try to unlock the secrets of nature. They can rightfully claim they are not responsible for their findings, (the classic example: Einstein— $E=MC^2$ —the atom bomb) Now social scientists use the same mathematical methods for finding truth and apply them to people. Natural scientists recognize the processes of nature and adjust to them: *Birth—growth—fruit—death*. Economists who are up tight on an abstract of continuous economic development, have not realized these scientific facts of life yet.

The Name of the Game today is economic development. "Uneconomic" is a dirty word. Things can be pornographic, vulgar, deadly to life and limb, but never can they be uneconomic. To be uneconomic is to lose the right to existence. (Please see Note II in appendix at end of paper.)

Applied production efficiency research based on growth is primarily a human decision, not a third tablet from Mount Sinai. Today, the USDA calls it MISSIONS. Billions, perhaps 10–15 billions or more of public monies, much in close cooperation with the businesses who will sell the technology, has been spent on research in the past 25 years. Who made these decisions? Farmers? An invisible hand?

POLITICAL POWER IN THE AGRICULTURAL REVOLUTION

How is research determined?

Our educators tell us this research is requested by us—the farmers. Let's examine at least part of our procedure. On October 21, 1966, "a committee composed of leaders in private life and officials of Land-Grant Colleges and the U.S. Department of Agriculture has been formed to study the role and responsibilities of the Cooperative Extension Service." Continuing:

"Purpose of the joint advisory committee is to evaluate Extension's past contributions and to project the future scope of the Cooperative Extension Service in order that it can make a maximum effort to meet the needs of the public."¹¹

Fifteen members of this Commission were either USDA professionals, presidents of Universities, or directors of state extension services. The members were designated by the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. They, and Secretary Freeman designated the following committee

members to represent the general public: a bishop of the Methodist Church, from the Iowa area, a homemaker and former Dean of Home Economics, and an assistant professor from New York University Center for Human Relations Studies. The USDA members were appointed by Secretary Freeman. Also included was George Mehren USDA research head.

In an address to Experiment Station Directors at the Annual Meeting of NASULGC, George Mehren, assistant secretary of agriculture clarified the new role of research further. Yes, Dr. Hardin, this paper runs on and on and on: but we must study these developments if we are to understand this revolution. (All italics or caps in following quotation mine:)

"Science has been turned to technology—and technology to wealth and power. American universities seem to be the primary channels for the remarkable translation of the findings of the research-teaching processes to developed industrial technology that soon is used . . . a series of distressing issues of agricultural research and education seem to be afflicting the Colleges of Agriculture today; their relationship to the vastly-different non-agricultural departments on their own campuses; their different status as the farm, forest and food economy continues drastically to shift . . . segregation from the intellectual and scientific life of the nation and the world.

"It seems unlikely that the colleges of agriculture, the experiment stations or the fabric of agricultural research-teaching-extension activities in the nation are in clear or present danger of withering away. Yet it seems likely that to avoid withering away, change will be required—and perhaps change that in some respects seem drastic and even hostile to some of the preconceptions and values that have prevailed for a full century . . . if we are to prosper, to give that which we can and must give, and perhaps even if we are to survive, there are still other things we must learn to do . . . We are looking forward to other media of support for kinds of inquiries that cannot best be done by the institutional procedures that have served us so well in the past . . .

"Now we—the states and the USDA—do know what we are doing. We can determine quantitatively and with substantial precision the activities associated with each element of each mission . . . We have finished broadly specified projections for each of 91 major areas of inquiry both for 1972 and 1977. These projections have been based upon quantitatively specified criteria of priorities formulated objectively by many people from many agencies, disciplines and operational interests . . .

"There is promise that we can develop standard packages, media and digital language such that identity or compatibility of sub-systems may be gotten with no severe constraints. This is no mere instrument of management. It can in fact open to scientific method a great variety of questions which until now could not even be identified or answered. . . .

"We are now working together to design some seventeen systems of research in packages that outline missions; representation of goals; unanswered but necessary questions related to goals; and allocation of such questions among agencies upon agreed criteria. Some missions like genetics, virology, weather modification, remote sensing—are promising of imminent breakthroughs. Others, like nutrition, must be expanded because so much remains to be done. Still others for example soybean yields or swine and dairy industry analyses—should be formulated because urgent practical questions should be answered. . . . It is clear now that structure for administration cannot parallel organization for missions. It is also clear that really to develop meaningful relation of mission operations to mission research, new

forms of interagency, interdisciplinary, and interstate collaboration must be found."

May I ask between these two paragraphs—Is the following just growth or Parkinson's Law?—let alone broaching the delicate questions the self-interest in survival of those involved in research, or for whom the research is being done?—the development of nutrition—the spinning of new protein sources we presume? Mr. Mehren's paper continues:

"There is clear need that programs for buildings, facilities, equipment and other support activities also be determined simultaneously with those for research activities and within the same process. Such programs sharply constrain that which can or should be done in research operations. Accordingly, operating and construction programs must be fully consistent.

"Yet now we can both identify and evaluate all of our activities. We can tie our research allocations directly into program evaluations and planning operations, and for the first time as an integral part. We should soon be able to include construction as part of this fabric . . . Coordinated activity is not merely an instrument to enhance efficiency or research performance. Far more important, it specifies sciences as systems of inquiry and not as separate and self-contained bodies of specialized knowledge. . . .

"Personally I see little work that is totally devoid of pragmatic purpose. Perhaps basic work really is that which involves broad latitude in following curiosity—and if that be true, then the difference between basic and mission work is so diffused that differential status or treatment really may not be meaningful.

"We need no czar, no high-level brokers of the board, no binding or authoritarian command structure at any level in order to do that which we need to do. Any of these would almost surely emasculate, perhaps even destroy us. . . . We all want to optimize mission achievement; to keep our field and our nation in the fore of science.

"I do see evidence that, given adequate and competent staff, we can get the coordination and the efficiency that quite properly will be required of us. . . . Personally, I see little necessity to consider structural changes in our still-evolving relationships and process of financial support. . . . In all directions and dimensions of institutional, in house contract and grant activities seem to provide ample latitude for effective service of our goals . . . As a matter of fact USDA State agricultural experiment stations relationship was rated highest by granters."

Among Mr. Mehren's recommendations for joint action in long-range study were to increase concentration and specialization at certain locations is really a primary purpose in our packing planning. It is a difficult matter and we have not really revolved it . . . to tie more firmly the extension function to research and education . . . that regional or national laboratories should be planned jointly. . . .¹²

I remember reading not long ago an address by Dr. Mehren to students at a New England college telling students of opportunities in the USDA. He projected the needs for all sorts of technicians in applied research. However he skirted the need for any kind of scientists or humanists that would be concerned with the question "is this good for people"? He said only that that kind of need was in a state of "flux."

Let us continue discovering how research evolves. Washington, Dec. 8, 1966.

"The Marketing Research Advisory Committee recommended at its recent meeting that the U.S. Department of Agriculture emphasize research on the problems resulting from the substantial changes which are occurring in freight rates on agricultural products. . . . The Committee met in Washington, D.C., Nov. 30-Dec. 2. . . . Another recommendation of the Committee was to continue

Footnotes at end of article.

and expand basic research, which will result in findings have numerous applications in the development of industrial products from agricultural commodities . . . recommended that research to develop methods of biological control of stored-product insects be emphasized even more than at present. . . . to give high priority to research on the effect of mergers of local, regional, or national cooperatives. . . . studies are needed on the potential benefits of other types of group by farmers. Some work on this has already been done concerning marketing orders, and results of this should be published, and further study initiated . . . assuring food safety, including sanitation on plant equipment and handling . . . immediate attention be given determining the degree and cause of damage from mechanical harvesting . . . establishment of a pilot market laboratory in Europe to determine the quality of U.S. products being received in European countries. . . .

"The Committee, established under the Research and Marketing Act of 1946, is composed of national leaders in the field of marketing research."¹²

The national leaders on the Committee were as follows: Agway, Harry & David's Bear Creek Orchards, Minneapolis Cold Storage, the director of the public administration clearing service, U. of Florida, Packaging Foundation, Inc., Marketing Publications, Inc., Davidson, Talbird and McLynn, Cooperative Marketing Association of Kansas City, North Dakota Public Service Commission, Lewis Grocer Co. of Indianola, Miss. (my note-owned by Super-Valu), Libby, McNeill and Libby, Lady Classen Cafeteria of Oklahoma City, Hannaford Brothers Co.

This lengthy exposition of research evolution is also necessary for an understanding of the structural revolution, and I might add this paper is increasingly agonizing difficult to write.

To most laymen, the above could sound bewildering. It shouldn't. We can however, begin to make certain conclusions:

1. The complete absence of any farmers on any sort of policy-making in agricultural policy making means that we have abdicated our responsibility in not being on committees. Perhaps many farmers (family farmers, that is) have been asked to participate, but that all have refused. OR we have not been asked. Perhaps, Dr. Hardin, you were in school or the armed services when this sort of thing began to evolve. Your letter has gone through the yearly reports of the CBA since 1946. The whole vast scope of the Full Employment Act with its accompanying "congressional intent" determined that all sectors of the Economy were to be present, and represented. While I have not yet had time to study those years thoroughly, the 1964 report, while I do not have at hand the actual page numbers and people concerned, showed that while industry and labor were well represented with their staffs of economists, the sole representative for agriculture, if I remember correctly was Mr. W. Murphy of the Campbell Soup Company.

2. One presumes that all research must come under the scrutinizing eye of a legislative body for justification, but apparently that is a quiet process.

3. That educators study themselves, recommend their own programs, and with the preponderance of career men, not politically responsible in most part, could easily form a select elite, not really responsible to the public any more than the corporate elite, yet using in large part tax monies for their support. This is of course conjecture. We hope so.

But we do feel we have the right to know. Admittedly, in this highly complex society, one cannot run around asking everyone what they think should be done. But then I do remember that a marketing specialist in public debate, told me that farmers should do just

that in trying to get a milk price increase. This particular well-meaning young PhD thought it would be helpful if all dairy farmers canvassed all their customers, the housewives to bring about a price increase for all our milk production. Yes, gentlemen, this did happen, I kid you not.

It is reasonable then, to assume that no invisible hand, very few if any farmers directed the brilliant minds of researchers to a concentration of their energies on applied research. Politically powerful commodity groups, professional elites, one farm organization, and regional congressional delegations: these were the movers in the agricultural revolution. It was raw economic and political power.

The "Farmers' Priest", our beloved Monsignor Louis Miller told much of the story:

"There was a time when USDA research was concerned with agriculture that had a three-fold dimension: land, people and society.

"A little over twenty years ago the Bureau of Agricultural Economics made what is now a benchmark study which I call the 'Tale of Two Cities.' The two cities were Arvin and Dinuba in the great irrigated valley of San Joaquin, California. It was one of the few comparative studies of two different kinds of agriculture and their respective impact upon people, community and land. Arvin was the center of corporation farming; Dinuba was a city in the midst of modest-sized family enterprises. The results were newsworthy: The comparisons dramatic . . . In short, it was one of the few studies that brought to the attention of the American Public the value of family farming as an adequate business unit, as well as a socially valuable contribution to sound social order. Then things began to happen. Shortly after the publications of this significant study as to the relative merits of family farming as against an absentee owned and operated corporate structure, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics was severely cut in its budget and personnel and their future research in this field was virtually destroyed."¹⁴

To keep this revolution of agriculture in perspective, the above study was the work of Walter Goldschmidt and his wife. He began his research project in 1942, 27 years ago. The revolution then as now was veiled by war. While some will call the following material "bone-rattling", the recorded activities of the Congressional hearings, the actions of then Congressman Everett Dirksen cannot be dismissed. Knowledgeable and concerned men documented this travesty.

The Farm Security Administration, a federal agency formed to deal with the almost impossible crisis in agriculture in the 1930's, made a dreadful political mistake. They tried to help black and white yeoman farmers in the South.

"Thirty-eight percent of all borrowers were located in 12 Southern states . . . The point of importance", wrote Grant McConnell, "is not so much that the FSA was energetic and alert in attacking these problems (health, education, housing, farm practices peculiar to southern problems), but that in so doing, it directly antagonized powerful organized interests:"

"The large private grain dealers of Minneapolis centering around loans to the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association."¹⁵

"The story of the attack (on the FSA) is one of the bleakest in the history of agricultural politics . . . the struggle seems to have been conducted behind a veil of obscurity woven out of superficial complexities and war distractions. The American Farm Bureau Federation was the agency which destroyed the FSA and bureau leadership directed the attack . . . A rider was successfully attached to the appropriation bill to keep FSA personnel out of the Civil Service.

"Slowly, however, an organization was improvised to defend the work of the FSA . . .

One of these assorted groups can be said to have been truly effective. The Catholic Rural Life Conference, represented by a remarkable priest, Msgr. John O'Grady. Monsignor O'Grady made by far the most forceful and persuasive appeal in the entire round of hearings asking not only the continuation but also the extension of the FSA. His efforts were nevertheless insufficient to still the charge that the FSA was Communistic."¹⁶

Ah ha! The magic word—communism! If the public is ill-informed, ignorant of real issues involved, and fearful of a change in the "status quo", and a power structure wants to keep it that way, just interject that little whisper, "Communism!" A tremendous doctorate could be written and defended on the history of this tool of destruction. If the USDA wanted to begin comprehensive land-use planning, per the Mount Weather agreement with farmers involved in doing the planning, just whisper that it was communistic. You see, educators, nothing is new under the sun, not even land-use planning. But I hear no cries of communism today over land-use planning, or regional planning from the leadership of "the largest farm organization" now that it is being done in the name of economic growth, by a professional elite. And we certainly have the USDA involved in planning the countryside right down to the county agent. Rural planning could have held tremendous potential for Rural America if we had been asked to share in the planning. The integration of centralized planning by such organizations as the CED (big industry), big foundations, the Federal Reserve System (big banking), big education (the Universities) under the sacred name of economic growth, and the sacrosanct title of education, is incredible. To put it modestly, Dr. Hardin, the bibliography of this 27 year evolution is formidable.

Let us continue on the history of the destruction of three-dimensional research in the USDA. And again, quoting Monsignor Miller:¹⁴

"I believe one important decision that has had a terrific impact on present-day policy was the complete reorganization of research in the USDA back in 1953. This reorganization took place with the arrival of a new administration. The old 'BAE' was completely fragmented. How did this political move have such tremendous repercussions on future developments? To find out, let's take a brief look back to that year.

"In protesting the reorganization of agricultural research, USDA economists wrote: 'They consider that in this reorganization, the objectivity of economic and statistical research may suffer from being too closely associated with action programs, that new arrangements could lead to over-emphasis on short run or service research at the expense of basic or longer-run research.'

"It became very evident to them that Secretary Coke and those who worked on the proposed reorganization were strongly sold on it, and would accept no sweeping departures from it no matter how strong the objections raised. It was also apparent that the top men in the BAE had already accepted it, 'sold out to it,' no doubt some will say."

"The short quotes are just some of the protest by top economists to Ezra Benson and Earl J. Coke. At the time, only scattered attention to the battle was given in the press. In the main the press mentioned Paul Sears, father of Soil Conservation in his bitter condemnation of the splintering and weakening of Soil Conservation programs, by the action of USDA. . . .

"We had mentioned a Mr. Coke as the assistant in the department who had drawn up this reorganization of research. Who was Mr. Coke? He only remained at the USDA a few months. He had been a corporate director of the Spreckels Sugar Corporation. After his short sojourn in the Department of Agriculture as under-secretary to Benson, he

Footnotes at end of article.

became California's Director of Extension, then on to the Vice-Presidency of the Bank of America. I might add here, that he is now Governor Reagan's choice to head the California Board of Agriculture.

"This same Mr. Coke in 1963 forecast a 'dynamic new agriculture . . . where successful management will find shares of stock in such an agribusiness enterprise, combining land, production, processing and marketing of food and fiber, a most attractive investment . . . a powerful attractant for risk capital and this is the first time in history that the application has been possible.'

"Another buried fact was that one of Mr. Coke's contemporaries in the USDA was a man called John W. Davis, the head of the Commodity Credit Corporation."¹⁷

You educators must remember Mr. Davis. He coined the word "agribusiness." In 1957 speaking to the annual meeting of the American Farm Economic Association, he minced no words; his remarks were never common knowledge, but Mr. Davis was obviously in a position of power to speak as he did:

"Developing a Vertically Integrated Agribusiness Policy . . . Obviously, a vertically integrated agribusiness policy cannot be attained overnight, but must evolve step by step as intelligent research, collaboration and negotiation takes place. Such a procedure will be an evolutionary process—starting with the present \$8 billion of surplus products in government hands, and building toward our goal. By and large, the blocks with which we build will be a series of commodity policies . . . Actually this basic procedure is nothing new in America. Essentially it is the same technique by which progress has been made in the past. (Emphasis mine.) The main new element that I am injecting is that we adapt and apply the process to the development of a more integrated (vertically) policy with agribusiness orientation—a policy that will lead us in the direction of our national objective."¹⁸

Mr. Davis in his paper kept stressing the democratic method of formulating national policy. His paper was challenged by a fellow economist who made the comment inferring that either Mr. Davis didn't understand what vertical integration really was or was quite naive in assuming one could have a market system and integration too.

But I find Mr. Davis intriguing in other ways. Obvious Mr. Davis could not have been stupid and yet be Director of the Program in Agriculture and Business, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University. That title is quite impressive. But it is my judgment that Mr. Davis' claim to authority in national policy-making based on growth alone for progress was not valid. Mr. Davis also seems to be a case in point of the sometimes sad contrasts between theory and practice one comes upon. Sorry, I cannot quote from his book, *Farmer in a Business Suit*, done in collaboration with a Kenneth Hinshaw. No reproduction in whole, in part, in any form, says the Foundation for American Agriculture who sponsored the paperback volume. Suffice to say, it is a "pitch" appealing almost to a kindergarten intelligence level, to sell the average farmer on just exactly what happened to him, the "big farmer bit." I would highly recommend it for your education, gentlemen, of what can happen to a perfectly good economist who practices the barrel-visioned theory of economic growth only.

Back to the rational ranch.

You, our educators, say you are scientists, not involved with ethical decisions. May I gently suggest that when you completely allowed yourselves to be oriented into being problem-solvers, in finding solutions to problems, in allowing your "Eyes of the Farmer" to become a vehicle for training in special-

ization, and increased productivity only, you did make a value judgment—to concentrate on things instead of people.

You've done a tremendous job in helping farmers to increase their productivity. Perhaps it should be enough reward for us to feel a warm glow knowing that each of us now feeds fifty people.

Other speakers at the regional forum have dwelt on price problems. They are correct. One cannot forever keep on feeding those 50 people, for we cannot continue to operate on money borrowed against inflated land values or depreciation, nor on distorted statistics adding over \$3 billions or 20% of our reported net earned income in non-spendable items such as farm dwellings' rental values, home-produced food, which have already been mentioned here. It's just not in the cards. Economists cannot solve the price problem particularly when their energies are directed in so much part to increasing farm production or handling of farm production, and the technology involved in that production. So in the present situation I will not berate you gentlemen for not guaranteeing us a price. I don't think that is your job. It's ours.

However, you do have a responsibility which to all practical purposes, you have sorely neglected. While you have made a fetish of mechanics, you have left us farmers economically illiterate. It might not be foolish to recommend that required reading for farmers would be to read daily the *Wall Street Journal*, among other things, to find out what really is happening in this agricultural revolution. And economists might learn "how it really is" if they were required to refer to such publications as *Moody's Industrials*, *Value-Line* in ever-required staff meetings, balancing this kind of fact as an important variable in their model-building.

You sincerely believe you have insured that America can take forever her bountiful and cheap food supply for granted, like breathing. One just doesn't have to think about it. None of us at this regional meeting think about it either unless we would start choking. This kind of thinking could well prove a dangerous fallacy. *Men trained in one abstract only could stagger a nation with their decisions.*

"THE WAY IT'S GONNA BE"

"That's the way it's gonna be" sing the Chad Mitchell Trio and the rush is on. No revolution, gentlemen?

I don't think Vernon Ruttan of the University of Minnesota is an idiot when he said, "A food and fiber industry in which 80-90 percent of farm output could be produced by 50,000 to 100,000 production units is not only technically feasible but is in the process of evolving."¹⁹

Harold Breimyer of the University of Missouri (and one of the few shining lights in this barren desert of mechanistic economic thinking), said back in 1964 that "Agriculture stands at the crossroads."²⁰ My accolades and respect for Dr. Breimyer are based on the fact that he fulfills his responsibilities as an education to people, not just towers:

The good Dr. Breimyer warned the Missouri Farm Bureau Federation two years ago that question is not whether commercial farms as independent proprietorships get bigger, but whether they continue to exist at all. . . . There is no absolute independence in a commercial agriculture. That is confined to a subsistence farming. And as to the role of government, A MARKET SYSTEM IS ENTIRELY THE CREATURE OF LAW AND GOVERNMENT. (Emphasis, mine.) To continue to sound off about avoiding a role for government is the sure path to oblivion. . . . The plain blunt truth is that to bring more system and order to marketing will require farmers to relinquish a little of their total independence in return for the advantages of joint or cooperative action."²¹

The good Dr. Breimyer further warned

livestock producers in a seminar at the American Farm Bureau's National convention, 1967, "Despite flurries of rhetoric at annual meetings, livestock groups seem to prefer to bask in reflected glory and give the old issues one more lick than to come to grips with the issues of today and tomorrow. They cannot afford the luxury much longer. Tomorrow no longer lies far ahead. Whether livestock farmers are ready for it or not, it is imminent. And more than that, the choice today, unlike 10 or 30 years ago, is not a costless one between adopting changes the times call for, and staying with the status quo."²²

No revolution, gentlemen? What did the former dean of agriculture at Purdue, Dean Earl Butz have to say? "Those of us in agriculture and agribusiness must increasingly help develop the rules for the new game we are playing." Dr. Butz in discussing marketing at the same meeting, said businesses moving into the direction of integration dare not expose themselves to the vagaries of an open market.²³

Now while I could challenge Dr. Butz' objectivity in his agricultural thinking and suggest legitimately, that he had a conflict of interest in his position as dean of agriculture, one surely would not question his knowledgability or competency in knowing "How it's gonna be!" (Dr. Butz while dean of agriculture was also on the board of directors of J. I. Case Tractor Co., Ralston-Purina and International Minerals & Chemicals.)²⁴

Your own Don Paarlberg in a very fine paper said:

"The revolution in agriculture has outgrown its technical phase and is threatening cherished institutions. It is out of this setting that new issues are emerging. In a country with a representative government, the people are in position to demand the institutional arrangements that seem to them good, in agriculture or elsewhere. Among these institutions are the family farm and the entrepreneurial status of the farm operator. According to the reasoning of many people, if the continuation of certain cherished institutional arrangements in agriculture should come at some cost in efficiency, this might nevertheless be a good bargain. We now provide ourselves with an excellent supply of food at a cost of less than 20 percent of our income and this figure is certain to drop still further. . . . Should we sacrifice honored institutions just to achieve some incremental efficiency in an already superbly efficient agriculture? It is a fair question, a question that will be asked often in the years ahead, and a question that calls for something more than a categorical 'No!'"²⁵

Presently the USDA assures the nation that corporate farming is not important in this nation, and they show research findings to prove it. However they concentrate on number of firms, not market share. With all due respect to Dr. Radoje Nikolitch, we see a different picture. Using Kikolitch's study, "Our 100,000 Biggest Farms", we present the following table:

| Year | Number of farms grossing \$100,000 or more | Percent of total farms | Average sales per farm | Percent share of total farm marketings |
|-------------------|--|------------------------|------------------------|--|
| 1939 | 5,000 | 0.1 | \$225,600 | 7.3 |
| 1949 | (¹) | (¹) | (¹) | (¹) |
| 1959 | 20,000 | .8 | 249,150 | 16.9 |
| 1964 ² | 31,401 | 1.4 | (¹) | ³ 25 |

¹ Not available.

² Figures for 1964 obtained from Nation's Agriculture, publ. of American Farm Bureau Federation, February 1969, p. 28.

³ Approximate.

In the same study Dr. Nikolitch noted that "family businesses accounted for eight percent of the marketing of farms with sales of \$100,000 or more."²⁵

We have offered this table as more factual data on this structural revolution. Surely 31,401 firms garnering approximately 25 percent of total farm marketings shows a tremendous growth. These facts have never been in a USDA news release that we know of. Remember these figures are already five years old. The time lag in research while the economic growth of these large firms pyramid is crucial in agriculture's managerial revolution.

Part and parcel of this managerial revolution is the behavior of the integrators in the past 15 years. No deep dark plot is implicated in any manner whatever, but an understanding of the methods the corporate firm uses in its economic growth is germane to this paper. I have not "picked on" any particular firm to abuse them, for these characteristics are common to all integrators. I am only reporting the actual quotations of those responsible in management. For that matter far more useful would be a study of the behavior of the Conglomerate.

Mr. Wayne Nussbaum, then treasurer of Ralston-Purina said in 1961:

"I don't intend to debate the subject of whether or not integration is good for the industry but simply accept it as an established fact . . . we prefer to stick to our specialty of manufacturing feed and let the retail experts do the retailing."²⁵

Mr. Donald Danforth, then chairman of the board of this firm wrote in 1961:

"Our company will tend to become more diversified in the food field which is our business. . . . We will control all stages of certain quality poultry operations, from ownership of breeders and the hatchery, and management of production facilities right through to the final processing and marketing of the eggs and poultry meat."²⁷

In 1966, Hal Dean, president of this company told his audience of his firm's worldwide role in feeding the hungry. Fascinating was Mr. Dean's use of the words "free" or "private" enterprise. He used these two words no less than 25 times in a talk of less than 25 minutes. He then consistently used the word "cash market," not competitive market, in describing these countries' farmers' selling activities. It is important to understand his usage of these words. A "cash market" is not necessarily a competitive market.²⁸ And surely a captive broiler producer does not sell in a market. However, to call a large firm a "private" or a "free" enterprise structure, it must co-exist within a competitive market or "free" market system, as economists apply the word to farmers' markets. If the competition exists only on one side of the fence, then the modal market so dear to the hearts of the economists and to many farmers is not legitimate and should be tucked away as lovely symbols of a nostalgic past. I, personally, would relegate it with the hopes I entertained of going to box lunch socials and quilting bees when I moved to the farm from a large city 20 plus years ago.

