

50 per cent of serious crime in Seattle chargeable to juveniles, it is vital to get young people in all parts of the city interested in constructive programs of crime prevention.

4. We must have continuous education in the causes and consequences of crime and means of prevention. Poverty is a cause in some cases, but even with poverty eliminated there would still be crime. For instance, the narcotics problem has broad ramifications, not only in the sale and use itself, but in the frequent conduct induced by the use of narcotics, such as robbery, burglary, sex offenses and others.

There are really only two curative approaches to the narcotics problem: One, to eliminate the supply (which appears most difficult), the other, to educate the consumer,

or potential consumer, not to use them. This is a large order and will require a perpetual program of enforcement and education. The oft-heard statement that marijuana is no worse than liquor is illusory. Liquor is government controlled and the buyer knows exactly what he is getting. When a person, young or old, buys narcotics on the street from a peddler, he doesn't know what he is getting and may suffer permanent injury.

5. We must have swift prosecution of offenders. The certainty of punishment is a greater deterrent than its severity. The prosecutors and courts must be always alert to the need of speedy and just punishment wherever deserved.

6. We need greatly enlarged detention and rehabilitation facilities. Notwithstanding a

vast growth in the area, the city jail and King County jail have not been expanded for 20 years and have long been full to overflowing, with no alternative for the judges but to release many questionable persons on bail—often to prey further on the community pending trial, because there is no place to put them. To meet this critical need, many millions of additional capital cost face the community.

7. Much larger probation and parole staffs are needed to reduce the incidence of repetition, commonly known as recidivism. This, too, will require additional millions of dollars.

In summary, to reduce and prevent crime, there must be total community involvement in crime prevention, full cooperation with the police, and a willingness to pay the cost.

SENATE—Tuesday, November 11, 1969

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by Hon. GEORGE McGOVERN, a Senator from the State of South Dakota.

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

O God of the nations, for the peace which once came to the world at this hour, on this day, in this month, we give Thee thanks. And for that universal and enduring peace which is yet to come, we earnestly pray.

We remember before Thee all who have bravely lived and nobly died in the service of this Nation. May the ranks of the visible and the invisible be joined this day in unbroken fellowship. Be graciously near all parents, widows, and orphans to whom this day renews poignant pain of heart and sorrow to the soul. Assure them that neither life nor death shall separate them from Thy love.

Give to the survivors of battle who are ill or infirmed the assurance of a grateful people and provision for all their needs.

Bless the youth now in the Armed Forces. Protect them in moments of temptation, strengthen them in the hour of danger, and when war is ended make them ambassadors of good will.

O Thou God of all men, we pray that Thou wilt so dispose of the issues of the present conflict that we may be led beyond mere armistice to lasting peace, and that the nations may be united in firmer fellowship for the promotion of Thy glory and the good of all mankind. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read a communication to the Senate.

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., November 11, 1969.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. GEORGE McGOVERN, a Senator from the State of South Dakota, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
President pro tempore.

Mr. McGOVERN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, November 10, 1969, be dispensed with.

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

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

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

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

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1970—EXTENSION OF UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, implementing the unanimous-consent request of yesterday, setting a limitation of time on amendments, I ask unanimous consent that on all amendments other than those mentioned in the agreement, there be a time limitation of 30 minutes, the time to be equally divided between the sponsor of the amendment and the manager of the bill.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it

stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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

(Subsequently, the Senate modified the above order to provide for the Senate to adjourn to 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.)

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.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. Jammie M. Philpott to be lieutenant general.

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

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army and the Marine Corps which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, without losing my right to the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

WITNESS FEES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 509, Senate Resolution 278.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 278) relating to fees of witnesses appearing before Senate committees.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That witnesses summoned to appear before the Senate or any of its committees shall be entitled to a witness fee rated at not to exceed \$25 for each full day spent in traveling to and from the place of examination and for each full day in attendance. A witness shall also be entitled to reimbursement of the actual and necessary transportation expenses incurred by him in traveling to and from the place of examination, in no case to exceed 20 cents a mile for the distance actually traveled by him for the purpose of appearing as a witness if such distance is not more than six hundred miles or 12 cents a mile if such distance is more than six hundred miles.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91-515), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

Senate Resolution 278 would increase the limitation on daily witness fees payable to witnesses summoned to appear before the Senate or any of its committees from \$16 to \$25. The resolution would also increase to 20 cents per mile the limitation on the payment of actual transportation expenses of witnesses traveling not more than 600 miles. Those traveling more than 600 miles would continue to be reimbursed for actual transportation expenses, not exceeding the present limitation of 12 cents a mile.

The proposed increase in daily witness fees is predicated upon and consistent with the increased limitation on per diem in lieu of subsistence rates for Government employees traveling on official business provided by H.R. 337, which bill received final favorable action by the Congress on October 30, 1969, and is now pending approval by the President. Such rates are and have been the criteria for determining the rate for witness fees paid by the Senate.

The increase in the limitation on transportation expenses of witnesses traveling not more than 600 miles was approved upon the recommendation of the Senate Financial

Clerk. He presented evidence to the committee that due to recent increases in short-haul air fares he quite frequently, under the present limitation, is unable to reimburse witnesses fully for their actual transportation expenses.

VETERANS DAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in this century, over a million and a half Americans have been killed or wounded in war. That is a measure of the failure to establish peace in the international life of our times. The numbers are grim. I mention them only because the peace we sought with these sacrifices is not yet in sight. How remote it remains is to be seen in the arms race which goes on without check. How distant it remains is stark in Vietnam.

We mark this day for those million and a half lives and more which were ended or hurt in the Nation's wars of this century. We mark it, too, for the tens of millions who at one time or another interrupted their personal pursuits to serve the Nation in the armed services.

This year, as last, Veterans Day has special and somber meaning. The war in Vietnam persists; the fighting and dying continues. As of this hour, the casualties of Vietnam surpass 300,000. At last summation, the dead were more than 46,000 and the wounded over 256,000.

We have asked much of the men in Vietnam. We have asked them to persevere in a struggle which, on all sides, it is now devoutly wished had never been joined. We have asked them to stay until an honorable way out of the conflict can be found. Whatever we may do for the men in Vietnam—and we will, all of us, do everything that can be done to support them until their return—will not change that face of this conflict.

Vietnam is a war unclaimed by this administration or its predecessors. It is a war unclaimed by this Congress or the ones before. Yet, this war belongs to us all. We cannot evade it—not this administration nor its predecessors, not this Congress nor its predecessors. We are all its possessors and we are all possessed by it. We are—all of us—the makers of the veterans of Vietnam. The relentless clicking which computes the casualties is our responsibility.

This day, then, is of special significance not only for veterans, but for us as well, for all of us, in the administration and in Congress. However, reluctantly, we are partners in the continuance of Vietnam. At this late hour it will serve no useful purpose to assess blame or praise, as between the branches or among ourselves. The responsibility—the joint responsibility—is to strive to shorten the path to peace. We owe that to our conscience. We owe it to the people of the United States. We owe it to the living and the dead of Vietnam and to all the veterans of the Nation.

WE WILL REMEMBER THEM

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, as one who was born at this 11th hour on this 11th

day of the 11th month, this day has always had special significance for me, as for all of us.

Today, at this hour, on the island of Guam, so remote from us, a bugler will sound the last, sad, silvery notes of taps in tribute to the dead. In our bases, in our places of conflict, as in Vietnam, in our communities where survivors gather, tribute is being rendered—always inadequate, when one considers the ultimate sacrifice of so many for so many more—that peace may come and that we may some day follow, as the Bible says, after the ways that lead to peace.

In Australia, at 11 o'clock today, they will be reciting, as the bells toll and the Westminster chimes are heard from church tower to church tower:

They shall grow not old, as we that are left grow old:

Age shall not weary them, nor the years condemn;

At the going down of the sun and in the morning

We will remember them.

Mr. President, November 11, a date observed in this Nation since 1918 as a tribute to our fighting men takes on a new meaning in these troubled times.

Veterans Day is more than a day set aside to honor the men and women who served their country during time of war. It is a day dedicated to world peace. The 26 million American veterans alive today would be the first to agree. Their deeds should remind all of us the unity this great Nation can demonstrate. Their spirit of courage, sacrifice, and loyalty did not end when the shooting stopped.

Drawing a profile of the American war veteran today would require an outline encompassing six wartime periods—from the few remaining Indian fighters to the young men now in Vietnam.

It is not suitable nor appropriate for us as Americans to be mere onlookers on this stage of life. We must play our own part in this observance and should demonstrate our support of those who today carry on the torch seized from the hands of the veteran of yesteryear.

Today, particularly when some Americans abuse their right to dissent by violent actions, we as veterans and as citizens of a free and benevolent country, should reassert our pride in being Americans by rededicating ourselves to the principles which gave our Nation its strength. Today we publicly demonstrate our love for America by attending and participating in our local Veterans Day ceremonies and by flying the American flag.

HISTORY

Concurrent resolution, June 4, 1926:

Whereas the 11th of November, 1918, marked the cessation of the most destructive, sanguinary, and far-reaching war in human annals and the resumption by the people of the United States of peaceful relations with other nations, which we may hope may never again be severed; and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this date should be commemorated with thanksgiving and prayer and exercises designed to perpetuate peace through good will and mutual understanding between nations; and

Whereas the legislatures of twenty-seven of our States have already declared November 11 to be a legal holiday: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President of the United States is requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the officials to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on November 11 and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day in schools and churches, or other suitable places, with appropriate ceremonies expressive of our gratitude for peace and our desire for the continuance of friendly relations with all other peoples.

Act of May 13, 1938:

The 11th day of November in each year, a day to be dedicated to the cause of world peace and to be hereafter celebrated and known as Armistice Day, is made a legal public holiday to all intents and purposes and in the same manner as the 1st day of January, the 22nd day of February, 30th of May, the 4th of July, the first Monday of September, and Christmas Day are now made by law public holidays.

Public Law 380—83d Congress, June 1, 1954:

This law substituted "Veterans" for Armistice" in the act of May 13, 1938.

A GREAT NATIONAL RESOURCE

The stability and responsibility of American veterans in our society—versus the unrest often seen among veterans in other lands—is due, in large part, to laws passed by Congress and soundly administered. It is also due to the basic character of the American serviceman.

But veterans do not want to be patted on the back for wartime achievements or peacetime rehabilitation. Knowing the rigors of war and postwar, they well know best the value of peace.

Their example should give confidence to all Americans. It proves that ordinary citizens are capable of meeting the challenges set before them. When the survival of this Nation and its ideals is at stake, Americans will show the courage, loyalty, and sacrifice of our veterans, our soldier citizens.

A PROFILE OF U.S. VETERANS

It is hard to draw a profile of the American war veteran whom we honor today, but here are some highlights:

First. There are over 26 million veterans of U.S. wars living today. In addition, there are about 4.5 million veterans who have seen duty since the close of the Korean conflict in January 1955, and many of whom have faced battlefield conditions without a war actually having been declared. The Nation's veterans and their families comprise about 50 percent of the U.S. population.

Second. About 35.7 million persons have served in the U.S. Armed Forces. More than half of these served in World War II.

Third. The last Revolutionary War veteran died in 1869, more than 85 years after the war officially ended; the last War of 1812 veteran lived until 1905 or 90 years after the close of hostilities; the last Mexican War veteran lived for 81 years after that war ended in 1948 and the last Civil War veterans, Union and Confederate, lived 90 and 93 years, respectively, after the end of that war.

Fourth. There are two veterans of the Indian wars, that occurred in various parts of the Nation from its founding up until 1898, still living today.

We honor them today, one and all.

VETERANS DAY

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, every year, America stands aside on Veterans Day to pay tribute to the brave Americans, living and dead, who have steadfastly served their country throughout our history so that we can remain free.

This year, with more than 27 million living veterans who have served in uniform, and with thousands of men risking their lives every day in Vietnam, it is particularly important that we set a day aside to pay tribute to the courage and dedication of these servicemen.

From the Revolutionary War until the present day, America's veterans have responded to every call to defend our country, and by their honor and valor have helped America grow into today's strong democracy. To the families who have lost loved ones in battle, and to all veterans who have suffered personal injuries in the defense of our country, we owe recognition and a large voice of thanks.

On this Veterans Day, 1969, our prayers and concerns should also go in particular to one group of servicemen who have suffered much on behalf of their country—our men being held prisoners by the North Vietnamese.

The Government of North Vietnam has been cruel and barbarous in not even taking the simple step of revealing the names of these prisoners, so that their families and friends back home do not know whether their loved ones are alive or not. That Government has also violated international agreements, and canons of human decency, by not allowing impartial international organizations, such as the International Red Cross, to visit these prisoners and inspect their living conditions.

Last week, the President called the Nation's attention to the plight of these prisoners by declaring Sunday, November 9, 1969, as a day of national prayer and concern on behalf of these prisoners of war. I urge all Americans to continue to pray that the plight of these veterans be ended, and that our Government can arrange to have them released as soon as possible.

As we observe Veterans Day, 1969, all elected officials and concerned citizens share a common desire to terminate the war in Vietnam, and are working so that our servicemen currently in uniform can be brought home. These men are not taking part in the discussion to end the war, but stand ready to serve whatever specific policy is set down by their commanders.

I think it particularly appropriate to observe Veterans Day by reminding ourselves of the unselfish dedication of our servicemen, so that we may dedicate ourselves to achieving the same peace for which they have been fighting.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I prepared in recognition of November 9, 1969, as "National Day of Prayer and Concern on Behalf of American Servicemen Being Held Prisoners by the North Vietnamese" be printed in the RECORD.

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

NOVEMBER 9, 1969: NATIONAL DAY OF PRAYER AND CONCERN FOR POW'S

I join the President, and the nation, in commemoration of Sunday, November 9, 1969, as a National Day of Prayer and Concern on behalf of American servicemen being held prisoners by the North Vietnamese.

All American servicemen who have fought in Vietnam, and their families, have given much to their country, but none have had to endure so much tragedy and duress, as our prisoners of war and their loved ones back home. A day of prayer on their behalf is most fitting.

On August 13, I signed a bi-partisan Congressional statement deploring the refusal of the North Vietnamese to disclose the identity of all American prisoners being held captive, and pledging support to the Administration in its efforts on behalf of these American servicemen. It is my fervent hope that this National Day of Prayer and Concern can be a positive aid to the President and Secretary of State as they continue these efforts.

I pray for the well-being of these gallant Americans and for an early end to this tragic war so that all Americans can safely return home. To this end, I will be doing everything I can to support the President's goals to carry out this conclusion of the war as quickly as possible.

VETERANS DAY—A DAY FOR ALL AMERICANS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, this will be the first Veterans Day, or Armistice Day as it formerly was called, in many years that I have not been at one or more patriotic meetings in my home State of South Dakota addressing audiences gathered together to pay tribute to those who have died in the protection of their country.

Unfortunately because of the unusually slow progress of this session of Congress and its long-delayed adjournment which should have taken place, in my opinion, several weeks if not months ago, I, along with most Members of the Senate, find myself in Washington where we have the business of the public and the Senate to attend to. Thus, I shall not be able to visit South Dakota this year to attend and address some of the inspiring, patriotic meetings sponsored by committees of our home communities, veterans' organizations and other patriotic organizations.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I take this means today, being in Washington at a time when I would rather be saying what I am about to say back home in South Dakota, to state on the floor of the Senate some of my feelings on this particular Veterans Day, which surely is a day for all Americans.

As we salute the many generations of young Americans who have made the supreme sacrifice in behalf of our Nation in the struggles of the past to defend our freedom, I think we particularly owe a special debt and a special recognition to those who have given their lives for this country in Vietnam and to those who today are in that far-off land in our behalf and in behalf of the beleaguered people of South Vietnam.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that our men in uniform, fighting this war against the latest military aggressions of the Communists have been bearing even more of a difficult burden than we

should demand of those who answer the call to the colors.

For their dilemma is not only of facing an enemy oftentimes hidden—and one who enjoys the privilege of sanctuary not afforded the defenders of freedom—but of also being confronted by the demoralizing prospects of nonsupport by many on the home front, whose freedoms they also sign to preserve.

Today, as we pay tribute to all of those who have served in our military forces—especially to the fathers, mothers, wives, sisters, brothers, sons, and daughters who have lost men in the service of our country—I think that one of the most important contributions we can make is to demonstrate in every way we can that those now wearing the uniform of our Armed Forces have every reason to be proud of their contributions. For they truly are the sentinels of peace as they strive to achieve an end to the war, as President Nixon said, “in a way that will bring us closer to that great goal of a just and lasting peace to which Woodrow Wilson and every President in our history has been dedicated.”

As a part of my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD portions of my newsletter, my regular weekly report to constituents, which is dated for today's release.

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

ARE YOU AMONG THE “SILENT MAJORITY?”

The “silent majority”—is it really most of America? President Nixon believes so. So does this Senator. The question, however, is whether the “silent majority” will continue to remain silent and thus present to the world and particularly to Hanoi the picture that not only have the divisions deepened in this country but that most Americans actually are so desirous to end our involvement in Vietnam that we are willing to just call it quits and surrender to Communist aggression.

No matter the consequences of such an immediate withdrawal and the strong possibility that it increases the likelihood for a later and more catastrophic conflict involving American manpower on the scale of World War II, the highly vocal opponents of United States policy are saying that is what America wants.

It seems to me it is time for all of us to disabuse ourselves of any notion that opponents of our policy, as enunciated by President Nixon the other evening are recommending anything other than surrender. No matter how the words are glibly tossed about, immediate withdrawal can mean only surrender. This is the alternative posed by those busily castigating the President in terming the present Administration's action as “no different than Johnson's.”

The fact that the critics can discern “no difference” in not only an approach but actual steps in a disengagement process now underway provides ample demonstration that the only real difference these critics will ever see is when we raise the white flag to North Vietnam and, in effect, say “South Vietnam is yours—what you do with the beleaguered people of that Nation and what you do with U.S. prisoners of war no longer concerns us.”

In addition to being the time, if not long past that point, to recognize what the President's critics demand and calling these demands exactly what they are—capitulation to Communist aggression—it is also overdue for those who do support the American

position and the President's policy to speak out in behalf of this course which President Nixon believes holds the best possibilities for achieving an end to the war “in a way that will bring us closer to that great goal of a just and lasting peace to which Woodrow Wilson and every President in our history has been dedicated.”

The “silent majority,” of course, can choose to remain silent. Indication in the first few days after the President's speech are such that the majority is beginning to speak out, clearly and forcefully, in behalf of the reasonable and realistic approach developed by President Nixon. However, it seems to me more such expressions and evidence of the support the President has are required to demonstrate to the North Vietnamese communists that Hanoi's hopes of winning the American public to its side will never occur and in actuality there is a developing groundswell of agreement with the President to continue to pursue the course he has set out.

SILENT MAJORITY ON CAMPUS

Last spring *U.S. News & World Report* reported that “for every hard-core radical on American college campuses today, it is estimated there are 99 other students whose main interest is getting an education. This large section of the student body has come to be known as the ‘quiet majority’ or the ‘sleeping giant.’”

Whether it was the clamor of the dissidents demonstrating a capacity not merely to undermine but to destroy institutions of higher learning, or the fact that many were simply getting sick and tired of having our country constantly maligned and pictured as a Nation of brutal, murderous, war-mongering, money hungry people while the leaders of North Vietnam and Red China were depicted as heroes and patriots comparable to George Washington, or a combination of all of these things, I don't know, but whatever the reason, the “sleeping giant” on campus is no longer dozing!

One example of the reaction in behalf of moderation has been the organization of a group called the Association of Student Governments which now has approximately 1,000 affiliates across the Nation. It has its headquarters here in Washington. Its purpose: Develop a moderate approach to the problems of higher education and achieve participation in the decision-making process by working “with the Establishment and through the system to effect changes.”

Another reaction has come from a student organization formed at Princeton, called “Undergraduates for a Stable America.” It has issued a proclamation urging participation on Veterans Day “as it has never been observed in recent years . . . by young and old across the country . . . to show their respect for America's past and present Armed Forces and their support of the government for which those men fought, and died, and are dying today.” The students in their proclamation expressed sharp criticism of the so-called “Peace Moratorium” as doing more “to hinder peace than to help it” by making more difficult “the task of our soldiers” and prolonging the war.

WHAT THEY CHEER WHEN THEY APPLAUD HO CHI MINH

President Nixon provided a not-so-gentle reminder of what it is the dissidents are cheering about when they wave the Viet Cong flag and loudly acclaim now-deceased North Vietnam dictator Ho Chi Minh: “For the South Vietnamese, our precipitate withdrawal would inevitably allow the Communists to repeat the massacres which followed their takeover of the North 15 years ago. They then murdered more than 50,000 people and hundreds of thousands more died in slave labor camps. We saw a prelude of what would happen in South Vietnam when the Com-

munist entered the city of Hue last year. During their brief rule there, there was a bloody reign of terror in which some 3,000 civilians were clubbed and shot to death.” It should be noted that these civilians were village and hamlet chiefs, teachers, government workers, Catholic priests, and women and children. Many were not only beaten and shot, but beheaded and some were buried alive. This is but one example of the kind of “peace” which would be achieved if the mandates of the “surrender now minority” were accepted.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I would also like to call the attention of those who are on the floor, or who read the RECORD, whether Members of Congress or not, to the fact that this is probably a unique Veterans Day in the history of our Republic. I suspect, Mr. President, we have never had one even remotely resembling this day and this week as we commemorate Veterans Day. I hope and pray, Mr. President, that we never see its like again.

In a sense, however, it seems to me that this is the day in American history when citizens generally across the land on this patriotic occasion are going to give voice to their convictions by the presence of their bodies and their activities on this Veterans Day and at other meetings during this week.

I feel that this is a week which, in the final analysis, should go toward convincing our Communist enemy in Vietnam that the spirit of America lives on; that the expected and hoped for crumbling and cracking of the home front in this country is not going to occur.

I am willing to predict today, Mr. President, that when the full count is in on the various communities, organizations, groups, and individuals participating in one way or another, at one place or another, in the events of this unprecedented week, those who read the reports—and they will be read around the world—will be convinced that the vast majority of all the citizens of the United States now, as always, cherish both their freedom and their peace and recognizes that in defeat there is no future for either.

There will be gatherings of our fellow citizens today and throughout the week in many, many communities. I want to say, as a prediction, that when we count the results, evaluate the crowds either quantitatively or qualitatively, and when the evidence is all available by Saturday night, it is my conviction that, by a margin of far better than 20 to 1—perhaps, more than 50 to 1—we will have found by the vote of the people, as manifested by their presence at meetings discussing the war and discussing public policy this week, in this country, will be on the side of those supporting the President of the United States, the policies of this country, and the determination not to accept a humiliating defeat, which not only would strike a vital blow against freedom in our own country and around the world, but end our country's career as a responsible leader of the free world.

Today I am convinced that this day alone—quite regardless of the other meetings which are scheduled in other places on other days this week—under the proud banner of the Stars and

Stripes, in meetings in cities and in large metropolitan areas and in country towns, in organized communities everywhere, there will be gathered, at this very hour, far more than 20 to 1—perhaps 50 to 1 or 100 to 1—of our fellow citizens proclaiming their faith in the future of this Republic and their determination to carry on, as contrasted with those of little faith among their fellow citizens who will be meeting in other areas, at other places, at other times and for other purposes this week, to suggest that we have lost the fight; to suggest that the time has come to call it quits and to pull out of our responsibility.

I am glad these events are happening during the same week, so that Hanoi and Moscow and the uncommitted areas of the world will have reported to them, as will be reported to them by the press and television and radio, the great concentration of a majority voice and majority will in this country, of people who have faith in the future and who have not joined the disciples of despair who feel that the cause is lost and that America has lost both its will and its strength to succeed.

Mr. President, what a dramatic opportunity, what a dramatic result, what an impact this can have at the peace conference in Paris. What an impact it is going to have in the halls of the mighty in Hanoi as at the end of the week they measure up the quantities and qualities of those Americans who met this week to pay homage to their country and who engage in a rededication of faith as compared with those who meet for other purposes, in other areas, and who feel that the time has come when we must decide that we Americans have to accept a humiliating defeat for the first time in history.

I shall ask that at the end of my remarks there appear in the *RECORD* a very interesting and, to me, impressive letter from Mr. Malcolm Thompson, of Las Vegas, Nev., who has written a letter to those who he believes, here in Washington or in California or elsewhere, are going to carry banners in a stimulated and well-financed protest against the war bearing the names of those who have died in the war in Vietnam.

He writes about his son, Pfc. Gregory M. Thompson, who was among those who gave their lives for your freedom and mine in this cruel and unfortunate war.

He is one who hoped he could take some kind of legal action to prevent this desecration of the name of his dead, patriotic son. Failing in that, he has been doing all that he can to tell the world that he resents such a misuse of his son's name by those who now would take away from him and his memory the fruits of victory and success that this young lad had in mind when he went off to war.

The letter was published in the *Las Vegas Review Journal* of October 16, 1969. It seems to me that reading it should give us all cause for sober reflection, so I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the *RECORD*.