French farmers did not consider Ralston Purina's opening a chicken processing plant in Brittany in their best interests. Their picketing forced the French government to "decide that Ralston's investments were unrealistic because of a chicken surplus in France."²⁹

To gain capital for paying off short-term notes, this same firm issued \$40 million in 4½ percent debentures due in 1992.³⁰ Our comment here is: does the family farm entrepreneur refinance his debt in this fashion? If he doesn't, WHY DOES THE FARMER IDENTIFY HIMSELF THEN WITH BIG BUSINESS?

Homer Young warned farmers of this above firm's plans to integrate their feed dealers in cattle-feeding contracts.³¹

New developments in this huge firm's activities have been in the under-developed nations. We offer just one example, South Korea:

"Cooperating with the Agency for International Development, Ralston Purina is putting up \$102,000, and arranging a total investment of about \$1,000,000 in Korea poultry production. AID is insuring half of Ralston's investment and 75 percent of the bank financing against both commercial and political risks . . . Ralston will own 51 percent of the company with the remaining 49 percent being held by four prominent Korean citizens, including some of the nation's best farmers."³² (italics mine.)

One notes the 75 percent commercial risk insurance by our government. One might even conjecture if AID funds in these possibly corrupt governments (or why political insurance) could possibly involve concessional 480 fund use of our "surplus" grains. We note at least six months ago, export subsidies were in effect for the export of broilers to meet European barriers. Also many millions of dollars particularly in "section 32" funds have been spent in the purchase of poultry. These expenditures cannot be excused to help the "family farm" broiler producers. In most cases, he is a laborer not an entrepreneur with control of management, labor, and investment. Such giants as Ling Temco Vought, Cargill, Swift, Arbor Acres, Textron—Are these infant (giants) firms to be protected? Yet broiler growers are still listed as family farmers.

Whatever kind of definition we wish to give this activity of the giants, and let us repeat, it is commonplace activity, let us not call it "family" farming, "free" enterprise or "private" enterprise. Many renowned economists hold the increasingly accepted view that to develop a nation's economy, capital accumulation in large part must be generated in the farming segment. How much opportunity is this type of investment going to contribute to a country's attempts to accumulate capital for their own "growth take-off"?

Again, Dr. Stout describes this revolution in a wry manner:

"For much of the post-war period, most of us believed that nothing very spectacular was occurring in agriculture, or at least that whatever startling rates of change we did encounter either would not amount to much or could not be maintained. We were too close to the information. Even information has diminishing marginal utility, and when you sit at the communications crossroads, the next little tidbit doesn't excite you too much and gets easily discounted. But the tidbits have been piling up, and while the standard classroom word to cadaver-eyed scholars has been "little opportunity in agriculture," something akin to tablets from Sinal have been accumulating at the crossroads."³³

So there it is, gentlemen, a minute documentation of a structural revolution. Much of it is conversations of educators with each other. We have deliberately over-killed in our name-dropping and we both know there are dozens of other examples. We are weary of the theme-song "technological revolution." Only in small part is this true. Farmers themselves have both invented and adapted the great technologies long before research teams came on the scene. We have heard of the discoveries of lone solitary men, the primary discoveries, the mold-board plow, the internal-combustion engine, the reaper.

Hundreds of thousands of us now know that the greater part of this revolution has been deliberately directed and politically motivated by powerful groups. Yes, our grandparents tried: remember the Granger movement; Our grandparents, our parents, and we in large part have neglected our own house. We are too busy producing, remember? (in spite of Mr. Brenton's concern that we do not have enough to do and want to work more). But your department has a responsibility here too and you have miserably failed just as we have.

THE UNASKED QUESTIONS

As an urban-reared and urban-oriented individual, it would be so easy to just "forget it" and stop trying to be some sort of a John the Baptist figure. You know he did get his head chopped off for his pains. Besides, needlepoint and gardening are much more fun.

But little signals keep flashing in the back of my head, gentlemen, and they won't go away.

Hypothesis I: Will the new agriculture continue to produce an abundant and reasonably-priced food supply, including food imitations, as the nation has had in the past? Is a government agency set up to insure that conglomerates will produce more and more food regardless of price cycles, recessions and—heaven forbid—a complete economic collapse? How powerful would this agency have to be? What kind of anti-trust policymaking would be necessary? Remember America will not have a large number of families on the land such as those rebellious Grangers which came out of southeast Minnesota, and it is relevant, I believe, that the main anti-trust legislation on the books today came from the heartland of family farming.

Will a Ralph Nader be able to pull it off? Back in 1945, Ted Schultz wrote, "It is obvious that the steady performance in agriculture is a major national asset, while the erratic rate of production in industry is a serious liability."³⁴

What did Dr. Schultz mean? If I do not misconstrue his meaning, perhaps Gardiner Means in his book *Corporate Revolution* can help us. If I remember correctly, he used figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the year was 1933-34. The prices are wholesale, for both farm machinery manufacturers and farmers sell wholesale. And remember, these were drought years.

Big Four Farm Machinery Manufacturers cut production 80%, cut prices 6%.

Farm Food & Fiber Producers cut production 6%, cut prices 56%.

We think these implications are staggering. What if a matured food industry had been able to keep its profits from nose-diving by cutting its food production 80 percent? Some historians have said the country could have been in revolution.

Was it of importance that the farms then were a sort of safety valve? What amounts of people were fed on farms out here instead of participating in a soup line, or joining the ranks of the apple sellers, and the relief lines, that I saw in the city? What sort of stability did that terribly inefficient kind of farming using "too many human resources" give to the nation with inefficient production of oats and hay for horses instead of cash gas bills; inefficient use of manures instead of efficient cash fertilizers, inefficient use of home-raised fuels and food instead of efficient modern processed foods. These human instead of capital inputs were the important margin in the family's very real and desperate battle for their land. How maudlin can I get? Dr. Hardin, *soup lines were not efficient*. Ghettos to which farm migrants have gone are not efficient either, sir. There are many kinds of price tags to the nation in the technologies the farmers have adopted, among them instability.

Any national agricultural policy maker must accept the fact that if agriculture is allowed to become completely industrialized, it will then take on all the other more undesirable, unstable characteristics of industrial production. And any who argue otherwise have more blind faith in the unknown than my youngest daughter in her "tooth fairy."

Can then, a hypothesis be proved that another agriculture will not produce food and fiber in the manner to which this nation has been accustomed? Is Chet Huntley right when he said "a decision is being made, but with no profound thought given to it that

two million farmers must get off their land. . . . there is a vast social question here, too: what social advantage is there for the nation in having two million or more families living in the stable and peaceful environment of the country. . . . can our already over-taxed cities and towns endure an influx of another two million families? . . . how wise are we in liquidating two million farmers . . . ?"³⁵

Where's the research? Doesn't America have the right to know?

Hypothesis II: The new agriculture will not regard stewardship of the land in the same light as the family on the land, and there are important costs that the nation will pay in transfer of the control of the resources of the land. Oh yes, we know about the new Agro complexes being developed at Oak Ridge, and we've read of the marvels of the new sky-scraping non-land based urban food factories. We even hear of Rockefeller's Standard Oil's brave promises in mile-long factories to produce protein from oil, and there's always sea-kelp. The inventiveness of men knows no limits. An important point is missed. The promises are: incredible supplies of never-ending food. But what is the record when land resources are in the hands of the few?

To me, the earth is the Lord's is no obsolete conundrum. Shades of fundamentalism! Would be many experts' cryptic comments, here. And I would agree, when you have no historians among your experts. On a macro-scale, any civilization that regarded its soil merely as an input for *economical growth* was doomed. The Fertile Crescent; Greece's Age of Pericles after Solon's policy of specialization of fruit and wines for export was very short-lived, and Greece is a beautiful pile of rock. My husband who has stood on the ruins of Carthage, made me go to several history books to prove to him that once she was the grain bin of the Roman Empire. That doesn't prove anything? *Let's go micro.*

Certainly the land wasn't used too gently by the ever-moving westward migrant. But who ravished the land in royal and giant scale?—the forests of Minnesota and Wisconsin; the British-controlled western cattle kings; the strip-miners of the Appalachias; the factored cotton plantations of the South—our tragic South; the Henry Millers of the Sacramento River Valley. *The tools have not been the same but the name of the game has been the same, economic growth.* Specialization, vast absentee-owned or controlled tracts of land, over-development by irrigation. What terrifies me is that these considerations don't go in the policy-making computer along with your multiple or simple regression charts.

"We hear a lot today about 'underdeveloped' and 'developing nations, but these actually tend to be overdeveloped nations," wrote LaMont C. Cole, world-renowned professor of ecology at Cornell University.³⁶ In particular Mr. Cole called attention to the saline soils of Iraq, and pictured the remains of irrigation ditch complexes with their shoulders several feet above the surrounding countryside.

Changes in Nature are subtle, slow-moving. Lakes do not die overnight. Deserts grow slowly. Even earthquakes tearing the earth apart in an instant build up pressure slowly. So it is with man. The atom and all its implications of destruction were not developed overnight. Most all USDA research and cooperative research stress "toleration", "safety". In the long range how safe—how tolerable—*Do we have the research to prove it?* And farmers are the people who are using these unproved technological tools, again in that "philosophy" of technical efficiency.

Question: Will land treated only as an input, as exploitable source of wealth, then

become an exhaustible resource such as oil or minerals?

Question: Are continued, ever-increasing applications of chemicals and fertilizers in combination with each other inducing subtle, slow changes in the living organism of the earth, perhaps inducing a build-up of explosive proportions. If Rachel Carson is not a dirty word to natural scientists, why has she so consistently been written off in ag research work?

Question: Is it profitable in terms of our responsibility to future generations to exploit our exhaustible water resources in production of crops such as cotton, when this water might be desperately needed in the future?

Question: If families in the future are to be denied free access to ownership of the productive resources of the land, could our descendants, our children, find out the meaning of the Marxist siren song of the agrarian reformer "We will give you back your land."

A citizen appearing before your Nebraska Legislature Agricultural committee, just this month of April testified:

"But, in the ultimate and final confrontation between these two giants of industry (mature food production industry) and government when we finally decide *which will own and control the agricultural resources of the United States*, and the life giving product thereof, is there any question in your mind but what the Federal Government will assume title to the agricultural lands of the nation, in the name of the people, in order to guaranty ample production at fair prices. Is there any other answer?

"The successor to the corporate farm system will be a Nationalized Agriculture which will have evolved in the *name of private enterprise*, and have succumbed to government domination in the name of the people, and I dare say with the consent of the people. From this point, one can visualize a revolution, new homestead programs and the beginning of a new cycle, perhaps.

This conclusion is not new with me. It was drawn as early as 1902 by Teddy Roosevelt when he inspired the 160 acre per person limitation in the Reclamation Law of 1902. It takes considerably less mental acumen, in the light of recent history, to draw the same conclusion today. . . . *The economic justification for few and larger farms has been a favorite theme with both the academic and the corporate economists who are irrevocably wedded to the economies of scale.*" (Italic mine.)

Hypothesis III: Don Paarlberg said the people in America are in a position to choose what kind of agriculture they want (assuming a free society). *We challenge that America is in no position to make a choice.* For a balance sheet of the dollars and cents cost and returns of the two agricultures in this nation has never been run. It could be and would be a most important tool in policy making, and it must be soon. How could this balance sheet be run? (Please see section under suggestions for effective reform.)

Mr. Secretary, perhaps the term balance sheet is not quite accurate. A better word could be *dossier*. I submit that quite a dossier of public and *human costs* can be compiled against an agriculture which depends on *economic growth for legitimacy*. The economic apologists, both north and south said cotton must reign. *Economic growth demanded it*, and northern farmers had to have a market for their goods. History proved it. The profits to be accumulated for re-investment were fabulous. Just the return on the slave trade alone—the infamous Middle Passage—returned 30 percent on investment, even after death losses.³⁸

Census figures on slaves in Alabama during the years that cotton became highly industrialized showed an increase from 41,879 in 1820 to 342,844 in 1850, and this after the slave-trade was declared illegal. But in terms of *productivity* the increase in cotton pro-

duction was enough to make any statistician starry-eyed. In the years just from 1834 through 1855, cotton production rose from 469,000,000 pounds to 1,138,935,600 pounds. Just consider what the tremendous *technology* of the cotton gin made possible.³⁹ But it took the explosion of the Civil War to stop the handling of the Black man as both an input and a part of a chattel mortgage. The Civil War was only the beginning. The South had been laid waste, and only now are the costs beginning to pyramid. Andrew Heskell, chairman of the board of directors of Time, Inc., understands:

"The other, most obvious reason why cities have been unmanageable is, to put it bluntly, that in the last 15 years five million underprivileged—mostly Negroes—have been driven out of the South and into our cities. I must say it has been a great revenge for the South."⁴⁰

Am I being over-dramatic, irrational? I think not. To tell me times are different in no way erases the *indictment* against a narrow concept of *economic growth and dollar payoff* legitimizing policy which has proved deadly to our country. So far, society is picking up the costs, but shouldn't they be charged against a particular kind of farming?

Now let's check out the kind of agriculture you come from, Dr. Hardin, and I dare say, the majority of your staff and the University personnel. Here I can certainly lay the claim of being a neutral observer. Yes, gentlemen, you are the migrants from family agriculture, and the small rural communities servicing it.

Yes, I grant that you, our children that go to the city cause problems. You and they go to suburbia, and certainly suburbia is a problem. Where you are living, the costs alone of the highway transportation system and its upkeep cost about \$20-25,000 per commuter car to bring you into the central city. Our migrants are much more willing to climb over other people's bodies to get ahead by dint of hard work. Don't forget we are pushing the Black man who is qualified off the rung of the economic ladder as we begin our climb. Oh yes, the cities love our kind of migrant. And way back in the recesses of our minds, history reminds us that there was no viable Homestead Act for the Black man.

The unasked questions are the "guts" issues. In my judgment, to continue agricultural policy based only on political pressures, commodity programs and short-run projections and research, while the structure of agriculture is afire, is to apply a very small bandaid to a very traumatic wound.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REFORM

I. Convince farmers to love each other or down with the halo department. This is not as ridiculous as it sounds. Really now—let us farmers just for once, be honest with each other. Do we, as individual operators deserve to be saved? Judging our past public performance, I would second a thundering No! We have screamed much about freedom but have refused responsibility. We're too busy producing. We have not only let everyone else handle our business and marketing affairs. We've expected them to do it. So why are we screaming now that others are doing just that? We hold fast to such halos as "stalwart sons of the soil," worship a Golden Calf of "free enterprise," but reserve our competition to eliminating each other in hopes of being part of the "elite." *Even wolves do not kill their own.* Does this sound too harsh? Dr. James Bonnen can sock it to us even better:

"Like the god of antiquity Saturn, Agriculture is devouring its own."⁴¹

Many of us belong to farm groups which have become public arenas for interstate warfare rather than concern for each other's welfare.

At this Lincoln conference, for example, small groups of farm Bureau members were whispering "Boy, is this a loaded session of the noisy minority," while a noisy minority of NFO people boomed the Farm Bureau speaker. To continue in this fashion could sentence us to well-earned oblivion. Sincere FB people had better begin to loudly question the motives of those who speak for them publicly. William Sellhorsts, the spokesman for the NFO, was not presenting a mere polemic against FB membership, but an indictment of the leadership.

We have become the most irrational segment in the American society (many say we also share this in common with economists). Many proponents of industrialized farming believe America can no longer afford the luxury of this atomistic bickering and in-fighting. They point out that a mass society must have orderly production and orderly distribution. Their solution is a combination of horizontal and/or vertical integration of farming.

What's to be done? For many years, the NCRLC has been trying to bring farm leaders together, to implant the idea of federation. In main, the efforts have proved a dismal failure. In between teaching her students, Sister Thomas More, a Franciscan nun with a PhD in "Agricultural History of Farm Organizations," has been on a nation-wide circuit as she terms it. She has alternately charmed and outraged leaders and farmers with her witty message.

I have personal knowledge of, by now hundreds of thousands of miles that Monsignor Edward O'Rourke, Executive Director and Monsignor George Weber, Executive secretary of NCRLC have logged begging farmers, pleading with farmers to unify. As early as 1960, Monsignor O'Rourke wrote:

"By your fruits you will know them (Matthew 1, 16). Extreme competition leads to poverty in the midst of plenty, a crushing of honest and diligent farmers and an economy of scarcity. These are bitter fruit. Let us strike at their roots. Let us establish instead a system of cooperation, especially in the market place."⁴²

In 1962, Monsignor O'Rourke told a convention of the NFO: "Your enemy is the disunity among farmers and the unwarranted attacks which are being directed toward good organizations and good policies."⁴³ And he has never stopped.

The work of these good men and other dedicated priests goes on today, in coordination with such men as Dr. E. W. Mueller of the National Lutheran Council and other concerned Protestant pastors. This is splendid, and the work must continue, for no great reforms or changes ever seem to have come about without the active concern and leadership of the churches. Farmers have to become Christians too.

Some of us have tried to obtain research of modern needs from our educators. Bernie Camp, former director of information for the Nebraska Farm Bureau was quoted in the "Notable & Quotable" column of the *Wall Street Journal*:

"The great want of agriculture, as it has been all the time, is for knowledge of markets, and marketing techniques. Agricultural scientists long since have learned how to 'grow two blades of grass where one grew before' even more than that about production technique. . . . Had the same amount of Government effort and a fraction of the billions of tax money (spent on price support programs) been directed to marketing and price research . . . it is probable agriculture would be a long way on the road to price and market answers. . . . A few million dollars worth of research annually . . . might have speeded development of farmer and rancher controlled bargaining associations

which would have given them the muscle to bargain intelligently with distributors and processors."⁴⁴

Kenneth Hood made the point:

"Here is what I have been suggesting to Farm Bureau leaders wherever I go: 1. *Solicit the help of agricultural extension* and others in waging an aggressive, membership-wide campaign on basic economic education. This will equip our members and other farmers to appraise various marketing proposals and to work intelligently on programs they may undertake."⁴⁵

In our own state of South Dakota, a group of us drew up a hypothesis for study of the dollars and cents efficiencies of the family-structured agriculture. After an hour of explaining to us how national research policy was formulated through an interplay of interest groups, all of course democratic, we were questioned at length in our definition of "firms." Then the State Extension Director, John Stone, went to the chalk board to find out what "acreage model farm we considered should be set up to study." All communication seemed suddenly to cease for Dr. Stone didn't seem to understand why we wanted or what we wanted researched. He could only think in terms of models.

If state land-grant universities have set up schools for the training of Chamber of Commerce directors, and home-economists hold seminars for unions in knowing the dangers of debt-financing and wise credit use, cannot leadership schools be quickly brought into play to help farmers learn to cooperate with each other and build leadership and bargaining ability. Now *don't tell me that's too controversial*. Extension supported REA, very audibly, in its construction period. You could begin telling farm leadership, to learn the lesson of Aramco, and other giants of the oil industry. They built one oil line from their oilfields. It was not only efficient, but sensible. If the giants can cooperate and farmers are businessmen, then farmers can cooperate.

Even these helps are not enough. There is another technique which I will term the good healthy scare method, very useful in its way, and this leads into.

II. Political action. None of us, Dr. Hardin, can possibly fathom the stresses to which you are politically subjected, to the powerful pressure of commodity groups, the influence of every agency from the State department to the legislative cliques. But the shift in power from rural to urban areas can work both ways. City congressional leaders are fed up with the petty often mean antics of many rural congressmen who no longer represent the true interests of their rural constituencies (witness the Rat control debate in Congress).

You know you could have other "bosses". You do have Senator George McGovern you know.

You could have others such as Jacob Javits, Edward Muskie, Harold Hughes, Abraham Ribicoff, Edward Kennedy, Walter Mondale, Leonor Sullivan, William Proxmire, Philip Hart, Jeffrey Cohelan, and Don Edwards. The list is long and growing, I believe. The power structures in the South are in the process of change. Only blood will stop it. The true conservatives in Congress, I must in good faith, believe will cooperate in re-orientation programs. One even notes the recent appointment of the brilliant Allard Lowenstein of New York to the agricultural committee of the House.

Of course it will be difficult; the ancient art of horse-trading is developed to a fine art in the hallowed halls of Congress. Agricultural committees, financial committees are not made in heaven, however, but here on earth. Much *courage, patience and determination* will be necessary. But if we farmers can become Christians, swallow our sinful pride and work together, can we ask less of you educators?

Surely if Senator Ernest Hollings of South Carolina had the moral courage to enter the black hovels in Beaufort County, face the worm-filled, dull-eyed children, under the watchful eyes of national television three days running, and worse yet, face the wrath of Strom Thurmond, then it is a propitious time for your department to act.

III. Government programs. Some farm organizations maintain that they want the Government out of farming. This is rubbish. With the exception of wheat and feed grains, mainly yet in the hands of family farmers, they have consistently fought for and supported every other commodity such as tobacco, rice, sugar, and cotton. While farm programs cannot be cut out overnight, farmers should be told *loud and clear*, that they have a time limit to start running their own affairs. Temporary supports should be based on bushels with a realistic limit. This will help eliminate the distortion of government supports to the huge "factories in the field", and the many pseudo-farmers presently receiving huge subsidies and yet claiming tax-loss farming deductions.

An alternative to bushel limitation payments would be restrictions on government supports in terms of dollar payment, with a limit to each *firm*, whether family or corporate. Criticism of bushel or dollar limitation which come from the experts are not completely logical. General Motors or U.S. Steel surely limit their production and one hears no outcries such as have come from the economists who consider restricting farm production a mortal sin.

Supports, guaranteed supports, must only last for a specified number of years, until we farmers by our own efforts, the help of the government, and you educators learn to manage our own affairs.

Soil banking, which we fear, is already policy is the poorest solution of all. We've seen the Iowa studies, again based on *economic growth*; We've also seen the Meyer and Heady studies prepared for the use of the Food and Fiber Commission.

They are not pretty, are they? Permeating these studies also are those ever-recurring themes of *supply, demand, free market price*. In studying a revolutionary transfer of production areas, we see the same inclination to cling to that nostalgic model of the small atomistic firm competing in a traditional market and nowhere is economic costs to the nation in the creation of more "efficient" producing areas by tax-paid projects such as the Arkansas River project, the Mississippi Delta area, the huge investments in Arizona and California public water, plus the projected Trinity River project in Texas.

The soil banking program would sound the final death knell for the small town, real damage to the not quite so small towns, particularly in the states of the Plains, for these areas would carry a very large percentage of land retirement. The program is politically unacceptable to congressmen from these areas. And don't write off the implications of more hundreds of thousands of us migrating to the beleaguered cities.

And here's a comment on small towns, I know that many will disagree with this opinion for many small towns have made tremendous gains in their efforts to attract industries, to bring about a real viable community. But they are in the minority, the gains, based on *economic growth* only, could be temporary. In general it is my belief from living in these areas and talking with these people, it is futile for you to depend on the small communities as long as present farm policies are being continued. How can you expect a small town to bloom out in the perennial youth of economic growth, when they have no young. If you destroy one economic base before reaching it with another you remain in trouble. People in small towns know they are written off the economic

Footnotes at end of article.

map. They cannot generate hope. One might even compare the present situation with that of the Delta Negro before the national effort of the Civil Rights movement, and increased education. A people without hope do not try to save themselves or improve their position. *Such rapid innovations* as the Litton National Farmer Stores in the Midwest are shaking the thinking of small town businessmen, even our economists.

IV. Public relations of the USDA. Here, gentlemen, the key word is imagination. Take a quick look at representative USDA press releases for the week of March 7th of this year: Milk Quality Standards are Refined by New Research; Aluminum Mulches Repel Disease-Bearing Aphids; Antibiotics May Cure Serious Plant Disease; A Septic Tank for the Hog House Makes Pigs Into Good Neighbors; New Pine Gum Derivative Has Potential in Plastics Manufacture; Apollo 9 to Photograph Farms for Signs of Drouth, Disease; Three New Rabbiteye Blueberry Varieties Introduced.

Do you get the picture? One can just see UPI and AP fighting over first chance at those three new Rabbiteye Blueberries.

Nick Kotz, Homer Bigert, Richard Strout have written tremendous articles on the real action in agriculture, but they didn't get their information from the USDA Press Service. Poor press service? But it can only release what it is given to release. What a waste! And here is where you people come in!

You can coordinate hundreds of releases from the brilliant men that I've been name-dropping all over the place, if you have the courage and will to do so. It will involve deadwood removal. It means a rapid overhaul and coordination of activities, with fresh new approaches, a bringing together of state and federal activities. This is not centralization. The public has the right to know what comes from the minds of all their educators who are being paid from tax funds. Before now, the extreme fragmentation of the state and federal research efforts, and the inter-department rivalry in coordination with the concentration on production research only has prevented this public service.

V. Research orientation. No Government agency can attempt to practice supply management in the industry they serve, and at the same time orient research agencies to increasing the amount of productivity of the industry's producers. One cancels out the other. One or/both is illegitimate. Which has priority? My immediate answer is an abundant safe food supply with a safety margin. This conclusion of course means that productivity in basic foods must be assured.

Footnotes at end of article.

We go further to say, this nation has never known a shortage of basic foods, and this means before the days of team research, and hybrid corn and internal-combustion engines.

We say a free society can choose its agriculture. We repeat society is in no position to choose, for there is no research showing a rational choice between the two agricultures. Therefore a thorough revision in research priorities is in immediate order. No lip-service, but policy-making from the highest echelons of power, the President and you, Dr. Hardin, for you are in the position of power. It means choosing your advisors most carefully. They cannot be just problem solvers. This means bringing economists and others kicking and screaming the same as farmers into cooperation with fellow scientists, agronomists, land-management, sociology, ecology, political science, history, bacteriology, engineering, philosophers, and any other disciplines needed. It also means that people are consulted.

It can't be done? Ridiculous? The Marshall Plan was conceived, oriented, and put to work within one year. It was a matter of priorities!

When you see the latest edition of the *American Legion Magazine* for May 1969, with a lengthy cover story no less on *How Pure Is Our Food?* We know that more than Ralph Nader is at work, and I for one, thank the good Lord, that perhaps public outrage is beginning to wave warning flags. Now perhaps the public's right to know can be served.

To show the contemporary sorry mess of the department's research affairs, and these are only two examples:

The *Wall Street Journal* (12-29-65) published the findings of a team of Cornell cell physiologists working at Cornell, showing possible health hazards in feed irradiation to humans. When I sent for the research summaries, 2 letters were returned with insufficient address given. The other brought two articles on the teams' conclusions, both reprints of articles published in the British magazine *Nature*. Meanwhile the USDA, IBBC's (International Basic Economy Corporation-Rockefeller Family), Ward Foods, have been cooperating in feasibility studies of food irradiation. Irradiated bacon to prevent rancidity has been tested on humans, with G.I.'s the guinea pigs.

Floyd Matthew, a professor of engineering at the South Dakota School of Mines, Rapid City, has been engaged in serious study in water pollution. He has found that the 370,000 cattle on feed, in South Dakota January 1, 1967, had the equivalent pollution capabilities for water, as that of the wastes of a city of 3,700,000 people.⁶⁶ Dr. Edward Berry of South Dakota State University was engaged in the same type of work as Dr. Mat-

thew. None of the work was published to my knowledge in Extension Public service bulletins. Nor have I been able to locate Dr. Berry's work as a bacteriologist except through a private source and Dr. Berry personally. There were two small almost want-ad size writeups of Dr. Berry's work in two state farm papers that I came across.

Meanwhile USDA and cooperative extension are doing such things as cooperative research with Montfort Feed Lots in Colorado on eliminating the smell of manure, and Norris Grain has been working in efficiency feeding in feedlots with Illinois State University.

What kind of business is going on here? The USDA and Extension can help farmers with everything from the actual plans for confinement feeding to cost analyses for ever and ever increasing concentrations of animals. It takes no advanced degree to know that huge feed lots choose areas for feeding with care. One of the first requirements is good drainage, and sandy light soils with quick permeability rate high.

You see what is missing are intelligent judgments, a careful weighing of costs and returns. As Ralph Nader testified before House and Senate interns, July 12, 1967:

By far, the most unyielding obstacles to a safer environment are the old greeds and frailties in modern garb. The struggle to defend, maintain and amplify economic power and bureaucratic position goes on, as it has throughout history . . . the corporate system of partial and partisan control of information crucial to evaluation of products and risk identification cannot be reconciled with democratic control of matters that touch us all.⁶⁷

To bring about a healthy balance in research could serve much more than the public interest. With a re-orientation in research, the true scientist could regain the intellectual and real freedom which is essential to freedom in his research.

A challenging new approach is being considered more and more, that of switching control of agricultural research out of the department. The Committee on Government Operations, particularly the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, has been very active. Senator Muskie has introduced Senate Bill 78 to establish a select Commission to rule on all research. Transferring agricultural research to judgment by many disciplines would relieve self-interest group pressures on your various agencies. Emilio Daddario of Connecticut with his subcommittee of Science, Research and Development, and Senator Fred Harris of Oklahoma are also active in this field. (Harris with the Senate subcommittee on Intergovernmental government research.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR RESEARCH IN COMPILING A BALANCE SHEET—ON THE COMPARATIVE COSTS AND RETURNS IN DOLLARS AND CENTS OF TWO KINDS OF AGRICULTURE IN AMERICA

| Costs of corporate, hacienda, plantation, absentee-controlled farming, past and present | Returns | Mutual costs of both agricultures | Cost of family farming, P. & P.R. | Returns of the family farm structure, past and present |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| <p>Hired labor, cheap, much of it season or migrant. The history of Chinese, Japanese, Filipino, Hindu, Mexican, human costs—death losses of black slave, etc.</p> <p>Present local and State relief load costs of migrant workers in offseason (i.e., Los Angeles County, 40 percent of relief), New York City percentages, ADC, etc.</p> <p>A share certainly of the Civil War costs. Other sundry items such as President Cleveland's putting Army in readiness to force big cattle ranchers off Indian territory. Withering of small communities.</p> <p>The whole legacy of cotton slavery. Many universities have a wealth of material. Political economy of slavery given legitimacy in large part because it generated tremendous economic growth outside the South. No rational decision brought it to an end, only the explosion of the Civil War, much as nature's explosion of the great blizzard finally put "finis" to the Scotch, New England, and English cattle ranching in the West.</p> <p>Costs of overgrazing of ranges, salinization of soils, deforestation, land erosion from specialization of crops beginning with the huge operations in the Hudson Valley to the Sacramento Valley in California, strip mining.</p> | <p>As yet cheap food and fiber; however, in the case of highly specialized products—lettuce—produced by few—wild fluctuations in price.</p> <p>Temporary quicker accumulation of capital.</p> <p>Uncontrolled overproduction such as western cattle companies.</p> | <p>Free land or cheap land in past.</p> <p>Taxpaid research.</p> <p>Farm-to-market roads, although the costs are certainly very noticeable in geography of 2 farmings, i.e., roads in Appalachia and Deep South to those of Midwest.</p> <p>Price-support programs most chargeable to big agriculture.</p> <p>Other subsidies, SCS, soil bank, etc. Which farming has most costs in actual soil conservation—not liming, etc.</p> | <p>A citizen not conducive to a cybernetic society.¹</p> <p>Increasing soil depletion costs as farmers expand.</p> <p>A type of citizen, reluctant to cooperate, isolated in a philosophy of "rugged individualism" which will have no place in a mass society. (but will qualify statement to say this is a correctable cost, hopefully).</p> <p>Vo-Ag programs.</p> | <p>As yet cheap food and fiber.</p> <p>Millions upon millions of family farm migrants to the cities, educated and trained in rural areas. In past cities have needed them. Today, some say, cities will reproduce themselves. Perhaps in short-run outlook; long-run projection is debatable. What is the benefit to the city and Nation in a youth from rural areas ready to contribute to gross product?</p> <p>Dollars and cents values of 40 percent of all doctorate degrees coming from the heartland of America, many of them farm and rural people. Is this an accident?</p> <p>Comparison percentagewise of youth. Here mental and physical requirement tests for the armed services really can give a researcher a shocker.</p> <p>Internal generation of capital—an economic base for small decentralized communities not huddled in cities or uncontrolled suburbias.</p> |

See footnotes at end of table.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR RESEARCH IN COMPILING A BALANCE SHEET—ON THE COMPARATIVE COSTS AND RETURNS IN DOLLARS AND CENTS OF TWO KINDS OF AGRICULTURE IN AMERICA—Continued

| Costs of corporate, hacienda, plantation, absentee-controlled farming, past and present | Returns | Mutual costs of both agricultures | Cost of family farming, P. & P.R. | Returns of the family farm structure, past and present |
|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| <p>The human costs of the black migrant. Yes, it can be compiled in Watts, Newark, Detroit, etc. These people were rural migrants, from the tradition of this agriculture. Watts did cost dollars and cents.</p> <p>Retraining costs, such as Job Corps—overwhelming majority from culture of rural Appalachia or Deep South—first or second generation.</p> <p>Fast tax writeoffs on migrant housing, outright government grants. Babysitting services in migrant day-care centers for mothers in the fields, Vista, medical and dental services estimated at 33,000,000 over a period of 3 years one example.</p> <p>Land reclamation areas such as Arkansas Delta, Mississippi Delta, Arizona, Great Valley, Trinity, most benefits to big agriculture.</p> | <p>Bringing of new land into production—but is it costless?</p> | <p>Irrigation projects most chargeable to big agriculture.</p> <p>Indirect subsidies free lock usage on waterways, no tax on barge fuel (Federal), etc.</p> <p>7 percent investment tax credits, capital gains, oil depletion, most to big agriculture.</p> | | <p>Soil practices—admittedly much to be desired with increased specialization. SCS research on who is doing the terracing, stripcropping, shelter belts, good soilbuilding practices.</p> <p>Management know-how from diversified farming ability to tie things together. Very hard to tie down in dollars and cents, but very important for rational decisionmaking.</p> |

¹ Perhaps with tongue in cheek. Are any of us?

V. Industrial Research. Another part of the healthy scare technique is to have the nation know that the new agriculture will have to do all its own research. It certainly cannot expect the public to pay for it. Industry will have to pay its own production efficiency research bill. That's not quite accurate, is it? The public will still pay it in their food prices. No more unpaid family labor, no more innovation of the individual farmer. The food industry has failed miserably to carry its share of Research and Development expense. The National Science Foundation's statistics for the last available year I have—1965—showed food companies' expenditures for research as *four-tenths of one percent* of net sales, the lowest of any industry with the exception of textiles and apparel. The scholars now engaged in public-paid research should also know that the new agriculture will not be scrupulous in respecting the researcher's vaunted "neutrality."

VI. A favorable climate for farmer bargaining. Past recommendations in group bargaining and marketing orders, etc., are not the solution. Bargaining commodity by commodity in highly specialized products as fruits and vegetables might be the best solution. But the basic foods, the food and feed grains, livestock production and dairy productions are still interwoven too closely to be neatly categorized. Separating this production on the basis of commodity by commodity is part of the present trouble. Yes, there are many complex problems (i.e. substitution of cottonseed meal for soybean meal). But compromise could at least bring about the beginnings of coordination of bargaining in the basic foods. And the nation can far better keep a watch over any exploitation in bargaining done by these producers than it ever could over huge conglomerates.

The policy of one farm organization (NFO) to disposal of surplus production in overseas relief and other charities is commendable. Working through relief groups such as CROP, and Catholic, Jewish and Protestant Services, could be meaningful. The food would go to the hungry, not through other bureaucracies. Cooperation with the government in transportation costs could be shared. The farmer producing 100 bushels of corn with seven or eight percent of it not needed for domestic consumption, cash exports, if educated, would gladly give away the surplus if an equitable price were received for the 93 percent.

Research is also needed on the legal limits of farmer bargaining in his own organization. Ground-rules must be established. Can a service organization which sells inputs to farmers, also bargain for his customer's production? I think there are legal questions here.

VII. Public service programming—TV and radio.—Radio and TV stations use the public-owned airwaves. They are subject to regulation. In controversial issues, the equal-time

fair doctrine concept is a tool to consider. Dr. Harold Johnston, head of the FCC calls its use the "Law of Effective Reform." In a most interesting recent article, he gave much attention to citizen action forcing anti-smoking public service advertising, and at prime time.

Space does not permit the myriad ideas we can offer in this area. A good beginning could be made in the area of *livestock market news reporting*. The Livestock Marketing Service certainly tries to do a yeoman's service in reporting the disintegrated and decentralized marketing of livestock. However, the usefulness of much material is lessened by different cut-off dates, no efficient breakdown of available market supplies at the terminals. The important consideration however, is that the news media does not report accurately the marketing of livestock. For example, the Sioux Falls TV and radio stations, and all other noon or evening livestock reports covers only the terminals as do the Extension public broadcast service. Terminals we all know or should know handle only a fraction of the livestock slaughtered. But the livestock reporter on the Sioux Falls station is an employee of both the station and the terminal. He, repeating, only reports the terminals. USDA does report much more than this. I believe in the public interest stations could be persuaded to report accurate marketings to farmers.

VIII. A National Land and Farm policy.—If we are to choose the agricultural institution which to us seems good, then America should be asked what kind of farming she wants, and informed of the implication of her decisions. Senators and congressmen send questionnaires to their constituents. How about a question on the choice of farming. How about a highly-publicized Gallup or Roper Poll on this issue. We have polls on everything else. The cities are where the people must be reached. I do believe we can reach them and find a sympathetic hearing.

Thank you for any consideration which you might give this paper. It is an extremely lengthy one, but the structural revolution, the market revolution, the managerial revolution is a lengthy subject. We have tried our best to clarify what we feel are the issues, and to recommend reform.

"Land without population is a wilderness and Population without land is a mob!"

FOOTNOTES

¹ The author is grateful for the criticism of Vincent Rossiter, Sr. of Hartington, Nebraska. Thanks are due also to the kind help both technical and critical of Bill Leonard, editor of the *Great Plains Observer*, and the *Madison Daily Leader* of Madison, South Dakota.

² Thomas T. Stout, "Effects of Changes in Market Structure on Ownership Patterns of Wealth and on the Distribution of Income Rights and Privileges. *CAED Report* 29, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1967, pp. 360-369.

³ "Toward a Sound Family Farm Policy," *National Catholic Rural Life Conference*, 3801 Grand Avenue, Des Moines, Iowa, 50312.

⁴ Kenneth B. Boulding, *The Legitimacy of Economics*, paper presented to the 42nd annual meeting of the Western Economics Association, Colorado University, August 24, 1967.

⁵ Op. cit., Stout.

⁶ "Farmers by the Truckload," *Huron Daily Plainsman*, June 16, 1968.

⁷ Dr. Hendrick S. Houthakker, "Economic Policy for the Farm Sector," *American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research*, Washington, D.C. 20036, November 1967.

⁸ "CED Farm Program", Hearings before the *Committee on Agriculture*, House of Representatives, 87th Congress, Second Session on Farm Policy Recommendations of the Committee for Economic Development, August 6-10, 28-29, 1962. Serial MM, U.S. Gov. Printing Office, Washington: 1962.

⁹ Rudolph A. Peterson, President of Bank of America, speaking to the annual meeting of the California Canners and Growers, November 25, 1968, reported in *California Farmer Consumer Reporter*, December 1968.

¹⁰ Reprint in *Human Events*, pp. 8-9, July 31, 1965. They gave source as July Monthly Economic Letter of the First National City Bank of New York, George S. Moore.

¹¹ USDA Press Release 3345-66.

¹² George L. Mehren, *Let's Move On Together*, address, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D.C., November 16, 1966.

¹³ USDA Press Release 3908-66.

¹⁴ Excerpt from TV talk by Monsignor Louis Miller, March 1967. Actual quoting and background material for these direct quotations will be found in Note III in appendix.

¹⁵ James G. Maddox, unpublished doctoral thesis, *The Farm Security Administration*, Harvard University, 1950, addenda: in personal files also a fantastic compilation "Concerning the Farmers Union & Communism", the typical smear of the anti-anti-Communist-fighters. The book could be laughable if tactics were not so frightening.

¹⁶ Grant McConnell, *The Decline of Agrarian Democracy in the United States*, University of California Press, Berkeley, California, 1953.

¹⁷ Monsignor Louis Miller, "Family Farm, Renaissance or Oblivion," paper given at Pastor's Conference, March 29, 1967, *Church and Community Proceedings*, North Dakota State University, Fargo, N.D.

¹⁸ John H. Davis, "Policy Implications of Vertical Integration in United States Agriculture," *Journal of Farm Economics*, Volume XXXIX, No. 2, page 307.

¹⁹ Dr. Vernon Ruttan, Head of Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Minnesota, *Journal of Farm Economics*, Vol. 48, No. 5, December, 1966, p. 1115.

²⁰ Dr. Harold Breimyer, former USDA Marketing specialist, visiting professor of Economics, "Agriculture at the Crossroads,"

News From Agriculture, University of Illinois College of Agriculture News Release, July 14, 1964.

²¹ Dr. Harold F. Breimyer, professor of agricultural economics, University of Missouri, *Agriculture's Old Dilemma in New Dress*, talk given to the Missouri Farm Bureau Convention, November 14, 1967.

²² Dr. Harold F. Breimyer, speaking to livestock growers, annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Convention in Chicago, December 12, 1967.

²³ Dean Earl Butz of Purdue, *Learning to Live with Big Business*, talk given to the Illinois Agricultural Cooperatives Recognition Program, University of Illinois, Bloomington, Illinois, October 12, 1966.

²⁴ Don Paarlberg, Purdue University, *Agriculture and Rural Living in the Next Ten Years*, talk given at a Sectional Meeting on Cooperative Credit, American Institute for Cooperation, Columbia, Missouri, August 9, 1965.

²⁵ Radoje Nikolitch, "Our 100,000 Biggest Farms, Their Relative Position in Agriculture," *AER Report* 49, USDA, Washington, D.C., February, 1964.

²⁶ Wayne Nussbaum, "Current and New Financing Methods in the Feed Industry & its Effect on the Industry," *Feedstuffs*, page 7, May 6, 1961.

²⁷ Donald Danforth, "Purina Notes Integration Steps," *Feedstuffs*, Dec. 9, 1961.

²⁸ Hal Dean, "The Challenge of World Hunger," *Proceedings of the Ninth Federal Reserve District Farm Forum, Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce*, Mpls., Minn. H-H7 March 9, 1966.

²⁹ *Business Week*, December 6, 1964.

³⁰ *Wall Street Journal*, December 13, 1967.

³¹ Homer Young, "Dealer Feedlot Plan Bodes Ill for Farmers," *Farmland*, February 28, 1967.

³² Curt Matthews, "Ralston-Purina Exports Know-How to Help Build Developing Nations," feature article, *St. Louis Post Dispatch*, June 8, 1967.

³³ op. cit. Stout, CAED 29.

³⁴ Theodore Schultz, *Agriculture in an Unstable Economy* research study done for the Committee for Economic Development, McGraw-Hill, 1945, page 13.

³⁵ Chet Huntley, NBC Monitor, Weekend April 1, 1967.

³⁶ LaMont C. Cole, "Can the World be Saved?" paper presented at the 134th annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, reprinted in the *Crop Grain Quarterly*, Summer, 1968, page 6.

³⁷ Vincent Rossiter, banker of Hartington, Nebraska testifying on Bill 668 Nebraska State Legislature, April 10th, 1969. One economist dismissed him "oh him—He's read one book 'The Worldly Philosophers' and become an instant authority." He has never met Mr. Rossiter, and obviously had never seen Mr. Rossiter's well-thumbed and impressive library.

³⁸ *American Heritage*, February, 1962, page 23.

³⁹ *The Culture of Cotton*, Cotton Is King: David Christy, Derby & Jackson N.Y. 1856, 2nd Ed., cotton statistics, p. 287, slave, p. 295. A wide array of sources published at that time carry the same theme as I have expressed.

⁴⁰ Andrew Heiskell, "The City at Bay" address published in *Magazine Day*, Dec. 1967, inserted in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 114, pt. 2, p. 2201.

⁴¹ James T. Bonnen, ag. economist, Michigan State University, *Politics, Power & Performance in American Agriculture*, talk given to National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, Washington, D.C. January 18, 1966.

⁴² Monsignor Edward O'Rourke, "Cooperation of Farmers will Aid Rural Economy"—*Urges Farmers to Try Collective Bargaining*, *Catholic Messenger*, Davenport, Iowa, December 29, 1960.

⁴³ Monsignor Edward O'Rourke, talk given

to the 1962 Convention of the NFO, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, December 12, 1962.

⁴⁴ *Wall Street Journal*, July 19, 1967, page 1.

⁴⁵ Kenneth Hood, Director of the American Agricultural Marketing Association, "Competition in Food Marketing," paper presented at conference at *Agricultural Policy Institute* P.O. Box 5368 North Carolina State University, Raleigh, 27607, May 1967.

⁴⁶ Floyd Matthew, professor of engineering, S.D. School of Mines, report on water pollution in South Dakota, Part I. *Sources of Pollution*.

⁴⁷ Insertion by Senator Bartlett of Alaska (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 113, pt. 14, p. 18497).

APPENDIX—NOTES

NOTE I

Background of Hendrick Houthakker

Born in Holland—educated in Europe.

Area of inquiry: Price theory—economic policy.

Books: "Analysis of Family Budgets"; "Review Preference and the Utility Function"; "Capacity Method of Quadratic Programming."

Testing the claim that the CED does not bring out, or participate in, methods of legislation. Sifting out the more than 1500 sources much of it CED policy statements, is impossible. Perhaps the best direct example of CED influencing legislation is the following:

Congress, in 1953, authorized the creation of a temporary Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (the Kestnbaum Commission), composed of members from both the Senate, together with persons appointed by the President, to make a thorough study of Federal-State relations. In its report, the Commission concluded that the "proper functioning of the federal system requires that concerted attention be given to interlevel relationships" and recommended the establishment of a permanent center for this purpose.

No action was taken on these proposals of the Hoover and Kestnbaum Commissions.

In 1956, the House Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee undertook an intensive study of Federal-State-local relations for the purpose of evaluating the 1955 Kestnbaum Commission report. . . . It is noteworthy that the Kestnbaum Commission's comprehensive 2-year study of intergovernmental relations was the first such official undertaking since the Constitutional Convention in 1787. . . .

Amid many hearings on several bills to set up an Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, H.R. 6905, H.R. 6904, S. 2026, final action:

Joint hearings were held. . . . H.R. 6904 was subsequently passed by the House and Senate and approved by the President as Public Law 86-380 on September 24, 1959.¹

One could fill up two more legal sized pages with the recommendations of this Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. But it is not "looking for deep dark plots" but facts that M-35, a nice fat volume entitled "1968 State Legislative Program of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations" is a compilation of recommended legislation for the 50 states, of neatly drawn up legislation with a blank left for a bill number, and the recommendations cover the methods of everything from Local Fiscal Powers, state tax concessions for New Industry, (policy statement only), standards for local governments, control of Urban water supplies, but in particular all facets involved in Metropolitan, region, Local planning, and government by commissions.

¹ 27th Report by the Committee on Government Operations April 28, 1966, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations: the First Five Years: House Rept. Number 1457, April 28, 1966.

So we have a nation concerned with planning for the people's good. Fine, we're all for it. However, we do want to know the orientation of the planning. Don't we have a right to know.

Mr. Yntema said CED did not lobby or influence legislation. Perhaps he is correct in a sense. CED goes much further. They become a part of the planning.

Meyer Kestnbaum takes over—CED in new era of influence, reads page 104 of *Business Week*, page 104, January 24, 1953.

Meyer Kestnbaum, president of Hart Schaffner & Marx, this week took over as the fourth chairman the Committee for Economic Development has had in its 10-year history. Kestnbaum had served nearly three years as chairman of CED's principal working group, the Research & Policy Committee. Before that, he had been a member of this committee for two years. So he's no newcomer to leadership of CED.

Continuing CED's "New Era of Influence": This continuity of management of CED—by the businessmen who belong to it, as distinct from its paid staff—is a big reason why CED has risen to high esteem and influence in national policy-making since 1942. . . .

CED's financial support comes from industry as a whole. . . . CED works on the premise that "What's good for the country is good for business". . . .

When a study is finished, the report is analyzed by members of the full committee who alone can submit memoranda, comment or dissent. . . . The theory behind this rule: Businessmen are qualified to pass judgment on the results of basic economic research.

The article writes of the impact of CED influence in the Marshall Plan:

. . . a deadlock in 1948 between Congress and the State Dept. over how the Marshall Plan should be implemented. A CED policy statement, an American Program for European Economic Cooperation suggested middle ground that was accepted happily by both sides. Paul Hoffman, was still chairman of CED, was selected to head the resulting Economic Cooperation Administration.

Mr. Yntema might choose to call CED's activities education. I choose to call it power. Mine is not a mathematical equation. It reads as follows:

CED (Meyer Kestnbaum) + Kestnbaum Report = ACIR (economics planning, based on economic progress and growth).

NOTE II

While preparing this paper, I received in the mail, an excellently-written paper by a British economist, Dr. E. F. Schumacher, economic advisor National Coal Board of England. The address was a Des Voeux Memorial Lecture, *Clean Air and Future Energy*, presented to the National Society for Clean Air's annual conference 1967, Blackpool England. Dr. Schumacher's qualifications: Rhodes scholar at Oxford, repeatedly called upon to act as Economic Adviser to Governments and planning commissions in developing nations such as Burma and India "convinced him that aid and development policies need to be given a new slant as they tend to by-pass those most in need—the people in the rural areas." He describes himself as an economist "concerned with people rather than goods."

I enclose his material because he says so much better than what I tried to convey:

"Going back into history we may recall that when there was talk about founding a professorship for political economy at Oxford some 150 years ago, many people were by no means happy about the prospect. Edward Copleston, the great Provost of Oriol College, did not want to admit into the University's curriculum a science "so prone to usurp the rest"; even Henry Drummond Esq. of Albury Park who endowed the professorship in 1825, felt it necessary to make clear that he expected the University to keep the new study "in its proper place". (Dr. Schumacher lists

quote source as Dwight Culler's "The Imperial Intellect." Yale U. Press, p. 250, 1955).

The first professor, Nassau Senior, was certainly not to be kept in an inferior place. Immediately, in his inaugural lecture, he predicted that the new science "will rank in public estimation among the first of moral sciences in interest and in utility" and claimed that "the pursuit of wealth . . . is, to the mass of mankind, the great source of moral improvement". (source—John Stuart Mill autobiography, 1924 ed, p. 165).

Here I think relevant to add to Dr. Schumacher's comments on Nassau Senior. I quote from Cecil Woodham-Smith's masterful study of the Irish Potato famine, *The Great Hunger*: "I have always felt a certain horror of political economists," said Benjamin Jowett, the celebrated Master of Balliol, "since I heard one of them say that he feared the famine of 1848 in Ireland would not kill more than a million people, and that would scarcely be enough to do much good." The political economist in question was Nassau Senior, one of the Government's advisers on economic affairs.**

Dr. Schumacher continued:

And the great John Maynard Keynes, some 80 years later, admonished us not to "overestimate the importance of the economic problem, or sacrifice to its supposed necessities other matters of greater and more permanent significance". (source here: Keynes, *Essays in Persuasion*, London 1933, p. 373).

. . . It is hardly an exaggeration to say that, with increasing affluence, economics has moved into the very centre of public concern, and economic performance, economic growth, economic expansion, and so forth have become the abiding interest, if not the obsession, of all modern societies. In the current vocabulary of condemnation there are few words as final and conclusive as the word "uneconomic". If an activity has been branded as uneconomic, its right to existence is not merely questioned but energetically denied. Anything that is found to be an impediment to economic growth is a shameful thing, and if people cling to it, they are thought of as either saboteurs or fools. Call a thing immoral or ugly, soul-destroying or a degradation of man, a peril to the peace of the world or to the well-being of future generations; as long as you have not shown it to be "uneconomic" you have not really questioned its right to exist, grow and prosper.

. . . I am asking what it means, *what sort of meaning the method of economics actually produces*. And the answer to this question cannot be in doubt: something is uneconomic when it fails to earn an adequate profit in terms of money. The method of economics does not, and cannot, produce any other meaning. Numerous attempts have been made to obscure this fact, and they have caused a very great deal of confusion; but the fact remains, Society, or a group or individual within society, may decide to hang on to an activity or asset for *non-economic reasons*—social, aesthetic, moral or political. . . . The judgment of economics, in other words, is an extremely *fragmentary* judgment.

. . . Even within the narrow compass of the economic calculus, these judgments are necessarily and *methodically* narrow. For one thing they give vastly more weight to the short than to the long term . . . and then, secondly, they are based on a definition of cost which excludes all "free goods", that is to say, the entire God-given environment, except for those parts of it that have been privately appropriated. This means that *an activity can be economic although it plays hell with the environment*, and that a com-

peting activity, if at some cost it protects and conserves the environment, will be uneconomic.