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

A FATHER WRITES TO DEMONSTRATORS: WHEN THEY READ THE NAME OF MY SON

When the peace demonstrators read my son's name, let them know how he felt about the Viet Nam war, and how the parents who shaped him feel about it.

It is we, the parents, who said goodbye to him when he went away to fight—not the peace agitators.

It is we, the parents, who wrote long, anxious letters to him during his three months almost continuous combat—not the agitators.

It is the ones who saw his body returned in a flag-draped coffin who first should be heard—not the protesters.

These transparent propagandists were not there to see my son buried, nor do they accompany me on my trips to lay flowers on his grave.

My son was killed while fighting for his country.

America cannot be permitted to perpetually persuade its citizens to instill in their sons a sense of patriotism, loyalty and a determination to defend the oppressed, and then, after the sons have died, suddenly change her mind and yield to those who killed them.

Most of the peace demonstrations and name-reading ceremonies across this nation are an obvious propaganda device designed to influence the President of the United States into surrendering South Viet Nam to an enemy which admittedly and openly seeks to conquer it by any and all means.

When they read my son's name to advocate peace at any price—the price being defeat—let them remember that he whose name they read did not surrender.

When these pretentious mourners read my son's name, let them realize that their grief would be better served if applied to the Viet Cong whose flag they wave even as they burn the one which graced my son's casket. Let them apply their bogus sorrow to those aggressors felled by my son as he won his posthumous Silver Star for heroism in ground combat.

And when they read the name of my son, let them know that he advocated an increase in the bombing of the ammunition depots in North Viet Nam—not a cessation so that his enemy would receive unlimited war supplies with which to kill him.

When they read the name of Gregory Malcolm Thompson, let them realize that they are proving before the world the truth of the oft-repeated Communist claim that many Americans have become soft, decadent and yielding to any determined force which opposes them.

And when these weak, gullible ones read his name in their avowed pursuit of peace, let them remember that a peace purchased at the price of surrender is but a brief Munich-type peace lasting only until the aggressor's appetite demands more victims.

Finally, when these hypocrites read the list of the dead who defended South Viet Nam, let them know that they have reached the ultimate low in the world-record of human infamy, in that they willfully and cunningly utter a dead man's name to achieve the defeat of the cause for which he died.—Malcolm Thompson.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, today we honor and mourn those who gave their lives in defense of our Nation and the principles for which it has stood.

Our mourning is very special today because so many Americans are no longer sure of what are, or what should be, the principles of our Nation.

We have lost much of the dedication and purposiveness that characterized those who have given their lives for us.

We have lost their clarity of thinking. We have lost their courage and their bravery.

For so many of us now seek the easy way out of crisis and confrontation.

We seek that safe way out physically now, even though it may be the disastrous way out for the children of tomorrow who may have to pay with their lives bartered for the temporary security of today that our timidity and faintness of heart have dictated.

And we do it under facades of hypocrisy and sophistry in which we try to camouflage our individual fears, lack of courage, and selfishness of living only for today.

Yes, Mr. President, the mourning that so many of us do today concerns our increasing failure to keep the faith with those who gave their lives for us—and our increasing guilt in making their supreme sacrifices for us having been made in vain.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, today the Nation pays tribute to the men and women who have served in our Armed Forces. When our country has been at war many fought on the battlefield and some of these were wounded or died. Others spent lonely months or years in isolated stations far from the front. In times of peace, no less than in times of war, freedom's price of constant vigilance has been paid by the members of our armed services.

It is fitting that we pay tribute to these men and women and while we remember the sacrifices of these individuals let us also reaffirm our belief in the principles and ideals which they served.

What are these ideals? No more concise definition has been reached than the one originally stated in the Constitution. In this age where the medium is supposedly the message, when "communication" is sought through flashing lights and garish noise, these simple words maintain the vitality and relevance to the national direction which they have had since their inscription in Philadelphia 182 years ago:

We the people of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

It is well for all of us to spend today reflecting on the significance of our veteran's contribution to today's America.

Today's America sees the right of free speech being exercised to an unprecedented extent through protest marches, rallies, seminars, sit-ins, and demonstrations. That such activities are taking place is largely due to our veterans, their time, their blood, and their lives. White crosses around the world in Verdun, Iwo Jima, Seoul, and Arlington mark the resting places of those whose lives assured that the October moratorium could take place.

We can do more than pay our fullest respects to our fallen veterans. Most of we 27 million veterans alive today want no special recognition or attention. We

did our duty, take pride in having served, and seek to live our lives as good and constructive citizens.

There is a group of veterans, however, who do need and deserve special recognition and our most dedicated attention. I speak of the thousands of veterans from all wars who are confined to hospitals throughout the country. We owe these men so much, and they are so appreciative of the smallest kindnesses and interest shown them that everyone on this Veterans Day and throughout the year, should resolve to show these great patriots and heroes that their Nation deeply appreciates and acknowledges their sacrifices.

In this age when so much energy is being spent on the exercise of the rights of speech, dissent, and assembly it would be appropriate to channel some of this energy toward serving those whose sacrifice made these freedoms secure.

The President has called upon Americans to engage in volunteer programs across the country to improve their cities, their neighborhoods, and the lives of their fellow citizens. For many years, Gray Ladies and similar volunteer groups have served in hospitals. They write letters, read to patients, and otherwise brighten the lives of the hospitalized.

It would be fitting today if those who are planning to participate in the events of protest and dissent later this week would spend today in some small way repaying the great debt owed to those who have served their country and now lie hospitalized.

A visit to a veterans hospital would not take much time, and a smile, a hello, a small favor would bring incalculable brightness to the lives of our hospitalized veterans. The visitors might also learn something about the freedoms which they exercise.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I should like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to America's veterans today, Veterans Day, which originated 51 years ago with the armistice of World War I on November 11, 1918.

From the Revolutionary War to the present, more than 38 million men and women have served their country in uniform during wartime. Those who have defended our Nation, with their lives when necessary, have rightfully earned the honor and respect which it is my fervent hope all Americans will accord them on this Veterans Day.

Today is also a most appropriate time for all of us to reassert our pride in being Americans. Our wonderful heritage of freedom and liberty has been preserved through the sacrifices of our veterans, and continues to be defended today by our men in Vietnam. Our debt to the soldiers of the past and present is much too large to be expressed in mere words.

But more important, this debt must never be forgotten, lest we forget, also, today's significance to each of us.

THE KNOWN AND THE UNKNOWN— AMERICA NEVER FORGETS

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, within the octave of Veterans Day, there has

passed away on peaceful Cape Cod the sculptor whose skills designed the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier where the sentiments of our Nation will be centered on November 11.

This year—like each succeeding year—our observance becomes the more solemn as the honor roll of American patriotism grows greater. For we honor not alone the "soldier known only to God" but the service and sacrifice of our men and women in uniform who have served and sacrificed in many posts of duty in every corner of this earth.

Whatever our feelings about this war or that war, each of us in his innermost heart will fashion his praise and his prayers for those who went to their destiny in obedience and patriotism.

We pay tribute to those who proved they possessed that love that God has called the greatest—that man should lay down his life for his fellow man.

"Peace, victory and valor" are graven in that memorial that looks down upon the historic Potomac—and those qualities are inscribed in our memories for those who will answer the rollcall no more.

Such tribute is written in our hearts for the living as well as the dead—and that tribute is written in a country's gratitude to the homes that inspired such Americanism—homes that carried the heavy burden of personal grief in many a brave hour.

We can never restore the lives of the fallen—nor fully repay the loyalty of their souls—but neither as a nation nor as individuals can we forget the nobility of our honored dead.

November is especially the month to remember.

November 11 is especially the day of remembrance of those to whom we owe so much—a day to be proud of the living, a day of praise and prayer for those in eternal peace.

Known or unknown—let it never be said of our heroic dead that they were unwept, unhonored, unsung.

Let it always be said that America never, never forgets.

ONE MINUTE OF SILENCE

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, in my community when we were growing up, November 11, Armistice Day, was very solemn. At exactly 11 o'clock in the morning the factory whistles would begin sounding.

At school, in all the classrooms, we would rise, face to the east—toward Flanders Field, if you will, Mr. President, with our hands on our hearts, and remain standing in silence for 1 minute. We knew that all over town—in the factories, the stores, on the street, and in our homes—everyone had stopped and was standing at the same respectful, silent attention, just as we were, at that very moment.

It seemed like the longest minute in the world. And we were all very quiet for a long time after we sat down.

Later during the day there were speeches and parades. But it was that moment of quiet which meant the most

to us—whether we were in the fourth grade or were standing downtown, ready to cross the street to go back to where we worked.

Veterans Day is a particularly difficult holiday to observe for most Americans. We do not really live close enough to danger, to battle, to death, to realize the full measure of sacrifice laid down by all those men in olive drab, in brown khaki, in blue, and in grey.

Some of us can still hear, resounding dimly in the muffled stillness, the beat of distant drums, the purposeful cadence of troops responding to their country's call. I think of this every time I listen to the evening news of Vietnam. But it is hard for most of us—living here in the green, rich beauty of America—to think of war, of battle, or heroism, in this 69th year of the 20th century.

Our memory fades as the years fall, one after the other, since that shadowy, bleak test of our will in Korea;

Since North Africa, and Normandy, and Guadalcanal, and Iwo Jima;

Since Belleau Wood and Chateau-Thierry;

Or, since our Nation came of age, at Appomattox.

It takes real effort, today, to conjure up the fields of valor, to vision the endless columns of doughboys in World War I, trudging through mud and rain and the shell-pocked dirt of France.

Even World War II is 25 years past. And Korea, so recent, so much the bellwether of the modern conflict, is slowly fading from our day-to-day consciousness.

Yet, through all these threads of distant thunder and far-off battlefields, there is a common pattern, a deep, underlying skein which binds together the entire fabric of our Nation.

It is molded in a system that breeds American men to be resolute and determined in defense of their country, their towns, their families, their children.

What I am talking about is the inner genius, the spirit of America; the compulsion of a people who conquered a wilderness,

Who fought and survived a Civil War to forge a stronger union,

Who fought two World Wars to gain a time of peace,

Who lifted this Nation to an unprecedented, unheralded pinnacle in the history of nations—

And who gave their lives that this might be so. Before this sacrifice we stand abashed.

Surely a part of this genius is rooted in the simple belief that our Nation is one with itself. That when one American is affected, is bound up, is thrust into a foreign jungle, is cast into a war, then all Americans are similarly affected, then all Americans are concerned for his welfare, then all Americans join in to help this boy return safely home.

And honor him for what he has endured in the name of this, his country, this flag, this bit of soil which because of its heritage, has been worth to him more than life, more than a personal future, more than anything.

In countless battles on the face of this

scarred old planet, the American soldier has known that once his Government sends him into battle, the American people will use all the power at their disposal to safeguard him.

For 100 years we have accepted this as a sacred duty and responsibility of our Government.

Our fighting men, often outnumbered—as at Wake Island, outgunned—as on Bataan, have waged battle far above the call of duty because, deep down, every American soldier believed his country stood behind him and would do all that it could to protect him.

How well has this ethic—this sacred duty—stood the test of time? Does this grand faith, this noble belief still hold true? Will we now let down this man—this boy with the strength of newly found manhood?

This week we will be tested, not on the battlefield of Vietnam but in the streets of Washington.

Would that we could stand, yet again, all Americans, for 1 minute of silence.

And through that silence heed the distant echo of unity; the bell that rings, faintly but clearly, for honor, and truth, and sincerity. Would that we could be truly one Nation, under God—indivisible.

VETERANS DAY

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, today we pause to honor the many who have sacrificed so much to keep our precious freedoms intact over the years. In this era of demonstrations, it is important for each of us to set aside at least a little of our time on this day of national recognition for our veterans to remember what they have done for all of us. Without them, our precious independence would have been lost a long, long time ago.

Our veterans continue to serve our country in a wide variety of ways. Not only as individuals, but through such fine organizations as the Disabled American Veterans, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and, of course, the American Legion, many of our veterans are adding still more to their already illustrious record of public service. These and a number of other excellent veterans' groups are quite active in community service programs all across the country. Moreover, they sponsor a number of rehabilitation and scholarship projects that are worthy of the support of us all.

Mr. President, our veterans play another role in our society that many of us in public life, particularly those of us who are veterans ourselves, deeply appreciate. I am speaking of their continued efforts to represent service in the Armed Forces as an honor and a privilege, not a punishment. Too many of today's youth scorn the armed services and ridicule the patriotism that motivates those who have made the defense of our country their profession. Veterans, as parents, and as leading citizens, have done much to stem the rising tide of cynicism that occasionally seems to threaten to engulf our youth. The fact that it has not and will not is due in no

small part to the unceasing patriotic example set by our veterans.

Mr. President, I and the 286,000 other veterans in Kansas are particularly proud today, because in many respects it is fair to say that Veterans Day had its origins in Kansas. As we all know Veterans Day used to be called Armistice Day and was celebrated primarily as the anniversary of the signing of the Armistice on November 11, 1918, in the Forest of Compiègne by the Allies and Germans, thus ending World War I. Armistice Day celebrations were regularly held each year after the end of the Great War, but it was not until 1938 that Congress passed a bill declaring that each November 11 "shall be dedicated to the cause of world peace and hereafter celebrated and known as Armistice Day."

In Emporia, Kans., on November 11, 1953, instead of an Armistice Day program, a Veterans Day observance was held to honor those who had fought in all of America's wars, not just World War I. This marked a new beginning for a national expression of gratitude to our veterans. Former Kansas Congressman Ed Rees, of Emporia, was so impressed by the 1953 ceremony that he introduced a bill into the House of Representatives to change the name of Armistice Day to Veterans Day. After this passed, the late Mr. Rees wrote to all State Governors and asked for their approval and co-operation in observing the changed holiday. The name was soon changed to Veterans Day by act of Congress on May 24, 1954.

Thus, Mr. President, you can see that the people of Kansas have played an interesting and influential role in making November 11 a national day of remembrance honoring all who have served our country in the armed services from the Revolution to Vietnam. But that is only to be expected from a State that has long been active in helping and honoring those of her sons who had been in the Armed Forces. For example, in 1945 the State legislature established the Kansas office of Veterans Affairs primarily to afford field services in all areas of the State to veterans and their dependents. This service was offered through the facilities of 15 field offices and itinerant service at more than 150 other locations.

In order to offer a better coordinated and more effective service, the legislature very wisely combined the two agencies effective July 1, 1951, and in lieu thereof established the Kansas veterans' commission as a division of the State department of social welfare. In 1953 the State legislature established the Kansas veterans' commission as a separate agency. The Kansas veterans' commission consists of a three-member commission, a director, an administrative assistant, a field service consisting of 14 field offices located strategically throughout the State, and eight offices operated in co-operation with the major congressional chartered veterans organizations located in Veterans' Administration facilities servicing Kansas veterans.

Mr. President, the Congress too has done a great deal to try and repay to

some small degree the debt the people of the United States owe to those who have defended their freedom. More needs to be done and doubtless will be in the months and years ahead. Today, however, let us halt long enough in our deliberations to pay homage to all those veterans, living and dead, to whom this national day of recognition is dedicated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the original Armistice Day proclamation issued 50 years ago by President Woodrow Wilson on November 11, 1919, be reprinted at this point in the RECORD.

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

To my fellow-countrymen: A year ago our enemies laid down their arms in accordance with an armistice which rendered them impotent to renew hostilities, and gave to the world an assured opportunity to reconstruct its shattered order and to work out in peace a new and juster set of international relations. The soldiers and people of the European Allies had fought and endured for more than four years to uphold the barrier of civilization against the aggressions of armed force. We ourselves had been in the conflict something more than a year and a half. With splendid forgetfulness of mere personal concerns we remodeled our industries, concentrated our financial resources, increased our agricultural output and assembled a great army, so that at the last our power was a decisive factor in the victory.

We were able to bring the vast resources, material and moral, of a great and free people to the assistance of our associates in Europe who had suffered and sacrificed without limit in the cause for which they fought. Out of this victory there arose new possibilities of political freedom and economic concert. The war showed us the strength of great nations acting together for high purposes, and the victory of arms foretells the enduring conquests which can be made in peace when nations act justly and in furtherance of the common interests of men.

To us in America the reflections of Armistice Day will be filled with solemn pride in the heroism of those who died in the country's service and with gratitude for the victory, both because of the thing from which it had freed us and because of the opportunity it has given America to show her sympathy with peace and justice in the councils of the nations.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, today is one of honor and recognition for the men and women who have served in the Armed Forces of this country. These Americans, in times of war and peace, have protected the ideals of freedom upon which this great Nation was founded. Many have died in order that we may live in a free society. However, at the present time, there are those who are willing to taste citizenship, but, at the same time, are not willing to fulfill the obligation that we all have to our country. We must remember that every right carries a responsibility and we must be willing to accept that responsibility.

This morning I visited the Veterans Administration hospital in Washington and had the opportunity to meet and talk with many of the patients. On behalf of the Congress, I expressed our gratitude for the service they have rendered to their country.

The veterans of this country as a body, represent one of the strongest forces for the preservation of our Nation. They have been asked to serve and make sacrifices for our country and in so doing have grasped the ideals and principles that made this country great. One of the strongest assets of our Nation and society has been the stability and responsibility demonstrated by its veteran population.

On this day we must all reassert our pride in being Americans and pay tribute to our veterans who have served our Nation well. But we must also remember that Veterans Day also expresses, in a unique and meaningful way this Nation's hope for peace for all mankind—peace with freedom and honor.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, today is Veterans Day, a time when we honor the men and women who have given their efforts and their lives to insure the continuation of our fundamental concepts of freedom and justice.

As we pay respect to our veterans and what they have contributed to the welfare of the United States, we cannot help but think of the real meaning of patriotism and its application in today's world. It seems to me that Adlai Stevenson expressed his thoughts on this in a most appropriate manner in the following quotation:

What do we mean by patriotism in the context of our times? A patriotism that puts country ahead of self; a patriotism which is not short, frenzied outbursts of emotion, but the tranquil and steady dedication of a life-time. These are words that are easy to utter, but this is a mighty assignment. For it is often easier to fight for principles than to live up to them.

This is the kind of patriotism we need; this is the kind of loyalty and devotion to country displayed by so many American veterans who have fought not only for a just cause at a particular time but who have had a sustaining commitment to the United States and the principles of our Government.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, in the course of my life, I have known the veterans of six wars. In my childhood, I met and often talked with the men of Antietam and Gettysburg—the gallant boys in blue or gray who lived on to be the wizened bards of their own heroic saga. I knew the men of San Juan Hill and Santiago who always carried themselves with a little of the confidence and flamboyance of their own hero—Teddy Roosevelt. Many of the veterans of World War I will always bear the mark of the brutal war they fought.

I cannot summarize in a few words my own generation of World War II veterans, my classmates, my shipmates, the fellows I met casually as strangers and will never quite leave as long as I live.

The men of Korea fought a terrible war and its hardships are reflected in their lack of talk about it.

The men of Vietnam are perhaps the most heroic of all, since it is they who have lived and fought and died on faith alone.

The fact that we have had—and been—and known veterans is not in it-

self unique. All of us who have lived through the excitement of the human drama of conflict reflect on our own experience with the mixed emotions that have characterized veterans through all ages. As we grow older, we are all more like the veterans of King Henry's wars, who were described by Shakespeare:

He that outlives the day and comes safe home,
Will stand a-tiptoe when this day is named,
And rouse him at the name of Crispian.
Then shall our name,
Familiar in his mouth as household words . . .
Be in their flowing cups freshly remembered.

It is not that veterans are usual in human society that surprises us. It is rather that in our society we have seen veterans of so much bitter fighting and veterans of so many vital causes. To each one of them, the Nation owes an individual debt for which no adequate payment has yet been devised. It is a debt of the same character and inviolable nature as the obligation that each of us owes his nation and his people when dangers threaten.

It is the proliferation of danger to society and to our Nation that has created so many veterans. It is this same proliferation that should renew our resolves to find different ways to settle the differences that divide men and embroil armies in war.

Only when we have done this, for the benefit of all men, will we have approached a recognition of the debts we owe to the veterans of all wars.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, today, on Veterans Day, we pay tribute across the Nation to the men and women—living and dead—who have served in our Armed Forces. These brave citizens answered the call of their country in times of military need. They sacrificed opportunities. They risked their lives. They fought for freedom.

Many fell in battle. Many others continue their contribution as private citizens. Today we honor both.

At the present time, there are over 27 million living American veterans, and veterans and their families make up close to half of our population. In my own State of Massachusetts, we have over 800,000 veterans. And approximately 1,200 GI's return to civilian life in Massachusetts each month.

It is especially fitting and proper, I believe, that we should pause to honor our veterans at a time when we pause as a nation to reexamine our current military activity in Vietnam.

For no matter how any citizen may feel about the merits of that conflict, many Americans serving there and elsewhere are performing bravely in extremely difficult circumstances. They endanger their lives daily—under grueling psychological and physical pressure in unfamiliar surroundings. Many have been wounded. Most have seen their friends injured and killed. All have given up personal comfort and gain for the service of the Nation.

For their quiet sacrifice, these dedicated men and women deserve our highest admiration and respect. Whether or

not we care for the war, we must show that we care for the men.

And so, on this November 11, we honor both the dedicated veterans of yesterday and the active servicemen of today. As citizens of all beliefs, from all walks of life, we express our respect for the dignity and bravery and patriotism and unselfish spirit of those who have served, and lived and died for our country.

Over 100 years ago, Abraham Lincoln stressed the duty of the United States—to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and orphan.

As a former chairman of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, I am proud to reaffirm my commitment to that sentiment. And I shall continue my effort here in the U.S. Senate to pass legislation and programs responsive to this fundamental obligation.

Finally, Mr. President, let us note that Veterans Day is a celebration not of war, but of peace—the anniversary of the signing of the armistice which ended World War I. In this spirit, let us all work together both to further the cause of peace and to honor and serve those who have sought to make it possible.

VETERANS DAY AND PEACE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in company with my colleagues and citizens generally, there is today a remembrance of the veterans of the United States.

The Evening Star of November 11, carries an editorial which is well balanced and meaningful. It does not stress polarization of viewpoints, but its appeal is for understanding in these times of heightened tension, between people and nations.

Yes, Mr. President, men and women of good heart and good conscience and good intent, are desirous for peace—and continue to work for peace. The editor wrote:

Nearly all Americans want the same thing: A peaceful world and a strong, decent America.

Mr. President, 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:

[From the Washington Star, Nov. 11, 1969]
VETERANS DAY

Half a century ago, President Woodrow Wilson proclaimed November 11 as Armistice Day, to honor those who had fallen in the "war to end wars." In 1954, a more realistic Congress changed the name of the holiday to Veterans Day, to pay homage to all those who had worn their country's uniform.

Today, in that spirit, many area residents gathered at the Washington monument grounds to rededicate themselves to the ideals which have made this nation great. They were right to do so.

It has become virtually impossible to hold a rational discussion on the question of Vietnam. We never have believed that all those who oppose the war are "effete snobs." By the same token, those who honor our nation's flag today and support the President's efforts to extricate us from Southeast Asia are neither red-necks nor jingoists.

There is no place in our politics for street clashes between followers of various persuasions. Donnybrooks only play into the hands of those who genuinely wish this country, ill. Those who lie in Arlington Cemetery did not die for an America in which such things happen.

If their sacrifice, which we honor today, means anything, it means that all Americans have the right and the duty to think rationally and act peacefully on the great issues of our day.

Later this week, other Americans will be marching for what they think right. Although we do not agree with them, we take them seriously. We take even more seriously their right to march. If they take themselves seriously, they will see to it that their forthcoming march is a peaceful one.

These are difficult days for all of us. But nearly all of us want the same thing: A peaceful world and a strong, decent America. We differ only on means to that end. And this should not be enough to divide us.

No nation which does not respect its past can build its future. Those who undertake the obligations to serve in the armed forces of this country are paying off in part the debt each of us owes for all that we have here.

We are proud to pay tribute to them, and to those who fell in battles not of their own choosing, for ideals which they may have only dimly understood. We are proud of this country's past. And that is why we believe in its future.

VETERANS DAY

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, when we pause to observe Veterans Day, we pay tribute not only to our fighting men but to the qualities of American life which they have fought to defend.

Veterans Day is an opportunity to appreciate anew the sacrifices and contributions which American fighting men have made in the pursuit of peace and national independence for nearly 200 years.

It is a day when Americans can unite in respect for those men and women, and for their deeds.

There is reason for a spirit of national unity today. If we reflect on our history, we see that different kinds of Americans have gone to war to protect different personal aspirations and values. We have fought to protect our loved ones, our neighborhoods, our family attitudes, our ethnic traditions, and many other values.

It is out of this diversity of objectives and motivations that America has had to summon the strength and the will to set national goals, to decide public policy and to build a nation.

We have succeeded, not because we were different, but because we have recognized our differences and accommodated to them.

We believe we can disagree with one another but still maintain national stability and purpose.

We believe we can pursue different careers and espouse different life styles and philosophies, and yet agree on the necessity to exercise our individuality in the framework of mutual trust and respect.

Our Armed Forces have taught us that no region, race, or creed has a monopoly on courage, valor, or wisdom under fire.