Economics, moreover, deals with goods in accordance with their market value and not in accord with what they really are . . . among primary good no distinction is made between renewable and non-renewable goods. . . .

We teach our children that science and technology are the instruments for man's battle with nature, but forget to warn them that, being himself a part of nature, man could easily be on the losing side. . . .

Something like an explosion has to occur before warning voices are listened to, the voices of people who had been ridiculed for years and years as nostalgic, reactionary, unpractical and starry-eyed.

The religion of economics . . . promotes an idolatry of rapid change, . . . the burden of proof is placed on those who take the "ecological viewpoint". . . .

You know, Dr. Hardin, the sad thing about Dr. Schumacher's paper is that it came from the Anti-Pollution League of the Connecticut River Valley, Brattleboro, Vermont. Citizens, at their own expense, have to do battle with their own-tax-supported Big Education—to publish the truths society has a right to. And we are further insulted by picked up the price-tag of the CED's power in the prices of their goods and services. CED is tax-exempt too.

James Kuhn wrote: "Advocacy of the market ethic is understandable, and insofar as it contributes to the continuous debate of public interest, it is desirable; but apotheosis of the market is dangerous and idolatrous. In suggesting that the competitive market was an institution of nature, guided by an invisible hand, Adam Smith provided his later disciples with the rationalization that it was the direct creation of God—a holy instrument for fulfilling His purposes. They forgot that men had created the market, and in raising it high, had fashioned a Golden Calf. They alienated themselves from the fulfillment of Smith's hope, which was that the free market would bring an increase in the wealth of the nation; and in turn the market alienated them from each other and their fellow men who bore the market's injustice.

James Kuhn, "What's Wrong With the Old Business Ethic," *Catholic Mind*, March 1965, reprinted from the Columbia University Forum. Mr. Kuhn was associate professor of industrial relations, Graduate School of Business, Columbia.

References for Father Miller's Talks—Background Material.

Coke, Earl J., "Farmers Issue Stock? Ag Ready for New Role, 11th Annual Conference in Research sponsored by Chas. Pfizer & Co., Chicago; talk given to 300 agricultural scientists, business leaders, etc., *Drovers Telegram*, May 29, 1963, p. 5.

Davis, John W., "Next Twenty-Five Years in Agriculture," *Journal of Farm Economics*, Vol. XXXIV, May 1957, pp. 5-57 and Ray A. Goldberg, *A Concept of Agribusiness*.

Downey, Senator Sheridan, *They Would Rule the Valley*, San Francisco, 1947. No publisher is given. Author paid continual tribute to "rugged individualists" such as Kern County Land Company, DiGiorgio Company. This book brings out the real battle at that time—abolishing the 160 acre limitation on public water. Mr. Downey spared little in dragging both the BAE and the Bureau of Reclamation over the coals and back again, with particular fury for Mr. Goldschmidt. Innuendos, warnings, with hints of mysterious leadership in the BAE, and CIO's intervention to destroy "free enterprise" in the Valley. A must if you wish to understand the role of raw power in agricultural policy.

Goldschmidt, Walter, *As You Sow*, Harcourt, Brace and Company, N.Y., 1947, Mr. Goldschmidt here goes into detail in his

studies of the communities of Arvin, Dinuba, and Wasco, California.

Hardin, Charles M., "The Bureau of Agricultural Economics Under Fire: A Study in Valuation Conflicts," *Journal of Farm Economics*, Volume XXIII, August, 1946. No. 3, pp. 635-658. Here Mr. Hardin covers much of the disastrous career of the FSA, but he also goes into the conflict of Land Use Planning; the role of the Farm Bureau, etc.

The Politics of Agriculture, Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1952, 282 pages. Mr. Hardin here discusses in length the trials and tribulations of USDA, State colleges and Extension and other power groups getting along with each other.

"Food and Fiber in the Nation's Politics," Volume III, Technical papers, *National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber*, August, 1967.

Kirkendall, Richard, "Social Scientists and Farm Politics in the Age of Roosevelt," *University of Missouri Press*, 1966. A most excellent source Dr. Kirkendall's book is an expansion of a history doctorate; the bibliography is most excellent, for anyone wishing to gain an intelligent understanding of the agricultural revolution.

McConnell Grant, *Decline of Agrarian Democracy in the United States*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1953. Originally this book was recommended to me by Solon Kimball of Columbia University. He sent a review of it from a National Council of Churches bulletin. The bibliography I found excellent for further research, particularly the FB, Everett Dirksen, and the Congressional Hearings.

Wells, O. V., J. D. Black, et al. P. H. Appleby, Henry C. Taylor, H. R. Tolley, R. J. Penn, and T. W. Schultz, "The Fragmentation of the BAE"—*Journal of Farm Economics*, Vol. XXXVI, Feb. 1954, no. 1, pp. 1-22. From this paper come all direct quotations of Msgr. Miller on the re-organization of USDA.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR COTTON IN EXECUTIVE SESSION ON TUESDAY NEXT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, with respect to the order which has been previously granted, under which the able senior Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. Cotton) will be recognized on Tuesday next immediately following the prayer and the disposition of the reading of the Journal, that debate of 2½ hours should be in executive session. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be in executive session.

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of 42 United States Code 2251, the Speaker had appointed Mrs. MAY of Washington as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 689, 84th Congress,

* Cecil Woodham-Smith, *The Great Hunger*, Signet Edition, Harper & Row, 1964, page 373. Here I am grateful for Mr. Rossiter's pointing out the economist's attitude at that time.

as amended, the Speaker had appointed Mr. DEVINE, of Ohio, as a member of that U.S. Group of the North Atlantic Assembly, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

The message announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 12964) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, 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. 12964) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, 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.

AUTHORIZATION FOR 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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which 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.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, it is very clear that we have had a wholesome debate on the pending bill and on several of its main features, but more particularly on an item that has become known as the ABM.

There have been presentations from the technical and scientific viewpoint, debates from the international and political viewpoint and the situation with reference to the timing, research, and development end of the minor part of the initial beginning of the deployment work.

I think that both sides have been presented in excellent fashion. We had an unusually fine discussion in the closed

session, which had to be held because of some very sensitive information.

I think there has been no contest here as to time. Everyone has had as much time as he wished to take, even though I know that properly some of us want to speak and maybe some who have already spoken will address themselves to another aspect of the matter.

I frankly think that the subject matter has certainly passed a stage where we ought to consider, if at all possible—and I believe it is possible—having a vote on the pending amendment, which is the Cooper-Hart amendment.

And in a full and wholesome spirit and wanting everyone to have a chance to say everything he wishes, after conference with the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Texas and others, I want to express a very strong hope that we can begin to dispose of the matter. I want them to respond if they will as to how they feel about the matter.

I do not know that we can dispose of the matter without giving prior notice. We should not just try to get an agreement now. And that is not my purpose. However, certainly we can bring the matter up at the next session of the Senate and perhaps then make a proposal and agree upon it.

I think there ought to be at least 48-hours notice in advance of an exact time to vote.

The Cooper-Hart amendment presents the whole issue in one bite.

There has to be notice and there has to be time for debate and we have to allow for the crowded airports and skyways. That is the sentiment of those of us who have a special responsibility here in connection with the pending bill.

I will be glad to yield to the Senator from Kentucky or the Senator from Michigan, or they may have the floor in their own right if they would rather do that.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I am sure the Senator from Michigan will also respond.

I have discussed the matter several times with the Senator from Mississippi and, of course, the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) and I have talked about it many, many times.

This is the third week of the debate. We considered that during the first week the Senator from Mississippi, as the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, would present the bill and discuss various sections, including the ABM. And, of course, that was done during the first week.

The Senator from Michigan and I intended to offer our amendment and ask that it be made the pending business last week. However, I think it was clearly understood that last week would not be satisfactory for the serious discussion of the amendment or any part of the bill. While it was a great week for the Nation and the world because of the moon landing, many were away, there was a holiday on Monday and with the closed session there was little time for debate.

On Wednesday, the Senator from Michigan called up the amendment and, on his motion, it was made the pending business.

It is my position—and while the Senator from Michigan will speak for himself, I think that he agrees with me—that we should proceed expeditiously to a vote.

Many Senators are interested in the amendment. They should have the opportunity to be present in the Senate at the time we discuss the time for a vote.

I agree with the suggestion that has been made, which, as a result of the discussion here today, will appear in the printed RECORD. It is to announce that on next Monday there will be a discussion on the floor as to a definite date to vote. Everyone will be notified and advised to be present and make their position clear.

I can say for myself I wish we would proceed as expeditiously as is possible to a vote.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I certainly thank the Senator. I know that has been his sentiment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the able Senator from Kentucky has expressed, I think, fully the attitude which is mine with respect to assuring first that everyone who has an interest in this amendment, on either side of it, be given the opportunity to voice it; that the vote be established at a time sufficiently in advance to insure that anyone with travel problems or scheduled commitments will be able to be present.

I concur in the suggestion made by the Senator from Kentucky, that with this exchange in the RECORD today, we plan on Monday next to develop further the discussion, and at that time any Senator on either side of the amendment, who has a problem, a concern, or a suggestion be here to voice it. I think that all of us then will feel clear in our consciences that everyone has had an opportunity, and the Senate will have the benefit fully of the opinions of any of its Members on this subject before we proceed to fix a date.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

As has been true with respect to the Senator from Kentucky all along, the Senator from Michigan has taken the high road, has given the utmost cooperation, and has given the utmost consideration to every Senator, regardless of which side he is on, to have full time for discussion.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the distinguished Senator.

I believe we are probably all in concurrence. There seems to be no disposition on the part of anybody to engage in any dilatory moves or debate.

The Senator from Kentucky just suggested that perhaps we sort of informally agree on something like 3 o'clock Monday afternoon to discuss this matter, which will give anyone out of town a chance to return, and we can work it out to everyone's satisfaction.

Perhaps we can get a line on how many

Senators have additional remarks to make. Considering that, we perhaps can arrive at a time certain for the vote.

Speaking for those whose views I express, we are ready to discuss it Monday afternoon. I think that is eminently fair, and I think the Senate is adequately on notice that that is what we are going to do on Monday.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Texas.

I think this reflects an attitude that we should not let a staleness develop about this matter. No Senator wants to do that. I believe that if we go on much longer, it will become stale. It will be stale with the Senators; it will be stale with the public. The matter is fully understood.

With the allowance of this time, everyone will have notice that there will be a request; and then with the allowance of more time for discussion, the outlook for proceeding is very good.

I think we should state that this has been mentioned to the majority leader and the minority leader, and they like the idea of proceeding as expeditiously as possible to a vote.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator from Texas has just said that we should fix the time certain as 3 o'clock on Monday afternoon and ask unanimous consent at that time that time be given for discussion.

Mr. STENNIS. I think that is a good suggestion. I want to agree to it, subject to this possible adjustment: The Senator from Mississippi has mentioned 48 hours as a minimum time of notice—that is, the lapse of time between the time of the actual agreement and the time of voting. If we set it for 3 p.m. and we have a good deal of discussion, that would run into late afternoon. Would it be just as well to say we will begin that discussion at 1 o'clock on Monday, with the idea that if we could conclude the discussion about a date within an hour or two, perhaps then a vote could be agreed upon for Wednesday? If we do not, it will take it into Thursday, and the week will be nearly gone.

What is the response to that? Is there any particular reason why the Senator wants 3 o'clock?

Mr. TOWER. It seems to me that we could go ahead and proceed at 1 o'clock, if everybody's interest is protected, and we could postpone the discussion to later on. I would be willing to set a time later in the afternoon. One o'clock sounds all right to me. I think we can all agree to protect everyone's interests, if someone cannot get here for the discussion at that time.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky. He may have a special reason.

Mr. COOPER. I think a time certain should be set. The Senator from Texas (Mr. Tower) suggested 3 o'clock, so that anyone who might be away could get back in time.

I have stated my position. I believe we

should move forward as quickly as we can and come to a vote. But I cannot speak for others who are interested in this amendment, either for it or against it.

I do know—I must be very frank—of a situation which I would think would postpone the vote until after Wednesday; because I understand that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE) is to hold a hearing on this subject on Wednesday morning. He has not spoken to me, but I have this information, and if that is correct, I would assume that he would object to any vote until after that time. I have stated the position as well as I can, and my own position.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Kentucky has been very earnest and concerned about this matter all the way through, as has the Senator from Michigan and others.

I am pleased that we can set Monday for a genuine discussion of this matter, and give notice, so that everyone who wishes to can be present.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I just entered the Chamber. I did not hear the discussion.

Mr. STENNIS. We just started an around-the-floor discussion of the prospects for getting an agreement on a vote on the Cooper-Hart amendment. We were not asking for any agreement now. We were going to give notice that on Monday this matter would be brought up and a request made for some agreement as to voting. Certainly, we would not even request it with less than 48 hours elapsing before the agreement was reached, in order to provide travel time and speaking time. Among ourselves, it seems agreeable to have this discussion on Monday and to proceed as I have said.

Mr. COOPER. May I add to that?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator from Mississippi, the Senator from Texas, and I were discussing providing means for all Senators interested to be present at a time which is known, and we have agreed upon Monday—I am not sure whether we have agreed upon the hour as yet—when we will discuss the issue of trying to agree upon a time to vote.

I have stated, and so has the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) that our position is that we should proceed as expeditiously as we can toward a vote. I have made it clear that I do not speak for others who are interested in this matter, and I have just said that I have been informed that the Senator from Tennessee plans to secure further information at a hearing; and I would assume from that that he would not consent to vote before that hearing is held.

Mr. TOWER. All we are doing now is talking about agreeing on a time to talk about a time to vote.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I see.

Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am very glad to have that information. I, too, am thinking of a hearing and trying to set up a hearing for Monday.

Just yesterday, a man who I think is well informed about the matters of com-

munication told me that he believes with respect to the national communications systems—and he is well informed—that the effect of radiation upon radars, upon electrical communications, is very significant in this debate and it is a matter we overlooked. I do not believe the subcommittee heard much of anything on that subject. But to give an illustration of the immense importance of it, in order to overcome or destroy the effectiveness of an ABM, all you have to do, Mr. President, is to send over one precursor weapon, as he calls it, explode it well above the radars and it would nullify and throw out of communication for 30 minutes to 2 hours the effectiveness of the radars, and during that time they could do anything they like.

I understand it is a slight effort, and it could be overcome. The Russians have discovered this and have withheld going along and building their ABM. The CIA has reported in secret session—I do not think it is secret, because this has been publicly stated—that the Soviets have held up proceeding with the deployment of their ABM. Anyway, it is an interesting further item about the effectiveness of it.

No one is alleging, as has been said here, that the ABM will not work. No one is saying an ABM could not be created that would work under normal conditions. The day before yesterday the Senator from Arizona asked, "How can anyone question our ability to build an ABM after what we have seen on the moon?" It seems to me that is totally irrelevant. As a matter of fact, if the Russians or anyone else cared to interrupt the moon shot with very slight interference electrically, they could have done it, because it is not possible to interdict electrical interference. We heard a good deal about that in the hearings on the Vietnam war.

There are items I would like to go into. What I would like to suggest to the Senator from Mississippi, for that reason and other reasons, is that we arrange to call up other amendments on this same bill. I have some amendments and I know other Senators have amendments; and we could defer the vote on this one—which has been discussed quite well, although new facts are coming up—until after the President returns.

I say that for the following reasons. I think it might be unwise and inappropriate, with the President out of the country, and more particularly behind the Iron Curtain, as has been said here—I understand he will be there next week—to take action on a matter in which he has involved himself, as in this matter. He has taken no position on a number of other matters. I do not think he has taken a position on some of the matters I have in mind, such as research projects, which have been discussed superficially on the floor. There are amendments which I think the Senator from Wisconsin is going to submit in which the President is not involved. He certainly is not directly involved in them and has not taken a position.

I think it would be bad policy to bring up a measure he is interested in and vote on it while he is abroad. He is due back on the 3d of August, as I understand.

I recommend to the Senator from Mississippi that, if there is the urge to go on with this measure, we discuss and vote on other amendments, reserving the vote on this amendment, which is the most important of all the amendments, until after the President returns.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I can say with certainty that the administration would not mind if we voted while the President is absent from the country. I do not think the administration has objection to our voting perhaps in the middle of next week. All we are saying is that now we would like to set a time to discuss this matter and put Members of the Senate on notice. We are not making a decision on voting. At that time the Senator from Arkansas can come up with whatever suggestion he wishes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was not making my suggestion simply to please the President. He has expressed himself on the ABM positively. It is a matter in which he is interested.

I can hear them now. Some of the proponents would say, "What a dreadful thing; pulling the rug out from under the President while he is in Rumania fighting communism," and so forth. This is the situation I do not wish to face. I was not trying to put it off on the President. It is my judgment it is bad policy to vote on this kind of an amendment while he is in Rumania. I would not agree to vote on it while he is there. On the other hand I am willing to discuss and vote on a number of other amendments I am interested in before that time, if the Senator from Mississippi is willing.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, this concern about the President is all news to me. It is totally new. The President knew the bill was pending. The President did not ask that it be deferred. I never heard of anyone—the Senator from Arkansas or anyone else—advising the President not to go or to hurry back, nor was anything said about deferring it until he got back, until after he was gone.

I just do not see the logic or reason or anything connected with it except that it seems to jar the opposition a little here just to suggest that the President is interested in this matter; and it does affect his position in this conference. That is a part of the picture here. There is nothing to be said with him here or gone that can change that. It is simply a part of the facts of life.

Mr. President, I wish to point out further that I do not have any particular personal choice in this matter. However, this is the 25th day of July and this bill has been under consideration by the committee and the Senate itself since a very few days after the inauguration in January. It contains all of the hardware for the military system for the fiscal year that started 3 weeks ago on July 1, 1969. We are already in the new fiscal year. This is merely an authorization bill, ordinarily contemplated to be passed by March or April. It is for the ships, submarines, airplanes, research and development, the missiles, and everything in the way of hardware.

I know from experience it is highly important that this matter be completed as soon as reasonably possible. No one is more in sympathy than I am with the procedure that everyone should have his say and get the facts. But the hearings on this subject have been going on in the Committee on Foreign Relations for about as long as we had the matter in the Committee on Armed Services. So if there are any real new facts to be developed, they could be developed in a few days as well as in a few months. I do not think there are many new facts to be developed unless it is something really new.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I shall yield in just a moment.

I think the bill should move along. We have lost a lot of time. I blame myself for not getting the bill here earlier, but there were requests for delay back then and they were legitimate requests. Everything is held up now, the whole program. I hope the bill will move along.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to make two comments. First, the President did not ask me about the advisability of making the trip. If he had I would have given it, but it would have been presumptuous for me to have given advice otherwise. That trip is his own idea. I did not have any opportunity to do so.

I wish to ask the Senator whether his committee at any time took testimony with regard to the effect upon the communications between the radars and the computers, and between the computers and the missiles. What is the effect of nuclear radiation upon such communications?

Mr. STENNIS. That is a form of jamming—what is ordinarily called jamming of one kind or another. I am sure that the matter has been fully gone into by scientists for both sides and by others who have to pass on the practical side of these matters. I know that they testified there were no problems that could not be overcome. This has to be worked out as they have to work out matters regarding Polaris and others. Yes, I think that matter is fully taken care of.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have seen no testimony. I was told no later than yesterday that there has been no testimony of the effect of radiation upon the system because, of course, this is a difficult thing to do. Under the test ban treaty, it is not easy to conduct a nuclear explosion in the air to test its effect upon communications. That is what was pointed out to me yesterday.

Frankly, I never thought of that. As the Senator knows, this was an aspect of it that had not occurred to me but, obviously, it is rather difficult to test the effect upon a missile or upon a system such as the ABM of a nuclear test in the atmosphere where that explosion will take place.

I was only asking: Has the Committee on Armed Services ever had any testimony on this question?

Mr. STENNIS. I am sure I definitely remember testimony about the possibilities, all the possibilities of jamming, and the working of the computers and the radars and all the rest of it. I cannot

put my finger momentarily on testimony directed to that point.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I want to ask the Senator whether he would be good enough to ask his staff to locate such testimony and submit it to me by next Monday or Tuesday, whenever it is convenient. I will be very much interested in seeing it, to check whether the advice I was given is true.

But that is only one aspect of it. The main point that I wish to make, and I again ask the Senator to consider it, at least between now and Monday, if he is interested in promoting or pushing the bill through to enactment—and I certainly do not wish to delay it—why we cannot take up other amendments and make that much headway and get them disposed of? They should not take nearly so much argument because many are simple amendments in their purpose, as the Senator knows. He and I discussed these same things last year. We already had some communication with the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. McINTYRE) earlier this session.

My own amendments will take me only 10, 15, or perhaps 30 minutes, so that we could dispose of some of them and get rid of a number of other amendments before the major one. I think the Senator will agree that the No. 1 amendment in significance is initiation of deployment of the ABM.

Mr. STENNIS. I do not know about that suggestion, so far as the authors of the amendment are concerned, that it be taken down, but even if it were, we have debated this question now into its third week and my opinion is based upon experience that if we take away or take off and leave the main issue alone, and abandon this part of the debate, we will have to go all through the debate again.

It will be almost like a new subject when it comes up again. I think that it would make the Senate look rather silly to spend 3 weeks and then abandon that part of the debate without some very substantial reason and then go over and go to talking about some experiments without any specifics somewhere on behavioral sciences or a subject of that kind which has little or nothing to do in a substantial way, that is, with our military program. I think the Senator is capable of making a decision now and we should proceed on this.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I beg to differ with the Senator. I have been in the Senate 25 years now and this is the first time in those 25 years that there has been a serious debate upon an important item in the defense budget. I believe the Senator from Mississippi agreed with me the other day that this is the first time the Senate has undertaken to examine, and in a way to exert influence on a decision of this kind. I am not sure whether it has been 2 or 3 weeks, but I do not believe that is very long. I can remember that the Senator and I have taken much longer than that on other issues of a domestic nature which we thought were important, for the sole reason of informing the public.

The Senator and I have joined in an effort to enlighten the public on certain subjects in which we were interested. Very often we performed a public serv-

ice in that connection. That is what the Senate is for. I think this issue of whether the Senate is to have any real influence in decisions on a department of this Government, a bureaucracy which absorbs nearly one-half of the total budget, is equally important. It is so important that it would certainly justify 2 or 3 weeks or whatever length of time the Senator just said that we have spent on it. In other words, the ABM is an important matter. The other items are of much less importance.

I do not believe that we would revert back to the beginning at all. We can lay it aside pending the final hearings, but most important, I think it would be bad policy to vote on the ABM issue at this time.

For example, suppose the vote should go against the President—which I hope it will and I will do everything I can to make it go against the President—it would be embarrassing for the President to be in Rumania and have the headlines read that one of the major proposals of the President of the United States had been rejected by the Senate. I would not like that to happen while he was abroad.

When I am abroad, I am very careful in what I say about our internal politics. I try never to say anything that is even critical of our own policy when I am abroad.

It is a different situation, and I am sure it would embarrass the President if the Senate should vote to assert its prerogatives of giving advice and of approving or disapproving a matter of this importance while the President is in Rumania.

I do not believe we should do that. I still think that the Senate has enough respect for its own functions. I think there are enough Senators who think that the Senate is sufficiently important that it should play a role in the balance of our Government, that we should not be completely under the control of the military bureaucracy of our Government.

Really, that is what the ABM is a symbol of; namely, whether the Senate has got enough independence from the influence of the great manufacturers of this country, the great industrial enterprises, and the military bureaucracy. Whether we have it, I do not know. I think we have. I think that Senators do have such pride and such feeling of responsibility in being Senators that they will assert their right to play a role in the Government of the United States.

I have been extremely impressed by the outspoken position of the new Senators in this body, men who have just been elected, who are closer, I would say, then I am to the pulse of the electorate as to what is going on, because they were elected for the first time. It is remarkable how interested they are in being Senators and not stooges of the military.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Will he yield right there?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield right there. I withdraw the word "stooge." I overspoke myself. I did not mean that in the way the Senator may think.

Mr. STENNIS. I do not think the Senator can withdraw an insult unless he apologizes for it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I apologize for us-

ing the word "stooge." I overspoke myself.

Mr. STENNIS. I am proud of the Senator. I believed he would, as a gentleman.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was overspeaking myself, but I will try, in a moment, to be more precise as to what I intended to say, if the Senator will allow me.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. I accept the apology of the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I apologize for using the word, although I did not use it as applying to the Senator from Mississippi. I used it in the negative. I said they did not wish to become.

What I have been trying to say is that for 25 years the Senate has never challenged what the Military Establishment has asked for, to my knowledge, of any consequence. Perhaps it has on something little. The usual challenge was, "Look, you ought to have more planes. You have asked for 1,000. You ought to have 2,000."

This is not just because of the military. We all know the country we have. Each industrial State has great enterprises that employ thousands of people whose jobs are dependent upon those programs. There is no secret about it.

In the State of Washington, what is the biggest employer? Boeing Aircraft. In the State of Missouri, what is the biggest single employer, with 50,000 workmen? That means 50,000 votes. It is McDonnell Aircraft.

I do not need to call the roll. From General Electric, from Bell Telephone, it is all over the country. It is the kind of country we have. We are proud of it. It is effective. It is a very productive economy. I am not criticizing it. I am calling attention to it.

We are elected, are we not? All of us got here by getting more votes than our opponents. That is what I mean. The word "stooge" is not the right word. I was just shortcutting. What I was trying to say was that what President Eisenhower referred to as the military-industrial complex has a tremendous influence in this country. The Senator from Mississippi really does not challenge that.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; I will challenge it at the right time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That it has a great influence?

Mr. STENNIS. I will challenge the Senator's whole remarks when the Senator has concluded.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Look at the advertisements in the newspapers. Look at the books being published—two books within a week, one by the great Hudson Institute. What is the Hudson Institute? Well, it is an institute created by the Pentagon, supported by millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money that goes into the Hudson Institute that subsidizes Mr. Herman Kahn and his associates. They write books which invariably support the major issues in which the Pentagon is interested.

That is a fact of life.

We have the Institute of Defense Analyses. We have a hundred other "think tanks." We have the Rand Corp. These are supported primarily either by the Pentagon or by big industrial enterprises or through contracts made by such companies. I am not referring to a

particular company with a particular "think tank," but, in general, the big companies of this country build the machinery and the gadgets that are paid for by part of the \$80 billion which is supplied by the Government for that purpose. They are the people who support these companies.

I am not saying that in a critical way. I am not saying they should not. There is no other way, under our system, to build a defense establishment. I have no alternative, and I am not saying it in a critical way. It is a fact of life, however, that these people have gradually been able to build up the greatest military machine the world has ever seen, with the biggest budget the world has ever seen.

What the Senate ought to do, and what I am trying to do, and what I think other Senators are trying to do, is to bring back into our Government the system of the checks and balances provided for in our Constitution, so that in the future the Senate of the United States will be in a position, whenever it is proper and appropriate, to raise a question about any part of the defense budget.

As I have said, it is, in a sense, the first time in 25 years that the Senate has made a serious effort to curtail a particular weapons system.

Articles have appeared recently that nobody has challenged, particularly by Bernard Nossiter, in the Washington Post. He outlined a number of weapons systems, amounting to, I think, \$30 billion, or something like that, that had been started, experimented with, and abandoned because they had been misconceived.

I do not say that because I think they should not have been tried. I know a certain amount has to be done. But in the past we have simply accepted them without any question. We hear around here an analogy with automobiles. It is suggested that the ABM is an Edsel. I saw one this morning. It is a sort of folklore that grows up. Everybody knows what the Edsel was. The Edsel was a mistake. Everybody agrees to that. That does not mean Ford does not make a good car. It does. It is making good cars now. Somebody just made a mistake. If someone had had the foresight at the time, it would have saved Ford \$3 or \$4 million.

I am not saying that we cannot make an ABM or make a missile. We know we can make one if we want to spend enough money and if it is the proper design. What I am saying, and what I think some of those who share my view are saying, is that this is not a proper design. Somebody has taken a concept called the Sentinel and overnight changed it and now calls it the Safeguard. I think even the Sentinel was very questionable. But they have changed it to Safeguard. The evidence is that the designs for the Sentinel are not proper for Safeguard, and, therefore, it ought not to be pursued at this time to the point of deployment.

All that Senators who are leading the opposition in this issue are saying is, "Look, it is premature to make a commitment to this weapons system. This weapons system could easily involve anywhere from \$10 billion to \$50 billion."

I know all these estimates and this numbers game can be challenged. This same principle was involved in the C-5-A, on helicopters, on tanks, and so forth. I do not want to get into that. But all I am saying is, "Just do not deploy this system. Do further research and if, after further research, you still think it is good, bring it back and we will look at it again."

All we are really doing is asking for a year's delay in deployment. That is all I believe the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky means—just wait for 1 year before deployment.

Mr. COOPER. That is right.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is all we are asking, bearing in mind the history of the requests from the Pentagon, the enormous cost of Government, and, above all, the very serious domestic budget situation we have, when every day we see the market going down.

Yesterday I spent nearly all day talking about the tax bill. The administration wants the surtax imposed right away, and they do not want any delay about it. The other day, when the President invited some of us to the White House, he had four secretaries of Treasury, present and past, impressing on us the dire situation in this country and the dire need of the surtax. Not once did he or anyone else say they might cut the budget.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator, before he gets off the surtax, I have been glad to yield to him all this time. I do not care to keep the floor indefinitely.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is all right.

Mr. STENNIS. I do have some responses to make as far as the Senator's remarks are concerned.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will stop now, if he wishes.

Mr. STENNIS. So if he could conclude his remarks within a reasonable time, I would appreciate it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will be glad to.

Mr. STENNIS. I am not asking him to stop now.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will either stop now and resume later or make a few more remarks. I do not wish to inconvenience the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. Just a reasonable time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. All right. There are different views of what "reasonable" is, but I will try to make my remarks reasonably short.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The point comes back to this, and I submit to the Senator it is a very serious one. In view of all our circumstances, in view of the domestic situation that I have mentioned, in view of the President's own pleading that we enact a tax, and so on, for the control of inflation, which is becoming very acute and tends to destroy the confidence of the people in their own Government, in view of the protests we have had in this country, in view of the history of the last 3 or 4 years, beginning with the riot in Watts, and going to other riots, then finally leading to the protests in our universities, all these are signs of something wrong in our great country.

I know we are interested in trying to

make our country as great as it is capable of being. Everyone has that purpose. The only difference among us is as to what it is that is great. Where is the priority? Is the building of an ABM now, as a symbol of our capacity, or a controlled defense budget more important? Are we so threatened by external enemies, in contrast to internal difficulties, that we must put that above everything else?

The delay for 1 year of the deployment of the ABM—that is what this argument is all about. That is important monetarily, but I still think the most important consideration of all is to reestablish the Senate of the United States as a coequal body, as a body that is capable of raising questions of this kind, and capable of making a decision in the face of the kind of influence and power that is represented by the great industrial enterprises of this country, and the Pentagon with all of its tremendous bureaucracy and its influence, all of which I do not criticize as such, but it does relate to whether or not the Senate still is an important body.

Lastly, I say to the Senator from Mississippi that when, as they often do, historians engage in looking at other great countries that have declined, right on back to the classic case of Rome, they find, for example, that the decline and destruction of Rome began with the decline and destruction of the Roman Senate. I only remind the Senator of that because there have been many other instances, also.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, in response, and with all deference to the Senator from Arkansas, the question we had here was really not an issue, just a discussion of whether next Monday we would discuss further the possibility of a vote on this bill. I think I gave my reasons for wanting to continue on this part of the bill, since the Senate set its course and made this amendment the pending measure.

But, Mr. President, I have fully made up my mind that no one could come here and impute bad motives, sinister influences, or anything that infers those things toward the membership of this body with reference to the military program, and go unchallenged. I challenged the Senator from Arkansas when he called us stooges, and I am very glad he apologized for that. But, in words that are a little more respectable, but have the same meaning, he said it over again when he asked, Is the Senate going to submit to military bureaucracy and the hyphenated industrial complex?

I think the Senator ought to prove those charges by something more than his bare, bald statement that he has made here before, and given to the press over a period of months. He ought to prove them with something substantial, other than just his assertion, or withdraw them.

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

Mr. STENNIS. Well, I want to make my point now.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. On that point—

Mr. STENNIS. To show just how one Senator, at least, feels toward such assertions.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would like to offer just one proof of the kind the Senator has requested, and I refer to the Starbird memorandum, which was itself generated in the Pentagon by General Starbird, submitted to Secretary Resor, and published. If that is not proof of their capacity to organize strength, I do not know what is.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator has, in effect, called names here, and made charges. He has been making them for many months. I say if we submit to things like that without proof, it will get to where a man will be afraid to go on the Appropriations Committee, the Armed Services Committee, or any of the others that has a responsibility to this Nation, of coming in here with what its members think is a sound military program, lest he have to face charges from the Senator from Arkansas—I do not know of any others, but there may be others who make the same charges—that he is base in his approach, that his motives are bad, and that he is serving some ulterior purpose instead of the welfare of this Nation. I am not going to let the membership of our committee, and I exclude myself, be so charged by any Senator, without his being severely challenged. I call on the Senator now to prove some instance of some particular Senator who has had a bad motive in mind when he took a position on these bills.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In the first place, the Senator has completely misrepresented the position I took. I said this is the nature of our country. It is not a bad motive to serve one's constituents.

Mr. STENNIS. I yielded to the Senator, now, for the purpose of giving an illustration, not to make that speech again about the bad motives of the membership.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But the Senator completely misrepresents what I said.

Mr. STENNIS. I did not misrepresent anything.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I made no charge of bad motives. I said it is the kind of country we live in. To illustrate, in my own case, I have always supported the poultry raisers of Arkansas, because they are an important industry, and I have gone out of my way to do it. I do not consider that a bad motive. We do not happen to have an electronics industry in Arkansas of any consequence. It may well be if we had, I would have been representing them. This is nothing bad; it is the nature of our democratic system.

Mr. STENNIS. All right; I yielded to the Senator to give an illustration.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator challenged me.

Mr. STENNIS. I ask him to be courteous enough—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me ask the Senator this: What did General Eisenhower mean when, in his last statement, he warned us about the military-industrial complex? Was he charging the Senator with bad motives?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Cook

in the chair). Does the Senator yield further?

Mr. STENNIS. I yielded for an illustration only, Mr. President, and I do not yield further just at this moment.

My purpose here is not to engage in debate. I have said what I wanted to say on that point. My purpose is not to engage in a personal controversy. I will respond in the same pattern to anyone else who makes any such assertion.

Our purpose here now is to begin these discussions, that will perhaps lead to a disposition of this matter. I think we have given notice and we will have a good discussion.

I mention one other thing, though, about the President's absence. As far as a personal basis is concerned, I think the sooner the President gets back the better it would suit me. I would like to see him back in the country soon, and I am sure he will be.

But I think, as a very practical matter, no one knows how many votes there are here on each side; but if I were wanting to vote, if it were to my advantage, if I had the votes, I would say, "Vote now." The Senator from Arkansas referred to our previous debates here. When we think we have the votes, we are usually ready to vote; but I do not think this time anyone knows. However, I am willing to vote anyway, after reasonable discussion by everyone who wishes to be heard.

So I think that about covers the point I wanted to make.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator from Arkansas was not present in the Chamber when the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) and I began our colloquy with the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS); and the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER); so I shall repeat something of what was said before.

Senator HART and I offered this amendment for ourselves and many other Senators. Since April 18, 1968, we have worked together on these amendments. So we have believed we had some responsibility to lead the way toward a disposition of this issue. We have had discussion over the past 2 weeks and with other sponsors of the amendment.

I must say that we did not think we had any responsibility at all to make the amendment the pending business until this week. The first week was one for the Senator from Mississippi to explain the bill and to support the different sections of the bill. Last week, as we know, it was impossible to have any rational discussion of the amendment. Senator HART made the amendment the pending business at the earliest date possible—Wednesday of this week.

We have had discussions with the Senator from Mississippi and the majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD. We propose, on Monday, to give notice that the subject of a day certain for voting will be raised in the Senate so that everyone who is interested in the amendment, proponents and opponents alike, may be here to give their views.

I have said that as far as I am con-

cerned, I approve moving toward the vote as quickly as is possible.

I cannot speak for anyone else. I have told the Senate that I understand that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE) intended to have a hearing on Wednesday morning which would bear upon the ABM and that I was sure he would not want to vote until after the hearing.

I want to be open. One of the difficulties that those of us who support the amendment have had in agreeing to vote comes from several factors—and I think I might as well state them—is that some feel, and I must say that I am one of them—that it has been very difficult to secure information from the Defense Department.

I have been able to secure information because I have written time after time to the Secretary of Defense, to Dr. Foster, and the CIA. I must say that I have received information. However, as it is not made public many Senators have not had the opportunity to have the same information.

Mr. President, another development that disturbs many who support the amendment is the statements made before the closed hearing. Statements were made that last minute intelligence had been received just before the closed hearing began. That intelligence was not available to all, and there was no way to answer because one would not challenge the honesty of the Senators. However, we did not have the opportunity at the time to examine and question that at its original source. Since the closed hearings, I have written the Department of Defense for answers on some of the information that was presented. I must say that from those answers one could exercise a judgment one way or the other for they were not definitive beyond judgment.

I have been informed that the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) is interested in reported studies in the Defense Department that would throw great light on this issue.

All of these factors made it apparent to me that we cannot agree on a certain date until these questions have been answered satisfactorily.

The Senator from Michigan and I want to bring these issues in the open on Monday.

I do believe that the meeting will be helpful and profitable in the discussion of these matters.

In fairness, Senator HART and I want to be open about these matters.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his remarks. It is always a pleasure to deal with the Senator. I know how earnest he has been in the matter.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his remarks. I think they clarify our motive in suggesting that we have the discussion and indicate to the Senator from Mississippi some of the concern we have had.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator very much.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I

wish to comment further upon the idea of the Senator from Mississippi that I am attributing bad motives to him. I assure the Senator that it does not mean that people who disagree with him challenge his motives.

I can understand that the Senator has different responsibilities because of his committee chairmanship and his long experience and association with the Pentagon and all of that. That is perfectly natural. It affects all of us.

I would not for a moment exclude myself from any of the things I have said, and I did not intend to reflect on the motives of anyone.

I do think it is a fact of life in the kind of country in which we live. We are representatives. We represent in a very real sense the interests of our different communities. In those communities there are diverse and different interests. So, naturally we have different views. And in our minds we are the products of our own experiences. And those experiences include our associations with different people.

We are all the products of every experience we have had in life.

It was the furthest thing from my mind to try to attribute a bad motive to the Senator from Mississippi or to anyone else. However, it is a fact of life.

The other day we had a man named Casey before our committee who, I am sure, is a very reputable lawyer in New York. He has been nominated to be a member of the Advisory Committee on Disarmament. He had formed a committee, of which he is chairman, supporting the ABM. It is perfectly legitimate for him to do so.

He had obtained the names of a great many people—many of whom were very prominent people—among whom were the directors of 11 of the most prominent corporations, all of which have large contracts on the ABM.

There is nothing bad about this. There is not a bad motive intended. Is it not perfectly natural that if one is a director of a corporation which is playing an important part in the production of a great weapons system, he would be interested in it?

I think it is the most natural and human thing in the world that that would happen.

If there is some implication of bad motive in it, I certainly do not see it. If so, I apologize. The word "stooge" was the wrong kind of word to use. It leaves an implication that I did not intend. What I was trying to say was that in a country as rich and big and powerful as ours, we have very great interests growing up. The biggest of all is what we call the bureaucracy of the Pentagon, because there is not any corporation, not even General Motors or General Electric, that has quite the equal in resources of \$80 billion. I do not quite remember the resources of General Motors. However, it is large.

This is a tremendous conglomerate of power. I make no point that there is anything bad about it. Every man, so far as I know, in the Pentagon today is doing his duty. I would not for a moment say that General Starbird, when he developed his so-called memorandum which

was published, was not doing his duty. He was clearly doing his duty as he saw it. He had the responsibility of promoting and selling to Congress and to the country the ABM system. And he put it down in writing, and Mr. Resor, I believe, approved it—one or the other of them approved it. They were both involved in it. It was called the Starbird memorandum.

It outlined and sought to muster together an organization of all of the various influences which are available to the Pentagon and tried to make the sale and get a favorable decision. That is his duty. He was given the responsibility of doing that.

The last thing I want to do is to imply a bad motive to General Starbird. As far as I can see, he is doing exactly what he was told to do by his organization. There is nothing bad about that at all. However, it is a fact of life.

The Senator from Kentucky has no such organization. He cannot write a letter and say to all the great corporations of the country, "will you please get your people together and will you solicit speeches? Will you have them written, and will you write books and will you do this and do that?" All of it is set out in the memorandum. I do not wish to mispeak what is said in the memorandum. But, as a result of that, we do see books being published. Two books were announced last week, both in support of the ABM. I do not know that the Senator from Kentucky can produce a book against the ABM. He has to use whatever he has in his own mind and what he picks up from hearings, and so forth.

It is true that a large number of independent scientists, none of whom is on the payroll of the Senator from Kentucky, on the payroll of the U.S. Senate, my payroll, or on the payroll of anyone else I know of who is involved in this argument, came and gave their testimony. Many of them are heads of universities that have nothing to do with this. Some of them may have something to do with it, an indirect interest; but whatever they do, it was not on the side of the Senator from Kentucky. It was on the side of the Pentagon. And I admired them.

In any case, I make no point of the motives. This is a matter of judgment, and I think it is perfectly legitimate to point out that in some cases I am not sure that their judgment is not influenced by these things. That is no crime. It is not a sin that you are influenced by your constituents or by your employer or by your own experiences. If you have spent your life in creating electronic devices, I am certain their grows up in your mind a desire always to respond to any challenge. If you are an electronics engineer and someone says to you, "Here is a challenge to you. Do you think you can shoot down a missile that is traveling at 20,000 miles an hour and shoot it down with another missile?" immediately you say, "Yes, I bet I can do that, if you give me enough money and enough time."

It is like the story of the man who said, "Why does a man climb Mount Everest?" And the other fellow replied,

"because Mount Everest is there." It is a challenge to him. There is no good reason to do it. I do not think there is any good reason to the ABM, other than that it is a challenge to Dr. Foster and some of his colleagues. They just want to do it. The trouble with that is a practical matter. I have no doubt he can do it in a normal peacetime operation, without interference from external elements such as radiation. I am not at all sure it can be done in an attitude of hostility, where someone is shooting at you with nuclear weapons.

It is like going to the moon. We are very proud of going to the moon. I doubt seriously that it would have been so easy to go, or possibly at all, if some other country was trying to thwart you, was interfering with your communications. I would doubt that it could be done.

I think the Senator from Mississippi misconceives the nature of the argument. I think it is perfectly legitimate to call attention to the fact that some of the arguments made in support of this could be less than objective or free from an interest in the ABM as a weapons system, aside from whether or not it is in the interest of the country or whether or not it is as important as some other priority. Even though it might be good under some circumstances and could be justified, in view of the financial situation of this country, in view of the inflationary pressures, and in view of the requirement for added taxes, is it justified?

This is where I come back to the Senate. I do not think General Starbird or General Wheeler or General X, Y, or Z feels that it is his responsibility—and I do not think it is his responsibility—to weigh such things as inflationary pressures, the budgetary situation, the need for the tax bill, and all the other elements that the Senate should take into consideration.

It seems to me that the Senator from Kentucky and his colleagues in this body have a different function to play from that of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

I think that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, under our system of Government, are given a special, restricted responsibility. I make no criticism now, or at any other time, of the Joint Chiefs of Staff discharging their responsibility in the way they see it. I do criticize myself and the Senate for having accepted, for at least the 25 years I have been in the Senate, as an infallible sort of dictate from above, the judgment on all these weapons systems of people like Dr. Foster or the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

In this case, Dr. Foster is the principal advocate of these various systems, as I understand it—and, of course, his predecessors. He happens to be the current one. His predecessors had the same role, and their role was to propose weapons systems of any kind they could imagine that might be useful. It is our role to take a look at them, to try to make some judgment as to whether or not they are essential under the present conditions, and to do the best we can.

Speaking for myself—I will leave out everybody else—I have not done my part, I know, in the last 25 years, because I always believed it was hopeless. I was

sure that if I made a motion to cut any of these programs, I would not get any votes, because nobody ever had, and so there was no use in trying.

Furthermore, the circumstances did not exist. During much of that time we had what is called the dollar gap. We were too prosperous compared with the rest of the world. We were looking for ways to spend money abroad as well as at home, and nobody raised the question about budgetary matters of any consequence. Now that is all changed, and that is the reason why a number of others and I are raising these questions. I think I have been too negligent too long in coming to a feeling that it is my responsibility at least to have hearings about it in order to give experts in this area an opportunity to express themselves.

I think that is the function that the Senate, peculiarly, has. We have to weigh all these things.

I do not make these criticisms of the Senator from Mississippi, any member of his committee, or the Joint Chiefs of Staff. What I am trying to say is that they have their responsibilities and they play their part, and others play theirs. I do not criticize the big corporations. In the common language of the street, they are doing their thing; they are doing what they are set up to do, whatever they may make. That is all they are doing. But it is our job—and we are sent to the Senate as representatives—to make judgments of the whole, broad spectrum of our policy and to make judgments as to priorities.

With regard to an immediate vote, one other thing that I believe the Senator from Kentucky did not mention is the fact that practically a week has gone by with the moon shot, and everyone's attention has been diverted in watching this great exploit. Whether or not it is very significant, as has been represented, I do not know. History will have to prove that. In any event, our attention has been engaged. The Senator from Mississippi will not deny that our attention has been diverted from the affairs on the floor of the Senate to the moon shot, which has taken out practically a week of the debate that has been in progress.

Mr. President, in order to fortify this question, since it has been raised, it is my understanding that the Starbird memorandum was first proposed with regard to the Sentinel system. It is also my understanding that after it was revealed and discussed in the Washington Post, and comments made here, it was canceled or withdrawn, or whatever is done to a memorandum. Whether another one has been prepared, I am not sure. But I believe that as a result of that it has been declassified and that it would be proper to put it into the RECORD as a part of my comments, because I think it is appropriate to the comments that the Senator from Mississippi made a moment ago in which he asked me for proof of what I had alleged to be a capacity for organization of influence behind a program such as the ABM.

So I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a copy of the so-called Starbird memorandum. While it goes to the Sentinel

system, I believe the Safeguard is the legitimate heir, by direct descent, of the Sentinel.

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

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

PUBLIC AFFAIRS PLAN FOR THE SENTINEL SYSTEM

1. References:

a. Part No. 1.01, subject: Sentinel System Charter, SSMP, 3 Nov. 1967.

b. DOD Memorandum OASD(PA) 22/1, subject: Sentinel System Public Affairs Plan, 15 March 1968.

c. AR 360-11, subject: Army Information Guidance for Sentinel Program, 23 August 1968.

d. AR 1-20, subject: Administration Legislative Liaison, 26 Jan. 1967.

2. Purpose and scope:

a. This plan establishes guidelines, implements policy and assigns responsibilities for an active public affairs program on a country-wide basis regarding the Sentinel System and the Sentinel deployment program; it sets forth specific DA information objectives and milestones, suggests certain techniques and delineates responsibilities for the planning, execution and evaluation thereof.

b. The provisions of this plan apply to all U.S. Army elements and to all individual industrial firms and civilian contractors participating in the production and deployment of the Sentinel System.

3. Background:

a. On September 18, 1967, the Secretary of Defense announced the decision to produce and deploy a Communist Chinese-oriented ballistic missile defense system. This system will be deployed at 15 to 20 locations in the continental United States, Alaska, and Hawaii. On November 3, 1967, the Secretary of Defense named this ballistic missile defense system the Sentinel System and announced the appointment of LTG Alfred D. Starbird as the Sentinel System Manager (SENSM). Also on November 3, 1967, the Secretary of the Army approved and issued the Sentinel System Charter which, in part, states: "The Sentinel System Manager will develop and, when so directed, assure the timely, effective deployment of the Sentinel System, and will provide a single point of contact within the Department of the Army for the coordination and direction of all activities pertaining to the Sentinel Systems. . . . The Sentinel System Manager, within instructions issued by the Chief of Staff of the Army, will exercise staff supervision over all Army Staff elements and participating organizations of the Department of the Army for planning, direction, and control of the Sentinel program. . . . The Sentinel System Manager will utilize to the maximum extent, compatible with System requirements and within guidance issued by the Chief of Staff, the functional and process oriented capabilities of the Army Staff. . . ."

b. Opposition to the Sentinel deployment decision has arisen and been publicly expressed in three sectors of public opinion: in certain segments of the U.S. Congress, in scientific circles and in citizen/public official interest groups in local communities. Congressional and scientific opposition centers around questions as the Sentinel technical and operational feasibility, cost, disarmament, the international arms race and national priorities and is national in scope. The local interest groups raise these same national questions but also base their opposition to the Sentinel deployment decision on various factors stemming directly from such actions and proposed actions as

(2) real estate acquisition, (3) effects of construction on the local environment, and (4) eventual impact of the Sentinel installation and its personnel on the community. Initial adverse reaction from private citizens and local public officials has been the direct results of site validation and acquisition actions which are a necessary prelude to the initiation of construction operations, and are vital to the Sentinel program.

c. The SENSM, in coordination with OCLL and OCINFO, will conduct a public affairs program, on a country-wide basis, to accomplish the objectives established herein.

4. Objectives: The objectives of the program are:

a. To gain public understanding of the reasons for a United States ballistic missile defense (BMD) system oriented on the developing Communist Chinese offensive ICBM nuclear capability.

b. To insure that all sectors of public opinion are fully informed of Sentinel System developments, progress, effectiveness and objectives (within the bounds of national security).

c. To inform the public regarding the reasons for the Sentinel deployment decision, the rationale behind it and why it is necessary and important to obtain real estate for use as Sentinel operational sites in particular geographic areas in implementing the Sentinel deployment decision.

d. To gain the understanding of the people of affected communities by keeping them informed of Sentinel oriented activities in their area. Such information will explain the general methods of site selection and validation, the local and national importance of the site, and the impact of Sentinel-connected activities in the community.

c. To provide timely, factual, and authoritative information by:

(1) Timely release of information on activities which will affect local communities.

(2) Responding to queries for information,

(3) Providing briefings and information fact sheets to members of Congress (OCLL coordination required), local governmental leaders and officials, military audiences, scientific, fraternal, and civic groups and organizations, and representatives of news media.

(4) Preparing informational or educational articles for general news and mass communication media, military, scientific and professional journals that are service-oriented.

(5) Preparing exhibits for showing before appropriate groups.

5. Concept: This program will use a gradual approach to the attainment of the objectives stated above. The thrust of the program will be directed primarily toward explaining the military requirement and strategic concepts inherent in the Sentinel deployment decision. As subordinate but related goals, the program will emphasize that the Sentinel System is specifically designed to meet a strategic defensive military requirement; that it is being deployed in an efficient and economical manner; that it is designed to provide a defense against a possible Communist Chinese nuclear ICBM attack through the late 1970's; (with the capability to continue to deny or at least substantially reduce damage from threats in later years); that it concurrently provides a limited added defensive capability over our Minuteman ICBM sites with the option of improving that defense if needed; that it provides added protection of our population against a possible accidental ICBM launch by any one of the world's nuclear powers; that it will complicate any attack on the United States by the Soviet Union; that its effectiveness in fulfilling its national missions requires the acquisition of Sentinel operational sites in certain selected areas for the emplacement of its missiles and radars.

6. Responsibilities:

a. SENSM will monitor the overall program for CofSA and will be consulted on all substantive implementing decisions or actions.

b. CINFO will:

(1) Serve as the initial DA staff level point of contact and coordinating agent on all public affairs matters pertaining to the program.

(2) Assume for the SENSM overall responsibility for coordination of all Sentinel, public affairs matters with the Army staff, other services when appropriate, applicable Unified and Specified Commands, and OASD(PA).

(3) Provide support and assistance to SENSM, as feasible and appropriate, in implementing the SENTINEL public affairs program.

(4) Arrange speaking engagements, as appropriate, for the CofSA, VCoFA, and senior members of the Army staff to provide opportunities for public explanation of the SENTINEL System.

(5) Establish within OCINFO a Sentinel Public Affairs Coordinating Committee (SENPAAC) to provide for periodic review, advice and on-going coordination, development and evaluation of the Sentinel public affairs program. The membership of this committee will include, but not be limited to, representatives from the following commands and agencies: OCINFO, OCLL, Chief of Engineers, ODCSOPS, OCRD, and the Sentinel System Organization (SENSCOM 1.0). The SENPAAC will meet periodically on the call of CINFO and submit appropriate analyses and recommendations to SENSM through CINFO.

c. OCLL, DA will:

(1) Provide support and assistance to SENSM as appropriate in implementing the SENTINEL Public Affairs Program.