We know, as John Kennedy reminded us, that at the Alamo a man was not asked for a copy of his genealogy before being put to the defense of the outpost.

Veterans Day should remind us that a sense of national unity is essential for freedom in our society, no matter what our differences may be.

In my judgment the greatest contribution to national unity each of us can make is to demonstrate restraint and forbearance in communicating with each other.

This is especially true at a time when there is a tendency to polarize Americans into conflicting camps on so many issues.

Our great challenge today is to build a whole country, one which draws strength and wisdom from the very diversity of its people and their views freely expressed.

We have repeatedly done so in time of war around the globe. Our test is to do so at home. Our experience demonstrates we can do so, and I am confident we will.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) is absent from the Senate on official business. However, he has prepared a statement regarding Veterans Day which he would have delivered to the Senate had he been here. I think that Senator HART's words are highly thoughtful and most appropriate. I commend his remarks to all Senators and ask unanimous consent that his statement "Veterans Day, 1969" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

VETERANS DAY, 1969

Mr. HART. Mr. President, Veterans Day, 1969, finds the nation deeply divided over how best to end our involvement in a war.

However, as we pause to honor those Americans who have fought in the present and past wars, we should, we must make clear that this nation is not divided in its desire for peace.

We cannot know, of course, what message those Americans who have died in battle might have for us today, but I believe their plea would echo the plea of each of us—the plea for "lasting peace and domestic tranquility."

As we look to the future, let us recall the past and that we fought World War I to make the world safe for democracy and World War II to ensure the Four Freedoms.

The fact that the struggle to achieve those goals continues, does not detract from the effort and sacrifice which went into those two global conflicts.

But if we are to remain true to those who died on battlefields, if we are to remain the people who fought for freedom, we must not sacrifice the right to disagree in the name of unity.

We find our strength in our freedom to disagree, in our freedom to march today in the name of national unity and in the freedom to march later in the week to petition for a different route to peace.

While those who may march today favor one policy, and those who may march this weekend, a different one, most of the marchers have the same end in mind—lasting peace and domestic tranquility.

In our search for the best route to those goals, let us pledge not to seek to silence, whether by word or deed, those with whom we disagree.

Let us recognize that the right to disagree and to articulate that disagreement is vital to building the national unity we need to protect freedom.

There can be no real national unity among a people denied the freedom to petition peacefully for or against their government's policies.

We can best honor our war veterans by protecting the freedoms for which they fought.

TO THOSE WHO HAVE SERVED OUR COUNTRY

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, today we honor the millions of Americans who have served in defense of their country. On November 11, 1918, an armistice was signed to bring an end to the war said to end all wars in the world. Regrettably history has not proven this to be true. At the end of World War I from the far corners of the world an estimated 8 million men had died in the conflict. Many American soldiers were among those who fought and died. When the guns went silent there was a tremendous celebration as America's young men returned to their homes. The Armistice Day celebration will never be forgotten by those who were there.

Now, many years later, we honor those men who fought in the "war to end all wars," and we also honor all those who have served since then. World War II, the Korean conflict, and now the Vietnam war, which has now taken more than 39,000 American lives.

Our Nation has called upon its men many times, and has always been rewarded with unmatched loyalty and dedication in defending this great country of ours. Men have interrupted promising careers, or their education—to serve in the Armed Forces where they commonly face disability or death. We have much to be thankful for in having such fine men among us. Today there are approximately 27 million veterans living in the United States whom we honor on this day, as we also honor those who paid the supreme sacrifice and gave their lives in defense of free America.

Also today we honor the many men and women who are now hospitalized because of disease or war injury incurred in the Vietnam war or as a result of past conflicts. I salute our veterans, whose patience, fortitude, and unwavering loyalty have established a high standard truly becoming this great Nation.

There is of course no way in which to measure precisely the value of each serviceman's contribution to his country and hence it is impossible to repay each serviceman and his family in a special way. There is also absolutely no way for a nation to compensate adequately for disability or death. What is possible and what continues to be a welcome reality is the continued development of a comprehensive veterans benefits program that encompasses a whole range of special needs.

I have and will continue to sponsor and cosponsor veterans benefits legislation proven essential to the wide variety of special needs of veterans and their families. Benefits such as medical care assist-

ance needed for disabilities which are service connected, extended nursing home care, income support, and of special significance is veterans educational benefits.

In 1944 the GI bill was enacted. Since then some 11 million veterans have taken advantage of the benefits by returning to civilian life and entering school. We will never be able to measure the benefits accrued from this legislation, but its value in human terms is very clear. We have supported in whole or in part the realization for millions who fought in our behalf—a better education—and in this way helped them achieve a better life.

The Senate recognizes the importance and recently passed a 46-percent increase in veterans educational benefits. I am proud to have helped achieve Senate approval of this increase. I believe it serves as a useful symbol of our country's continuing recognition and remembrance of America's veterans.

Let us remember our veterans not only on November 11 but on all days, and in all ways. Let us remember them in their youth and help them obtain an education, let us remember them if they are disabled by providing the best available medical care, and let us remember them in their old age with income support if warranted.

All veterans deserve our unfailing support and our gratitude for giving generously in times of our country's greatest need.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of the distinguished Republican leader (Mr. Scott), I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated November 7, 1969, addressed to us by Shaffe T. Courey, national commander of the Military Order of the Purple Heart.

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

MILITARY ORDER OF THE PURPLE HEART,
Washington, D.C., November 7, 1969.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
U.S. Senator, Montana,
Majority Leader,
Hon. HUGH SCOTT,
U.S. Senator, Pennsylvania,
Minority Leader,
U.S. Senate:

Whereas the Senate has elected to conduct business on the National holiday, Veterans Day, November 11, I sincerely hope that it will set aside a few moments at 11 a.m. to pay respect to the 38.5 million men and women who have contributed to the security of our Nation in seeking peace with honor. The military order of the Purple Heart is host for the National Veterans Day Observance at Arlington National Cemetery, in addition to nine regional ceremonies throughout the Nation. Never before have we witnessed such keen and sincere interest in the observance of Veterans Day as this year. Most ceremonies in schools, churches and other public meeting places are to commence at 11 a.m., signifying the time that peace came to the world on November 11, 1918. I hope that Members of the Senate will not overlook this revered occasion and will appropriately pay respect to the more than 27 million living veterans at 11 a.m., Tuesday, November 11. This will be a clear demonstration to our citizens and the rest of the world that we have united love and respect for our flag, our Nation and

for those who time and again have sacrificed to maintain peace with honor.

Official:

RICHARD P. GOLICK,
Adjutant General.
SHAFFE T. COUREY,
National Commander, Military Order of
the Purple Heart.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR RANDOLPH WITH RESPECT TO CONSULAR CONVENTION WITH BELGIUM AND AGREEMENT WITH CANADA ON ADJUSTMENTS IN FLOOD CONTROL PAYMENTS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, yesterday in the Senate there were votes on two matters and inadvertently I was not recorded as favoring those measures had I been present.

The first vote was on Executive F, 91st Congress, first session, and dealt with Consular Convention with Belgium. The second vote was on Executive H, first session, 91st Congress, the agreement with Canada on adjustments in flood-control payments.

Had I been present I would have voted "aye" in both instances.

Mr. President, I was in West Virginia at the time of these rollcall votes. Earlier I had attended the funeral services in Fairmont for William D. Evans, who was a beloved and respected journalist and editor for approximately 40 years in our State.

I express at this time, for unnumbered West Virginians, their appreciation for the fruitful life Bill Evans lived and for the day-by-day counseling he gave thousands and thousands of our citizens.

JUDGE HAYNSWORTH

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the time is approaching when each Member must vote for or against the confirmation of Clement F. Haynsworth, Jr., as Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Every Senator has enough homework to do if he studies the testimony and masters the details of matters coming out of his own committees. On other matters he is justified in depending to a certain extent on the reports of the committees handling them and upon the recommendations of colleagues in whom he has confidence, who serve on the committees involved.

In this instance, however, I feel that the issues at stake in the confirmation of Mr. Haynsworth are so important, the public interest so keen, and the controversy so heated, that it is the duty of every Senator to make his own study of the testimony before the Committee on the Judiciary and not take his information secondhand either from his colleagues, the White House, or the Department of Justice, and certainly not from press reports, columnists, and commentators. Therefore, I have taken the time during the past three weekends to familiarize myself with all the evidence brought forth in the committee hearings. I do not claim that I have read every word of every witness, but I did re-

view his testimony enough to analyze his position and I read and in some cases reread with great care the more vital testimony that bore on Judge Haynsworth's conduct as a jurist and his attitude as an individual.

As a result, I arrived at certain conclusions which I shall state as briefly as possible.

First, I did not need to rely on the searching analyses of the alleged improprieties of Judge Haynsworth by the able Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA) and the able Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK) to reach the inescapable conclusion that these matters have been magnified far out of proportion to their significance and do not reflect in the slightest degree upon the honor and integrity of Judge Haynsworth. It is absurd to believe that a man of substantial wealth, both inherited and accumulated through long years of professional practice, would be swayed in his decision on a case by the remote possibility that it could affect his own pocketbook by a few cents or at most a few dollars.

If that were true, the President could not carry out his avowed intention of appointing to the Supreme Court men with previous judicial experience, because the probability is that no man with any means at all who has participated in many decisions would be entirely immune from such attack. We would have to vote upon those without judicial experience who were only practicing lawyers, as we have at least three times in recent years, or the nominations would be confined to those who were not successful enough in their profession to have acquired any of this world's goods. Indeed, most of us in the Senate would ourselves be subject to attack for much of the legislation upon which we act could affect even the least affluent of us if a dollar or a fraction thereof is to be the test.

A man's reputation should be the determining factor in a situation like the one now before us. I cannot believe that Judge Haynsworth could have spent most of his 56 years practicing law in a medium-sized town, and sitting as Judge of a Federal court of appeals having jurisdiction over the southeastern part of the country, without having left in the minds of the people with whom he is associated a clear picture of what kind of a man he is. One of the tasks undertaken by the American Bar Association committee, in connection with the making of its recommendation, was to interview both lawyers and judges who have been associated with the nominee. The chairman of the association's committee, Judge Lawrence E. Walsh, gave this testimony about those interviews:

As far as integrity is concerned, it is the unvarying, unequivocal and emphatic view of each judge and lawyer interviewed that Judge Haynsworth is beyond any reservation a man of impeccable integrity.

The six other judges of the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, on October 9, sent Judge Haynsworth the following telegram:

Despite certain objections that have been voiced to your confirmation, we express to

you our complete and unshaken confidence in your integrity and ability.

I find this support from the people who know the nominee best much more impressive than the hit-and-run tactics of the opposition. I find it a good deal more convincing than the journalistic ramblings of some instant experts on ethics which this nomination seems to have produced.

I have too high a regard for the integrity of all my colleagues in the Senate and am too conscious of my own frailties to question the motives of any, but I am forced to conclude that, though they may be unconscious of the fact, these alleged irregularities are not and could not be the real reason for the opposition to Judge Haynsworth—they are only a smokescreen. The basis of the opposition to his confirmation within and without the Senate is that his opponents have an instinctive feeling that Judge Haynsworth is a biased and bigoted individual, incapable of the detachment and objectivity which is a required qualification for one who sits in judgment and interprets the law. They see in Judge Haynsworth a member of an old southern family who for five generations have practiced law in the same South Carolina community. Therefore, they assume he must be race conscious and weak on civil rights. They know that members of his family have long been identified with the textile industry. Therefore, he must be against labor.

In the 12 years that he has sat on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, Judge Haynsworth's record is a complete refutation of these suspicions.

In the case of Lankford against Gelston, he participated in the opinion that an injunction should issue to prevent the Baltimore police from making blanket searches on uncorroborated anonymous tips. Most of the homes searched were occupied by Negroes. The court took note of the deteriorating relations between the Negro community and the police in Baltimore and said that "it is of the highest importance to community morale that the courts shall give firm and effective reassurance, especially to those who feel that they have been harassed by reason of their color or their poverty."

In Hawkins against North Carolina Dental Society, Judge Haynsworth wrote the opinion which desegregated the North Carolina Dental Association. He joined in North Carolina Teachers' Association against Asheboro City Board of Education, reversing a lower Federal court which had upheld the displacement of Negro teachers who had lost their jobs to whites when schools were integrated. He joined the Court's decision applying the Civil Rights Act in the case of Newman against Piggy Park Enterprises.

In addition to these, I note that Haynsworth wrote an opinion holding, over vigorous dissent by other members of the court, that a Federal court had properly released Rap Brown on his own recognizance—Brown against Fogel.

Mr. President, a judge, whatever his background and tradition may be, who insists, over opposition, in according to

Rap Brown the full measure of his rights can hardly be charged with racial prejudice.

Reference should be made to the testimony of Prof. G. W. Foster, Jr., who prefaced his detailed statement by saying:

By faith I am a liberal Democrat, and while Judge Haynsworth would not have been my first preference . . . I am convinced that it is both wrong and unfair to charge that he is a racial segregationist or that his judicial record shows him to be out of step with the Warren Court on racial questions. I now support his nomination unreservedly.

Reading charges made by the AFL-CIO, one might assume that Judge Haynsworth had never written a pro labor opinion. Yet, as it was subsequently pointed out, opinions in eight cases sustaining decisions by the National Labor Relations Board against various corporations were written by him, and he has participated in at least 37 pro labor decisions.

I can find no reason to believe that Judge Haynsworth has allowed any prejudice to affect his service on the court.

Mr. President, there has been so much discussion in the press and elsewhere concerning Judge Haynsworth's fitness and impartiality that too little has been said about what he can bring to the Supreme Court of the United States.

I believe that what the Supreme Court needs now, more than it needs a doctrinaire "liberal" or a doctrinaire "conservative," is a judicial craftsman who can write clear, concise opinions so that judges, lawyers, legislatures, and citizens throughout the country will be able to know exactly what the law is. Those who have objectively evaluated Judge Haynsworth's abilities and temperament believe that he is ideally suited to fill that role. Prof. Charles Alan Wright, himself a distinguished scholar of the law, stated:

It would be very hard to characterize Judge Haynsworth as a "conservative" or a "liberal"—whatever these terms may mean—because the most striking impression one gets from his writing is of a highly disciplined attempt to apply the law as he understands it, rather than to yield to his policy preferences.

Professor Wright added that Judge Haynsworth's opinions are direct and lucid explanations of the process by which he has reached a conclusion. He faces squarely the difficulties a case presents, but he resists the temptation to speculate about related matters not necessary to decision.

One area of concern to the Congress and to the country alike is the field of criminal law, in which many people have felt that the present Supreme Court has placed too great an emphasis upon the rights of a criminal defendant, as opposed to the rights of society. Here I think Judge Haynsworth will bring a needed balance. His opinions in the field of criminal law are neither those of a "hanging judge" nor those of a "bleeding heart." Instead, they are ably written and pragmatic solutions to thorny questions, which reasonably balance the

right of every criminal defendant to a fair trial against the right of society to be protected.

In *United States against Chandler*, Judge Haynsworth wrote for his court a masterful opinion canvassing the law of "insanity" as a criminal defense, and concluding that the best rule was that previously formulated by the American Law Institute. But even as he adopted this modern rule which gives more latitude to modern psychiatric knowledge, he stated that "Criminal law exists for the protection of society."

In another case, *Rowe against Peyton*, he combined scholarship with practicality to conclude that an old Supreme Court precedent was harmful to both the prisoner and to the State, and therefore would ultimately be overruled by that Court. He proved correct in this prediction. In yet another case, *Hayden against Warden*, he wrote a separate opinion urging the overturning of an earlier doctrine which he felt unnecessarily restricted police in their scientific investigation of crime. In this view, he was ultimately upheld by the Supreme Court.

In his years on the bench, Judge Haynsworth has demonstrated high legal capacity. He is in every sense of the word a "lawyer's lawyer" and a "judge's judge."

The American Bar Association's Committee on Judicial Selection rates Judge Haynsworth as "highly acceptable from the viewpoint of professional qualifications."

Mr. President, I shall vote to confirm Clement F. Haynsworth because I believe him to be honorable, because I believe him to be fair, because I believe him to be competent.

It is always a grave responsibility when the Senate has to pass on the qualifications of an individual nominated by the President of the United States to serve for life on the highest court in the land. Certainly it is the duty of each Senator to satisfy himself most carefully as to the character and ability of the nominee before placing the mark of his approval upon him. It is no less the duty of each Senator to be very sure of his grounds before he votes to reject. It would indeed be a tragedy to place a stigma on one who has been universally honored and respected by his fellow citizens through long years of practice at the bar and service on the bench. In my opinion, we are not justified in doing that except for the gravest and most serious reasons. No frivolous or purely technical objections would ever justify such action.

Nor, in the opinion of this Senator, are we justified in voting to reject a nominee because we think we might not agree with his political or social philosophy. In my service here I have voted to confirm nine Justices of the Supreme Court, with whose political philosophy in the majority of cases I was quite sure I differed. Early in my service here, it was impressed upon me by those seniors who were steeped in the traditions of the Senate that the sole test which we were justified in requiring from the President's nominee was character and ability. Mr. President, I believe it would be

most unfortunate if we now change that test. For if Judge Haynsworth should be rejected, I believe it would be purely because of his supposed background and beliefs and not for any other reason.

Therefore, Mr. President, in voting to confirm him, I am not only, according to my own conscience, doing justice to Clement Haynsworth but I am also in a deeper sense voting to preserve the standards of this Senate. It will be a sad day when we let politics sway our judgment on the character of men.

Mr. THURMOND subsequently said: Mr. President, the very able and distinguished Senator from New Hampshire has given a great deal of thought and study to the record concerning the nomination of Judge Haynsworth to the Supreme Court. As a result of this careful and detailed reading of all the evidence, Senator Cotton has announced his intention to support Judge Haynsworth.

It is heartening to see a man of such high character and such dedication to principle come out strongly for the confirmation of Judge Haynsworth. Senator Cotton has noted the objectivity with which Judge Haynsworth has approached various issues before him and has determined that he is a man who possesses the character, ability, and integrity to serve with honor on the U.S. Supreme Court.

I should like to commend the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire for his fine remarks and to express the hope that all those Senators who have doubts regarding this matter will study the record as carefully and thoroughly as Senator Cotton has.

BOTH SIDES SHOULD BE HEARD

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, last week on the Senate floor and in the newspapers some dissatisfaction was expressed concerning President Johnson's efforts to provide a modern nursing home for the senior citizens of Austin, Tex. The home that was constructed features the kind of innovation that I find all too lacking in my investigations of nursing homes in America. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Long Term Care for the Elderly, I have spent many days and weeks in hearings on adequate nursing homes.

So, although I have no direct knowledge of the transactions involved, I do believe that both sides should be heard. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that a letter to the editor of the Washington Post from former Secretary Wilber J. Cohen be printed in the RECORD.

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

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION,
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,
Ann Arbor, Mich., November 4, 1969.

EDITOR,
Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

Usually the reader of the Washington Post can find on its editorial pages (whether he agrees or disagrees) some of the most intelligent and thoughtful discussions of the major issues of our day.

I was shocked, therefore, to read your editorial of November 3, 1969, relating to Senator John William's charge concerning the

Geriatric Center in Austin, Texas. It reflects a disregard of all the facts and a judgment rendered out of that ignorance.

As Undersecretary and Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare during 1965-68, I am thoroughly familiar with President Johnson's efforts to stimulate the construction and operation of an innovative model nursing home since all of us were appalled at costs and conditions in nursing homes.

Those efforts go back at least to 1966 (if not earlier) when President Johnson began urging us in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to develop a model Geriatric Center in this country with modern research capability which would include nursing home facilities and housing for the elderly. I brought one of the most distinguished experts in this field from England, Dr. Lionel Cosin, to meet with the President and myself in order to plan a nursing home program which among other things, would help to rehabilitate persons for self-care.

On October 12, 1966, President Johnson established a Task Force, including health experts and architects, to put together the basic framework for a model Geriatric Center and Nursing Home.

In January, 1968, when federally-owned land at the National Training Site in the District of Columbia became available, President Johnson asked that it be used to build a "new town in town"—including housing and schools as well as a model nursing home.

At that time, it was believed that it would be possible to build the project promptly, since no one was living on the land (and therefore no one would have to be displaced), and since the Federal Government owned the land in an essentially federal city, the District of Columbia.

President Johnson and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare also encouraged the National Medical Association Foundation, a group largely composed of Negro doctors, to put the nursing home project together. The concept provided for operation in conjunction with the Medical School of Howard University. It was hoped this would set an example for the rest of the country; that it would encourage cities and states to use surplus or available government land to build new innovative projects within existing cities, complete with housing and medical facilities.

Due to a variety of local problems, and despite every effort by President Johnson to achieve this goal, it was not feasible to use this Washington site. Nevertheless, a number of ideas which we wanted to utilize had been developed for the construction and operation of an experimental nursing home.

It should be kept in mind that Congress had spelled out in Section 1902(a) (28) of the Medicaid law a series of six requirements for nursing homes and in Section 1908, six requirements for nursing home operators. I felt strongly then—as I do now—that we needed more experimental projects in this entire area.

In 1968, when the tract of Federal land in Austin, Texas became available, it seemed like a stroke of good fortune to try and utilize it for a nursing home experimental project. This land had originally been purchased by the City of Austin 30 years before for \$11,000. At that time the then Congressman Lyndon B. Johnson prevailed upon the city to give this land to the Federal Government for use as a fish hatchery.

In two separate actions, found this land to be excess to its needs. In August 1968, the first portion of this tract of Federal land to be declared excess was used to construct model low-cost housing. Ten houses were built on that land, each costing less than \$8,000, in an experiment with new building materials and techniques that many feel is the genesis of "Operation Breakthrough."

The second portion of this land which was declared excess involved the remaining 26 acres, on which it was decided to build the modern geriatric center. Originally, the plan was for the University of Texas to operate the experimental nursing home. Because of legal limitations, the University of Texas was unable to finance and operate a nursing home and therefore were unable to accept the land. Therefore, a non-profit public corporation was formed for this purpose.

The three directors of that corporation during its organizational phase were Frank Erwin, Chairman of the Board of Regents of the University of Texas system; Roy Butler, President of the Austin School Board; and John Burns, President of the City National Bank of Austin and a member of the Austin Public Housing Authority. (J. C. Kellam signed the original papers as director but resigned after 3 days and was replaced by John Burns).

Mr. Erwin was chairman of this public group because it was contemplated that the University of Texas would monitor this project and would deploy its academic, medical and other scientific expertise for experimentation and research in care of the elderly. Messrs. Butler and Burns were chosen not merely because of their high standing in the Austin community, but because both were directors of St. Jude's, a non-profit organization which operates two nursing homes and a psychiatric center.

The Interior Department declared the land "excess" in late 1968. This "excess" property was declared "surplus" property shortly thereafter, a legal act solely and fully within the authority of the Administrator of the General Services Administration.

Under the law, the Administrator "in his discretion" assigned this surplus property to the Secretary of HEW for health purposes including research. This was perfectly appropriate, since the law places total discretion in the Administrator. At that time, the Administrator of GSA and his deputy indicated that there was ample precedent for such action without regard to the 30 day waiting period.

Under the law, the Secretary of HEW in fixing the value of property "shall take into consideration any benefit which has accrued or may accrue to the United States from the use of such property . . ." As is common in such cases where property is to be used for schools, hospitals, or nursing homes, I directed that the property be donated under this provision to the public non-profit corporation with every expectation that with the full cooperation of the University of Texas, the research results which would accrue to the people of the United States would be many times the value of the property.

The organization which received the land was a non-profit public corporation, to be qualified under the Internal Revenue Code and to become a tax supported institution under State law.

Subsequently, by an Act of the Texas State Legislature, the public non-profit corporation was provided tax exemption for the operation of the geriatric center and in effect made a tax-supported institution.

As I understand it, the Internal Revenue Service has already granted tax exemption under Section 501(c) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code. Technically, such exemption should be under Section 501(c) (3) of the code, but I understand that the public non-profit corporation had applied for this exemption and that no problem should exist on this point.

The salient points to remember are: 1) No one that I know of stands to make any profit out of this institution. The only beneficiaries will be the elderly poor in Austin and

all those throughout the Nation who will benefit from the demonstration and research work performed there; 2) This project was the culmination of many months of effort and many attempts to build an innovative geriatric nursing home center in this country; 3) Austin was selected because the surplus Federal property became available, and similar property in the District of Columbia was not able to be used.

There is nothing "unlawful" about the means used. There is nothing "undercover" or "concealed" about this transaction. The deed was filed of public record in Austin. The only "irregularity" may be that the wheels of bureaucracy were pressed to move at a pace that most of us interested in promoting the economy and efficiency of medical service would hope they would move more frequently.

If the Washington Post would review all the facts in this case, it is my judgment the Post would conclude that not only did everyone involved act properly, but also with the highest of motives, and with a desire to improve the quality and efficiency of nursing homes and to advance the quality of life for our Senior Citizens.

WILBUR J. COHEN,
Dean.