(2) Provide a representative to SENPAAC.

(3) Coordinate with OATSD(LA) as appropriate.

d. ODCSOPS, DA will:

(1) Provide support in those SENTINEL public affairs related to the military requirement and strategic concept of the SENTINEL System.

(2) Provide a representative to SENPAAC.

e. OCRD, DA will:

(1) Provide support in those SENTINEL public affairs areas relating to scientific and technical matters or to the Nike-X Advanced Development Program.

(2) Provide a representative to SENPAAC.

f. OCE, DA will:

(1) Provide support in those Sentinel public affairs areas relating to Sentinel Systems real estate acquisition and facilities design and construction.

(2) Provide a representative to SENPAAC.

g. All elements of the Sentinel System Organization, CONARC, AMC, ARADCOM, and STRATCOM will provide support in those Sentinel public affairs areas germane to their mission and functional areas and as specifically assigned elsewhere in this plan.

h. The basic public affairs responsibilities of CINFO, SENSM, and participating organizations are included in AR 360-11. The SENSM has established as his staff agent for administration of the Sentinel Public Affairs Program the Information Officer assigned as Chief of the Information Office of the SENSCOM. The SENSCOM Information Officer will coordinate all Sentinel public affairs matters for the SENSM and will be the principal point of contact within the Sentinel System Organization on such matters.

i. Within instructions issued by the SENSM the SENSCOM Information Officer may clear and release the information described in paragraph 5.a.(3), AR 360-11.

j. Time phases for the execution of the Sentinel Public Affairs Program are established in paragraph 4.a., AR 360-11. Basic responsibilities are with CG, ARADCOM during Phase I (initial briefings of public of-

ficials), the SENSOCOM Information Officer acting for the SENSOCOM during Phase II (prior to IOC) and (with CINCONAD, CINCPAC) during Phase III (subsequent to the IOC of individual sites).

k. The SENSOCOM Information Officer will coordinate activities pertaining to visits to Sentinel installations, facilities or sites by representatives of news media or the public during Phase II, and will advise OCINFO directly on appropriate matters, with an information copy of all notifications furnished to the SENSOCOM, CINCONAD and CINCPAC exercise this responsibility during Phase III.

l. Sentinel information release requests will be processed through the SENSOCOM Information Officer, who will transmit his recommendations to OCINFO for staffing within the DA, and, as necessary, with appropriate Unified and Specified Commands, and OASD(PA). It will be the responsibility of OCINFO to coordinate all proposed releases with the SENSOCOM. The following schedule will apply:

(1) News releases and photos will arrive at the SENSOCOM Information Office not less than 15 working days before the intended release date.

(2) Speeches and films will arrive at the SENSOCOM Information Office not less than 25 working days before the intended publication date.

(3) Briefing texts and technical papers will arrive at the SENSOCOM Information Office not less than 25 working days before the intended publication date.

m. The following expands upon the statements of responsibilities contained in AR 360-11 only to the extent required to assure accomplishment of all aspects of the total public affairs program.

(1) CG, ARADCOM:

(a) Plan, supervise and execute the SENTINEL public information and public affairs responsibilities assigned in AR 360-11, and assure appropriate coordination with other participating organizations.

(b) During Phase II, submit proposed SENTINEL related public information releases, not previously cleared, to SENSOCOM Information Officer for review and appropriate action.

(c) Support and assist the SENTINEL information and public affairs activities of SENSOCOM, USAEDH, SENLOG, STRATCOM and SENSEA.

(2) CG, SENSOCOM:

PHASES I AND II

(a) Monitor and coordinate for the SENSOCOM overall Sentinel public affairs and public information activities.

(b) Furnish necessary data on Sentinel public information and public affairs matters as appropriate to SENSOCOM and OCINFO, DA.

(c) Review proposed information material to include displays and obtain clearance for its use from the SENSOCOM, OCINFO, DA; and DODOASD(PA) as appropriate.

(d) Coordinate with OCINFO, DA and SENSOCOM proposed information actions involving other military services, i.e., Sentinel System tests requiring Navy or Air Force launched target vehicles or interface with Navy or Air Force operational systems of those under development.

(e) Review and coordinate with OCINFO, DA and SENSOCOM, information plans prepared by major DA commands and agencies.

(f) Coordinate with OCINFO, DA and SENSOCOM appropriate Congressional notifications through OCLL, DA concerning Sentinel information to be released.

(g) Advise SENSOCOM and OCINFO, DA of impending developments in the Sentinel information program.

(h) Provide individuals to brief Members of Congress, public officials, news media representatives and the public as stipulated by SENSOCOM.

PHASE I

(a) Provide CG, ARADCOM with qualified members of the Phase I initial briefing teams as authorized by SENSOCOM.

(b) Assist other DA commands and staff agencies as appropriate.

PHASE II

(a) Conduct Sentinel Community Relations briefings as appropriate.

(b) During Phase II(a) and Phase II(b) monitor, coordinate and assist the community relations activities (AR 360-61) of the Division Engineer, USAEDH, at potential or approved Sentinel sites, as appropriate.

(c) During Phase II(c) plan, supervise and conduct community relations activities (AR 360-61) at approved Sentinel sites.

(d) Review for technical accuracy, security and consonance with SENSOCOM policy proposed information materials submitted by all participating organizations and contractors; submit to OCINFO, DA for clearance as required by references b and c; advise originating agency and OCINFO of changes in the text of the proposed material made during the SENSOCOM review.

(e) Conduct other public information and public affairs activities in consonance with the responsibilities of the SENSOCOM as specified herein and in AR 360-11.

PHASE III

Provide such public affairs assistance as may be required to facilitate turn-over of Sentinel sites to CONAD/PACOM and to insure continuity and consistency of Sentinel site community relations activities with ongoing Phase II community relations activities at other sites.

(3) Division Engineer, USAEDH:

(a) Coordinate and supervise the Sentinel information, public relations and community relations activities of Engineer Districts and Divisions.

(b) Submit public information releases concerning Sentinel related engineer activities which contain material or information not previously cleared for publication through the SENSOCOM Information Officer for review and appropriate action.

(c) In coordination with SENSOCOM conduct, as appropriate, other Sentinel public information and public affairs activities.

(d) Provide individuals to brief Members of Congress, public officials, news media representatives, and the public as stipulated by SENSOCOM.

(e) Provide CG, ARADCOM and CG, SENSOCOM with qualified members of the ARADCOM initial briefing team and subsequent SENSOCOM briefing teams as required.

(f) Support and assist the Sentinel related public information and public affairs activities of CG, ARADCOM as appropriate.

(g) During Phase II(a) and Phase II(b), in coordination with CG, SENSOCOM, plan, supervise and execute Sentinel public information, public affairs and community relations (AR 360-61) activities, as appropriate, in Engineer Divisions and Districts.

(h) During Phase II(c), support and assist the Sentinel public information, public affairs and community relations activities of CG, SENSOCOM, as appropriate.

(4) CG, SENLOG: Support and assist the Sentinel information and public affairs activities of ARADCOM, SENSOCOM, USAEDH, STRATCOM and SENSEA, as well as other participating organizations, as appropriate.

(5) CO, SENSEA: Support and assist the Sentinel information and public affairs activities of ARADCOM, SENSOCOM, USAEDH, SENLOG and STRATCOM, as well as other participating organizations, as appropriate.

(6) Other Participating Organizations:

(a) Plan, supervise and execute appropriate public information and public affairs

activities in consonance with DA policy as stated in AR 360-11 and this document.

(b) Support and assist the Sentinel information and public affairs activities of SENSOCOM, ARADCOM, USAEDH and other commands and agencies as appropriate.

(c) Coordinate all SENSOCOM identified activities through the SENSOCOM Information Officer.

7. EXECUTION: The SENTINEL System public affairs program will be a responsive implementation of the policy guidance contained in references (a), (b), (c), and (d) as expanded and restated herein.

a. Information Kit. A kit will be assembled and distributed to all commands (to include applicable Unified and Specified Commands) and agencies participating in the Sentinel System Program for use in response to requests for information and to serve as background information.

(1) The SENSOCOM will have the overall responsibility for assembling the kit and for procuring appropriate inputs to it from all commands and agencies participating in the Sentinel System Program and for processing its contents.

(2) The kit will include, but shall not be limited to, the following:

(a) Kit folder.

(b) A fact sheet on the Sentinel System which tells within the bounds of security regulations: What the Sentinel System mission is; what the functions of major Sentinel subsystems and components are; how the Sentinel System will operate; when deployed in CONUS, that Sentinel will be an operational element of CONAD; and when deployed in Hawaii, that Sentinel will be an operational element of PACOM; its defensive coverage area (schematic national footprint chart) and how operational sites are selected, validated and acquired for Sentinel radars and missiles.

(c) A chart showing all commands, agencies, contractors and subcontractors participating in the Sentinel Program together with a capsulized statement of mission or contract requirements.

(d) A listing of Sentinel information milestones as specified herein. (See Inclosure 1 hereto)

(e) Biographies and photos of key service personalities associated with the Sentinel System Program.

(f) Photos or artist-concept sketches of Sentinel missiles, radars, site lay-outs and test or training installations.

(g) Copies of all news releases of national import which have been made on the Sentinel Program.

(h) Copies of major speeches or articles pertaining to the Sentinel System considered appropriate for general distribution.

(i) Copies of major statements or testimony on the Sentinel System made by key DOD and DA personalities.

b. Press Releases.

(1) Press releases will be made when justified by newsworthy Sentinel activities executed in the public environment or by the accomplishment of a Sentinel Information Milestone (see AR 360-11 and Inclosure 1, hereto, for Sentinel Information Milestones). Such releases will normally originate with the Army element or Sentinel contractor or subcontractor having immediate responsibility for or cognizance of the event being reported. Releases will be cleared as required by AR 360-11.

(2) Requests for information about the Sentinel program received from members of the press, radio or television will be met with an affirmative response within security regulations.

c. Magazine Articles: All magazine articles and responses to queries will be processed in accordance with references b and c.

(1) Magazine articles will be prepared by Army staff members or major DA subordinate commanders having operational cognizance

of the Sentinel Program for submission to military, scientific and professional journals and publications that are service sponsored or oriented.

(2) OCRD will encourage and assist in the preparation for magazine articles on the Sentinel System by civilian scientific or technical writers of national stature.

(3) There will be an affirmative response to specific requests made by representatives of civilian, military and technical magazines for information about the Sentinel System Program.

d. Interviews.

(1) Requests by representatives of national news media to interview senior DA operating officials regarding the Sentinel System will be met affirmatively.

(2) Officials granting interviews will ascertain to the extent feasible the questions that will be asked concerning the Sentinel System by the news media representatives; where questions regarding the Sentinel System are asked which are outside the context of previously cleared Sentinel material, or where an answer to a question would reveal classified information, the official being interviewed will decline to answer. Every effort will be made to anticipate the questions that will be asked by the interviewing reporter; where unclassified Sentinel information has not been previously cleared which is responsive to the anticipated questions, the anticipated question and the proposed answer will be submitted to OCINFO for review and clearance by SENSM and OASD(PA).

(3) Requests by representatives of local or regional news media to interview Army officials concerned with Sentinel activities in their circulation/broadcast area will be met affirmatively. Officials granting such interviews will be guided by paragraph 6.d(2) above, and the provisions of AR 360-5.

e. Speakers Program. An active speakers program will be established. Senior Army personnel associated with the Sentinel Program will participate in this program to the maximum extent feasible in order to explain to the American people the reasons for the Sentinel deployment decision, the strategic rationale supporting the deployment decision and why it is necessary and important to obtain real estate in particular areas for Sentinel operational sites for the System's missile, radars and supporting facilities.

(1) Speech engagements in support of this program for senior Army staff members will be coordinated by CINFO.

(2) Speech engagements in support of this program for senior Sentinel commanders and members of their staffs will be coordinated by major Command Information Officers.

(3) Every effort will be made to interest high-ranking military and civilian personnel within DOD in making public statements in support of the Sentinel, System Program and the Sentinel deployment decision.

(4) OCINFO, DA and major Command Information Officers will maintain a library of quotations and public statements about the Sentinel System and the Sentinel deployment decision for insertion in speeches made by participating personnel.

(5) A standard briefing text with appropriate slides will be prepared by the SENSM, with appropriate inputs from participating commands and agencies and cleared in advance with OASD(PA). The SENPACC will review this briefing text periodically and suggest up-date inputs as appropriate. Copies of this briefing text will be distributed to major DA commands/agencies participating in the Sentinel Program.

f. Exhibit Program. If available, mobile exhibits cleared by OASD(PA) may be used in conjunction with speeches, panels, conventions and symposiums in which the Sentinel System is discussed.

(1) CG, SENSCOM and the Division Engineer, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Di-

vision, Huntsville (USAEDH), will coordinate and collaborate on the construction of several mobile Sentinel exhibits suitable for display at Community Relations briefings conducted in local communities in connection with Sentinel site validation, acquisition and construction activities.

(2) Requests for utilization of all exhibits in civilian sponsored fairs, expositions, conventions, etc., will be coordinated by OCINFO with the SENSM and OASD(PA) on a case-by-case basis. (Note: This does not apply to exhibits at Sentinel Site Community Relations Briefings conducted by SENSCOM or USAEDH personnel).

g. Sentinel Site Community Relations Briefings.

(1) SENSCOM and USAEDH will collaborate and prepare a Sentinel Site Community Relations Briefing Text, with supporting slides, which (after appropriate clearance by OASD(PA)) will be used by Corps of Engineers, SENSCOM and ARADCOM personnel in briefing, as appropriate, local governmental officials and citizens groups regarding Sentinel site activities underway or anticipated in local communities.

(2) These briefings will be designed to inform recipient audience groups regarding the reasons for the Sentinel deployment decision, the strategic rationale supporting the deployment and why it is necessary and important in implementing the Sentinel deployment decisions to obtain real estate in particular areas for use as operational sites for Sentinel radars, missiles and supporting facilities, and the operational roles of CINCONAD and CINCPAC after IOC. Whenever briefings are given in Unified Command areas, or in communities adjacent to military installations, the commanders concerned will be notified beforehand.

(3) The briefing text shall also include factual information identifying potential Sentinel sites in or near the local area where the briefing is given, and appropriate comments regarding site acreage requirements, site physical lay-out and functions, anticipated site population data, estimated site pay-roll data, how potential sites are validated and acquired (described entire decision-making process to include Title 10 action required by law), expected or anticipated effects of potential Sentinel sites on local property values, tax structure and payments, schools, sewers, water supply, fire protection, police protection, TV and radio reception, roads, highways, and safety to include its radiation and nuclear accident aspects.

h. Operation Understandings.

(1) CG, ARADCOM will periodically update ARADCOM's Operation Understanding Program to highlight appropriate aspects of the Sentinel decision and its supporting deployment program.

(2) Corps of Engineers Districts and Divisions participating in the Sentinel Program, and SENSCOM, will nominate appropriate citizen leaders and officials from local communities adjacent to potential Sentinel sites to ARADCOM for participation in ARADCOM's Operation Understanding.

(3) CG, ARADCOM will issue invitations to nominated citizens to participate in Operation Understanding as feasible and appropriate.

i. SENTINEL Training.

(1) CG, CONARC will develop a Sentinel Training Public Affairs Plan for implementation at the earliest feasible date.

(2) This plan will be submitted to OASD(PA) for review prior to implementation. (See AR 360-11).

j. Press Visit to National Missile Ranges.

(1) CG SENSCOM will develop, in coordination with OCINFO and OCRD, a Public Affairs Plan supporting a visit or tour by news media representatives to Kwajalein Island or to White Sands Missile Range to witness appropriate portions of Sentinel System tests.

(2) These plans will be submitted to OASD(PA) for review prior to implementation (see AR 360-11).

k. Radio/Television.

(1) A program to acquaint service personnel with salient portions of the Sentinel System and the Sentinel deployment decision through Armed Forces Radio and Television will be conducted. CG, USCONARC, in coordination with CG, ARADCOM, will develop a plan to implement this program as part of the overall DA Command Information Program.

(2) There will be an affirmative response by all commands and agencies participating in the Sentinel Program to requests by commercial radio and television for cleared Sentinel newsworthy items to include film clips of missile flights, photos and taped interviews.

1. State officials and Civilian Aides to the Secretary of the Army, state Governors, state Adjutant Generals of the National Guard, Civilian Aides to the Secretary of the Army and other state officials as appropriate will be kept informed by direct mail or by personal visits by senior officers regarding Sentinel plans or activities which will or may have an effect in the respective states or areas of these officials. Specific notifications or briefings of these officials will be as directed and authorized by the SENSM.

m. Local Officials. CG SENSCOM and the Division Engineer, U.S. Army Engineer Division, Huntsville, will coordinate activities to keep local government officials informed as to activities which affect their areas. Co-operating Corps of Engineers division and district engineers will maintain liaison with public officials in affected communities to keep them informed of Sentinel-related real estate and construction activities which will impact on those officials' areas of interest.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi that I apologize for that word "stooge" or any implication or any other word I used that would reflect on his good faith and good judgment. I think he is discharging his duty and he always has. I have told him on many other occasions in matters which have nothing to do with this matter that the Senator from Mississippi has made one of the greatest contributions of anyone I know of around here. He has been given some very difficult assignments by the Senate, and he has always discharged them with great integrity and judgment.

I hope he knows that there is room for legitimate differences of opinion on this particular system at this particular time and under these particular conditions of our financial situation that afflict the country at this particular time. I do not think the Senator should take offense because we differ on this particular weapons system.

Mr. President, there have been many more occasions on which we agreed than differed in the last 25 years, if my memory serves me correctly. I hope the Senator will understand that there is room for difference of opinion on the ABM.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief statement?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the Senator's remarks. I want the RECORD to clearly show that the remark I was taking exception to was saying that the Senator should not submit to the military bureaucracy or the industrial complex.

I really feel kind enough toward the

Senator from Arkansas personally. I do not feel I was speaking for myself at all. I had made up my mind I was going to speak for the other 98 Senators if these charges were made again. That is the way I feel about it. There are no ill feelings toward the Senator from Arkansas at all.

As much as I can, and with my years of experience, I leave myself out of what he has said. I speak for the other 98 Senators.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With respect to the other 98 Senators, I do not think the Pentagon comes up and says, "Senator X, you do so and so." That is never the way it works.

I say this is characteristic of our country. A Senator is serving an important interest or a friend in an important matter. I confess I am influenced by it. I am very much influenced by rice growers, cotton growers, and poultrymen. I do not lie down and do exactly what they say, but I am influenced by them. They are important elements in my State. We have that kind of representative democracy. The only kind of government which does not have that kind of influence is a dictatorship where there is one man who is not responsible to anyone. We do not have that kind of government. I was seeking to make that plain, and what I think General Eisenhower was calling attention to: The probability of the growth of this kind of influence which he warned us against; that we must be on our guard against the growth of it because it could become so influential.

I was not impugning the motives of anyone. This is the type thing that can occur when there is the growth of such an enormous organization which dispenses so much money in our society. That is all I meant.

I had forgotten to mention another matter, but the Senator has reminded me of it. This has no bearing on that aspect. However, it has been remarkable to me that Senators who were elected last year have the attitude that they do on this question. I think it is significant. I do not know of any of these Senators and I am not being personal, but I think it reflects a feeling that is very widespread in this country. It is made up of very different things: First, the war in Vietnam, probably more than anything else. The great and overwhelming emphasis that has been given the war in Vietnam since 1965. I do not wish to review all of the record about that. I had my part in the beginning of it, of which I am not very proud, as the Senator knows. I was mistaken in my judgment. I think I was misled partly because I had been—what shall I say—complimented by the President and my judgment was a little warped and I did not exercise the judgment I should have been capable of exercising at the time in 1964.

But that is water over the dam. I think these new Senators come here free from past commitments. They come here fresh from the electorate and they look at these things with a fresh look. They are not burdened with some of the old alliances and influences that I and others have. I thought it extremely interesting

and extremely reassuring. The most encouraging thing politically about this year is the quality and the intelligence of the men who were elected and who were sworn in last January. I think it is interesting that so many of them look on the ABM in what I think is a very enlightened manner.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I cannot pretend to speak for any Senator except one and that is the senior Senator from Florida. I found out a long time ago that the 100 Senators are very, very different in their points of view. They are different in their experience and in their background. That background helps to make the attitudes of each of us.

The distinguished Senator from Arkansas, whom I am happy to call my friend, whom I was happy to support in his resolution of a few days ago after it had been changed in several important particulars to which I called his attention, has a background different from any of us. Certainly, I would expect that background to reflect somewhat in his point of view. My own background reflects mine.

I speak for no one but myself at this time. I came into this debate knowing very little about the subject. I am not privileged to be a member of either the Committee on Armed Services or the Committee on Foreign Relations. I came with somewhat of an inclination to support my President, although he is not of my party, because I knew that he was hoping—and the Nation was hoping—that he would soon begin a difficult confrontation with the Soviets, a summit conference on the question of whether we should have a limitation of armaments.

But I declined to make any commitment, and I stated to the press from time to time that I would make no commitment, until after the Senate had had a closed session and I could have access to classified information to which I had not been entitled up to that time, by reason of the fact that I was not a member of either the Committee on Armed Services or the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I attended very carefully the closed session, which had been requested, by the way, by Senators who oppose the ABM item in this important bill. I must say that I came out of that session not with a feeling that it had raised difficult questions for me and might bring me to feel that opposition to the deployment of the modified ABM was appropriate at this time but, instead, with a feeling that it had done exactly the opposite. I came out of the closed session feeling that the case of the President in asking for the modified ABM system and the position of those who were supporting him was made much stronger because of what we saw and heard in the closed session than it was by what is general knowledge.

With that background, let me say now that it is my very strong feeling that we should vote for the inclusion of the ABM in its modified form. I call attention to the fact that we are asked to vote for it—and it is what the President has asked us to do—as an authorization just prior to his entering a conference with the Soviets at the summit on the im-

portant question of limitation of armaments. I have voted for many authorizations which did not find fruition later in appropriations. I have voted for some appropriations based on authorizations made before that time which did not come into full fruition because the money was not actually expended.

What we are talking about now is only the first step in a change of direction from what we voted for last year and the year before last—a system which was primarily designed to protect cities, for what I think is a sounder, smaller program to protect our retaliatory power by protecting a part of our missile strength from destruction in the event we are attacked by forces from outside with nuclear weapons. It is my strong feeling that we would make a very great mistake—a very great mistake, indeed, at this particular time, to withhold this authorization.

I invite attention to the fact that this is only an authorization. Going to the summit conference for the important purpose which will carry him there, the President, under the circumstances now existing, will go either with an authorization, indicating that Congress, speaking for the people are back of him or without an authorization, indicating that there is great difference in our country to the extent that a majority of Congress is against him in that particular.

I think that any of us who have been through many conferences—I do not pretend to have been through any of as great importance as this one, and I do not suppose any other Senator has—but to go there without the assurance given by the facts, given by what has taken place, that his country is back of him is, in my judgment, to send the President there in a very weakened position and one which I do not wish to impose upon him.

Now, Mr. President, insofar as the backgrounds of the various Senators are concerned—and I question the motives of no Senator, and never have—I invite attention to the fact, again, that we are all of a different background.

If I may contrast the very distinguished background of the Senator from Arkansas with the much more modest background of the senior Senator from Florida, the Senator from Arkansas is a Rhodes scholar, he was the president of a university, and he saw at first hand the workings of the parliamentary system in Great Britain. The Senator from Arkansas has admired that system to the extent that he has expressed on this floor what amounts to questions as to whether it is wise—as we do—to separate the executive from the legislative, or whether the British parliamentary system may be a sounder and better system.

The Senator from Arkansas is in all ways a man of peace, a man of learning, a man of science, a man of great understanding—and, if I may say so, a man of very wonderful personality.

From that background he comes to one conclusion. I wish that I could say I have come to that conclusion, but from a very different background. In war quite a while as a young man, in law practice, and in public affairs in my own State of

Florida as a young man, and also as an older man both in the legislature for a long while, and then as Governor, and now here in the Senate, with entirely different committee assignments and with entirely different interests in many fields of study, certainly not the same interests and scholarship which my good friend has, I come to the conclusion that the practical, commonsense thing is for us to stand back of the President in this authorization.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. First, I, of course, cannot resist thanking the Senator for the implications in his remarks which are most complimentary to me about some of my past activities, although I do not think they are particularly relevant to this point. Let me say one other thing about this present situation. The Senator from Florida left out his own accomplishments. He has had a very long and distinguished career as Governor of his State, as a Senator, and as a public servant in many other ways.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my good friend.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We know that. No man in the Senate is more respected for attention to his duties and the contributions he makes to the Senate in many different ways, in his integrity, and so forth, than the Senator from Florida.

On many occasions, we have been on the same side of controversial issues. The Senator from Florida has always taken the lead in those and has done a very fine job.

But on this particular question, I have had some pretty bitter experience myself in adopting the attitude, "He is our President; therefore, we should follow him." Perhaps that is one of the things which has made me most skeptical about that particular approach. That is the point the Senator from Florida, apparently, really is making.

Mr. President, I felt that way in 1964. In 1964, I went out of my way as much as any man in the Senate to support the then Democratic candidate for President of the United States. I made speeches here and elsewhere, particularly in my own State. I was one of the few office holders in my State who made public speeches and took the responsibility of organizing a campaign in the summer of 1964.

I was chairman of the committee which reported to this body a resolution sometimes called the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. I later found out that that resolution, in my view—and I am more convinced now than I ever was—was based upon false information. It was not directly given by the President. It was given to my committee by his appointees. Of course, I think he has to take the responsibility for it. That was the beginning, in my view, of the greatest tragedy this country has suffered since the Civil War.

Maybe that is part of our background that makes me most skeptical just to say, "Well, the President wants it, so let us give it to him."

That is where I think I differ with the Senator. Perhaps it is because of my ex-

perience. The Senator from Florida did not go through that experience. He did not have the same responsibility for it. I doubt, being only one Member of this body, that I could have influenced the outcome in that situation, because it was a highly emotional one. The House of Representatives had voted unanimously for it, and in this body there were only two skeptics. Perhaps that is one of the deciding elements why I do not feel that, because the President wants it, we should give it to him.

I have great respect for the President. He used to be a Member of this body. He used to be a Member of the other body. He has moved from this end of the avenue to the other end. I have great respect for him as a public servant, but I do not think he is infallible.