AUSTIN, TEX., REAL ESTATE TRANSACTION QUESTIONED

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware subsequently said:

Mr. President, as appearing in the RECORD on Thursday, October 30, I criticized the manner in which 26½ acres of Government property in the center of Austin, Tex., had been given to a group of Texans under procedures which were in direct contradiction to Government regulations.

Today the Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss) incorporated in the RECORD a letter written by former Secretary Wilbur Cohen as addressed to the Washington Post wherein Mr. Cohen tried to defend this transaction.

Now, I respect those individuals who are charitably motivated in contributing their money or their talents toward helping their fellow men, but let us get the record straight. The only charity in this instance was the charity of the American taxpayers, who were losing possession of property that had an appraised valuation of over \$2 million, property that was being given to this group of Texans. Furthermore, this property was transferred to this group under procedures that were in direct contradiction to all rules of disposing of Government property.

While it is true that under the contract this group of Texans was committed to build and operate a geriatric center on this site for the next 30 years, it is also true that under the arrangements not only was this group receiving the real estate as a free gift but in addition the Government had approved loans totaling \$8½ million to finance its construction and HEW and HUD had approved grants aggregating over half a million dollars to begin the subsidizing of its operation.

Furthermore, the property itself at the time of its selection had not been declared surplus to the needs of the Interior Department, which agency had been operating it as a fish hatchery. Nor did Mr.

Cohen comment on the fact that these cash grants and the transfer of this free land had been approved by him over the objections of the evaluating board of the respective agencies.

I point out that not withstanding all the flowery statements of the charitable intentions of this group of individuals Mr. Cohen overlooked mentioning the fact that in all of these arrangements not one dime of their own money was committed. All their plans are centered around the fact that for the next 30 years they are to act as the conduit for the expenditure of millions of dollars furnished by the American taxpayers.

During this 30-year period contracts for the construction of buildings being financed 100 percent with Government money and operational contracts for the buildings after construction, again being financed with Government subsidies and grants, could all be awarded or spent as they see fit.

Likewise, in defending this project, while placing great emphasis upon their desire to help the poor elderly in that area, Mr. Cohen forgot to mention that after having operated this project for 30 years with Government subsidies and Government financing, at the end of that period this land, which has a present-day value of over \$2 million, plus all improvements thereon in the interval could accrue to them as the organizers.

There is not one word in this contract which provides that at the end of the 30-year period the so-called poor elderly, for whom they now express so much sympathy, would be the beneficiaries of one dime.

Let us not be deluded: If this project had been negotiated with the charitable idea of helping these elderly the contract would have provided that at the end of the 30 years this valuable property would have accrued to the elderly and not to a group of Texans who happened to have had a close enough relationship with the White House to have gotten their hands on it in the first place.

Furthermore, at the time this property was transferred to this group it was on the premise that they had been approved as a tax-exempt organization, but in reality no such approval had ever been made.

I have already called this transaction to the attention of the Department of Justice, and I shall continue to insist that the interests of the American taxpayers be protected and that this land be returned to the Federal Government.

In order that today's RECORD may be complete, I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of my statement of October 30, outlining the details of this strange transaction, be printed in the RECORD; and for continuity, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks and insertions here today follow the earlier insertion of Secretary Cohen's letter.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOHN J. WILLIAMS

Mr. President, today I call attention to a highly questionable transaction wherein real estate with a real value of over \$2 million

was given away in the last 90 days of the Johnson Administration.

Between October 21, 1968, and January 20, 1969, a group of Texans Mr. J. C. Kellum, Mr. Roy A. Butler, and Mr. Frank C. Erwin, Jr., formed a nonprofit corporation and then received a free gift from the Government of 26½ acres of choice real estate in the center of Austin, Texas. A low value of \$642,000 was used, but actually this valuation was far too low since in the Government files at that same time was an earlier appraisal which showed a valuation on this same land of over \$2 million. As if that were not enough, in addition to receiving this gift of land this same group was approved for large cash grants from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and for Federal Housing Administration loans totaling over \$8 million to build a nursing home and apartments on this same project. F.H.A. loans are not supposed to be for more than 90 per cent of the construction cost. To provide the necessary 10 per cent down payment the group pledged as collateral the land which the government had just given them plus the proceeds of three cash grants awarded them by H.E.W. totaling nearly a half million dollars. This meant that the group would have no money invested in the \$10 million project.

The files indicate that these liberal transactions were arranged upon orders from the White House, and official approval was given by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who overrode the strenuous objections of subordinates who recognized this deal as a land grab in which the interests of the Government were not being properly protected.

I shall review the chronology of these transactions and let the record speak for itself.

First the President developed the idea of establishing a geriatric center in Austin, Texas. The project was originally supposed to have the sponsorship of the University of Texas; but the University soon withdrew, and then a group of individuals formed a so-called nonprofit organization and proceeded with the plans.

On October 29, 1968, there was a special meeting at the White House to discuss this project. Present were Mr. M. Nimetz, Special Assistant to Mr. J. Gaither, representing the President; Dr. Thomas McCarthy, National Center for Health Services, Research and Development; Mr. H. R. Moskof, President, Committee of Urban Housing; Mr. T. Ray Ogden and Mr. C. L. Tilley, of Brooks, Barr, Graeber and White, of the Washington and Austin offices, respectively; Mr. A. H. Dilly, Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs, University of Texas, Austin; Mr. A. D. Grezzo, Chief, Elderly Nursing Homes and Medical Facilities Branch, F.H.A.; and Mr. J. A. Cunningham and Dr. Milton L. Bankoff, both of Division of Medical Care Administration, Public Health Service.

The purpose of this meeting was to develop a definitive program in response to the President's request for a new and innovative nursing home for Austin, Texas, as soon as possible.

The representatives of the University of Texas expressed their desire to cooperate completely with the President; however, they insisted on a permanent well-built building which would be operated according to high standards.

In view of the local bed situation (1,500 nursing home beds in Austin, which has a population of 200,000 and a new medicenter of 225 beds) and the low amount of financial reimbursement under current Texas regulations it was decided at this meeting that the maximum building size should be 250 beds for the nursing home.

The National Medical Association Foundation (N.M.A.F.) program was discussed in

depth, and it was decided to use the N.M.A.F. plan of a continuum of care with construction of a nursing home to be followed by construction of housing for the well-elderly as rapidly as possible. Both were to be included in the master plan for the site which was to be approved as soon as possible so that construction could be begun by December 25, 1968.

The group at the October 29 meeting was told that 26 acres of federal land then being used as a fish hatchery and located five minutes east of the center of Austin, Texas, was available. That was price land and had been valued at \$2 per square foot, or over \$2 million, but later when transferred this valuation was arbitrarily reduced to \$642,000. There appears to be no justification for this lower appraisal.

After much discussion at this October 29 meeting this federal site was chosen. Significantly as of the date this property (consisting of 2 tracts—one of 5.79 acres and one of 20.704 acres) was selected it had not even been declared surplus, nor had the Texas group filed their organization papers.

Two weeks later, on November 15, 1968, the 20.704 acres plus an easement of .390 acres, for a total of 21.094, was conveniently reported as excess to the needs of the Interior Department, and four days later, on November 19, 1968, it was declared surplus. This property was not screened for use by the other federal agencies as is required by the law.

Meanwhile a new group took over. On this same date, November 19, 1968, the Austin Geriatrics Center, Inc., was formed under the Texas Nonprofit Corporation Act with directors and incorporators as follows:

Directors: Frank C. Erwin, Jr., Roy A. Butler, and J. C. Kellam.

Incorporators: Burnell Waldrep, Richard C. Gibson, and William R. Long.

On November 20, 1968, Mr. Sol Elson, Director of Surplus Property, sent a memorandum to Mr. Donald F. Simpson, Assistant Secretary for Administration, giving a status report on the surplus property situation and raising questions which needed to be answered in order to meet tables set by his superiors (namely, to get this transaction cleared before January 20, 1969). In this memorandum Mr. Elson outlined his problem as follows:

1. They had not yet received an application, so they didn't know what the proposed program was.

2. They had no knowledge regarding the nature of the corporation that was to get the property or its financial ability.

They assumed it would be eligible as a nonprofit organization. Since the construction was going to be fully subsidized by the federal government and since the operation might have to be subsidized Mr. Elson felt serious doubt might exist as to the financial feasibility of the project unless there were a pledge for underwriting continuing long-term operations by some financially responsible organization. He requested additional information so that they could meet the Administration's wishes.

On November 22, 1968, their application was filed and sent to Mr. Sam O. Wynn, Regional Representative, Office of Surplus Property Utilization, H.E.W.

On November 26, 1968, the remaining 5.79 acres were reported as excess to the needs of the Interior Department, and the following day, November 27, 1968, Mr. Donald Simpson, Assistant Secretary of H.E.W., gave Secretary Wilbur Cohen a report promising that the property would be ready for delivery by December 11, but Mr. Simpson raised a question as to whether publicity of the transaction would be appropriate.

On November 29, 1968, the 5.79 acres, which on November 26 had been declared excess to

the needs of the Interior Department, was officially declared surplus. Again there was no screening of other federal agencies as to its possible use.

On December 6, 1968, Secretary Cohen advised the President that as of December 2, 1968, the 26.5 acres had been officially declared surplus by the General Services Administration, that it had been assigned to H.E.W. for disposal, and that he would be ready to deliver the deed to the Austin group on December 10, 1968, at 2:00 P.M.

On December 10, 1968, the signed deed was delivered to the Texas group with a provision therein for a right of reverter for thirty years if:

1. The property were not used continuously for health and health research purposes in accordance with the application and "the supplement thereto."

2. The Center sells, rents, encumbers, or transfers the property without the consent of H.E.W.

3. The Center fails to report yearly to H.E.W.

4. The Center violates the Civil Rights Act. The Texas group did have one problem regarding its ability to pledge the property as collateral to obtain financing from the F.H.A. This was soon resolved by the execution of a Consent Agreement on January 10, 1969, which allowed them to use this property, which was costing them nothing, as collateral for an \$8 million low interest government loan.

The plan was for the Center to build a large facility, which meant a large loan and a fair amount of equity money. This could be difficult for the Center from a practical standpoint. From a technical standpoint H.E.W. had the right to revert if the Center mortgaged without first obtaining the Department's consent; however, if the Center could comply and had private financing without F.H.A. help it could be difficult to refuse such consent.

Assuming the Department of H.E.W. refused to consent it would be possible for the Center to abrogate the condition subsequently by paying to the Department \$642,000 the low GSA appraised figure.

While \$642,000 was the appraisal figure used for the transfer of the property to the Texas group, actually at the time of the transfer the agency files showed that earlier the same land had been appraised at well over \$2 million. I found no basis for the lower valuation except to make this giveaway transaction appear less odorous.

As mentioned earlier, in addition to the free land this Texas group needed some cash. They were applying for \$8.5 million in loans, and the Government required that they furnish ten per cent collateral.

The land they had received as a gift, while actually worth \$2.2 million, had been accepted at a low appraisal of \$642,000 and therefore would not cover the required ten per cent. (The Government loans are supposed to be for only ninety per cent of the construction costs.)

Again H.E.W. came to the rescue. On January 8, 1969, Mr. Thomas McCarthy, the Deputy Director of the National Center for Health Services Research and Development, wrote the Chief of the Contract Branch requesting that a contract be awarded the Center in the amount of \$150,000 with a 12-month period of performance. Mr. McCarthy claimed that the Center had unique, important, and predominate capabilities to do the work they sought to undertake and that therefore it was impractical to secure competition by formal advertising. I suppose what he really meant was that only 12 days remained before the Administration would be out of office and that they did not have time for competitive bids.

On the following day, January 9, 1969, the

Center was invited to submit a proposal, which was done on January 10 by Mr. Frank C. Erwin, Jr., President of the Center. The total estimated cost was \$150,000, and Articles of the Center were attached indicating it to be a nonprofit corporation incorporated on November 19, 1968.

On January 13, 1969, Mr. William W. Brownholtz, Chief, Cost Advisory Branch, Office of Financial Management, submitted to the Chief of Contract Operation Section, Procurement Division, Health Services and Mental Health Administration (H.S.M.H.A.) an adverse report recommending against giving this contract to the Center. He commented that the contract was to be a cost reimbursement type and that the organization was not ongoing and had not established an adequate accounting system to implement the contract. He also noted that the contract contemplated charging many overhead costs to the contract program. This naturally would be inappropriate if the Center also carried on activities unrelated to the Contract Program as they would have the benefit of overhead cost payments made through the contract. He felt the Center should file a security bond.

On January 14, 1969, Mr. Samuel J. Dick, Contracting Officer, likewise submitted an adverse pre-award onsite evaluation. Some of the points raised in this report were as follows:

1. The Center had no legal domicile, but Mr. Erwin suggested that his office address in Austin be used.

2. The Center had no assets other than the property deeded to them by the Federal Government.

3. F.H.A. mortgage negotiations had not been concluded, but the Center hoped to break ground by January 23, 1969, and commence construction in February. The Center therefore did not have facilities to perform the contract and would not have them until the nursing home was built.

4. The Center did not have an administrative staff or employees. Mr. Erwin was to select an administrative staff and a Director of Research, and the Center hoped to obtain consultants.

5. The Center did not have an adequate accounting system or controls to administer a government contract.

6. The Center did not have financial capacity nor other resources to perform the contract, nor had it demonstrated the ability to obtain such financing. The Center felt advance payments would be necessary for operating capital.

7. The Center had no prior contracts or experience.

8. The contract contemplated was for one year, which was not within the ability of the Center, and it hoped a 2- to 3-year contract would be considered.

In this report of January 14, 1969, it is clear that Mr. Dick felt that the Center did not meet the standards of the Federal Procurement Regulations and recommended that the contract not be awarded.

On January 15, 1969, the following day, a synopsis was published in the Commerce Business Daily indicating that the Center was the sole source for the program by reason of its unique plans and capabilities and that there therefore would be no competition.

On that same day, January 15, 1969, Mr. J. Keesler, Chief, Procurement Branch Office of Procurement and Material Management, H.S.M.H.A., wrote a memorandum to the Deputy Administrator attaching Mr. Dick's memorandum of January 14. He reviewed the file with Mr. Weiner, Office of the General Counsel, and Mr. William Brownholtz, Office of Financial Management, and pointed out that they all agreed that the contract should not be awarded to this Texas group.

But White House pressure was on, and no attention was paid to any of these adverse reports.

On January 17, 1969, H.E.W. signed the contract in the amount of \$150,000.

Three days later, January 20, 1969, a government-guaranteed loan in the amount of \$2,283,800 was approved for the 168-bed nursing home with the San Antonio Insuring Office issuing a commitment under Section 232 (Project No. 115-43011-NP).

This loan application carried the notation that the closing requirements of about \$227,000 would be cared for by H.E.W. grants.

On January 20, 1969 (the same day), a second government-guaranteed loan for \$6,350,000 was approved under Section 236 for a 363-unit project designed for elderly with 20 per cent rent supplement units (Project No. 115-44008-NP-SUP).

In addition to the gift of land, this group during the same 90-day period received approval of a series of grants: From H.E.W. \$150,000; and from H.U.D. \$298,582 interest reduction payment (Section 236) and \$58,779 in rent subsidies.

These advance cash grants and the free land received from H.E.W. were the only security advanced as representing the sponsors' ten per cent security for the \$8.5-million government loan.

Thus here we have the government, in cash grants and free land, furnishing collateral for their own loans.

Mr. President, an examination of this transaction clearly shows that the free gift of this land and the approval of these cash grants and these \$8.5 million in loans were obviously political decisions, and as the result of this last-minute scramble to get just one more grab from the Federal Treasury the taxpayers stand to lose millions.

To illustrate just how bold this deal was I call attention to a memo signed by Secretary Cohen on January 16, 1969, just four days before leaving office.

On January 15 two adverse reports had been received, recommending against the approval of the H.E.W. grants and the transfer of this land to this Texas group.

On January 16, 1969, Secretary Wilbur J. Cohen dictated a memorandum for the file indicating that he had personally reviewed the files, that he knew Mr. Frank Erwin, one of the directors of the Texas group, to be a man of integrity, and that he personally had discussed the project with the officials of the University of Texas who had assured him of their support of the Center. Based on said assurances he was approving the project. There is a hand-written note in the Department files on a route slip, which states:

1. Sign all three copies.
2. Sign memorandum for the record saying you reviewed, etc., and therefore approve the project.
3. Ship whole package to Lewis, and we will get a man on a plane to Texas to get them to sign before January 20.

Mr. President, I question not only the propriety but the legality of this multi-million dollar giveaway transaction wherein all rules governing the disposition of government property were ignored. Grants were made and loans were approved for this group in a manner which underscores bureaucratic contempt for the American taxpayers. This transaction cannot remain unchallenged.

I am today requesting the Department of Justice to investigate this transaction and take whatever steps are necessary to protect the interests of the Government and to recover this property. Meanwhile I am suggesting that all government agencies which approved any grants or loans to this group stop all disbursements until the Department of Justice has had an opportunity to act.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT OF TITLE I AGREEMENTS UNDER THE AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954, AS AMENDED

A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of agreements signed under Public Law 480 in October for foreign currencies (with an accompanying report and agreements); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PROPOSED RETIREMENT LEGISLATION FOR CERTAIN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS

A letter from the Assistant to the Commissioner, Executive Office, Government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain teachers in the public schools of the District of Columbia to count as creditable service for retirement purposes all periods of authorized leave without pay taken by such teachers when serving as officers of employee organizations (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the effectiveness and administrative efficiency of the Neighborhood Youth Corps program under title IB of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, St. Louis and St. Louis County, Mo., Department of Labor, dated November 10, 1969 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on audit of financial statements of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, calendar year 1968, Department of Transportation, dated November 10, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Board of Trustees of the Township of Summit, Jackson County, Mich., remonstrating against proposed legislation to limit the tax-exempt feature of interest paid on public bonds issued by State or local governments; to the Committee on Finance.

BILL INTRODUCED

A bill was introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MONTTOYA:

S. 3134. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to conduct special educational programs and activities concerning the use of drugs and for other related educational purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

S. 3134—DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1969

Mr. MONTTOYA. Mr. President, earlier this year I introduced a bill, S. 2592, to establish comprehensive treatment centers to treat drug addicts and users. This measure would also provide for an intensive campaign to publish and disseminate educational materials in drug abuse and to make State and local officials aware of current activities in the area of drug abuse and illegal drug traffic.

The lawmakers and law enforcers of this Nation have become increasingly aware of the need for massive educational programs to teach children and adults alike of the dangers of drugs. Every available piece of evidence points to an alarming increase in the rate of drug use and abuse in this country. In the annual crime report of the FBI, issued in August 1969, the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs revealed that the number of arrests for drug violations had increased by 329 percent since 1960. This explosion in the use of drugs cannot be attributed to any one age, racial, social, or economic group. Rather, it is a problem which exists at every social and economic stratum—the upper- and middle-income communities as well as the ghettos.

Again and again, those who are familiar with the problem have emphasized the need for drug abuse education legislation. Those who have experimented with drugs, including ex-users and ex-addicts, have consistently stated that if they had only known about the effects of drugs, they would have been less inclined to experiment with them. The overwhelming consensus of opinion has been that an effective educational program would be the best possible method of prevention of drug abuse.

Despite this agreement, however, funds available for educational purposes in this area are, at the present time, extremely limited and represent only a small fraction of the total efforts expended in attacking the drug problem. While about \$50 million is now being spent by the Justice Department and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on the drug problem, less than 5 percent of that amount is programmed into education.

Mr. President, I am today introducing a new bill which, I believe, would go far to compensate for the present lack of attention to drug abuse education within our Government. My bill, to be known as the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969, would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to conduct special educational programs and activities concerning the improper use of drugs. Specifically, the bill would encourage the development of new and improved curriculums in drug abuse education; demonstrate their use; evaluate their effectiveness in model programs; demonstrate developed educational materials; provide training programs for teachers, counselors, law-enforcement officials, and other public service and community leaders; provide for grants to local educational agencies and other

private and nonprofit organizations for community education programs on drug abuse; provide for coordinating the activities of the Federal Government in drug abuse education by establishing an Interagency Coordinating Council; establish an Advisory Committee on Drug Abuse Education; and provide for technical assistance by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Department of Justice to assist local educational agencies, public and private nonprofit organizations, and institutions of higher education in the development and implementation of programs on drug abuse education.

This measure is not meant to supplant my earlier bill but to supplement it.

Mr. President, a special Alcoholic and Narcotics Subcommittee was created last spring under the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. In the past few months this subcommittee has been holding extensive hearings on a number of bills relating to drug abuse and will be, I understand, reporting out legislation in this area in the fairly near future.

The bill which I am introducing today is identical to one which has been considered by the House of Representatives and is, therefore, one which can be taken up promptly by the Senate without undue delay. I urge my colleagues in the Senate to give their full support and approval to this vital legislation at the earliest possible time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3134) to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to conduct special educational programs and activities concerning the use of drugs and for other related educational purposes, introduced by Mr. MONTOMY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3134

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969".

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that drug abuse diminishes the strength and vitality of the people of our Nation; that such abuse of dangerous drugs is increasing in urban and suburban areas; that there is a lack of authoritative information and creative projects designed to educate students and others about drugs and their abuse; and that prevention and control of such drug abuse require intensive and coordinated efforts on the part of both governmental and private groups.

(b) It is the purpose of this Act to encourage the development of new and improved curricula on the problems of drug abuse; to demonstrate the use of such curricula in model educational programs and to evaluate the effectiveness thereof; to disseminate curricula materials and significant

information for use in educational programs throughout the Nation; to provide training programs for teachers, counselors, law enforcement officials, and other public service and community leaders; and to offer community education programs for parents and others, on drug abuse problems.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$7,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1970, \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1971, and \$12,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1972 for the purpose of carrying out this Act. Sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall remain available until expended.

USES OF FUNDS

SEC. 4. (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 3, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, hereinafter referred to in this Act as the "Secretary", shall assist in educating the public on the problems of drug abuse by—

(1) making grants to or entering into contracts with institutions of higher education and other public or private agencies, institutions, or organizations, for—

(A) projects for the development of curricula on the use and abuse of drugs, including the preparation of new and improved curricular materials for use in elementary, secondary, and adult education programs;

(B) pilot projects designed to demonstrate, and test the effectiveness of curricula described in clause (A) (whether developed with assistance under this Act or otherwise);

(C) in the case of applicants who have conducted pilot projects under clause (B), projects for the dissemination of curricular materials and other significant information regarding the use and abuse of drugs to public and private elementary, secondary, and adult education programs;

(2) undertaking, directly or through contracts or other arrangements with institutions of higher education or other public or private agencies, institutions, or organizations, evaluations of the effectiveness of curricula tested in use in elementary, secondary, and adult education programs involved in pilot projects described in paragraph (1) (B);

(3) making grants to institutions of higher education and local educational agencies to provide preservice and inservice training programs on drug abuse (including courses of study, institutes, seminars, workshops, and conferences) for teachers, counselors, and other educational personnel, law enforcement officials, and other public service and community leaders;

(4) making grants to local educational agencies and other public and private nonprofit organizations for community education programs on drug abuse (including seminars, workshops, and conferences) especially for parents and others in the community.

(b) In addition to the purposes described in subsection (a), the Secretary may make available not to exceed 5 per centum of the sums appropriated to carry out this Act for each fiscal year for payment of the reasonable and necessary expenses of State educational agencies in assisting local educational agencies in the planning, development, and implementation of drug abuse education programs.

APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS

SEC. 5. (a) Financial assistance for a project under this Act may be made only upon application at such time or times in such manner, and containing or accompanied by such information as the Secretary deems necessary, and only if such application—

(1) provides that the activities and services for which assistance under this title

is sought will be administered by or under the supervision of the applicant;

(2) provides for carrying out one or more projects or programs eligible for assistance under section 4 and provides for such methods of administration as are necessary for the proper and efficient operation of such projects or programs;

(3) sets forth policies and procedures which assure that Federal funds made available under this Act for any fiscal year will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available by the applicant for the purposes described in section 4, and in no case supplant such funds;

(4) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this title; and

(5) provides for making an annual report and such other reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may reasonably require and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Secretary may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

(b) Applications from local educational agencies for financial assistance under this Act may be approved by the Secretary only if the State educational agency has been notified of the application and been given the opportunity to offer recommendations.

(c) Amendments of applications shall, except as the Secretary may otherwise provide by or pursuant to regulation, be subject to approval in the same manner as original applications.

INTERAGENCY COORDINATING COUNCIL ON DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION

SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary shall establish an Interagency Coordinating Council on Drug Abuse Education which shall consist of the Secretary (or his designee) as Chairman, the Attorney General (or his designee), the Commissioner of Education, the Director of the National Institute of Mental Health, and with the consent of such other departments or agencies as the Secretary may from time to time designate as having a substantial interest in the field of drug abuse education, representatives as such departments and agencies.

(b) The Council shall advise in the coordination of the respective activities of the Federal departments and agencies concerned in drug abuse education.

(c) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall promulgate regulations establishing the procedures for consultation with other agencies and with other appropriate public and private agencies.

(d) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may not approve an application for assistance under this Act unless he has given the Interagency Coordinating Council an opportunity to review the application and make recommendations thereon within a period not to exceed sixty days.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION

SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall appoint an Advisory Committee on Drug Abuse Education, which shall—

(1) advise the Secretary concerning the administration of, preparation of general regulations for, and operation of, programs supported with assistance under this Act;

(2) make recommendations regarding the allocation of the funds under this Act among the various purposes set forth in section 4 and the criteria for establishing priorities in deciding which applications to approve, in-

cluding criteria designed to achieve an appropriate geographical distribution of approved projects throughout all regions of the Nation;

(3) review applications and make recommendations thereon;

(4) review the administration and operation of projects and programs under this Act, including the effectiveness of such projects and programs in meeting the purposes for which they are established and operated, make recommendations with respect thereto, and make annual reports of its findings and recommendations (including recommendations for improvements in this Act) to the Secretary for transmittal to the Congress; and

(5) evaluate programs and projects carried out under this Act and disseminate the results of such evaluations.

(b) The Advisory Committee on Drug Abuse Education shall be appointed by the Secretary without regard to the civil service laws and shall consist of twenty-one members. The Secretary shall appoint one member as Chairman. The Committee shall consist of persons familiar with education, mental health, and legal problems associated with drug abuse, young persons, ex-users, parents and others familiar with drug use and abuse. The Committee shall meet at the call of the Chairman or of the Secretary.

(c) Members of the Advisory Committee shall, while serving on the business of the Advisory Committee, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding \$100 per day, including traveltime; and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 8. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Attorney General shall, when requested, render technical assistance to local educational agencies, public and private nonprofit organizations and institutions of higher education in the development and implementation of programs of drug abuse education. Such technical assistance may, among other activities, include making available to such agencies or institution information regarding effective methods of coping with problems of drug abuse, and making available to such agencies or institutions personnel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Justice, or other persons qualified to advise and assist in coping with such problems or carrying out a drug abuse education program.

PAYMENTS

SEC. 9. Payments under this Act may be made in installments and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 10. In administering the provisions of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or private agency or institution in accordance with appropriate agreements, and to pay for such services either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be agreed upon.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 11. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(b) The term "State" includes, in addition to the several States of the Union, the Com-

monwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF A BILL AND A JOINT RESOLUTION

S. 2846

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS) be added as cosponsors of S. 2846, the Developmental Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act of 1969.

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

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 120

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF) be added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 120, providing for the preparation and submission to the Congress of a master ground transportation plan for the United States.

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF A RESOLUTION

SENATE RESOLUTION 280

Under authority of the order of the Senate of November 7, 1969, the names of the following Senators were added as additional cosponsors of Senate Resolution 280, affirming the support of the Senate for the President's efforts to negotiate a just peace in Vietnam:

Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. FONG, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. RANDOLPH.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC WORKS FOR WATER, POLLUTION CONTROL, AND POWER DEVELOPMENT AND ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1970

AMENDMENT No. 275

Mr. ELLENDER submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 14159) making appropriations for public works for water, pollution control, and power development, including the Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Panama Canal, the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, the Bureau of Reclamation, power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, and related independent agencies and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

Page 25, line 7 after the word "expended",

insert the following: "Provided, That not more than \$100,000 of the funds appropriated herein shall be available for preliminary engineering required by the Bonneville Power Administration in connection with the proposed agreements with the Portland General Electric Company and the Eugene Water and Electric Board to acquire from preference customers and pay by net billing for generating capability from non-federally financed thermal generating plants in the manner described in the Committee report."

Mr. ELLENDER also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 14159, making appropriations for public works for water, pollution control, and power development, including the Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Panama Canal, the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, the Bureau of Reclamation, power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, and related independent agencies and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

AMENDMENT No. 276

Mr. ELLENDER submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 14159) making appropriations for public works for water, pollution control, and power development, including the Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Panama Canal, the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, the Bureau of Reclamation, power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, and related independent agencies and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

Page 6, line 17 after the word "expended", insert the following: "of which \$75,000 shall be available for the preparation of preconstruction planning for the flood control project at Minot, North Dakota, and such preconstruction planning is hereby authorized".

Mr. ELLENDER also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 14159, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

NOTICE OF POSTPONEMENT OF HEARINGS ON S. 2108

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON) has asked me to announce that the hearings on S. 2108, a bill introduced by the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS) to coordinate family planning services and population research activities of the Federal Government, previously announced for November 12 and 13, have had to be postponed because of an unavoidable conflict in scheduling.

The hearings on the bill are now scheduled for December 8 and 9.

VETERANS DAY AND THE MEANING OF HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, 51 years ago today the war to end all wars finally was brought to a conclusion. After 4 years of horror, man was determined to prevent any repetition of the nightmare that had destroyed a generation of young men. The League of Nations was established in order that all future disputes would be negotiated peacefully through discussion and compromise. The Versailles Treaty emphasized the absolute need for international guarantees of human rights in order that another tragedy would be averted. It was clear to the world that it was a violation of these basic rights which had precipitated the war and that only strong guarantees that these rights would be protected in the future would prevent future wars.

Although the United States subscribed in principle to these declarations, it refused to ratify the Versailles Treaty and become a member of the League of Nations. Once again, we were all too willing to give lip service to the principle of international cooperation and resolution of disputes, but we refused to assume our expected leadership role in this movement. We refused to guarantee the basic human rights which Americans had taken for granted since the Nation's founding.

Mr. President, we cannot afford to make the same mistakes again. The next war would indeed be the war to end all wars; it would be the war that ended all mankind. Guarantees of human rights are essential to the preservation of a stable peace. It is only when one people feel their rights are being denied or trampled upon by another people that wars get started.

Mr. President, on this 51st anniversary of the close of World War I let us look to the great lessons that war provided. Let us renew our efforts toward guaranteeing these basic human rights. Ratification of the three human rights conventions covering genocide, the political rights of women, and forced labor would represent a great stride in the right direction. We must regain our leadership position as the world's principal spokesman for human rights. Only these efforts will avert future catastrophes such as World War I.

Mr. President, man only advances if he is able to learn from the bitter lessons of the past. His willingness not to repeat these bitter lessons each generation is the real measure of our progress. Guaranteeing these basic human rights would show the world that we were determined to learn from the mistakes of prewar Europe and take the necessary steps to avert a similar disaster. Let us move toward ratification of these basic treaties now.

THOUGHTS OF THE MOTHER OF A SERVICEMAN MISSING IN VIETNAM

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, we are all aware of the deep concern all over this Nation concerning

the war in Vietnam and particularly how to bring this to an honorable and right conclusion at the earliest possible time.

Many good and sincere Americans are involved in the anti-Vietnam war demonstrations, but, unfortunately, many of their leaders and many of those involved have taken a position which I believe is wrong.

I am sure that many of the demonstrators are not expressing the same feelings about the war that many of our young people who fought and died believed in.

The mothers and wives of those who are missing and those being held prisoner by the brutal and murderous North Vietnam leaders have some thoughts that are entirely different from most of the demonstration leaders.

One such person is Mrs. Lois Belcher, who was formerly from North Dakota, but is now living in Texas. Mrs. Belcher has a son who is listed as missing in action. She is a person I have known, admired, and respected for many years.

Mrs. Belcher has written an open letter to President Nixon, to me, and to others in which she expresses her thoughts as the mother of a serviceman who is missing. I believe it is most appropriate to ask unanimous consent that her letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

LETTER FROM MRS. HAROLD A. BELCHER, SULPHUR SPRINGS, TEX., MOTHER OF CAPT. GLENN A. BELCHER, U.S. AIR FORCE PILOT MISSING IN ACTION IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

I am the mother of Captain Glenn A. Belcher, pilot in the United States Air Force, who has been missing in action in Southeast Asia for almost two years.

No one yearns for Peace more than I do, for only then can I hope to learn conclusive facts of my son's fate. But I want an HONORABLE PEACE—NOT PEACE AT ANY PRICE.

So I can no longer keep silent about some of the plans being made for the second "demonstration" for peace set for November 13, 14, and 15.

I am unalterably opposed to the Peace Moratorium, and especially to the March Against Death as planned by the Mobilizers and Moratorium leaders for November 13, 14, and 15, in Washington, D.C., with a similar "performance" for San Francisco on November 15.

In the program covering the incidents for those three days of activities, a copy of which I have just received, I read: "40,000 Americans from across the country will march past the White House each bearing the name of an American GI who has died in Vietnam or of a Vietnamese village which has been destroyed." The "March Against Death" begins November 13 at Arlington Cemetery and will continue past the White House where one marcher at a time will pause and call out the name of one man. It is planned to have one marcher for each man killed, and to group by states with marchers equalling each state's dead. "Continuing in single file, the Marchers will proceed to the Capitol where the name placards will be placed in 'caskets' on our nation's Capitol steps" . . . At "11:00 a.m., November 15, a Mass March to the White House led by GIs and next of kin, with names of war dead in caskets", will take place, the program reads.

Most vigorously, do I decry this "March Against Death". I have asked supporters of

the Mobilization and Peace Moratorium to give names of "GIs and Next-of-Kin" who will participate in this action. I believe they will be few.

First—This is an invasion of the personal lives and defensible convictions of men who have no opportunity to present their "side"—no "equal time"—nor will they ever have the privilege to express either their opposition to, or their approval of, this indignity.

Secondly—This, to me, is exploitation, repudiation, mockery, and denunciation of the most unsavory and offensive kind directed toward men who have fought and continue to fight and die in this conflict.

How can the people of this nation fail to raise justifiably angry voices against Moratorium leaders who claim that this is an "immoral and evil war"? Moratorium leaders who encourage "demonstrations like the March to honor the dead" (?) and to express "utterances of Christian conscience" (?)

How can the Moratorium leaders defend these actions as appropriate and gainful ways to effect peace?

Third—I abhor what seems, to me, an undermining and divisive effort toward our government.

Granted, we do not all agree, and fortunately. This is one of our most blessed freedoms. But divisiveness can carry us far along the road to destruction, when unity could bring us toward moral victory, at least.

While we are among those who do not know the fate of our missing son, I would challenge anyone, anywhere, at any time, to "call out" his name, or to place a "name placard" in any "casket"—saying, as the Moratorium-Mobilization leaders proclaim, "We are doing this to honor the men who have died".

Have these "planners", or will the marchers have, asked for, or received consent from the families of the men whose names they plan to call?

Not unless you are one of the affected ones, as we are, can you possibly understand the sickening revulsion I feel toward this proposed action. I wonder how many thousands will be sharing this additional heartache with me on Moratorium Day? Heartache caused by WHOM? Many may be well-meaning Americans, but have they probed deeply enough to know and understand the Moratorium leader's motivations and intent?

Wives of men missing and prisoners of war have gone to Paris to plead for humane treatment as defined in the Geneva Convention, which North Vietnam signed in 1957, but thus far has refused to honor.

I raise my voice today to plead for compassion for all, and for a Prayer Moratorium for unity of purpose to bring Peace at the earliest possible moment.

LOIS M. BELCHER.

SENATOR FRANK CHURCH ON U.S. AID TO LATIN AMERICA

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, from September 9 through 11 of this year, governmental and academic leaders of the Western Hemisphere gathered in Mexico City for the Pacem in Terris Seminar, conducted by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

The seminar featured 3 days of discussions on inter-American relations and on prospects for development in Latin America. At the closing evening session of the seminar, the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH) proposed a new approach to U.S. aid to Latin American. The speech was enthusiastically received by the seminar participants; but because Senator CHURCH

spoke only from notes, the full text of his remarks was not available.

This month, the transcript of Senator CHURCH's speech was published in the Center magazine. The speech is a unique and major contribution to the search for effective means of assisting our Latin American neighbors; I think it should be distributed as widely as possible. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

UNITED STATES AND LATIN AMERICA—CALL FOR
A NEW POLICY

(By Senator FRANK CHURCH)

Economists agree on what is fundamentally required if the sluggish rate of economic growth in Latin America is ever to be overcome. They agree on the need for drastic agrarian and fiscal reform; on the requirement for enlarging internal markets; and on the necessity for integrating the national economies into a common market. They seem to agree that internal savings must be greatly increased to achieve a much higher rate of investment. They advocate a more favorable system of trade between the underdeveloped countries of South and Central America and the developed countries of North America and western Europe. They also acknowledge that a disastrous population explosion in Latin America is presently absorbing economic growth to the point of nearly wiping out net gains.

In sum, there is a large measure of agreement among economists on the remedies necessary if the dynamic development to which Latin Americans aspire is to be achieved. There is also an apparent consensus that real development depends primarily on self-help, on meaningful internal change, rather than on massive injections of foreign capital. Indeed, some are candid enough to point out that too much imported capital would simply create burdensome debts that could easily strangle growth.

There is likewise a tacit recognition that, although economists may agree on the remedies, it remains up to the politicians, to the men who govern, to adopt these remedies and put them into effect. That, of course, will entail far-reaching changes in the existing power structure of Latin America.

I propose to discuss the political aspects of the problem involved in bringing about such far-reaching change, with particular focus on the current role of the United States.

I must say, first of all, that I am deeply disturbed by the growing gulf separating the United States from Latin America. We should not deceive ourselves. The gulf is widening. It is an urgent matter, for it distorts and endangers friendly relations between the United States and its neighbors.

The image of the United States in Latin America keeps deteriorating. What else can one conclude when, seven years after the establishment of the Alliance for Progress and after our expenditure of nearly nine billion dollars implementing the program, our relations with Latin America are worse than before. What else can one conclude when President Johnson dared not visit a major population center south of Mexico throughout his term of office? (When he finally did go to South America, he was secluded at a remote resort far removed from unruly crowds.) What else can one conclude when President Nixon was recently greeted with wild applause by more than a million people in the streets of Bucharest, a thousand miles behind the Iron Curtain, while his emissary to Latin America, Governor Rockefeller, was received with hoots and

catcalls, his journey plagued by arson and violence? What else can one conclude when an American ambassador is abducted in Brazil, chosen by his captors as the "symbol of imperialism," in a move calculated to humiliate a hated military regime with which the United States is notoriously identified?

In view of these disturbing events, we must take very seriously the rising hostility toward the United States which seems to be spreading throughout Latin America. More and more, we are portrayed as holding the whole hemisphere in a kind of economic captivity, exploiting its raw materials to feed our industry while selling back our finished products at highly profitable prices.

As if this weren't enough, many young people of Latin America, whose views will largely shape the future, seem to see the United States in an even more lurid light. They envision us as a monstrous nation, intoxicated by our power, addicted to marathon warfare, controlled at the highest levels by military counsel, and determined to keep Latin America in a permanent state of quasi-colonialism. Worse still, these young people appear to believe that we are determined to preserve the status quo, that we are against changes inside Latin America which are indispensable to rapid economic and social growth.

In a word, my country is increasingly regarded in these quarters as the enemy of progress. It naturally follows that the United States has also become, in growing measure, the convenient scapegoat for failure and frustration with Latin America, for which we actually bear little or no responsibility.

As a senator of the United States, I must ask myself what accounts for this inimical attitude toward my country, an attitude at once so formidable and so foreboding. Is it, as some of my colleagues would say, due to the devilish work of communists? I have no doubt that communists are doing their utmost to defame the United States. But no person conversant with the facts of Latin-American life could possibly credit communists with such commanding influence.

Is it, then, the result of simple misunderstanding concerning the motives and purposes of the United States? Here again, one must concede that the very size of my country, with its great wealth and power, casts a long shadow over the hemisphere. Regardless of what policies we adopt, however enlightened and progressive they may be, some kind of "Yankee" hegemony in the Western Hemisphere will persist for many years to come. Consequently, the United States will inevitably remain an object of criticism, misgiving, suspicion, and distrust. However, this natural, built-in antagonism toward the United States cannot possibly account for so bitter and extreme a viewpoint as I have described.

Harder questions must be raised. I must ask, for example, to what extent the policies of my own government may have contributed to the dismal image of the United States in Latin America. I must ask myself: Does the United States really stand for development in Latin America? Or do we stand for stability instead?

The truth is, we face a hard choice. We presently sit on top of the hemispheric heap. Should we risk the consequences of drastic change throughout the hemisphere, with its attendant upheaval, violence, and revolution of unpredictable result. Or should we weigh in on the side of stability and try to preserve an existing order which works, in many ways, to our advantage?

American policy makers, faced with this hard choice between development, which is just another word for profound internal change, and stability, which is just another word for little or no change, behaved in a typical way. They chose both. The United States, they decided, would stand for change within limits, for peaceful change within the

existing power structure; for evolution instead of revolution; for reforms of the kind with which we were familiar and of which we approved. But the United States would stand against unacceptable change, by which we meant communism or the threat of communism.

For example, in the case of the abortive Bay of Pigs assault the United States supported an invasion of Cuba, in the naive belief that the return of a band of dispossessed, formerly rich Cuban exiles would trigger off a mass uprising against Castro's regime, all in the cause of restoring an unloved and unwanted prerevolutionary order. In the subsequent case of Santo Domingo, American troops intervened to put down an insurrection on behalf of a deposed legitimate government because of our fear that communist elements *might be, or might become*, strong enough eventually to seize control of the movement.

These interventions, taken in violation of solemn commitments under the Rio Pact and the Charter of the Organization of American States, have gravely damaged the reputation of the United States throughout the hemisphere. They have given credence to the belief that we are indeed determined to act as the self-anointed sentinel of the status quo.

To overcome the injury done by such interventions, and to demonstrate that, while we strongly oppose communism, we nevertheless favor internal reforms essential to the rapid economic development of Latin America, the United States launched the much-publicized Alliance for Progress. The concept was novel, even noble. It was based on the belief that governments in Latin America, wherever necessary, would undertake fundamental land and tax reforms with a helping hand from the United States. Seven years later, the failure of that experiment must be acknowledged.

A primary objective of the Alliance was to promote the growth of democratic government, out of the belief that this was at least as important to the people as economic progress. Yet, when the Alliance was formed, 180 million people in Latin America were living under civilian governments of constitutional legitimacy. Today, 140 million of these people are living under some form of military dictatorship. The precipitous slide toward militarism in Latin America certainly underscores the failure of the political objective of the Alliance for Progress.

Moreover, I think that we must admit that feudal, oligarchical governments are not disposed voluntarily to undermine their own power base, least of all with foreign money, least of all at the insistence of a foreign government. The faith we placed in the Alliance for Progress as an effective instrument for bringing about fundamental change must certainly represent the high-water mark of American innocence abroad.

The results should have been predictable. Except for a handful of countries, the Alliance funds have been used, not to alter the existing order, but to benefit the governing elites. And, regrettably, the program itself is now being pointed to as added evidence, written in its failure to accomplish its objectives, that the underlying purpose of the United States is the preservation of the established order.

I must add, however, that other aspects of our bilateral foreign-aid program also reinforce this impression that the United States is the enemy of change in Latin America. There is the insistent effort of our government to support the military forces of Latin America. For years, some of us in Congress have tried to curtail this program, to reduce its size and scope. But, at the urging of the Executive, the program has stayed alive. I never have believed that any benefit derived from our close, cordial embrace of the military establishment of Latin America could

possibly counterbalance the heavy political price we pay for this association.

When we supply the tanks later used to batter down the gates of the presidential palace during a military *coup d'état* in Lima; when we furnish the tear gas and mace, along with the training, for putting down public protest in the streets of Rio de Janeiro; when we subsidize military budgets with gifts of arms having no possible use except against the people of countries actually occupied by their own armies; then we have, by our own choice, identified the United States indelibly with that element in Latin America which epitomizes static, authoritarian rule. (If the present military government of Peru turns out to be an exception, then it will be the exception that proves the general rule.)

For many years, liberals in the United States have been critical of our close association with, and support of, the military forces in Latin America. At the same time, however, it has been chapter and verse of the liberal credo to endorse our ongoing program of economic aid. Indeed, we have been instructed that liberals must be for economic aid, as it symbolizes the American commitment to change in the world, even as our military aid may symbolize our coexisting commitment to stability. It represents, so the argument goes, our effort to uplift living standards in impoverished lands, which is part of the obligation we must assume as an affluent nation.

I can no longer accept this credo. After ten years on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I have concluded that the economic aid we extend to foreign governments links the United States fully as much to those governments as our military aid. I am forced to concede that our bilateral aid program, regardless of avowed purposes, has had the inescapable consequence of committing the United States to foreign governments, good, bad, or indifferent, throughout the hemisphere and the world. Its net impact has necessarily favored the preservation of the status quo.

Now it is logically possible to defend the liberal credo if our economic aid were given to certain governments that are progressive and reform-minded. But it is not logically possible to believe the credo when one recognizes that our foreign aid has been extended, over the years to no less than a hundred different governments of the world, most of which are reactionary and repressive in character. No, I can no longer accept the liberal credo, or continue giving my support to our bilateral foreign-aid program. It not only furnishes grist for the mill of those who maintain that the United States is fundamentally committed to the existing order in the underdeveloped world, but it is actually working against the best interests of the United States, even with respect to our relationship with the very governments we seek to help.

In countries receiving our aid, large colonies of American administrators live in conspicuous luxury, under conditions which can't help but feed popular resentment against the United States. Moreover, government-to-government aid inevitably puts the donor in a patronizing posture, while the recipient is invariably placed in a demeaning position. A strained relationship immediately develops. The tension is then compounded by our tendency to use aid as a means for meddling in the internal government of recipient countries. In some capitals, our aid administrators actually sit as advisors in the ministries, which can only exacerbate anti-American feeling in a most lethal way. Small wonder that we now witness an eruption of militant nationalism in so many Latin countries!

Finally, any bilateral foreign-aid program cannot help but become politicized. As long as aid is disbursed on a government-to-gov-

ernment basis, I would say, speaking as a United States senator, that Congress cannot resist the temptation to use the aid program both as carrot and stick to reward or punish recipient governments, depending on how we may judge their behavior. Thus have the many restrictive amendments been added to the American Foreign Aid Act. When these amendments first commenced to appear, the subdivisions were numbered "a," "b," "c," "d." Now, we have nearly run out of alphabet. Every year, new penalties are added. What appeal it has at home if a congressman call tell his constituents that he was instrumental in writing into the Foreign Aid Act a provision to discipline a Nasser or punish a deGaulle, or whoever else may have incurred our national displeasure.

Let me mention just a few of these restrictive provisions that are now a matter of law. Most notorious, no doubt, is the Hickenlooper Amendment. I believe there is no hope that Congress will repeal this provision. Few congressmen would relish explaining why they voted to strike from the law a prohibition of further aid to a foreign government which expropriates business owned by American citizens, but refuses to pay the owners just compensation. So, the Hickenlooper Amendment will stay in the law, posing an awkward problem for the President of the United States, as he attempts to avoid a final rupture in our relations with Peru.

But the Hickenlooper provision is only the most prominent of a whole series of similar amendments. There are, for instance, the fishing-boat amendments. Should one of our fishing boats be seized by a foreign government, say Ecuador or Peru, and the crew charged with illegally fishing in waters claimed by these governments, and should a fine be imposed, the Foreign Aid Act provides that military assistance to the offending country must be suspended, and that any such fine must be subtracted from the total amount of aid we give to the guilty government. Now, this is solemnly intended as an appropriate punishment for misbehavior, though sometimes it doesn't work as intended. In Ecuador, for example, our aid program was so small that the government preferred taking our money in fines to accepting our aid, with all the strings attached.

More often, penalties of this character provoke a series of diplomatic showdowns which corrode, weaken, and eventually destroy good relations. This has been true in the case of Peru. If one reviews the history of the deterioration in our relations with Peru. It goes back to the time when the Lima government decided to purchase modern jet aircraft for the Peruvian Air Force. Under the Foreign Aid Act, Congress has said that the United States should withhold aid from any country purchasing military equipment of a kind, or at a cost which, in the judgment of the President of the United States, impairs the economic growth of that country. When we told the Peruvian Government that we intended to withhold sixty million dollars in aid if it persisted in its intended purchase of modern jet aircraft from France and when Lima replied that it would proceed regardless, we bluffed it out to the bitter end, and then said, "Well, since you're going to buy the aircraft anyway, why don't you buy them from us?"

This was the reckless beginning of a running diplomatic battle with Peru, which later involved an empty threat to invoke the Hickenlooper Amendment over the Peruvian expropriation of the International Petroleum Company, and now consists of the current wrangle over fishing boats. The effect has been to jeopardize seriously our working relationship with Peru. When the United States Ambassador to Peru told me, as he did a few weeks ago, that all his difficulties with the Peruvian government stemmed from our foreign-aid program. I think it is

not too much to say that this program has become a serious impediment to good relations between the United States and its neighbors.

So these are among the reasons, deeply imbedded in the foreign policy of my own government, for the worsening condition that confronts us in Latin America. The time has come to call for a drastic change in policy, not because we should grope for nonexistent panaceas, but because it is evident that the present policy has failed.

I call, then, for a new policy that will end American military assistance outright and bring home our military missions now located in no less than seventeen Latin-American countries.