I differ with the Senator from Florida as to the effect on his representation at a conference, assuming he goes to a conference. I could make as good an argument for the view that we should go there without trying to impress the Russians that we can overcome them, that we are the "big fellow," and we do not want to do anything unless they do this or that. I think it would be more effective if we approached them a little from the standpoint of equality.

I think the Russians suffer from the feeling that we are trying to outdo them; that we are the richest nation—everybody knows that—that we have great missiles—as everybody knows—that we spend at least 25, if not 30, percent more on our defense than they do. This is a psychological thing. The Senator thinks it strengthens the President's hand. I am not sure that it does not make it more difficult to arrive at an understanding, even on that basis.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I say again, I do not question his motives or objectives. I did not in connection with his sponsorship of the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. I supported him. We had a long colloquy on it on the floor—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was wrong.

Mr. HOLLAND. I believed everything he told me. I reexamined it the other day. I think all the things he told me were true. They had to do, generally, with the relations of the nations in the Southeast Asia area, if the Senator will look at the colloquy, and not with the question of the soundness of the facts as related to him, and by him to us, as to what had taken place in the Gulf of Tonkin. They had to do more with the relationship of the various nations in that area.

I believe in the Senator from Arkansas, and I have tried to say so, but I do not always agree with him, and neither do I always agree with my President. But when I send my President, as I hope I may be a party to sending him, with every good wish, to confront the Soviets, I want him to have every assurance of support and backing from his own people that we can give him. When I know it is not a final expression we are asked to make, but simply an authorization, and when I know they know that just as well as we do, whether or not we pass this authorization, I want him to go there feeling that he is backed by his own people and his own Congress, and I

think they should have the knowledge that he is so backed.

May I say, with reference to this whole question, that I have not blindly supported the President of the United States. The Senator from Arkansas spoke of a President whom we jointly helped elect in 1964. I think the Senator knows, without recounting them, how many times, in my conscience, I opposed that particular President, and I did so, and sometimes strongly. One of them was last year, just before he left office, when he tried to name as Chief Justice of the United States a man who I felt was not of the proper philosophy, as was shown by his own actions upon the high Court. The Senator may not know some of the things visited upon the Senator from Florida because of his position then, but the Senator from Florida did not waver.

So far as his support of the Defense Department is concerned, the Senator from Florida has frequently differed with it. I remember last year and the year before they wanted expensive, big ships to be stationed in various parts of the earth, full of all kinds of implements of war and peace, so that when anything broke out at remote areas of the earth, we could act very quickly. The records of the Congress show I opposed that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It was taken out in committee, was it not?

Mr. HOLLAND. When they were trying to build a very impressive and large bomber—I do not remember the name of it, but it was an alphabetical name—the Senator from Florida opposed it. Another time, when they were trying to build an additional nuclear carrier, the Senator from Florida opposed it.

The Senator from Florida has, on frequent occasions, opposed the Defense Department, and he stands ready to do so again. But the feeling of the Senator from Florida at this time is that, if he were going into an argument, confronting our only great potential hostile force in the world, he would want to have the assurance of the backing of his own people, as shown by the vote of the Congress, which represents the people of this country; and the Senator from Florida would not want to send him there naked, and not clothed with that expression of support.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I will yield, but may I finish with just one additional comment?

I remember when the question came up on the issue of selective service a few years ago. The Defense Department was begging for an extension. I remember that the Armed Services Committee was begging for an extension. I remember that, finally, after long debate, the Congress extended selective service by one single vote. That was the margin in one House of the Congress. And within a few weeks, Pearl Harbor fell upon us, and we realized how terrible a handicap we would have been under without an extension of selective service.

I think this is one of the issues we may be divided on, just as the Congress was then divided; but I think I am entitled to have a very strong conviction,

which I do have in this instance. I promise nothing further, because I may vote against the President next time it comes before us. This is not because he asks for it. It is because he is going to represent the people of this Nation. I think he should go with the assurance of our support and that in giving him that support he will carry greater weight and greater strength with respect to those with whom he will be in difficult contest—and that is what it amounts to when he gets into such an experience as that conference will be.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield—

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator misconstrues the issue. The issue of the ABM goes beyond that conference. We have already had a vote which clearly supports the President on the conference. If the Senator will look at the debate on the Nonproliferation Treaty, he will see that article VI of the treaty commits us to discussions with the Soviets for the purpose of stopping the spiraling of the arms race. That was put in there at the urgent request of the smaller countries who were parties to the treaty. It was put in as article VI of the treaty itself. We discussed it in the committee. I discussed it on the floor. The vote for it was overwhelming. I think 80 Members of this body voted to advise and consent to the Nonproliferation Treaty.

That is the vote which is relevant to the President's going to a conference with Russia.

This issue is on just one item in a military bill, which, it seems to me, is utterly irrelevant to the President's discussions on armaments.

If the Senator wants to take an item which is more relevant, it would be the question of the MIRV. Much was said about it in the hearings before our committee. It was revealed that that is a far more dangerous weapon and much more likely to disrupt a conference. I refer to our proceeding with MIRV.

I could make a far better argument, I think, if we want to strengthen the President and place him in a position they could not challenge, for laying on the table the fact that we have MIRV, that we have MIRV-ed our weapons, and that we are absolutely invulnerable because of our strength.

I do not think that is really the way to approach a conference, if we are serious about seeking an agreement with the Russians. I would say that the ABM is of little consequence. The Russians have tried an ABM. They started to deploy one. They got it half way in, and they discovered it was a bad deal and quit deploying it. This is the information we had, and the Senator knows we had it.

Mr. HOLLAND. I listened to the information in the closed hearing. It was not entirely to that effect.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I beg to differ with the Senator. That is as far as you could go in reading anyone's mind. This was the conclusion of the intelligence community, that they had stopped and were not proceeding, and what they are doing is what we are saying we ought to do now, which is only to conduct research on it. They are not proceeding to deploy.

One thing that is very difficult to deal with is when the proponents of deployment get up and say, "The Russians have an ABM. Shouldn't we have?"

What the Russians have is absolutely nothing like what is proposed here. It is around only one city. If anything, it is like Sentinel, which we have abandoned, which was designed for the protection of a city. But they got it halfway up and decided it was a bad deal, and they have stopped deploying it. That is the uncontroverted testimony of the Chairman of the United States Intelligence Board. We had this information before we even got into this controversy over a year ago, when this matter came up with regard to the Galosh system.

They are not proceeding to build it because they know it needs further development, and maybe they cannot make it work at all; they do not know. That is the only rational conclusion one can draw from what they have done.

I do not see how the Senator thinks this would be a vote of confidence in the President. If any vote could be that, it was the vote on the nonproliferation treaty, which has a specific article on this subject. This is simply one item. I suppose, one could pick out any item in this bill and say a vote for it is a vote of confidence.

Why is it? I cannot understand the Senator's point that if we should vote not to deploy, but simply to go ahead as the Senator from Kentucky suggests, it would be interpreted abroad as a disavowal of the President. I think that is an absolute non sequitur. I do not think anyone would interpret it that way, and certainly not the Russians, because they know what an ABM is, even if we do not. They know how faulty it is. If they did not, why did they not proceed to put it in, not only around Moscow, but around Leningrad, Kiev, Irkutsk, and so on? Obviously because they have not been able to make it work up to this time, and there is grave doubt whether they can.

I have no purpose of disavowing the President, if and when he goes to meet with the Russians.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sure the Senator does not, but there are Senators who think that to agree to the amendment would weaken the President, and the Senator from Florida, for one, is very strongly of that feeling.

I ask the Senator to go back with me a little bit. I think, in the first place, we here in this country are not as cautious as we should be in our dealings with the Russians. I hope that they are frank this time. I hope that the fact that Mr. Gromyko has indicated that they would like to have this conference for arms control may be taken at face value. But my memory goes back to some things that make me a little more cautious than I would be otherwise, and I am a little bit inclined to be suspicious and cautious, and I make no apology for so being.

I remember that we thought we had an assurance from the Russians that they would not explode a nuclear weapon in outer space, and we woke up suddenly to find that they had done so, and that they had secured information which we wished we had, and which we cannot get

because we are, of course, conforming to the later treaty on that subject.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. May I say that was not a treaty.

Mr. HOLLAND. May I finish my point on this matter?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Just as a point of—

Mr. HOLLAND. May I please finish my point?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It was not a treaty. That is the only point I wish to make. There is no such treaty.

Mr. HOLLAND. I supported the Senator in his nonproliferation treaty, and was glad to do so. I thought it was the patriotic thing to do so, just as I think now that in order to give our President the greatest strength and the greatest showing of unity at home, we should support him in this request, which comes from the Armed Services Committee on a perfectly nonpartisan and bipartisan basis.

I remind the Senator that not only did the Russians completely breach their agreement with us with reference to the explosion of a nuclear body out in space, but that this same man, Gromyko, when the Russians had transported some of their great weapons, some of their long-distance missiles, into Cuba, and they were installed there, and the President had on his desk the picture taken by some of our people in the Air Force showing that the missiles were there, and right where they were, this same man, Gromyko, came into the office of President Kennedy and told him that this was all a pipedream, that Russia had not sent any of its missiles to Cuba.

The Senator well remembers that, because I think he was close to that situation as the distinguished chairman of our highly distinguished Committee on Foreign Relations, I am sure that he knew all about that, and he knows of the rather atrocious misstatement made by Mr. Gromyko to our late, beloved President John F. Kennedy.

Then I remember that, though they were committed by treaty to give us access to Berlin, that they forgot all about that commitment, and we had to go through the very expensive but very effective airlift program, to show that even though they did violate it, we did not propose, because of a few million dollars, to abandon the people of Berlin on our commitment to them and to our allies in Europe.

Knowing these things, it seems to me that we would appear rather naive, that we would appear over optimistic, that we would appear over credulous to the Russians and to the world if, at this time, we took at face value—though I hope that later we can take it at face value—the assurance of Mr. Gromyko that they want to limit arms. We all know how badly we need to curtail the arms race, and I think Russia needs just as badly to curtail it; perhaps they need it more than we do. I think we would look very naive indeed, however, if we took the fact that he has approached us on this subject as a sort of assurance that the difficult objective was going to be worked out, and that therefore we were going to abandon what we had already entered into as a program to protect our retaliation.

tory strength—not to make an offensive gesture of any kind, but in order to defend, if we needed to make use of them, the continuing availability of our weapons up in the areas of our Midwest where they are in place.

Mr. President, I feel so strongly about this issue that I felt that I should place this statement in the *RECORD* at this time. I am not prepared to discuss now, though I have read a great deal on the matter, the scientific questions that are involved. But those questions have been adequately discussed. I simply wish to bear down on this one point: that I think we would make a great mistake to leave the Nation with the feeling that we did not propose to support our President on this first step—and that is what this is—that as far as the modified ABM is concerned, and that we did not propose to support him just prior to the time that he goes away to this all-important conference. I feel that we should do so, and I do not think I need to remind my distinguished friend that I have very frequently opposed the Presidents, not just this President—though I have not had much chance to oppose him yet, because he has not asked for much that has come to the floor as yet—but I have frequently opposed my own Presidents, if one can so speak of those who belong to the party to which he and I both belong—and I opposed the previous President of the other party, under whom I had the privilege to serve together with the Senator from Arkansas.

I do not feel an obligation to support everything they ask for, and never expect to do so. But I feel that in this instance, whether he had asked for it or not, we should arm him with the additional assurance that his Nation is behind him and his Congress is behind him; that we are taking this first step, an authorization step only, on a program designed to protect our retaliatory power.

There is no crime in protecting our retaliatory power. There is no offensive action of any kind in doing that. I think we should begin on that path at this time.

I thank my friend the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for his patience. He knows how I feel toward him. I have shown that frequently by what I have said and how I have voted on the floor of the Senate.

I think the Senator is wrong in his conclusion at this time, although from the best of motives. I think he is entitled to know what my decision is, why I have made it, and why I feel the President will be a much stronger advocate of what we want him to stand for when he goes to have a summit conference with the Russians if he goes with the knowledge not only of himself and the Russians, but also of the world, that his Nation stands behind him in the beginning of an effort to protect our retaliatory power so that always we need not fear destruction at the hands of one who tries to destroy us by nuclear weapons.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have a few words to say in response.

There are a number of points that the Senator raises. I would be more than

willing to cosponsor, sponsor, or vote for a resolution which in no uncertain terms states that we are behind the President in his efforts to reach some agreement on the limitation of armaments and so forth.

As I say, I consider the vote on the nonproliferation treaty, which contained article VI, to be just such a vote. I feel that this is just a weapons system on which there certainly is great doubt.

The Senator will agree that when we take the testimony of the scientists—and especially if we take into consideration those scientists who were the advisers of the previous Presidents, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson, who are not now in the employ of either the Pentagon, the Government, or a contractor—and put it against the others, it is very impressive. I think that there is doubt about the state of the art at the present time.

As to the retaliatory strength that the Senator has mentioned, we have the weapons. There is no question about the number of weapons we have in place at four different locations: the Minuteman in silos, the Polaris in the submarines, the Poseidons in the Polaris, and the weapons at airports and even abroad.

The deterrence grows from the belief on the part of the Russians that we will use them. The way they were designed and the way they will operate as deterrents is that when our radars and satellites indicate the Russians are attacking, they will be released and destroy them. This is the whole theory of deterrents. It works now. It will work in the future.

In my opinion, I do not believe the ABM is relevant to the proposed conference with the Russians in any substantial way.

The question is whether we will use them. I think we will. They understand that; we understand that.

What we are going for now is—and it is the purpose of the conference—that we cease to escalate and cease to spend all of our money, or so much of it, on both sides for this nonproductive instrumentality known as nuclear weapons.

All we are doing in creating MIRV and ABM is stepping up an arms race and doing exactly the opposite of the purpose of the conference.

With reference to the conference—and I do not believe I am naive about it—I think it is very dubious that we will get any results, because I think there is great question about our credibility in really meaning to go forward with a restriction on the number of armaments because we are now making the decision to put in ABM. We have already begun the MIRV. Contracts were let and publicly announced a week or two ago for the deployment of MIRV.

Many of our best authorities have said that this is a more significant thing than the ABM because once we get the MIRV in operation, it is very difficult to find out what is going on by means of satellite or any other means.

There is no reason to be very optimistic about it. That is another reason, it seems to me, that we can agree this is not likely to promote an argument. I am not so

optimistic when it comes to getting an agreement. I would like to get an agreement. However, in the meantime, I do not want to spend all of our money on this.

Actually, with respect to the Senator's point of view about supporting the President, the day before yesterday the President had a large number of Senators and Representatives at the White House at 8 o'clock in the morning. And the present Secretary of the Treasury and his three predecessors were there.

What was he talking about? The ABM? No. He was talking about the surtax and its importance.

I would say that a vote against the surtax would be perhaps a more significant disavowal of the President than a vote against the ABM. At least the President gave the surtax far greater prominence in his efforts at prevailing upon the Senators. There were more Senators and Representatives present to listen to his very fervent pleas for the surtax than he has ever had present concerning the ABM.

Am I going to be in a position to say, "I can't vote against the surtax because it would be a disavowal of the President and he would go abroad without the full support of his Congress." Surely, to me the surtax is just as relevant to the purpose of the conference as is the ABM.

I do not think the ABM is so significant to the Russians one way or the other.

They know it is a rather insignificant thing. What I am really interested in is not going down the endless road of pouring our money into weapons systems which serve no useful purpose. We have serious matters to consider, and I agree with the President about inflation and the surtax.

The only criticism I made about his presentation at the White House with his people was that he spoke only about taxes, nothing about cutting the budget. I think that budgetary matters are as important as taxes. But that is another subject. I raise it at this point merely to say that the President himself has given, within the last 2 weeks, greater attention to persuading us of the necessity for a surtax than he has for the ABM. I think the ABM, even from his point of view, is merely another item in the overall program which his new Secretary of Defense, because, I am sure, of his feeling and his duty, is urging upon the President.

But I do not believe the President thinks at all that the ABM is as significant as the Senator from Florida thinks it is to support him. If it is support, and that is all it is, I would be more than willing to submit a resolution of support, backing the President 100 percent in his efforts in Moscow, if that is all it would take to satisfy the Senator from Florida on that point. If he has some other point, that is another matter. But I would have no hesitation in backing the President in that way.

I do not believe there is a relevant connection between the ABM and backing the President in his conference on the limitation of armaments. Some persons have already said that the ABM is a de-

fensive weapon. Why should the Russians particularly care about it? I do not think the Russians particularly care. In the first place, they know it will not work. Second, it would be expensive. It would weaken us to divert money to the ABM, which is useless, instead of procuring more MIRV's or Poseidons, which are more dangerous. I think the Russians would be glad to have us proceed down this futile path.

It has been suggested that we ought to go all out in the arms race because the Russians will go bankrupt before we will. That argument has been suggested by some columnists and others who think that we cannot make an arrangement with the Russians anyway. They make the argument the Senator has made, that the Russians cannot be trusted.

They call attention to the fact that the Russians exploded a nuclear weapon before we did. Actually, that was not under a treaty. They had made no formal agreement; it was a tacit understanding which they broke. I do not think the Senator was correct in saying that there was a treaty—in other words, a formal agreement. It was what might be called a gentlemen's agreement, although that might not, perhaps, be appropriate in this connection.

I dislike to be in a position of trying to defend the Russians. They have done many things of which I do not approve. I think they have made many mistakes. I do not approve of their having gone into Czechoslovakia. I think it was a great mistake on their part. But I must say, also, that I did not approve of our intervention in the Dominican Republic in violation of treaties. We had made treaties with Latin American countries at Rio de Janeiro and other places, in which it was said in no uncertain terms that we would not intervene in those countries—the Senator knows that—but we did intervene directly against those treaties. So I do not like to use that type of action.

I think that big countries, when they feel that their interests are threatened, rightly or wrongly, and mostly wrongly, intervene.

I certainly do not approve of the misrepresentation about Cuba, but neither do I approve of the misrepresentation about the Gulf of Tonkin to my committee.

Surely, the Senator does not take the position that we are the only good people and that we have never gone against any of our treaties—going back to the Indians or anybody else. The Senator will not approve of the way we treated the Indians. The Senator will not approve of the way we treated the Filipinos after the Spanish-American War. I do not approve of it; I do not think history approves of it. I think we were absolutely without justification. It was a cruel and barbarous thing to do, after we had cooperated with Aguinaldo and then turned upon him and destroyed him.

But those are things that big countries have done, and I do not think any of us are without fault.

I am not trying to defend the Russians and say they are good people and we can trust everyone. The only purpose in having a conference with them

is that their interest in this instance coincides with ours. We did make a treaty with them in the Antarctic. There was a great deal of opposition. I believe 30 Senators voted against it. To my knowledge—and we inquire from time to time—the Russians have abided by it to the letter, to this day, because their own interest coincided with ours. It was a good treaty. So far as I know, they have abided by the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, as well as we have. Both of us, I think—I know we did—inadvertently allowed a little to escape in our underground testing. I do not think it was intentional, and they have made no point of it, nor have we in their case. I think we all are subject to making mistakes or doing things we should not do.

Now, that has nothing really to do with this. What it comes back to on the ABM, the point I am trying to make, is that in all good faith I think the Senator, to some extent, misconceives the relevance of the ABM to the support of the President. I do not want to weaken the President; I do not think it does weaken him; and I am willing to do whatever the Senator thinks appropriate, other than this type of thing, to support him, if the Senator thinks it is necessary. I do not think it is necessary. I believe that the vote of 80 Senators on the Nonproliferation Treaty, with article 6 in it, is all the backing the President needs from this body to go to Moscow with the full assurance that they know he is speaking for us when he makes a proposal to limit armaments.

On the contrary—and I will end with this—I think that in proceeding with ABM and with MIRV, we are guilty to a degree of talking out of both sides of our mouth. On the one hand, we are saying we want to limit armaments. On the other hand, we are proceeding with both the MIRV and the ABM.

This is a characteristic which has been much in the public eye. The Senator knows about what was called the credibility gap and how it afflicted the last administration to the point that people felt there was a degree of talking one way and acting another. I do not like it. I think it destroys the faith of our people in their own Government. I believe this is bad.

If we are really serious about this negotiation, if we really mean to try to get an agreement, to be consistent with that I think we should, as the Senator from Massachusetts has so well put it, have a moratorium on the MIRV, and we should suspend the ABM at least until after the conference. I think that logically we could be accused of saying: "You voted 80 to 16, or whatever it was, to say we will proceed to a conference, and you turn around and begin to deploy ABM's and MIRV's. So you are speaking one way and acting another."

As our Indian friends, who had so much experience with us, said, "The white man speaks with a forked tongue"

And I think we could be guilty of it.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

I just want to make it clear that, so far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, he thinks that the authorization to proceed with the ABM is a necessary ingredient of our effort to remain

strong. The Senator speaks of how strong we are. It is a defensive effort to make sure that we have the retaliatory force not only to defend ourselves but also to wipe out an opposing enemy, if we have to, if we are first attacked. No real criticism can be made of a nation that tries to protect its power to defend itself.

The Senator knows full well that so far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, he has not been summoned to the White House, he has not talked with the President, and he has not talked with the Secretary of Defense. He has been forced, so far as his information about classified material is concerned, to rely upon the closed session, at which he heard a great deal, and it made him feel that there was a good case made for the authorization of the ABM.

I want to make it very clear, also, that the Senator from Florida has not been approached by anybody of the industrial-military complex to which the Senator has referred; but he has been approached by his own people, who did not know how he was going to stand. I had a count made of my thoughtful letters—from my own people the other day, and they were practically 3-to-1 in favor of the ABM, some 1,500 to 500. Many of them take the position that since it is a purely defensive effort, they feel that by all means it is necessary to help us preserve our strength. And that is what it is for.

I hope the Senator will not mind if I tell him a little story about something that happened to me many years ago. The Senator will recall that shortly after World War I, we used to have Armistice Day celebrations every November 11. The Senator from Florida, as one who had taken part in that war, was called upon at times to make speeches on Armistice Day. He recalls one that he made at the fine little city of Arcadia, Fla.

The host there was the preacher of the Methodist church, the largest place of meeting in the city, who later became a very distinguished bishop of the Methodist church. His name was John Branscomb, and I am certain that the Senator will recall him.

After the Senator from Florida had completed his speech, the customary type of speech made in those days about Armistice Day, about the efforts to make the world safe for democracy, about our having successfully fought a war to end all wars, and then with something about preparedness thrown in for good measure, we were all talking in front of the church. The preacher, who was a dear friend of mine, the Reverend Branscomb, said:

Well, Judge Holland—

I happened to be a judge at that time—I want to tell you that I thought you made a fine speech, except the part about preparedness. I don't believe we ought to stay militarily prepared. I don't believe we ought to arm. I believe we ought to be peaceful.

I questioned that very mildly and finally we both turned to an old friend who was standing by. His name was Dr. Aurin. He was the dean of all doctors in south Florida at that time. As a young man he had fought in the Spanish-

American War as a cavalryman. Brother Branscomb said:

What do you think about it? What is your judgment?

Dr. Aurin said:

I have been here a long time. I was here in the days when there was much disorder here every Saturday night. The cowboys would come to town and the Indians would come to town and there would nearly always be a fight, there would nearly always be a shooting, and there would nearly always be all kinds of scraps. One of the things I noticed was that when a man came to town with a six shooter strapped to his hip where everyone could see it, nobody ever picked a fight with him.

That ended the discussion. For years I was good friends with Brother Branscomb. We both became trustees of Florida Southern College. He would frequently recall that incident.

I think that to have the ABM is to have a pistol on our hip where it is available and where all the world knows it is available; and we have the striking strength, if the need comes to strike back, so we can demolish anyone that has the effrontery to attack us. It is not an offensive effort; it is a defensive effort.

I want the Senator to realize that those who would confront us may honor us the more if we try to move from a position of strength rather than from a position of relative weakness.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In his last phrase, the Senator made reference to "relative weakness." That, I think, might be the key to the entire matter. The relative weakness is utterly inappropriate to our situation. I realize the Senator is not on our committee, and he could not possibly have heard the testimony from official witnesses about our relative strength and have any idea that we are relatively weak. We are relatively very powerful. There are many ways this can be judged.

In the first place, there is no question, according to people in authority, that we are spending at least 4 to 3 in purchasing dollars. This is translated by the best authorities as the purchasing power, not the number. We went into the matter in great detail.

I asked, "How do you estimate what the two countries are spending?" Of course, we have twice as much productivity as they have and they may be spending a little more of their GNP percentagewise, but we are spending far more in purchasing power.

Mr. HOLLAND. Our wages and living costs are vastly more than theirs.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am sure the Senator is being misled if he believes that. This is the very thing we asked the Director of the CIA to translate for our committee. Taking into account the cost of living, the cost of materials and everything else, he comes up with a ratio of 4 to 3, which is considerably more. We have these weapons, sufficient to destroy all of Russia several times over.

I beg to suggest that the analogy of

the six shooter on the hip with hydrogen bombs is not appropriate. The days of six shooters, and rocks, and slingshots is gone. There was a different concept then. We are talking about nuclear weapons.

Nuclear weapons translate into hydrogen bombs which can utterly demolish a country. At the same time, they are piled up far beyond the capacity to destroy them completely, far beyond anything in the Soviet Union.

I also call attention to the fact that the ABM is not intended or designed to do anything about protecting the *Polaris* submarine or the weapons in airplanes. It is only designed, even if it were effective, for the Minuteman. So you have all these Poseidons, and more than enough to destroy the whole Soviet Union.

The Senator is talking about only one aspect. If there is only that insignificance, why does the Senator oppose it? I am absolutely convinced we have more weapons than they have. We could destroy them. The deterrence is there. The best people in the military will confirm that, except when they are trying to make a sale on the ABM.

The Senator said that his constituents favored the ABM 3 to 1.

Mr. HOLLAND. 1,500 to 500.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This is the result of the kind of misleading advertising and polls that I referred to. There have been polls in full-page ads. The question is: "The Russians have an ABM to protect them; wouldn't you like to have one?"

If that is not a loaded question, I do not know what is. Anyone who knows nothing about the ABM would say, "Sure, the Russians have it; we should have it also." This is the type thing which creates an impression.

Mr. HOLLAND. Has the Senator seen the page-long ads of the opponents of the ABM? I have.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have seen some of them, but they are very few compared to the others.