I call for a new policy terminating the bilateral economic-aid program and channeling the money we are now putting into that program to the multilateral agencies: to the Inter-American Development Bank, to the World Bank, and to the developmental agencies of the United Nations, where the money can help furnish Latin America with needed outside capital for long-term economic growth. This new policy, moreover, should recognize the importance of putting less reliance on external aid and more reliance on improved trade practices, better designed to meet the real needs of underdeveloped countries.

Finally, I call for a policy that reestablishes, as the cornerstone of our future relationship with our neighbors, the principle of nonintervention in the internal affairs of Latin America. I do not mean the lip service we customarily give to the principle of nonintervention, but making that principle a governing rule. Never again should the United States unilaterally employ its armed forces within this hemisphere, except where, as in the case of the Cuban missile crisis, there is posed a clear and present danger to our national security—to the safety of the American people.

I propose this sweeping revision in our foreign policy, not alone because I believe the changes will be welcomed by Latin America, but because I think they are vital to the United States as well.

President Nixon, in his inaugural address, spoke of a "crisis of the spirit" in the United States. All of us are aware of it. I believe it exists, at least in part, because our foreign policy has gone so far astray.

In Vietnam, in Greece, in Spain, and many other places in the world, we actively support governments that are living contradictions to the historic ideals for which we have stood as a nation. I am unable to explain to vital, intelligent, idealistic young college students in my country why it is that our troops should participate with Franco's troops in exercises simulating an emergency in which Franco must put down an uprising of the Spanish people. I don't know how to explain why my government should be spending more money supporting a military dictatorship in Brazil than we have furnished any other foreign government, save India, in recent years. Young people in the United States are asking the question, "If we do not stand against dictatorship of this kind, then what is it we stand for in the world that matters?" Economists, I respectfully suggest, cannot supply the answer to that question.

For, in the final analysis, each country lives by the values it prizes most highly. That is the basis upon which governments must turn to their people for loyalty and support. When our foreign policy becomes unhinged from the historic values we prize dearly as a people, when the role of the United States in the world becomes inexplicable to its own young people, then a crisis of the spirit arises.

That has happened to us, and it concerns me more than anything else, more than economic theory, more than technical considerations which must be given to the prob-

lems of growth abroad. Within the United States, we have to overcome our crisis of the spirit if we are to heal our divisions and reunite our people.

Finding the right role for the United States in the world at large, a role consistent with our historic ideals, would go far toward quieting the torment in our land. Then the United States once more would stand as tall as it rightly should in the community of nations.

NIXON WILL NOT CUT AND RUN

MR. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, one of the best editorials that has come to my attention on our involvement in Vietnam is entitled "Nixon Makes One Point Abundantly Clear: He's Not Going To Cut and Run," published in North Dakota's largest newspaper, the Fargo Forum.

The editor, Mr. John Paulson, I believe speaks for the great majority of the people in North Dakota in the sentiments he so ably expresses in the editorial. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

NIXON MAKES ONE POINT ABUNDANTLY CLEAR: HE'S NOT GOING TO CUT AND RUN

In his broadcast report to the nation on the war in Vietnam, President Richard M. Nixon made one point abundantly clear: He is not going to cut and run, thereby telling the world that the 40,000 American lives went down the drain in an unworthy cause.

He is going to reduce the American military commitment to whatever extent possible as the South Vietnamese become stronger and capable of effective defense for their people and their government.

Understandably, the campus protesters and the congressional critics were disappointed. The President didn't bow to their wishes and say that the war would end by next June 30 or next Nov. 1 in abject surrender and complete admission that America was wrong from the beginning in everything it did in Vietnam.

The President asked for a convincing display of support from the American people for his present course of action. Thousands of telegrams have poured into the White House showing that a substantial number of Americans—perhaps a clear majority—support President Nixon in his effort to end American participation in the Vietnam conflict.

These three accomplishments stand out:

President Nixon has brought about a reduction in the number of American troops committed to Vietnam. The troop reductions ordered to date total 60,000, and President Nixon says that further reductions in the near future should be accomplished on even a faster scale than had been anticipated when the first troop reductions were ordered.

American casualties in recent months have declined dramatically. If the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong keep the battlefield lull going, the American troop reductions will proceed that much faster.

There apparently is no way to negotiate a settlement with the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese. They will never, apparently, say anything or sign anything that would make it possible for America and the South Vietnamese to claim that a "just peace" had been achieved.

But if President Nixon is successful in his program to replace American troops with South Vietnamese troops and bring most of the American troops home, the North Vietnamese can claim they have achieved their

objective, the elimination of American troops from Southeast Asia.

Mr. Nixon explained it this way:

"We really have only two choices open to us if we want to end this war. I can order an immediate and precipitous withdrawal of all Americans from Vietnam without regard to the effects of that action. Or we can persist in our search for a just peace through a negotiated settlement, if possible, or through a continued implementation of our plan for Vietnamization, if necessary, a plan in which we will withdraw all of our forces from Vietnam on a schedule in accordance with our program as the South Vietnamese become strong enough to defend their own freedom.

"I have chosen the second course. It is not the easy way—it is the right way. It is a plan which will end the war and serve the causes of peace—not in just Vietnam but in the Pacific and in the world."

Now the critics say that Johnson's war has become Nixon's war, but they have no other solution except an immediate and complete withdrawal, without regard for the consequences to South Vietnam and the world.

President Nixon is taking a decided gamble for peace, and for his own political future. He is not going to adopt a course that would appease the draft dodgers, the student radicals, the big spenders who would rather spend the money being used on the Vietnam war on some far-out government aid programs.

President Nixon made it clear he realizes that most Americans want the fighting to end, want the boys to come home, but he cannot turn his back on the course that this nation has set through the presidents who preceded him in office, and on the Congresses which have endorsed American action every step of the way through their elected representatives. The fact that some members of Congress now are shifting their attitudes with the political winds when they refused to make a thorough study of the war issues during the period of escalation doesn't change the obligations of Mr. Nixon as President.

He has chosen the only course open to him. He has asked for a significant show of support from the people who support his efforts to bring the war to an end, and he is getting this support through telegrams and letters and petitions.

Maybe the flood of messages will help convince the protesters that they too are born with a commitment to support their country in times of stress, rather than to echo the claims of the enemy that America is an imperialist nation, dedicated to supporting corrupt governments. America has made some mistakes, unquestionably, in its Southeast Asia policies, but we are not in Vietnam to establish a colony or a possession. We have participated in the war in an effort to protect what we believe was the safety of one nation against outright aggression.

When the threat of this aggression goes away, American troops will come home. We should give Mr. Nixon every chance to carry out his program.

AMERICAN TRIAL LAWYERS ASSOCIATION OPINION POLL ON THE NOMINATION OF JUDGE HAYNSWORTH

MR. BAYH. Mr. President, it is expected that this week the Senate will have before it the question of the confirmation of the nomination of the Honorable Clement F. Haynsworth, Jr., to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Recently the American Trial Lawyers Association conducted an opinion poll of approximately 1,000 of its members on their attitude toward this important nomination.

In order that the Senate may have before it, in convenient form, the results of the poll, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the text of the letter from the president of the association to its members explaining the poll; a letter from a certified public accounting firm setting forth the results which had been received by October 23; a tabulation, State by State, of the returns from the poll; a letter to Senators from the president of the association summarizing the results; a resolution adopted by the board of governors of the association opposing the confirmation of the nomination; and a press release from the association dated October 31, which further sets forth its views on this issue.

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

AMERICAN TRIAL LAWYERS ASSOCIATION, Cambridge, Mass., October 15, 1969.

DEAR ATL MEMBER: Pursuant to a vote taken at a telephonic conference of the Executive Committee, I sent telegrams to the White House and every member of the United States Senate "firmly cautioning (them) against prematurely approving" the appointment and confirmation of Clement F. Haynsworth, Jr., to the Supreme Court of the United States "until and unless all available information is fully and fairly considered and properly evaluated."

I stated that there may have been approval "by a few individual members of this Bar Association", but that our Bar Association "has not yet evaluated or taken a position upon either his appointment or his confirmation".

I pointed out that the American Trial Lawyers Association lauds and approves without reservation the basic concept "that membership of the Supreme Court should be composed of men of unquestionable scholarly ability, and who also have demonstrated they are unquestionably discreet and sensitive in all matters that might undermine public confidence in the integrity of the Supreme Court and its membership, consistent with the need of an independent judiciary".

I further stated that since our Bar Association consists of a "large segment of the knowledgeable trial lawyers of America . . . representing the interest of the public . . ." that I would poll approximately 1,000 members—such as yourself—to obtain their opinions as to whether:

1. The Nomination should be approved;
2. The Nomination should be disapproved;

or

3. The Nomination should be withdrawn.

The poll will be unsigned and confidential. Although I stated that I would inform you that the full text of the Senate Judiciary Hearings on this appointment will be available through that committee and that the position of the White House is available through its legal counsel, some people have informed me that they have endeavored to obtain this information but without success. If you too experience such difficulty, I respectfully suggest that you respond to this poll, basing your response upon an objective analysis of the information disseminated through the communications media.

An immediate reply and prompt return of your opinion is urgent since our poll must be completed and evaluated before the Board meets next week. Hence, your response must be received in Cambridge, Massachusetts no later than Wednesday, October 22, 1969. Kindly send it to us via air mail.

Your anticipated prompt consideration of this matter is appreciated.

Sincerely,

LEON L. WOLFSTONE,
President.

Mail to: President Leon L. Wolfstone, American Trial Lawyers Association, 20 Garden Street, Cambridge, Mass.

CHECK THE BOX OF YOUR CHOICE

1. The Nomination should be approved ☐.
 2. The Nomination should be disapproved ☐.
 3. The Nomination should be withdrawn ☐.
 No signature required.

BOSTON, MASS.

LEON L. WOLFSTONE, Esq.,
 President, American Trial Lawyers Association:

In accordance with your instructions, we have tabulated the results of the poll mailed by the American Trial Lawyers Association on October 15, 1969 with respect to the appointment of Clement F. Haynsworth, Jr. to

the Supreme Court of the United States. The tabulation of the replies to the poll are attached hereto.

We understand that on October 15, 1969 the American Trial Lawyers Association mailed 1,204 questionnaires to a selected sample group of its total membership of approximately 24,000. The replies to the questionnaire were returned directly to the office of the Association. We then had a member of our staff call for and return the unopened envelopes to our office for tabulation. In most cases, we were able to correlate the responses to the list of members to whom the poll was sent.

Accordingly, the enclosed summary represents only the results of the 715 replies that were received at our office through October 23, 1969.

PEAT, MARWICK, MITCHELL & CO.

OCTOBER 24, 1969.

AMERICAN TRIAL LAWYERS ASSOCIATION TABULATION OF HAYNSWORTH POLL REPLIES OCT. 23, 1969

Total number of questionnaires sent.....	1,204
Replies received.....	715
Percentage of total received to total sent.....	59.39
Votes for approval.....	191
Percentage of approval to total receipts.....	26.71
Votes for disapproval only.....	264
Percentage of disapproval to total receipts.....	36.92
Votes for withdrawal only.....	174
Percentage of withdrawal to total receipts.....	24.34
Votes for disapproval and withdrawal (note).....	86
Percentage of disapproval and withdrawal to total receipts.....	12.03
Total.....	715 100.00

Note: Some replies recommended both disapproval and withdrawal of the appointment. These votes were tabulated and reported above as a separate classification and are not included in either the disapproval or withdrawal category.

AMERICAN TRIAL LAWYERS ASSOCIATION TABULATION OF HAYNSWORTH POLL REPLIES BY STATE, OCT. 23, 1969

State	Number of questionnaires sent	Number of replies received	Approval	Disapproval	Withdrawal	Disapproval and withdrawal ¹	State	Number of questionnaires sent	Number of replies received	Approval	Disapproval	Withdrawal	Disapproval and withdrawal ¹
Alabama.....	16	10	9			1	Nevada.....	11	5	1		2	2
Percent.....		62.5	90			10	Percent.....		45.5	20		40	40
Alaska.....	4	1		1			New Hampshire.....	6	3	1		1	1
Percent.....		25		100			Percent.....		50	33		33	34
Arizona.....	20	12	4	5	3		New Jersey.....	37	17		9	7	1
Percent.....		60	33	42	25		Percent.....		45.9		53	41	6
Arkansas.....	10	5	3	1	1		New Mexico.....	9	7	1	3	1	2
Percent.....		50	60	20	20		Percent.....		77.8	14	43	14	29
California.....	96	46	6	24	10	6	New York.....	75	30	3	10	8	9
Percent.....		47.9	13	52	22	13	Percent.....		40	10	33	27	30
Colorado.....	21	14	5	4	4	1	North Carolina.....	15	12	8	2	2	
Percent.....		66.7	36	29	29	6	Percent.....		80	66	17	17	
Connecticut.....	23	14	1	6	3	4	North Dakota.....	6	4		3		1
Percent.....		60.9	6	43	22	29	Percent.....		66.7		75		25
Delaware.....	6	4	2	2			Ohio.....	62	37	8	14	10	5
Percent.....		66.7	50	50			Percent.....		59.7	22	38	27	13
District of Columbia.....	22	7	2	1	4		Oklahoma.....	13	7	3	2	2	
Percent.....		31.8	29	14	57		Percent.....		53.8	42	29	29	
Florida.....	63	39	16	9	10	4	Oregon.....	19	14	4	7	2	1
Percent.....		61.9	41	23	26	10	Percent.....		73.7	29	50	14	7
Georgia.....	16	11	7	2	1	1	Pennsylvania.....	47	33	3	16	6	8
Percent.....		68.8	64	18	9	9	Percent.....		70.2	9	48	18	25
Hawaii.....	5	1	1				Puerto Rico.....	6	2		2		
Percent.....		20	100				Percent.....		33.3		100		
Idaho.....	5	1			1		Rhode Island.....	6	4		2	1	1
Percent.....		20			100		Percent.....		66.7		50	25	25
Illinois.....	52	35	6	17	9	3	South Carolina.....	12	5	2	1	2	
Percent.....		67.3	17	49	26	8	Percent.....		41.7	40	20	40	
Indiana.....	25	19	7	7		5	South Dakota.....	8	6	3	2	1	
Percent.....		76	37	37		26	Percent.....		75	50	33	17	
Iowa.....	16	10	3	2	4	1	Tennessee.....	33	24	14	5	5	
Percent.....		62.5	30	30	40	10	Percent.....		72.7	58	21	21	
Kansas.....	16	11	3	3	3	2	Texas.....	51	29	3	15	9	2
Percent.....		68.8	27	27	27	19	Percent.....		56.9	10	52	31	7
Kentucky.....	17	12	5	3	3	1	Utah.....	7	5		3	1	1
Percent.....		70.6	42	25	25	8	Percent.....		71.4		60	20	20
Louisiana.....	31	17	10	5	2		Vermont.....	8	2	1	1		
Percent.....		54.8	59	29	12		Percent.....		25	50	50		
Maine.....	15	10	1	4	5		Virginia.....	28	19	6	7	6	
Percent.....		66.7	10	40	50		Percent.....		67.9	32	36	32	
Maryland.....	17	12	2	4		2	Virgin Islands.....	2					
Percent.....		70.6	17	33	33	17	Percent.....		16	6	5	3	2
Massachusetts.....	48	27	1	13	10	3	Washington.....	25	64	38	31	19	12
Percent.....		56.3	4	48	37	11	Percent.....		5	2	1	2	
Michigan.....	50	32	6	11	8	7	West Virginia.....	7	71.4	40	20	40	
Percent.....		64	19	34	25	22	Percent.....		15	3	7	2	3
Minnesota.....	25	21	2	6	8	5	Wisconsin.....	21	71.4	20	47	13	20
Percent.....		84	10	29	38	23	Wyoming.....	5	3	1	2		
Mississippi.....	13	8	7		1		Percent.....		60	33	67		
Missouri.....	31	22	4	11	6	1	Total.....	1,204	715	191	264	174	86
Percent.....		71	18	50	27	5	Percent.....		100	26.71	36.92	24.34	12.03
Montana.....	9	5	3	1	1								
Percent.....		55.6	60	20	20								
Nebraska.....	13	5	2	3									
Percent.....		38.5	40	60									

¹ Some replies recommended both disapproval and withdrawal of the appointment. These votes were tabulated and reported above as a separate classification, and are not included in either the disapproval or withdrawal category.

AMERICAN TRIAL LAWYERS ASSOCIATION,
 Cambridge, Mass., October 26, 1969.

DEAR SENATOR: In fulfillment of the commitment of the American Trial Lawyers Association to conduct a poll of over one thousand of its members with regard to the appointment and confirmation of Judge Clement Haynsworth to the Supreme Court of the United States as set forth in our telegram to you of October 13, 1969, you are informed as follows:

(1) The promised poll was immediately conducted of 1204 members, consisting of 680 present and former officials of this bar association, plus 524 of its membership selected by taking in proportion to the number of members in each state every 40th name, selected at random but with a special effort that at least one be polled from each city or town in which there are members of this bar association. A total of 715 responded.

(2) Those polled were informed of the availability of the record of the Senate Judiciary Committee and the position papers of the White House.

(3) Those polled were requested to submit their views as to whether:

1. The nomination should be approved;
2. The nomination should be disapproved;
3. The nomination should be withdrawn.

(4) Considering the time limitation for response, the return of 715 opinions was (as

compared to other polls by mail) unusually high and geographically widespread.

(5) The returns from the poll, when received, were turned over in unopened envelopes, to an independent firm of certified public accountants for tabulation and also for correlation of the responses to the list of members to whom the poll was sent.

(6) The results of that poll and the covering letter to that firm of certified public accountants is attached. Briefly and fairly summarized it states that only 26.71% of those responding favored confirmation, whereas 73.29% favored either withdrawal or disapproval of the confirmation of the nomination. It should be noted that some indicated both of the latter choices, namely "withdraw" and "do not approve." No other dual opinions were received.

(7) The poll was carefully considered by the Executive Committee and the Board of Governors of the American Trial Lawyers Association. The transcript of the "Hearings before the Senate Judiciary Committee" was extensively discussed. After full discussion, the Board of Governors adopted a Resolution, a copy of which is attached. Summarized, the Resolution states that the American Trial Lawyers Association opposes confirmation of the nomination and strongly urges withdrawal or disapproval.

(8) The American Trial Lawyers Association is always willing and anxious to fulfill its professional responsibility and public duty to weigh carefully the advisability of this or any other judicial appointment and transmit this information and recommendation to those who have the constitutional right and duty of decision.

Very truly yours,

LEON L. WOLFSTONE,
President.

RESOLUTION BY THE AMERICAN TRIAL LAWYERS ASSOCIATION

Whereas, the nationwide poll conducted by the American Trial Lawyers Association among 1204 of its members established that 73.29% of the attorneys returning the questionnaire believe that Judge Clement Haynsworth's nomination to the United States Supreme Court should be withdrawn or disapproved and that only 26.71% of the attorneys returning the questionnaire believe that his nomination should be approved, and

Whereas, the Board of Governors of the American Trial Lawyers Association believes that public uncertainty over the ethical conduct of any nominee to the United States Supreme Court seriously affects public confidence in the integrity of our judicial system, and

Whereas, the Board of Governors of the American Trial Lawyers Association concurs and affirms that it is essential that there be the highest degree of public confidence in the United States Supreme Court, and

Whereas, the Board of Governors of the American Trial Lawyers Association is persuaded, based upon the record before the Senate Judiciary Committee, that Judge Clement Haynsworth has failed to demonstrate that sensitivity to the high standards of conduct required and expected of nominees to the United States Supreme Court, and

Whereas, the Board of Governors of the American Trial Lawyers Association believes that the confirmation of Judge Clement Haynsworth would not help in maintaining public confidence in the United States Supreme Court, but would instead undermine such public confidence, and

Whereas, it is clear, based upon the testimony before the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate, that the confidence of our citizenry in the fairness and impartiality of the judicial system would be

impaired by the confirmation of Judge Clement Haynsworth, and

Whereas, the Board of Governors of the American Trial Lawyers Association had available and considered the testimony presented in "Hearings before the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate on the nomination of Judge Clement F. Haynsworth, Jr. to the Supreme Court of the United States," and

Whereas, the Board of Governors of the American Trial Lawyers Association believes that there are many eminent judges and attorneys in all sections of the nation who are qualified to serve on the United States Supreme Court, and whose selection would not undermine public confidence in the Court,

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Board of Governors of the American Trial Lawyers Association opposes the confirmation of Judge Clement Haynsworth's nomination to the United States Supreme Court and urges that said nomination be withdrawn or disapproved.

Be it further resolved that the President and Officers of the American Trial Lawyers Association are hereby authorized and directed to take all such action as may be necessary and appropriate to oppose said nomination and cause its withdrawal or disapproval.

PRESS RELEASE BY AMERICAN TRIAL LAWYERS ASSOCIATION, OCTOBER 31, 1969

Today's news reports on the various radio stations, based upon three United Press information releases from Washington, D.C., advise that the White House has mounted a nation-wide campaign amongst local Republican organizations, businessmen's groups, trade associations and others to *swamp senatorial offices with letters urging the confirmation of the appointment of Judge Clement Haynsworth to the Supreme Court of the United States.*

In 1906, Dean Roscoe Pound, who before his death was the editor-in-chief of the Bar Journals of this Bar Association, shook America by pointing out the impaired public confidence in the judicial system in the United States.

In 1969, the American Trial Lawyers Association, a responsible bar association composed of over 24,000 trial lawyers throughout America, being similarly disturbed at the present apparent or threatened loss of public confidence in the Supreme Court of the United States, conducted a poll of 1204 of its knowledgeable members as to whether the nomination should be: (1) approved; (2) disapproved; or (3) withdrawn.

After a prolonged discussion and evaluation of the sworn testimony and records before the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate, together with consideration of the position papers of the White House in support of the nomination, and after consideration of all points of view in a lawyer-like manner, this bar association, acting through its Board of Governors, adopted a resolution urging that the nomination be withdrawn or disapproved.

Although the White House and other supporters of the nomination of Judge Clement Haynsworth to the Supreme Court have accused the press media of having presented biased and unbalanced points of view with regard to the nomination, I feel that in the aggregate and overall the press media has presented all points of view, pro and con, with regard to this nomination.

Although it clearly would be better if all now advising their Senators of their points of view had fully read and considered the transcripts of the hearings and the other available information, and had had the benefit of prolonged discussion as did the Board of Governors of this bar association, none-

theless I do feel that the public has been substantially well informed by the press media. Similarly I feel that the entire body public has been so informed and should be invited to express its views rather than those limited and select groups included in the UPI press releases, namely urging that those supporting the nomination so advise their Senators.

To the contrary, I urge that all Americans, wherever they may be, and of whatever political or philosophical persuasion, notify their Senators immediately of their views as to whether: (1) the nomination should be approved; (2) the nomination should be disapproved; or (3) the nomination should be withdrawn.

The American Trial Lawyers Association does not urge upon the American public its point of view. The American Trial Lawyers Association is, however, seriously concerned that all points of view be promptly and clearly presented to the United States Senators who have the constitutional responsibility of providing the White House with their advice and who have the constitutional responsibility of deciding whether or not to give their consent to the nomination of Judge Haynsworth.

It is imperative that the American public have full and undiminished confidence in the integrity and sensitivity of the members of the Supreme Court of the United States less public confidence in the Supreme Court and indeed the entire judiciary be undermined.

I concur wholeheartedly with the statement by President Bernard Segal of the American Bar Association reported in the October issue of the American Bar News in his discussion of the appointment of a committee to update the canons of judicial ethics. In his statement he puts it so well when he says that: "Since public confidence in the courts rests heavily upon the reliance of the people in the integrity of their judges."

We fear that in this instance that public confidence may have been or may become impaired. Hence we urge that the entire public rather than limited and select groups express their views to their respective Senators.

We urge that insofar as possible and practicable that the members of the public read and fully consider the transcript of the proceedings before the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate and the position papers of the White House.

PRESIDENT ANNOUNCES RURAL AFFAIRS COUNCIL

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, last Thursday, President Nixon announced the formation of a Cabinet-level Rural Affairs Council. I consider this to be an announcement of extreme importance, and I commend the President for taking this action. Also, because this announcement has not received the attention it deserves I want to take this opportunity to call it to the attention of the Senate and the public. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the President's statement announcing the creation of the Rural Affairs Council be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, within the past 2 or 3 years there has been a growing national recognition of the great need to expand the economic and social opportunities of the countryside and our smaller towns and cities so that those who would prefer to live in such communities will have the freedom to do so rather than being

forced to move to the already overcrowded, and overburdened cities. Indeed, the development of our rural communities is now rather widely recognized as a necessary part of our efforts to deal with the growing crisis in the cities.

Without question, there is a great interest in rural development and an eagerness to move ahead with positive programs. But while there is no shortage of interest, the rural development movement has suffered from the lack of centralized leadership needed to instill a sense of direction and commitment.

The Rural Affairs Council will help to fill this need. Its creation signals the President's interest in rural development, and this alone is worth a great deal. Moreover, the Council will in due time function as a coordinator of existing Government programs and a source of new program proposals.

Thus, the creation of the Rural Affairs Council is a milestone in the rural development movement. I applaud the President for his initiative and vision.