We had a Mr. Case before our committee the other day. He is the chairman of a committee which took a poll. The question was: "The Russians have the ABM to protect themselves. Don't you think we should have one?" How could anyone who has not heard anything about this help but say "Yes"? It says nothing about the facts. There is not a word in it that is factual at all. This feeling has been created by this very sort of thing which I mentioned a while ago. It is a good illustration of the military-industrial complex, because among the sponsors of that advertisement were representatives of 11 of the biggest contractors in the country, companies like General Electric, IBM, and so on. The directors of those companies pay for such ads.

As I have mentioned, they are putting out books. Mr. Herman Kahn of the Hudson Institute is publishing a book that I am sure will be spread all over the United States. I do not know who will pay for it, but undoubtedly it will be plenty of people. The \$80 billion in the Defense budget is such an enormous amount of money that no one can conceive of it.

The Senator says we have to be strong. Nobody has ever been as strong as we are.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator was present in the Chamber during the closed session the other day, was he not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator knows that neither he nor I can reveal the information disclosed there, but with respect to nuclear submarines does the Senator remember that information?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes, I remember the reference of our having 41. It is not secret. It has been in the newspapers.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator remember the information about the ones they are constructing?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes, they are building submarines, but we are doing it, too, and we can build them faster and we will if we need them. It was only a few days ago that some of our people thought we have so many more than we need that they are thinking of retiring 10. We can destroy Russia 10 times over and some of the more thoughtful people said, "Why should we keep this up at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars?"

This brings me to one further point. I do not wish to belabor my argument with the Senator. If we have to build everything that comes up, there is no limit—we are already outspending them—unless one assumes we are more stupid than the Russians. We are doing lots more than they in the way of defense. I do not think we are stupid. I think our industrialists are more competent and efficient. There is no way to accept that result. We are already strong enough.

When the Senator refers to a position of strength in which we should go to this conference, we are in a position of strength.

I think we run a risk, by continuing to build the MIRV and ABM, of destroying credibility and creating a situation in which the Russians and everybody else will say, "The Americans are not serious about this. They talk one way and act another way."

But we want to negotiate by proceeding with MIRV which is the most dangerous development since the hydrogen bomb itself.

Mr. HOLLAND. Are not the Russians proceeding with a similar three-headed monster of their own?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But we were proposing that we stop. Everyone agrees, I think, that we are ahead of them insofar as the rate of development and the place of development are concerned. The Committee on Foreign Relations held a hearing with three or four of the best scientists we have. They said that MIRV is the most dangerous new development in the sense of preventing an agreement, because it cannot be supervised or—that is not the right word—

Mr. COOPER. Observed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Observed. In other words, we cannot tell what the other parties are doing. That is why we wanted to have a hearing. We had one. It was a good one.

When we go to the extent of proceeding with MIRV, under these circumstances, we are setting the stage for a failure in any conference. I do not think

by threatening people, by saying we are coming in with twice as many weapons, that we are likely to create an attitude or an atmosphere in which we would get any agreement. If we want to sabotage that matter, that is one way to do it.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not agree with that last statement at all. I think, to the contrary, if we do not proceed with an authorization, which is the first step only of this project, that the very reasonable conclusion for the Russians to reach is that again we are showing we are a bunch of saps, that we believe everything they say, that we are naive, because Mr. Gromyko comes this time to say that, "We sincerely want to limit armaments, so let us have a summit conference," and we regard that as already completed.

I think that we should go to the conference and do everything in our power to bring it out to a successful conclusion, but I do not believe that we will do it by the overoptimistic approach under which we would abandon what we were beginning to do, simply on the strength of his having said that we want to do thus and so. We have seen enough of him heretofore to know that he talks out of both sides of his mouth.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is not new. That was a conciliatory speech. This proposal for negotiating on arms limitations was made nearly a year ago. The preceding administration was seriously getting ready for a conference at the time of Czechoslovakia. We suspended it then and the preceding President—I happen to know from my own knowledge, because the last time I saw him was on this very question—asked me if I thought it was wise to proceed with negotiations with the Russians on arms limitations. That was in the early part of December. I said, so far as I could see, it was. It is my understanding, but this is second-hand, that subsequent to that the incoming administration vetoed the idea. But the Senator should not imagine all of this to be some devious idea of Gromyko's in his speech the other day. This matter has been underway for over a year.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understand that, but I know that the recent hope and the recent effort stem from the statement made by Mr. Gromyko. The Senator knows that that is true. It is not the first thing on this negotiation—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator spoke of the preceding President. Does the Senator take the same position that he does with reference to the ABM?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know about the ABM. I have not talked to him about that. I am talking about negotiations. The Senator brought in the question of negotiations.

Mr. HOLLAND. The press states that the preceding President has exactly the same conviction that the present President has.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With all deference, that is not persuasive with me.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thought the Senator was relying upon the preceding President.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Oh, no. The Senator was talking about the Gromyko speech. In all fairness, I do not think

that because he made a conciliatory statement, that we should make the argument that he is double dealing in order to proceed. On that theory, then they could condemn us.

But I do not attach that kind of condition to the speech he made. One of his main points was that he would like to have better relations with us and maybe we should exchange some Senators and Representatives to come over there. I do not know what he has in mind, in the long run. But we should try to eliminate expenditures and I said I do not think it was a wise policy to spend each other into bankruptcy. The real reasons the Russians want a conference is the reason I want one; namely, to quit breaking ourselves by spending our money on non-productive enterprises. I think the demands by my constituents for sewer projects, water projects, roads, jobs, and so forth, are so great that this is a foolish and very irrational way to proceed—that is, to continue to spend our money in this way.

I am confident that the Russians feel the same way. They need money as badly as or worse than my constituents. This is ultimately the most persuasive reason not to continue an unlimited arms race.

Mr. HOLLAND. Again I appreciate the candor and always the motives of my distinguished friend, but it seems to me that we would be extremely naive to change our plans. The reason we require this new authorization at this time is that we are changing our plans for a cheaper program and for a clearly defensive program. I think just to change those plans on the eve of sending our President over there is not strong but weak.

It is for that reason, among others, that I want this project to be approved.

Now, Mr. President, one more thing. One of my friends from Virginia has sent me a fine editorial from the Daily Progress, published in Charlottesville, Va., an editorial on Tuesday, July 22, 1969, entitled, "Senator Byrd's Warning."

I have read the editorial, as it quotes from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with a great deal of appreciation. I have read the comments made by the editorialist on that warning of our distinguished colleague from Virginia with a great deal of appreciation also; and I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

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

SENATOR BYRD'S WARNING

Sen. Harry F. Byrd Jr. of Virginia had a great deal of common sense packed into a speech he made to the Senate last week in support of a \$20 billion Defense Department authorization for military weapons and research and development.

First off, Sen. Byrd declared his support for a reduction in the \$23 billion authorization sought for the Defense Department by President Johnson before he left office. The Nixon Administration reduced this by \$1 billion and the Senate Committee on Armed Services, of which Sen. Byrd is a member, cut out another \$2 billion.

Sen. Byrd supports the \$20 billion authorization now proposed and in doing so he warned those who would curtail the nation's strategic offensive capability.

"All of us would like an end to the arms race," said the Virginia senator.

"All of us would like to devote to more constructive purposes the money being sought for weaponry.

"But the day that those objectives can be accomplished is not yet here—nor does it appear imminent.

"For the foreseeable future a strong military posture remains essential to our national survival.

"We cannot take a chance on just what might be the intentions of other nations.

"Hours of discussion have been consumed on the floor of the Senate as to the intentions of the Soviet Union, as to whether it intends to seek a first-strike capability against the United States.

"Frankly, I do not know just what the intentions of the Soviet Union are, nor, I submit, does any other member of the Senate. Nor does the President, nor the Secretary of Defense, nor the Central Intelligence Agency.

"In recent years, the Soviet Union has greatly increased its offensive capability. The Soviet Union is continuing to increase its offensive capability. The Soviet SS-9 missile has the capability of knocking out a U.S. missile site. It is our strong offensive missiles upon which we rely to deter any nuclear aggressor.

"The entire strategic concept upon which the United States has been relying to avert a nuclear war is that the United States be so strong that any foreign power deploying missiles against us would know that we could retaliate by destroying him who struck the first blow.

"Today, we are in such a position. But we must constantly be on the alert. These major weapons systems have a long lead time. We must legislate today for four and five and six years hence. We cannot let down our guard—not until the day, not yet discernible, when effective arms control agreements can be reached."

These are not pleasant words to hear or read but they are comforting to the extent that they face up to hard facts and the price the United States must pay in today's world. Once the nation learns to accept a burden that it must shoulder despite its natural reluctance, the stronger our national security will be. In today's world we cannot afford to drag our feet, to take chances or to make educated or uneducated guesses as to what our potential enemies intend to do.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR MCINTYRE ON MONDAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. Fong) on Monday next, under the order already agreed to, the able Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. McIntyre) be recognized until, and not to extend beyond, 12 o'clock noon.

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

COMMUNICATIONS RELATING TO
EXPRESSIONS FROM BRITISH OFFICIALS
ON LANDING OF AMERICANS ON MOON

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I have been asked by the Vice President to call attention to a communication from the British Embassy addressed to the Vice President, in which communication there is conveyed to the Vice President a letter from the Right Honorable Lord Shackleton, of the British House of Lords, together with an official extract from the House of Lords' official report of July 22, 1969.

The letter to the distinguished Vice President from Lord Shackleton reads as follows:

HOUSE OF LORDS.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: Today in the House of Lords I was asked by Lord St. Oswald a Private Notice Question: "Whether in view of the unique and inspiring achievement of the Moon Landing by the American Astronauts, and its importance to human history, it would be desirable for this House to convey their admiration to the Senate of the United States of America."

This suggestion was warmly supported in the Lords by Lord Jellicoe, Deputy Leader of the Conservative Party, Lord Byers, Leader of the Liberal Party, and Lord Snow, a former Minister speaking from the Labour Benches. It was clear that the proposal had enthusiastic and unanimous support in all quarters of the House and I hasten therefore to transmit this message of admiration and congratulation to you, Mr. Vice-President, in the hope that you will do us the honour of conveying this message to the United States Senate.

May I add my own personal warmest regards and admiration.

I remain,

Yours sincerely,

SHACKLETON.

The British Embassy asks that Lord Shackleton's message be read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and also that the extract be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and, at the request of the distinguished Vice President of the United States, the Presiding Officer of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the British Embassy addressed to the Vice President, the letter addressed to the Vice President by Lord Shackleton, and the extract from the House of Lords' Official Report dated July 22, 1969, be included in the RECORD.

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

BRITISH EMBASSY,
Washington, D.C., July 24, 1969.

THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: In the Ambassador's absence from Washington I should like to convey to you the attached letter from Lord Shackleton, the Leader of the House of Lords, together with an official extract from the House of Lords Official Report of 22 July, 1969.

Lord Shackleton would be most grateful if it were possible for his message and the extract to be read into the Senate Record.

Yours sincerely,

E. E. TOMPKINS.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: Today in the House of Lords I was asked by Lord St. Oswald a Private Notice Question: "Whether in view of the unique and inspiring achievement of the Moon Landing by the American Astronauts, and its importance to human history, it would be desirable for this House

to convey their admiration to the Senate of the United States of America."

This suggestion was warmly supported in the Lords by Lord Jellicoe, Deputy Leader of the Conservative Party, Lord Byers, Leader of the Liberal Party, and Lord Snow, a former Minister speaking from the Labour Benches. It was clear that the proposal had enthusiastic and unanimous support in all quarters of the House and I hasten therefore to transmit this message of admiration and congratulation to you, Mr. Vice-President, in the hope that you will do us the honour of conveying this message to the United States Senate.

May I add my own personal warmest regards and admiration.

I remain,

Yours sincerely,

SHACKLETON.

EXTRACT FROM HOUSE OF LORDS OFFICIAL
REPORT, JULY 22, 1969

LORD ST. OSWALD. My Lords, I beg leave to ask the Question of which I have given Private Notice; namely, to ask the Leader of the House whether, in view of the unique and inspiring achievement of the moon landing by the American astronauts and its importance to human history, it would be desirable for this House to convey their admiration to the Senate of the United States of America?

LORD SHACKLETON. My Lords, I hope the House will agree that I was justified in allowing this Question on grounds of urgency and certainly in relation to timeliness. Speaking personally, I very much welcome the noble Lord's suggestion. He and I have both had a great interest in this subject for many years, so he is perhaps not surprised that I should be so much in agreement with him. Strictly speaking, this would probably be best done by a Motion on the Order Paper. On the other hand, if the House is in general agreement and there is not any dissenting voice, I would certainly be willing to make the feeling of the House known by conveying a message to the Vice President, who is the President of the Senate, to indicate our great admiration for this achievement; and I personally hope, whatever anyone may think about the best way of spending money, that this will be a real and vital unifying force for the whole of humanity.

LORD BYERS. My Lords, I am quite sure that my colleagues on these Benches would wish to be associated with the action that the noble Lord has proposed.

EARL JELICOE. My Lords, I am certain that what the noble Lord has suggested would equally meet the feelings of all our colleagues on this side of the House in admiration for an extraordinary technical and extraordinary human performance.

LORD SNOW. My Lords, I should like to support this suggestion, if I may, speaking as one whose belief in the future of space exploration is not unqualified. Nevertheless, I suggest that this is probably the most remarkable single technological achievement yet made by man, and also an example, which is more important, of really astonishing and enduring human courage, which helps to make us feel proud for once of belonging to the same species; and I hope that this particular pride might give us the courage to attack more mundane problems, such as too little food and too many people.

LORD ST. OSWALD. My Lords, in thanking the noble Lord for his response, which does not take me entirely by surprise, I wonder whether I could add two observations which I did not think appropriate to include in the substantive Question, which I hope will be allowed by the Rules of Order: first, I should like to say how particularly and personally pleasant it is for me to have been able to address this Question to the Leader of the House in the person of the noble Lord, Lord Shackleton, knowing and sharing with him, as I do, his philosophical and cordial enthusiasm for this kind of endeavour, espe-

cially when it is crowned with triumphant success as in this case. Second, the universal nature of the achievement was most beautifully expressed some years ago in certain words, themselves a reflection of Zen Buddhism, which I beg leave to repeat: "One moon and one only is reflected in all waters, All moons in the water are one with the one moon."

LORD SHACKLETON. My Lords, I am much obliged to the noble Lord. We have gone so far out of order on this occasion, when clearly the House is tolerant in this matter, that I think I should be safe in saying that there will be no dissenting voices. I therefore greatly welcome the noble Lord's initiative. It would not be for me to discuss what the future space policy of this country should be, but I noticed yesterday in another place that at the time the astronauts blasted off from the moon there was a certain Member of Parliament quite properly called Mr. Moonman on his feet. I will certainly convey in the warmest way possible the feelings of your Lordships' House.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

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

The 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 Selective Reserve of each reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, for many weeks I have been engaged in an intensive review of President Nixon's recommendation to deploy the first phase of the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system. It has been difficult to arrive at a decision on this issue because of basic disagreement among eminent scientists on the efficacy of the system itself, and because of the wide diversity of expert opinion on how deployment will affect prospects for arms limitations and a lessening of international tensions. Moreover, my study has been complicated by that fact that I do not serve on the committees which have examined these issues, and therefore have not had the benefit of hearing first-hand the testimony submitted at the hearings.

My evaluation of the testimony on the technical aspects of the ABM, and an appraisal of this Nation's history of scientific and technical accomplishments, is persuasive that a missile defense of our Minuteman sites can ful-

fill the objectives of its design. As the Armed Services Committee said in its report on this issue:

The testing and design work on both the missile and radar components, and the computers, so far has not indicated that there are insuperable technological problems confronting the Safeguard system. It is prudent that any doubt on this question be resolved in favor of confidence in the system.

If our scientists can resolve technical problems involved in epochal achievement of landing a man on the moon, they should be able to integrate successfully the components of the ABM. Questions relating to the feasibility of other projects—most notably the hydrogen bomb and the Polaris missile—have been resolved by the scientific community. Accordingly, there is justification for the belief that our scientists and technicians can overcome any problems that may arise during deployment.

Deployment of the first phase of the system at two Minuteman sites is a logical extension of the research and development program which dates back to 1956, when the Nike-Zeus system was started. I would be constrained to oppose proposals limiting the administration to continued research and development in view of testimony that the first phase of the system is a prototype installation needed to enable the Defense Department to conduct shakedown tests and expose any problems not encountered in research and development. It is only through first-phase deployment that the system can be tested as a coordinated unit. Research and development cannot give answers to technical issues that only operational experience can provide.

In view of the intensity of opinion on this subject, I am confident that the Congress will assess the ABM situation on a continuing basis. Hopefully, with the reporting system recently announced by the Armed Services Committee, cost overruns and wastes which have occurred in the development of other defense projects can be avoided. The quarterly reports to be filed with the committee under its reporting system should provide up-to-date cost information on all weapons, and prevent recurrences of the miscalculations of the past.

One cannot deal with the question of ABM deployment solely on the basis of its technical feasibility. My consideration of whether deployment should proceed inevitably has involved the larger question of the effect of Safeguard upon arms control. Initially, it seemed necessary to decide whether first-phase deployment would have an adverse effect upon the convening of discussions on arms limitations. A review of the history of the ABM has persuaded me that a favorable vote should not impede efforts to begin these talks. Soviet Premier Aleksei N. Kosygin said at a news conference in February 1967, that defensive systems, which prevent attack, are not the cause of the arms race, but constitute a factor preventing the death of people. As has been affirmed time and again during the debate on the ABM, Safeguard in no way can be considered an offensive weapon. It is intended to intercept incoming ballistic missiles fired by an aggressor, thereby protecting our deterrent. Within

a week after Congress appropriated funds last year for deployment of Sentinel, Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko expressed a willingness on behalf of Russia to discuss disarmament. Similar overtures were made earlier this month.

In view of Russia's reaction following the last ABM vote, and the more recent expression of interest by Mr. Gromyko, I have concluded that the Soviets, on the basis of their own utterances, cannot consider as provocative a favorable vote on the first phase of Safeguard.

In my judgment, a far more serious threat to arms limitations arises from MIRV, the offensive multiple warhead missiles being developed by both the United States and Russia. MIRV, a weapon which presents difficult on-site inspection problems, should be a top-priority matter for discussion at the forthcoming negotiations. I recognize that it is uncertain whether Russia's multiple warheads are independently targetable, but it must be assumed that it will be only a matter of time before the Soviets in fact have developed this weapon. In any event, the leadtime involved in MIRV deployment is shorter than that for Safeguard. Should the Soviet Union perfect and deploy multiple independently targetable reentry vehicles, a hard-point defense system would become absolutely necessary in this country.

A moratorium on MIRV would serve to preserve the existing second-strike capability of the United States and Russia, whereby either side could absorb an attack by the other and effectively retaliate. This situation promotes stability, because a first strike would constitute an invitation to destruction. A MIRV agreement could prevent mutual first-strike capability, whereby each side could destroy the other by firing its missiles first. Such capability would have a destabilizing effect, because the side which attacked first would win.

Because of the destabilizing effect of MIRV deployment, and because of the present absence of an agreement on testing and deployment of this system, it would seem desirable to me to support first-phase deployment of the ABM until we know the extent to which arms negotiations will be successful. If the talks lead to an acceptable agreement, it may not be necessary to proceed with further ABM deployment. On the other hand, if there is a breakdown in negotiations, or it appears they otherwise will not be productive, the United States at least will have initiated first-phase deployment of a defensive system which will provide a measure of protection against incoming ballistic missiles.

Because of the escalatory effect of MIRV, I shall support Senate resolution 211, sponsored by the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), which expresses the sense of the Senate that the President propose to Soviet Russia an immediate bilateral suspension of tests of multiple independently targetable offensive weapons, subject to national verification or such other measures of observation and inspection as may be appropriate. The resolution also provides that the United States should declare its intention to refrain from additional

flight tests of multiple reentry vehicles so long as the Soviet Union does so.

Mr. President, as is obvious from my preceding remarks, I have decided to support the committee majority and vote for first-phase deployment. However, I reserve judgment on future authorizations and appropriations for the system. I shall be guided in subsequent voting by progress in arms control talks, estimates of the extent of offensive weapons deployment by Russia and China, and by evaluations of progress pertaining to both offensive and defensive weapons technology.

Proceeding with first-phase deployment may well serve the desirable purpose of providing an incentive for productive talks on arms limitations. It is a better response at the present time to the Soviet buildup than an increase in our offensive forces. First-phase deployment would serve notice only that we desire to provide a measure of protection for our deterrent force while arms talks are in progress, and give the President an additional measure of flexibility in the range of options available as a response to an attack.

It is my hope that the negotiations will be successful and it will not be necessary to proceed with subsequent phases of deployment. Because a defense of Washington is contemplated in a later phase, I have expressed to the Department of Defense my concern over planning and property acquisition for prospective ABM sites in metropolitan Washington.

Both the United States and Russia have much to gain from productive talks on arms control for both offensive and defensive weapons. The President, our Commander in Chief, is of the opinion that congressional approval of Safeguard would strengthen his hand in negotiations on arms limitations. If the United States acts unilaterally to stop deployment of defensive weapons, with the knowledge of Russia, it could encourage the Soviets to prolong talks on arms control while they continue their weapons development. Moreover, the system could guard against accidental or irrational attack upon our strategic forces, and provide a measure of protection in the event of a nuclear ultimatum.

I recognize there is a great division of opinion in the Senate on this issue, and respect the deep conviction which has motivated those on either side of the debate. It would seem desirable to me for the Senate to express its intent to proceed with a measured deployment of ABM, with a willingness to cease further offensive and defensive nuclear weapons development if the Soviet Union will do likewise.

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

Mr. SPONG. I am pleased to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I have had the pleasure of serving in this body with the distinguished Senator from Virginia, and serving on committees with him, and wish to congratulate him on his talk. I think he has made a very careful analysis of the problems we face, of the situation vis-a-vis the Soviet Union, of our prospective problems in the seventies,

and of the question of arms limitation talks with the Soviets.

I think his conclusions, particularly with respect to the deployment of the ABM, are certainly shared by many. The question of what we should do with respect to the MIRV has, of course, still not been fully debated in this body. It would involve the question of the Poseidon, and would involve title III and a few other things of that kind, on which research and development have already gone forward. But I suspect we will be into that at some length after we finish the debate on the pending measure. Meanwhile, I simply wish to express my thanks to the Senator for his careful consideration of the situation, and I welcome his support on behalf of the ABM.

Mr. SPONG. I thank the Senator from Colorado. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. MONDAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock on Monday morning next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, July 28, 1969, at 11 o'clock a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, July 25, 1969:

U.S. AIR FORCE

Gen. John P. McConnell, [XXXXX] (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general, under the provisions of section 8962, title 10, of the United States Code.

Gen. John D. Ryan, [XXXXX] (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be appointed as Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force, for a period of 4 years beginning August 1, 1969, under the provisions of section 8034, title 10, of the United States Code.

Lt. Gen. Seth J. McKee, [XXXXX] (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force,

to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the grade of general, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10, of the United States Code.

The following-named officers to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10, of the United States Code:

In the grade of general

Lt. Gen. John C. Meyer, [XXXXX] (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Jack J. Catton, [XXXXX] (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

In the grade of lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Harry E. Goldsworthy, [XXXXX], Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John W. Vogt, Jr., [XXXXX], Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Timothy F. O'Keefe, [XXXXX], Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. George S. Boylan, Jr., [XXXXX], Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. George B. Simler, [XXXXX], Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. David C. Jones, [XXXXX], Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Paul K. Carlton, [XXXXX], Regular Air Force.

The following officers for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the U.S. Air Force, to the grade indicated, under the provisions of sections 8218, 8351, 8363, and 8392, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be brigadier general

Col. Clarence E. Atkinson, [XXXXXXXX], Delaware Air National Guard.

Col. William J. Crisler, [XXXXXXXX], Mississippi Air National Guard.

Col. Jack Motes, [XXXXXXXX], California Air National Guard.

Col. Earl C. Pate, Jr., [XXXXXXXX], Tennessee Air National Guard.

U.S. ARMY

The following-named officer, under the provision of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. William Joseph McCaffrey, [XXXXX], U.S. Army.

Lt. Gen. Richard Giles Stilwell, [XXXXX], Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), for appointment as senior U.S. Army member of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 711.

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list, in grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Harry William Osborn Kinnard, [XXXXX], Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of

importance and responsibility designated by the President, under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. George Irvin Forsythe, [XXXXX], Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

IN THE NAVY

Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, U.S. Navy, for appointment as Chief of Naval Operations in the Department of the Navy for a term of 2 years.

Vice Adm. Kleber S. Masterson, U.S. Navy, and Rear Adm. Robert J. Stroh, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral when retired, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Rear Adm. C. Edwin Bell, Jr., U.S. Navy, having been designated for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

D.C. COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

William S. Thompson, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge of the District of Columbia court of general sessions for the term of 10 years.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The nominations beginning LaVerne F. Huston, to be lieutenant colonel, and ending Donald C. Zartner, to be 2d lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 8, 1969; and

The nominations of Col. William R. Jarrell, Jr., to be Registrar, U.S. Air Force Academy, and Richard H. White, to be 2d lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 15, 1969.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning Claude W. Abate, to be captain, and ending James E. Robert, Jr., to be captain, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 26, 1969; and

The nominations beginning Jimmie B. Kinder, to be major, and ending Dwight Williams, Jr., to be 2d lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 10, 1969; and

The nominations beginning Glenn E. Nida, to be colonel, and ending Gerald D. Cox, to be 2d lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 18, 1969.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations beginning Hugh E. Loftin, to be captain, and ending Wayne M. Wynkoop, to be 1st lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 26, 1969; and

The nominations beginning Garland S. Bishop, to be 2d lieutenant, and ending Bruce M. Windsor, to be 2d lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 2, 1969.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ADDRESS BY GOV. MILLS E. GODWIN, JR., OF VIRGINIA

HON. WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 25, 1969

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, last Friday it was my pleasure to attend Virginia

Night at the National Press Club along with our Governor, the Honorable Mills E. Godwin, Jr., several other members of the Virginia congressional delegation, and numerous civic and industrial leaders from our State.

The division of industrial development, Virginia Travel Service, the Virginia Ports Authority, the departments of agriculture and commerce, and the Virginia

State Chamber of Commerce all joined together to arrange an outstanding meal featuring Virginia dishes and a variety of door prizes reflecting the best in our State's resorts and products. Governor Godwin was the principal speaker of the evening and, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the speech