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

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

Shortly after I became President, I established a new Cabinet-level Urban Affairs Council to help me develop an overall strategy for meeting the problems of the cities and to coordinate the wide variety of government efforts in this area. It's a fact of our national life that the concerns of rural America also deserve more careful consideration and more effective coordination at the highest levels of government.

We are a nation of cities, to be sure, but we are also a nation of small towns and villages, farms and forests, mines and ranches, mountains and rivers and lakes. The people who live in rural America have urgent problems which deserve our attention. More importantly, they represent a great resource upon which all of us can draw.

It is for these reasons that I am announcing today the establishment of a new Rural Affairs Council at the Cabinet level. The Council will meet next week for the first time. The following officials will join me as members of the Council: The Vice President, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Interior, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, the Secretary of Labor, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors.

It is to this Council that the Task Force on Rural Development will submit its report and recommendations.

As I announce the formation of the Rural Affairs Council, I would note several facts which underscore the importance of its work. It is shocking, for example, to discover that at least one-third of the housing in rural America is presently substandard. It is disturbing to realize that more than 3 million rural Americans have not completed five years of school. It is disheartening to see that one-third of our rural communities with a population over 1,000 have no public sewage facilities.

It is also important to note that the population of our country is likely to grow by 50 percent in the next thirty years. Where these next hundred million persons locate is

a tremendously important question for our society. After an era in which people have moved steadily from the countryside to large and crowded cities, we must now do what we can to encourage a more even distribution of our population throughout our country. The Rural Affairs Council can help our nation to meet this challenge by helping rural America, once again, become an area of opportunity.

SPECIAL INTERESTS CARVE OUT NEW TAX LOOPHOLES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, soon the Senate will begin to debate one of the most significant pieces of legislation at this session—the tax reform bill, H.R. 13270.

Tax reform is long overdue. The average American taxpayer has for too long paid taxes which should have been paid by the many special interests who can afford high priced lobbyists to present their "special" needs.

The most glaring example of special interest legislation has been the many tax loopholes for the oil industry. These loopholes have enabled the oil industry with its fantastic profits to pay less in Federal income taxes than the individual in the lowest tax bracket. And, to make matters worse, these hidden subsidies to the oil industry do not go through any budgetary review and as a result have skyrocketed far beyond what Congress would have appropriated under any circumstances.

Fortunately, we have astute reporters who watch the machinations of the oil and other special interest lobbyists. Murray Seeger is preeminent. He is a reporter who has the courage and ability to expose the lobbyists who operate best behind closed doors.

He has exposed and explained certain technical changes in the tax reform bill which benefit only a few, very powerful interests to the detriment of the average taxpayer. I have great faith in the Senate's desire to reject special interest legislation and to act on behalf of all the people once the consequences of the technical changes are explained. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that two of his articles exposing these special interest machinations be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Los Angeles Times, Nov. 4, 1969]
SENATE TAX WORK WORTH MILLIONS TO MINERALS INDUSTRY
(By Murray Seeger)

WASHINGTON.—A very expensive thing happened to one of the big tax loopholes, the minerals depletion allowance, as it passed through a closed-door working session of the Senate Finance Committee.

Administration sources estimated Monday that changes made by the Senate committee in the tax reform bill were worth \$285 million to the oil, gas and hard minerals industry.

As it passed the House in August, the tax reform bill was estimated to pick up \$420 million a year in new federal revenue by lowering the tax-exempt depletion allowances

granted to about 100 minerals. The Senate committee provision is estimated to gain only \$135 million.

The House cut the biggest depletion allowance, the 27.5% benefit given oil and gas producers, to 20%. All other mineral allowances were trimmed by the same proportion except gold, silver, copper, iron and oil shale which were maintained at 15%.

DETAILS OF SENATE CHANGES

In cutting the impact of the House bill, the Senate committee took these actions:

Restored all the depletion cuts for hard minerals to their current levels ranging from 23% for uranium and sulphur to 5% for sand and gravel.

Set oil and gas depletion at 23%.

Made depletion allowances available for the first time to minerals recovered by a small number of companies from the Great Salt Lake in Utah. Salt and saline water were exempted.

Set a new limit on the amount of depletion which can be claimed for gold, silver and copper, a benefit which will accrue largely to four big copper producers, Anaconda, Kennecott, American Smelting & Refining, and Phelps Dodge.

Established a special class of "small" oil producers, those earning less than \$3 million a year, which could claim depletion up to 65% of their income instead of the present limit of 50%.

The committee went along with the House and voted to redefine the point at which oil shale would be valued for depletion purposes. This would have the effect of doubling the amount of depletion that could be claimed when this mineral goes into mass production.

MAY BE AMENDED

All these committee actions are subject to amendment on the Senate floor, with the final decision being made by the House-Senate Conference Committee that will draft the final version of the tax reform bill.

The House bill would raise \$60 million a year in new revenue from the hard minerals industry. Under changes proposed by the Senate committee, this bite was eliminated and a new tax benefit worth \$20 million was granted.

Adjusting the oil depletion figure to 23% would be worth \$185 million to the oil industry compared with a 20% figure. The special small producers' benefit would cost another \$20 million in lost federal revenue, according to reliable estimates.

The Senate bill, like the House bill, would wipe out the tax advantages in two complicated financial transactions called "carved out payments" and "ABC deals" used by minerals operators to sell shares in their properties.

These two reforms would bring in an estimated \$200 million in new money when fully effective several years from now. Combined with the \$135 million from lowered oil depletion as voted by the Finance Committee, the total new revenue gained by the Senate bill from the minerals industry would be \$335 million.

The House-approved legislation would have raised \$620 million in new taxes from the same industry.

Changes in the House bill by the Senate committee reflect the representation of mining states among its 17 members. Some of the changes also represent tactical moves made to put the Senate in a better bargaining position when, as expected, a conference committee is called with the House to draw up a final reform bill.

The depletion provision has been expanded steadily since it was first written in its present form into the tax law in 1926 to encourage exploration and development of gas and oil supplies.

DEDUCT FROM GROSS

This section allows producers to deduct from the gross, pre-tax income of a property a fixed percentage of the value of the minerals. The law sets a limit of 50% of the net income from the property for depletion claims.

The law also declares that the mineral should be valued as it comes from the ground before any manufacturing is done to increase its value.

Because of the income limit, the effective rate of oil depletion is actually about 26%. For small, independent producers with less efficient wells than the big companies, depletion benefits are estimated at 20%.

The amendment to raise the limit on depletion to 65% of the net income would thus benefit the smaller producers. This amendment was sponsored in the committee by its chairman, Sen. Russell B. Long (D-La.), who has large investments in oil and gas and represents a major oil-producing state.

Raising the income limit for copper, gold and silver producers to 70% would be a lucrative change for the companies involved in that production because of their high production costs.

A Congressional source suggested this example:

If a copper mine produced \$1 million worth of ore at a cost of \$900,000, the present law would limit tax free depletion to \$50,000. This would be half to the net income from the mine, considerably less than 15% of the gross which would be the potential depletion.

SEVENTY PERCENT OF NET

The Senate committee bill would raise the amount of tax-free depletion from the same mine to \$70,000, or 70% of the net income.

"That's the same as a 40% increase in depletion," the congressional source observed.

The Treasury Department argued that the changes affecting gold, silver and copper were unnecessary. Little gold is mined in the United States and the federal government is about to sell its remaining silver supply. The Administration considers the copper industry, which finds gold, silver and other minerals as by-products, healthy enough without new tax subsidies.

At the Treasury, some officials terms the Salt Lake amendment "crazy." The Internal Revenue Service several years ago studied the lake and concluded its deposits were not eligible for depletion because they were being reproduced faster than they were extracted. Minerals from the oceans are exempt from depletion for the same reason.

The products most likely to benefit from the proposal are potash, magnesium, sodium sulphate and lithium.

IN THREE STATES

Although oil shale is not produced in large quantities yet, many experts believe future supplies of petroleum can be extracted from large deposits in Colorado, Utah and Wyoming.

The Treasury has historically classified oil shale with iron ore and copper in the 15% class of minerals instead of the 27.5% petroleum group.

By permitting depletion to be figured on oil shale after the liquid is extracted from the rock, the value of the tax-free rebate is doubled, according to Treasury estimates.

The oil shale provision was included in the House bill and the Treasury asked the Finance Committee to remove it. But the section was stoutly defended by Sens. Clifford P. Hansen of Wyoming and Wallace F. Bennett of Utah, both Republicans.

Bennett was also the sponsor of the Great Salt Lake amendment while Sen. Paul J.

Fannin (R-Ariz.) sponsored the copper amendment.

While the committee restored all the House cuts in hard minerals depletion allowances, an attempt by Sen. Long to return oil to its full 27.5% failed on a tie vote, 8 to 8, with one member, Sen. Eugene J. McCarthy (D-Minn.), absent.

Sen. Jack Miller (R-Iowa) sponsored the move to put oil depletion at 23% to, as one committee source said, "have something to bargain over with the House."

Oil depletion was set originally at 27.5% in 1926 as a compromise between the Senate, which sought 30% and the House, 25%.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 10, 1969]
SENATE PANEL'S TAX BILL GIVES BREAK TO TWO MAJOR FIRMS
(By Murray Seeger)

In its final closed meeting on legislation designed to close tax loopholes, the Senate Finance Committee approved new, special exemptions worth millions of dollars for two major corporations.

The firms, Uniroyal, Inc., and Mobil Oil Corp., are not named in the massive tax reform bill, but sections were drawn to fit their requests for special consideration in repeal of the 7 per cent investment tax credit.

In addition, the committee earlier voted to make McDonnell Douglas Corp. eligible for a special provision the House Ways and Means Committee put in the legislation to benefit Lockheed Aircraft Corp.

These special exemptions were noted along with more general provisions drawn to take some of the sting out of repealing the investment tax credit.

The broader privileges would apply to commercial airlines, railroads, coal producers, some shipping lines and purchasers of air and water pollution control equipment.

COMMITTED TO BUILD PLANTS

In the cases of Uniroyal and Mobil, the companies argued that they committed themselves to build big new plants on the basis that they would get tax credits amounting to 7 per cent of the investment in new machinery and equipment.

The Treasury Department at first opposed both applications with the argument that the general rules on repealing the tax credit would be violated if the exemptions were granted.

At the last closed-door session of the Finance Committee Oct. 31, the Treasury withdrew its objection to the Uniroyal amendment but stood firm against the Mobil request. The committee voted for both amendments.

The Uniroyal proposal was offered by Sen. Fred R. Harris (D-Okla.), chairman of the Democratic National Committee, who had been asked to sponsor it by Rep. Carl Albert (D-Okla.), majority leader of the House, in whose district the company is building a new tire factory.

Sen. Wallace F. Bennett (R-Utah) sponsored the Mobil proposal which he inherited from the late Senate Republican Leader Everett M. Dirksen (Ill.).

For Uniroyal, the special exemption would mean a saving of about \$3 million. Mobil stands to save \$12 million.

McDonnell Douglas would get a tax credit of about \$6.5 million, much less than the estimated \$14 million Lockheed would save under the same section.

These special provisions are subject to further change or deletion when the tax reform legislation goes to the Senate floor later this month and to a House-Senate conference committee which will write the final bill.

When the administration proposed repeal of the business tax credit last April as a reform and anti-inflationary move, Treasury

spokesmen agreed there should be no exemptions to the cutoff.

The administration originally set the repeal date as Sunday, April 20, the day before President Nixon announced his tax reform proposals. The Ways and Means Committee rolled the effective date back to April 18 after some members asserted a few businessmen had advance notice of the President's decision and signed contracts over that weekend to build plants and buy machinery that would produce tax credits.

Uniroyal claimed it was entitled to the credit for its new \$73-million plant in Ardmore, Okla. It is being built with money raised by a local industrial development corporation, even though there was no contract specifying the kind of facility to be built.

OBJECTIONS WITHDRAWN

Treasury officials withdrew their objections to the claim when they found the company had filed a description of the plant with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Mobil asserted it was entitled to the credit because it has bought a pipeline and started roads to the site of a new refinery at Joliet, Ill., which will cost between \$160 and \$200 million. Planning for the facility started in early 1968 but the contract to build the refinery was signed on April 20, the original deadline suggested by Mr. Nixon.

ADDITIONAL CALIFORNIA WAR DEAD

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, between Saturday, October 25, 1969, and Friday, November 7, 1969, the Pentagon has notified 17 more California families of the death of a loved one in Vietnam.

Those killed were:

Sp4c. Robert L. Aday, son of Mr. George W. Aday, of Santa Barbara.

Pfc. Danny E. Appleton, son of Mr. and Mrs. James R. Appleton, of Sanger.

Sgt. Arthur B. Bengen, husband of Mrs. Eva L. Bengen, of San Diego.

Pfc. Gary W. Bruhn, son of Mr. and Mrs. Walter W. Bruhn, of Torrence.

Pfc. Richard J. Coston, son of Mrs. Dorothy M. Coston, of San Jose.

Lt. Oliver E. Deal, Jr., son of Mr. and Mrs. Oliver E. Deal, of Santa Monica.

Pfc. Thomas A. Engelman, husband of Mrs. Jacqueline L. Engelman, of Imperial Beach.

Sp4c. Marcos J. Garcia, son of Mrs. Socorro V. Avila, of Vallejo.

CWO Murray W. Hearne, son of Mr. and Mrs. Roger B. Hearne, of Norwalk.

WO Kenneth R. Leach, husband of Mrs. Pamela K. Leach, of Hemet.

B1c. William C. Leght, husband of Mrs. Cleo I. Leght, of Ventura.

Pfc. Richard R. Manemann, son of Mr. and Mrs. Richard G. Manemann, of Granada Hills.

Pfc. Florencio Q. Marquez, son of Mr. and Mrs. David C. Marquez, of Westmoreland.

Sgt. Vincent Saldano, son of Mrs. Mary Saldano, of Oakland.

Sgt. Charles E. Shultz, son of Mrs. Louella P. Bieri, of Long Beach.

Sp4c. Alexander Vigil, son of Mr. and Mrs. Audenago Vigil, of Santa Maria.

Capt. James C. Woods, husband of Mrs. June C. Woods, of Fairfield.

They bring to 3,864 the total number of Californians killed in the Vietnam war.

RETIREMENT OF DWIGHT J. PINION

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, as the co-author of the Civil Service Retirement Amendments of 1969, which became Public Law 91-93 a few days ago, I regret to advise Senators that the advantages included in that legislation have led to the retirement of a most distinguished Federal employee. What was intended as an inducement for well-qualified applicants to enter the Federal service, or an improvement upon benefits for employees already retired, has led to the loss of a most deeply valued employee within our own Senate family.

Dwight Pinion retired on October 31 as legislative counsel of the U.S. Senate. To say that he will be sorely missed is so much an understatement that I hesitate to say it at all. Anyone who has had anything to do with Dwight during the 27 years he has served in the Office of the Legislative Counsel knows of his outstanding ability, loyalty, and dedication. He is truly the personification of what Congress envisioned in establishing an independent, nonpartisan Office of the Legislative Counsel. I have known him best in his service to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. But his expertise extended to almost all fields of legislation, and his quiet, effective leadership has resolved more problems in finding out what the Senate means to say in developing legislation than many Senators ever think about.

His work has always been characterized by judicious, intelligent, and incredibly thoughtful analysis. His suggestions have been helpful, and his counsel has carried great weight with the committees and Senators he has advised. Likewise, his tutoring of and work with members of our committee and personal staffs have been a key factor in developing the able staff the Senate now enjoys.

On behalf of myself and, I am sure, my colleagues, I extend to Dwight and Mrs. Pinion my most sincere good wishes for a very happy retirement.

DRAFT REFORM

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, during the past week we have seen the chances for Senate consideration of President Nixon's proposal for a draft lottery system improve immeasurably. First, the majority leader announced that although he would vote against anything but comprehensive draft reform, he promised not to hold up Senate debate on the President's proposal. Second, the majority whip was convinced by Yale president, Kingman Brewster, Jr., that some reform was better than none. Yesterday, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services announced that the committee had unanimously approved a draft lottery bill, but would not allow it to come to the Senate floor without previous agreement from draft reform advocates to withhold floor amendments.

Mr. President, I have long advocated comprehensive draft reform, and re-

quested serious consideration be given to the creation of a volunteer Armed Force. However, I am hopeful that those who so vigorously advocate complete overhaul of the Selective Service System will not forget the many young men who would benefit from a lottery system this year. I urge the Senate leadership to do everything possible to expedite passage of the proposed legislation.

The Washington Evening Star, on November 8, 1969, published an editorial directed to this problem. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE BREWSTER COMPROMISE

Kingman Brewster Jr., president of Yale University, told the Kennedy draft reform subcommittee nothing more than what the Nixon administration has contended all along. To wit: It makes no sense to prevent the Senate from considering the administration's lottery system plan merely because there are other aspects of the draft that also need fixing. As Brewster put it, the best is the enemy of the good.

What the Senate Democratic leaders apparently could not accept under administration sponsorship, they did accept when a New Haven label was attached. So we now have the Brewster compromise of 1969—Senators Mansfield and Kennedy will permit the Nixon bill to come to the Senate floor in return for agreement to advance the expiration date of the draft act by six months, to January, 1971. Presumably this will make it easier, next year, to amend the act.

The compromise makes good sense. For one thing, the lottery system is as fair a selection process as can be devised, leaving the choice of draftees strictly to chance. It merits prompt approval for the sake of the young men whose futures are at stake.

As for the further reforms contemplated by the Democratic leaders, they include a re-vamping of the Selective Service System's administrative set-up and the issuance of new guidelines for draft exemptions. Given that such proposals are more complex, and certainly more controversial, than the lottery system, they would benefit from hearings and study during the remainder of this session.

It should be noted, however, that the Brewster compromise is only the first step toward getting the administration request to the Senate floor. Unless a sufficient number of Democrats undertakes not to press for further reforms on the floor, Armed Services Chairman John Stennis will simply refuse to report a bill out of committee.

Senator Kennedy now says he can understand how other Democrats will have difficulty resisting the urge to amend the administration bill. Majority Leader Mansfield confides that he will not vote for the administration request himself, because he disapproves of such a half-way measure. In the absence of more forceful leadership than this, the Brewster compromise will exist in name only, and the administration draft proposal will remain buried in the Armed Services Committee.

INDIAN AFFAIRS—WHAT HAS BEEN DONE AND WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

Mr. MONTTOYA. Mr. President, I recently had the pleasure of addressing the 25th annual convention of the National Congress of American Indians in Albuquerque, N. Mex. I was pleased to have

been invited to address the NCAI because I have long been interested in the problems facing our American Indians, and have become increasingly involved in seeking to assist them.

During the course of the annual convention of NCAI, I had the pleasure of listening to the keynote address given by Mr. Wendell Chino, president of the National Congress of American Indians, and president of the Mescalero Apache Tribe.

Mr. President, Mr. Chino's remarks deserve the close attention of each of us, not only in Congress or in the administration, but throughout the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Chino's address be printed in the RECORD so that others may share in his thoughts.

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

INDIAN AFFAIRS—WHAT HAS BEEN DONE AND WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

(Keynote address by Wendell Chino, president, National Congress of American Indians, and president, Mescalero Apache Tribe, to the 25th annual convention of the National Congress of American Indians, Albuquerque, N. Mex., Oct. 6, 1969)

In the face of the agony of the Viet Nam War, revolution for relevance, and revolution of racial hatred, our Country has made tremendous progress in the fields of science and technology. We can send a man to the moon, we can go to the depths of the sea and probe its darkness. We have learned to harness the energy of the sun and use its energy, and we can build giant computers. So—we stop and take stock of our achievements—a technology that very few nations of the world can match. In spite of progress and advancements—we are falling in, and have neglected our primary duty to our people, and especially among our people—the American Indian.

I share the very deep common concern we all feel and have felt for these troubled and terrible conditions in our country and the world. Today, we, the American Indian people are faced with many problems—political, economic, financial, racial, and many more. As an individual, I am a concerned citizen of this country—the country, which, in spite of its failings, that I love so very much. Indeed, I want to do everything that I can to promote its welfare and to see that it does not neglect its people.

Therefore, I want to address myself to: "Indian Affairs—What Has Been Done and What Is Remaining To Be Done."

From that first historic encounter between the American Indians and the "white men", our Indian lands have been diminished, leaving only certain allotted lands and established reservations as the remaining land base for the American Indians.

The Congress of the United States assumed responsibility for the Indian people. That responsibility included their education, health, and their general welfare. After almost 200 years, we are even more cognizant of this responsibility and the commitment to our people and the great job which still needs to be done.

In addition to the concern and the responsibility of the Federal government, certain Indian-interest groups and non-Indian individuals have made numerous reports on the administration of Indian affairs. We have been studied to death by reports and task forces representing the expenditure of vast sums of money. With this expenditure to improve our conditions you would think that we ought to be better off than we are today

with all the reports and recommendations made in our behalf, suggesting ways and means of improving our conditions and welfare.

The changes in the administration of this country have made the Indian people and their problems a political football resulting in vacillating policies. Some administrations advocated keeping the status-quo by leaving Indian matters and policies like they have been for a good many years. Some administrations have initiated action requiring premature withdrawals of Federal services to the Indian people in several states—perhaps in more of the states, if the National Congress of American Indians and their friends had not intervened in certain cases in behalf of the Indian people. A review of the present condition of certain "terminated Tribes" does not speak well of the Federal government and its termination policy.

In view of these seemingly adverse and weak efforts by all parties concerned, we need now to look ahead and ask ourselves what needs to be done in Indian affairs?

Since all of the studies and reviews reflect the weakness of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the reticence of the Congress to deeply concern itself with the Indian people and their problems, then, in line with our theme, we must become involved! There is no other recourse but to stress the need for a strong leadership among our Indian Tribes, Pueblos and groups. If you see a need or a job that is waiting to be accomplished—put your hands to the plow, then having put your hands to the plow, request assistance if you need it. The need of this hour among Indian people is for strong, positive leadership that must come to grips with local problems—leadership that must be heard on state and national levels. It is not enough to speak only of our ills and the short-coming of the Bureau of Indian Affairs—let us provide the leadership to provide the motivation and the stimulation to attack those areas needing our time, energy and effort.

Whether we are reservation or urban Indians—radicals or conservatives, we are Indians—let us not knock one another or seek personal aggrandisement. Let us, with common interest and energy make united efforts to attack those problems affecting our people. Unite we must—lest we divide and lose our strength.

Another thing that needs special attention is to secure from the Congress, an annual appropriation that is realistic, and large enough to attack and combat our problems. At the present rate of appropriation for Indian programs, it will take centuries to accomplish the task mutually facing all of us.

Turning our attention to the New National Administration, I have some remarks to address to it:

The "New Federalism" advocated by the new administration, has no appeal or interest for me as presently enunciated and I'll tell you why. The concept of the "New Federalism" that I hear is that all grants-in-aid and all Federal funding of projects and programs are going to be channeled through the states. By channeling funds through the states, the Federal government will be abrogating its responsibility, a primary and a constitutional responsibility, to the several states for administration. I do not believe that this form of the "New Federalism" will work to the benefit of the American Indians, in fact, it will work against them. *It will put all of us out in the cold!*

"New Federalism" could work for the Indian people if it is handled in the right way. For "New Federalism" to work among the Indian Tribes, those Tribes must be dealt with on the same basis as the several states. Federal assistance must be granted to the Indian Tribes in the same way that it is granted to the states—directly! For Federal Indian help to be channeled through the

states will result in only tokenism. We need only to look at the administration of funds appropriated under the Omnibus Crime Law. Have any of our tribes really gained or received any benefits from this law, a law which grants funds to the several states for administration? At Mescalero, we have not received one iota of service or benefit from the Federal grant to the State of New Mexico.

Instead of "new Federalism" and tokenism for Indian people, there must come and there must be direct funding to Tribes for Indian programs. The Indian desks now existing in the various Departments of the government must remain and continue; in fact, we need more of them.

The Congress of the United States must, without question, proceed immediately to enact Senate Concurrent Resolution Number Thirty-Four, a Resolution enunciating a NEW National Indian Policy which is being spearheaded by Senator McGovern and his other Senatorial colleagues. This proposed National Indian Policy Statement by the Congress concerning the First American must be enunciated very clearly and positively. It is a new policy that will lay to rest all the hidden and known fears manifest to us because we just do not know where we stand in our unique relationship with the Federal government. I do not believe that this decade should come to a close without a marked improvement for our Indian people.

The Congress, through this Resolution, and its disavowal of the Termination Policy will restore the confidence of the Indian people in the Federal government, making it possible for the Indian Tribes and the Federal government to go forward together to brighter future for our people and all people of this great Country. The Indian must have the right of self-determination on the selection of his way of life!

Let us not be lulled into accepting programs from the states!

Most of our Indian people do not now have, nor have we ever had political or legal relations with state governments. We do not now receive state assistance in any form except for those Federal funds given to the states specifically for Indians. Our experience with the states' administration of Federal funds in behalf of Indians has not been good. Only recently have we been allowed the vote in many states and today few of our Indian people do vote in state elections and have no power base in the state political machines.

The first Congress of the United States reserved unto itself, the power to deal and negotiate with Indian Tribes, showing a wisdom thereby which was not fully appreciated until recent times. The Indian Tribes were then, and are now legally considered as pseudo-sovereign nations—exercising the powers of residual sovereignty. As early as 1775, Article Nine of the Articles of Confederation asserted: "The United States in Congress assembled shall also have the sole and exclusive right and power of . . . regulating the trade and managing all affairs with the Indians . . ." This Article was approved in Congress in 1777. In 1787, the Constitution clearly established the Federal relationship to Indian Tribes in the "commerce clause" which reads in part . . . "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

Subsequently, Congress passed a series of Federal laws "to regulate trade and intercourse with the Indian Tribes, and to preserve peace on the frontier", such laws were commonly known as the "Indian Trade and Intercourse Acts" which served to further clarify the absolute relationship between the Federal Government and the Indian tribes, and excluded the interference of any State. The Federal government was anxious then to promote Indian friendship and prosperity because it needed the might of the Indian warriors allied with the government

in the fight against European colonialism. The few thousand American whites could not stand against several million Indians at their backs and several million Europeans at their shores.

Recently, a brief article appeared, stating, and I quote—"Approximately \$525 million dollars has been allotted by the government for Indian Affairs for fiscal 1970. If that money were given directly to the heads of Indian households, they would be receiving an annual income of almost \$6,000.00 (There are about 100,000 Indian heads of households and not more than a half-million Indians in the United States.) At present, their average annual income is under \$2,000." End of quotation. That is a nice thought, but the writer failed to realize that the major portion or share of the \$525 million will go to maintain, sustain and perpetuate an empire of the Federal government—the empire of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Parenthetically, we have offered, through our N.C.A.I. Position Paper ideas that we believe could provide solutions to the problem of getting more funds into the hands of the Tribes, and the elimination of a bureaucracy.

This great country which we call the United States of America would not have been created without Indian participation and Indian help. During the Revolutionary War, the Federal Army invited the assistance, the cooperation and the participation of the Six Nation Confederacy, the Delawares, Wyandottes, Chippewas, the Ottawas and the Shawnees to protect the northern and western fronts, and the Cherokees, Choctaws, Creeks and Chickasaws to protect the Southern Front against the invasion of the British Army.

The Indians did such an outstanding job that it resulted in total victory for the United Colonies. *Thus, was the foundation of this Country saved by the Indians.* Had the Federal Army been defeated, then, there would never have been a United States of America. The early colonists looked to the Iroquois Confederacy for the formation and framing of the United States Constitution—one of the greatest and mightiest documents this world has ever known. Again, it was Indian help and Indian influence through the Iroquois Confederacy that provided the mold for the Constitution of the United States of America.

In the war with Japan, the Japanese could not decode the Navajo language, this was one code that they could not break. What a vital role the Indian Language played in the Second World War—not to mention the large percentage of Indians who served in that war.

This is the kind of Indian involvement that we need. We will not accept anything less!

Now, how sad—how ironic, that our people—the American Indians, who have certainly played a viable and vital role in the shaping of this great country can be given only lip service by the leaders of our country, and in many cases, by the leaders of our states.

We are sick, tired and disappointed with tokenism, political platitudes and promises that were never intended to be kept; it is going to take more than "lip service" from our government, more than political tokenism from the leaders of our country to improve and accomplish the needed programs existing among our people today.

What about the pledges given to the American Indians at last year's convention in Omaha, Nebraska? How many, can we truthfully say have been kept or fulfilled to the satisfaction of our Indian people? We are sad that all of our pleading, prodding, and requests have been shrugged off and fallen on deaf ears to be ignored.

Our pleas on behalf of our people aren't shallow or slight, they affect the basic well being of our people. Our requests for better

and greater service is not welfare or tokenism! We are asking that the historic commitment of 1775 to our Indian people be fulfilled in this century.

Finally—I say to our Indian leaders and our Indian people, let your people see you take an active part in Indian affairs, and be involved in salvaging the ideals of our people, the traditions of our people. Fight the non-Indian values that would destroy our culture, and oppose the platitudes of our time and of the dominant society. Our mutual concern and protection will preserve and sustain our Indian heritage and culture for generations to come.

Thank you.

PROFESSOR MELLINKOFF WRITES ON JUDGE HAYNSWORTH

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, a copy of a letter to Senator EASTLAND was sent to me by its author, David Mellinkoff, a professor of law at the University of California, Los Angeles. It seems to me that this letter sheds significant light upon the questions of appearance of impropriety which have been raised in regard to Judge Haynsworth's qualifications for a seat on the Supreme Court. I ask unanimous consent that Professor Mellinkoff's letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES,
Los Angeles, Calif., October 20, 1969.

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR EASTLAND: As a professor of law teaching legal ethics to future lawyers, I write to invite your further attention to what I believe to be the central issue in the consideration of the fitness of Mr. Justice Haynsworth for appointment to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Three instances of apparent conflict of interest have been given prominence in the press: the Justice's purchase of Brunswick Corporation stock before announcement of his Court's decision in favor of Brunswick; his substantial ownership of Carolina Vend-O-Matic, a company having a valuable business relationship with a successful litigant before the Court; and his small stock holding in the W. R. Grace Co. at the time of a decision favorable to its subsidiary Grace Lines. According to report, Justice Haynsworth has explained that the Brunswick case had been decided and forgotten before he bought any Brunswick stock, and that financial interest did not influence his vote in any of these cases. As a member of the bar for 30 years I accept Justice Haynsworth's explanation.

At the same time I cannot but observe that to the unsuccessful litigant in Justice Haynsworth's Court the explanation would ring hollow. At best losing a lawsuit is a disheartening, at worst a crushing experience to anyone convinced rightly or wrongly of the justice of his cause. The disappointment is endurable only under a system of justice in which the loser knows that the process by which he lost was a fair one.

In a grosser age, when the brilliant Francis Bacon was forced from office and forced to acknowledge that as Lord Chancellor of England he had been taking gifts from litigants, he was still able to assert, "... I am as innocent as any born upon St. Innocent's day: I never had a bribe or reward in my eye or thought when pronouncing sentence or order." It may have been true, but it was hardly satisfying, least of all to the man who lost his case in the Lord Chancellor's court.

In a United States district court a jury awards an injured seaman \$50.00 on a claim against Grace Lines he thought worth \$30,000. Saddened, he takes his case to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals. It is not difficult to imagine the bitterness in the heart of the injured seaman when he learns that one of the judges to whom he appealed in vain to right the supposed wrong of the Grace Lines was even a small owner of the company that owns Grace Lines. By the standard of the marketplace Justice Haynsworth's stockholding was trifling. It looms large in the mind of the unhappy litigant searching to discover just what it was that tipped the scales of justice against him.

To avoid such avoidable strains on the legal system, it has long been a maxim of the law that courts shall not only do justice but that they shall seem to do justice. This ancient wisdom finds expression in the Canons of Judicial Ethics of the American Bar Association providing that a judge's conduct should not only be "free from impropriety" but from "the appearance of impropriety." (Canon 4). The importance of the appearance of things is stressed again and again (Canons 13, 24, 26, 33), culminating in the injunction that "In every particular his conduct should be above reproach." (Canon 34).

These Canons apply to judges at every level. They apply most stringently to the men who are to grace the court which sets an example of right to the rest of the nation. I hope, Senator, that you will consider the nomination of Mr. Justice Haynsworth in this light. If you do, I believe you will come to share my conclusion that his confirmation would not promote that necessary public respect for our system of justice which each of us in his own way seeks to preserve.

Very truly yours,

DAVID MELLINKOFF,
Professor of Law.

DEATH OF JUDGE THURMAN ARNOLD

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, yesterday, in my hometown, funeral services were held for a man whose name certainly is well known. Thurman Arnold—lawyer, teacher, judge, public servant, and a man of vast wit and humanity—died last Friday at the age of 78 at his home in Alexandria, Va.

Judge Arnold, who was born in Laramie in the second year of Wyoming statehood, 1891, and served both as mayor and as the lone Democrat in the Wyoming House of Representatives before moving to the national scene, has gone home for the last time. But he has left our Nation richer by his years of service. His contribution to America was substantial, as the Washington Post observed in an editorial salute.

I ask unanimous consent that the Post's editorial, entitled "Thurman Arnold, Teacher and Friend," be printed in the RECORD.

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

THURMAN ARNOLD, TEACHER AND FRIEND

A friend of ours once called Thurman Arnold the "youngest senile man" he had ever met. He didn't know Judge Arnold well and it was a pity. For the judge, despite that outward appearance of bluster, brusqueness and sloppiness which made him the bane of Washington hostesses, was one of the youngest of men where it really counts—in the mind and in the soul.

We laughed with Judge Arnold, were outraged by him, and learned from him for a

third of a century. He made the most difficult aspects of the law and of economics seem simple, except when he wanted to make either of them seem obscure, and he was a master at doing either. Phenomenally successful as a lawyer, he could have been just as successful as an author, a lecturer, or a humorist, all of which he was in his spare time.

It is easy now to forget what this nation was like when Thurman Arnold arrived—exploded might be a better word—on the national scene. The law was then a brooding omnipresence and laissez faire capitalism assumed the desirability and the superiority of bigness in business. Judge Arnold was a leader among those who stripped away the myth of the early Twentieth Century and raised the curtain on the operation of business in the courts. If for no other reason, and there are others—his devotion to and his willing defense of the principles of the First Amendment is one—his contribution to America was substantial.

AIR POLLUTION ABATEMENT IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, for many years a critical smog problem has existed in southern California, and this problem is becoming increasingly evident in metropolitan areas throughout the Nation.

Experts agree that motor vehicle emissions constitute a major portion of the remaining smog problem.

Because the southern California area has for many years been in the forefront of efforts to counteract air pollution, I feel that it is fitting that a southern California firm is using its resources to energize development of a virtually smog-free fuel system for the motor vehicle. The Los Angeles-based Pacific Lighting companies—Southern California and Southern Counties Gas Co.'s, and Pacific Lighting Service Co.—have developed a natural gas fuel system that reduces the emission of air pollutants from the motor vehicle up to 90 percent. These companies should be commended for their successes in the area of air pollution abatement.

The Federal Government currently is involved in testing the natural gas fuel system on 12 General Services Administration vehicles in the Veterans' Administration motor pool in West Los Angeles. Four sedans and eight trucks have been equipped with the system. A news conference was held in Los Angeles on Monday, October 27, to mark the official beginning of the natural gas vehicle test program.

This test program is a fine example of private industry working with the Federal Government in an attempt to remedy a nationwide problem.

The system that Pacific Lighting has developed permits vehicle operation alternately on either natural gas or gasoline. A choke-like control switch on the dashboard allows the operator to switch from one fuel to the other. A vehicle can operate on natural gas in urban air pollution areas and be switched to gasoline for high-speed freeway operation or rural driving.

For the past year, Pacific Lighting's fuel system has undergone extensive tests at the California Air Resources Board laboratory in Los Angeles.

One test vehicle showed carbon monoxide emissions were reduced from 25.3 grams per mile on gasoline to 4.4 grams per mile on natural gas. Hydrocarbons were reduced from 8.9 to 0.3 grams per mile and oxides of nitrogen dropped from 5 to 0.6 grams per mile on natural gas. All of the vehicles tested showed similar results.

Based on the test results, the air resources board certified the system for use on all vehicles in California. However, Pacific Lighting is advocating application of the fuel system initially to large-fleet vehicle operations.

More than 60 vehicles in southern California have been installed with the natural gas fuel system at the present time. The gas utilities in the Pacific Lighting system have announced that they will convert more than 1,100 of their customer service vehicles to the system during the next year.

Several governmental agencies and private firms are testing or planning to test the natural gas fuel system. Among them are the California Division of Highways, the city of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, the Los Angeles Times and Disneyland.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I feel this natural gas vehicle program of the Pacific Lighting companies proves that something can and is being done to further reduce the hazardous air pollution problem that affects and concerns us all.

I congratulate the Pacific Lighting companies for their efforts in behalf of air pollution abatement.

NEED FOR INCREASED FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO EDUCATION

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, educational institutions across the country are in dire financial straits as they attempt to educate students on budgets too limited to meet their needs. This predicament is, in part, our responsibility since Congress has not as yet passed the appropriation for the Office of Education.

Thus, despite House action on the HEW appropriations bill providing \$4,246,241,455, schools are receiving only the \$3,327,049,455 provided by the continuing resolution currently funding education. They are, therefore, deprived of \$1 billion that could be effectively utilized for teachers, equipment, special education programs, and student financial assistance.

The Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTANA) has introduced, and I have cosponsored, Senate Joint Resolution 163, which would make this additional \$1 billion available to the schools. This joint resolution would fund education programs at the level approved by the House rather than the level recommended in the budget request for fiscal year 1970.

Illinois' share of this increase would be approximately \$36.8 million. Both Governor Ogilvie and Ray Page, the superintendent of public instruction in the State, have impressed upon me the vital need for this additional money. My own investigation of how this money would be allocated has further convinced me of its importance for the students and the schools in my State.

Of the \$36.8 million, \$8 million will be allocated in Illinois for programs to assist educationally deprived children under title I of ESEA; \$2.6 million for library materials for schools; \$1 million for guidance and counseling services. In addition, \$10 million will be utilized as assistance to schools in federally impacted areas; \$3 million for student loans, and \$6 million for vocational education. The distribution of the remainder of the additional funds is indicated on a table which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record.

Mr. President, Illinois needs the increase in Federal assistance to education provided by Senate Joint Resolution 163—as does every other State. I therefore urge rapid consideration and passage of this resolution. I can think of no better investment in our country than insuring that our educational system has the funds to teach and guide our youth.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF ILLINOIS—OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1979	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants	\$47,565,775	\$44,407,826	\$46,788,843	\$46,788,843	\$54,513,049
State administrative expenses	474,998	444,130	467,888	467,888	0
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	5,337,276	2,681,475	2,252,460	0	2,672,463
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	9,382,000	8,223,590	8,648,036	5,650,541	8,251,199
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	1,013,556	1,056,099	1,130,757	1,130,757	1,130,757
Grants for special projects				0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	3,056,642	3,085,357		0	3,157,687
Loans to nonprofit private schools		181,753		0	0
State administration	102,071	99,990		0	100,742
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	1,283,562	894,406	622,243	0	901,171
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	68,215,880	61,074,626	59,910,227	54,038,029	68,727,068
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874)	12,220,000	12,724,000	7,217,000	4,280,000	11,805,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	97,094	934,000		0	0
Subtotal, SAFA	12,317,094	13,658,000	7,217,000	4,280,000	14,805,000
Education professions development:					
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDS B-2)		619,473	886,082	886,082	886,082
Training programs (EDPA, pts. C and D)	3,468,409			0	0
Subtotal, education professions development	3,468,409	619,473	886,082	886,082	886,082
Teachers Corps	1,109,679	1,067,674		0	0
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	1,068,000			0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	389,618	385,726	389,721	389,721	389,721
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	641,295	627,907		0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I, sec. 103)	2,776,977	3,299,943	1,706,263	1,706,263	1,706,263
Other undergraduates facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104)	10,439,144	6,640,145	4,340,960	0	1,688,339
Graduates facilities (HEFA II)	1,500,000			0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105)	244,312	215,020	215,020	215,020	215,020
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	6,429,725	770,306	3,707,326	3,707,326	2,730,279
Direct loans (NDEA II)	9,192,661	9,603,647	7,628,040	7,628,040	10,931,945
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds	92,355	642,626		0	0
Interest payments	(1)			0	0
Work-study programs HEA IV-C)	5,129,105	6,321,681	6,622,714	6,624,079	6,624,079
Special programs for disadvantaged students: Talent search	255,380			0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	4,692,300			0	0
Training programs (EPDA, pt. E)	148,000			0	0
Subtotal, higher education	42,998,872	28,507,001	24,010,044	20,270,449	24,285,646

Footnote at end of table.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF ILLINOIS—OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1979	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
Vocational education:					
Basic grants.....	\$10,397,146	\$10,300,874	\$9,830,472	\$9,380,472	\$15,169,414
Innovation.....			324,227	0	0
Work-study.....	503,371			0	503,114
Cooperative education.....			374,227	374,227	374,227
Consumer and homemaking education.....			622,822	622,866	622,822
Subtotal, vocational education.....	10,900,517	10,300,874	11,151,748	10,377,565	16,669,577
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I).....	1,746,355	1,746,355	1,746,355	776,280	1,746,355
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II).....	656,395	1,653,747	354,115	0	354,115
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA II).....	47,539	48,925	48,925	48,925	48,925
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A).....	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B).....	23,750	25,776	25,776	25,776	25,776
College library resources (HEA II-A).....	1,532,824			0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B).....	666,077			0	0
University community service programs (HEA I).....	359,848	333,347	333,346	333,346	333,346
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States.....	1,221,492	1,460,494	1,633,780	1,633,780	1,633,780
Special projects and teacher education.....	483,000			0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities.....				0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services.....	6,775,280	5,308,153	4,181,806	2,847,616	4,181,806
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI).....	687,167	1,488,885	1,488,885	1,488,885	1,488,885
Teacher education and recruitment.....	1,211,167			0	0
Research and innovation.....	796,468	446,441		0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf.....	77,590			0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped.....	2,772,392	1,984,761	1,488,885	1,488,885	1,488,885
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories.....	600,000	270,000		0	0
Research and development centers.....	1,465,500			0	0
General education.....	1,554,377	137,690		0	0
Vocational education.....	1,022,991	363,581	32,100	32,100	32,100
Evaluations.....				0	0
National achievement study.....				0	0
Dissemination.....	64,312			0	0
Training.....	314,657			0	0
Statistical surveys.....	23,400			0	0
Construction.....	22,000			0	0
Subtotal, research and training.....	5,067,237	771,271	32,100	32,100	32,100
Education in foreign languages and world affairs.....	1,305,133			0	0
Civil rights education.....	264,413			0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act).....	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act).....	360,319	360,319			
Student loan insurance fund.....				0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund.....	6,875,000			0	0
Total, Office of Education.....	162,480,225	123,702,152	109,527,392	94,280,726	131,126,164

1 Not available.

THE PROTEAN PROJECT SANGUINE

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Janesville, Wis., Gazette struck a very responsive cord in an editorial on the protean Project Sanguine. On November 6, 1969, the Department of Defense announced that new technical developments had given more flexibility to the military in testing and designing this one-way grid system for communicating with our Polaris missile submarines. The flexibility does not imply a major breakthrough. The size of the grid could still cover the same 21,000 square miles as before with a reduction in power, or it could be reduced to about one-third of that size but require the original great amount of power forecasted.

Clearly this does not remove the reservations raised in the editorial, which I share. The potential harm to human life and the ecology of northern Wisconsin is too great to allow this program to sail forward without strong public debate. Also the military urgency has not been substantiated.

Secretary of Defense Laird has reiterated that Sanguine will not be built unless our Nation's strategic deterrent force requires it and unless it can be built in a manner entirely compatible

with its surroundings. This statement places the burden on the Department of Defense to make a case for national need, not mere technical feasibility.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled, "Wild Statement on Sanguine," be printed in the RECORD.

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

WILD STATEMENT ON SANGUINE

Rep. Alvin O'Konski is a strong supporter of Project Sanguine, a huge underground transmitter the Navy wants to build in Northern Wisconsin. The project is opposed by many conservationists who fear great damage to Wisconsin's forests, farmland and wildlife.

In defending the project, O'Konski is ranging very far afield. He said recently that Sanguine would create 5,000 jobs, and where he got this figure is a mystery.

Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird, in a speech Oct. 21 at Stevens Point, said Sanguine would have few economic benefits for the State of Wisconsin and after initial construction work, would require only a few employees to maintain. Even the Navy, which wants the project, says it would create only 300 jobs in the 26-county area the project would cover.

Even wilder was O'Konski's statement that Sanguine would be "a great tourist attraction."

Oh, sure. We can just imagine families all over the Midwest piling into their cars on a long weekend to drive to Northern Wisconsin to see miles and miles of slashes through the forest where underground cables are buried. Why, it might put Disneyland out of business.

Dr. E. L. David, a natural resource economist, said "There will be little to attract tourists since the cables and terminals will all be underground. Since the cables will be laid every few miles, the countryside will be disturbed in straight lines running as far as the eye can see. This does not seem to be very much of a tourist attraction and I would suspect that such lines would be less rather than more aesthetic . . ."

And a Gazette reader, Anthony DeWerd of Milwaukee, writes: "Who would want to travel to Northern Wisconsin to see raped forest land? Personally I would have great reservations about traveling to a prime nuclear target area and in addition subjecting myself to strong electromagnetic fields."

What is Project Sanguine? It is a giant radio antenna designed to give our nuclear submarines the order to fire their missiles in case a Soviet first strike wipes out normal channels of communication.

Why build it in beautiful Northern Wisconsin instead of in a desert out West? Because the military says a unique underground rock formation in Northern Wisconsin makes it the only place in the world where the Sanguine electrical trick can be performed.

Perhaps. And perhaps not. Sen. Gaylord

Nelson of Wisconsin, who opposes Sanguine, said "there has never been a debate in Congress to prove that, even if the system will work, it is a necessary or justifiable expense."

What really disturbs opponents of Sanguine are the electrical currents that will be given off by the giant transmitter. Even low-frequency currents far less than the 800 million watts Sanguine would throw off electrify metal objects nearby and can upset telephones, television and household lighting. Scientists don't know what effect the low-frequency radio waves would have on animals and people, although high-frequency radio waves are known to have profound effects on longevity, body weight, reproduction, growth, behavior and the central nervous system.

Project Sanguine might—repeat, might—be justified if it can be proven that the radio waves will be harmless, that forests and farms will not be destroyed and it cannot be built somewhere else. Unless these guarantees are forthcoming, it should not be built.

COMMENDATION OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I rise to commend the Vice President of the United States. He is the defender of that great body of Americans who are orderly and who bear our country's burdens.

That is why I am so proud of the Vice President of these United States. A son of immigrants, he has a real feel for this Nation of ours, a feeling of loyalty to the American dream, a feeling of being a part of the national destiny, a feeling for the real meanings of peace and freedom and honor.

In recent weeks he has sought to impart these feelings to his fellow Americans. He has sought to point out to the vast majority of decent, loyal, silent Americans that it is only a very small group that, though it makes all the noise and gets all the headlines, is involved in degrading and dishonoring our country and our flag.

I am proud of him because he continues to carry the message, though he is ridiculed and reviled. I am proud of him because he has said that he, for one, "will not lower my voice until the restoration of sanity and civil order allow a quiet voice to be heard once again."

ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I introduced on Wednesday, November 5, 1969, a bill to provide for the establishment of a National Institute for the Social Sciences—S. 3115. The Institute, to be located in the District of Columbia, would function primarily as a national center where individuals of outstanding ability could identify, conduct research on, and evaluate our Nation's most pressing social problems. The proposal would provide for:

A quasi-independent agency of the Federal Government,

A board of trustees consisting of 13 members,

An Executive Director to manage the affairs of the Institute,

An annual report to the President and the Congress of the United States and, thus, to the people,

A fellowship program for U.S. citizens to allow advanced research and study by visiting fellows selected by the Board of Directors,

The designation of the Institute as the George Washington Memorial Institute for the Social Sciences.

A recent report by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare entitled "Toward a Social Report," noted:

Only a small portion of the existing statistics tell us anything about social conditions, and those that do often point in different directions. Sometimes they do not add up to any meaningful conclusion and, thus, are not very useful to either the policy-makers or the concerned citizen.

The Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE) in a recent hearing of his Subcommittee on Evaluation and Planning of Social Affairs observes:

We now produce over \$400 million worth of statistics in this government and it is worth about four cents when it is all done because nobody looks at it.

Mr. President, the research now being conducted or supported by the Federal Government is so fragmented and diffused as to cry for a central agency to analyze and coordinate this vast mine of information. One of my deep concerns and one I know many of my colleagues share is: What is the direction of the Federal structure—what can we do to determine the causes of unrest and relate them in a practical way to the national capability in terms of priorities and costs?

I am convinced that if an appropriate viable Federal structure is created it will make a significant contribution toward solution of the multiple social problems of today and tomorrow. This Institute will provide a practical blueprint for action by relating multifarious national problems and their priorities to fiscal reality. It will provide members of Congress with a unified body of data which 535 individual overworked staffs cannot provide. The Institute we propose can and would be of immeasurable assistance in policymaking by assumption rather than fact.

Mr. President, to better understand the relationship of this proposed Institute to the Congress we should look at this Nation in broad perspective. In less than 200 years it has grown from 13 separate colonies with divergent aims to the most powerful nation on earth. It has done so always maintaining its initial fundamental aim of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The genius responsible for this proud legislative record, I submit, is that its government has always represented a true cross section of our Nation: leaders in farming, labor, industry, education, humanities, and others. For this reason, this Institute's Board of Directors is patterned after the Congress in that it likewise represents a cross section of civic leadership from all fields.

The issues and problems facing our Nation are compounding. The means to identify and deal with them must be updated. Failure to face the need is beset with even graver consequences. The George Washington Memorial Institute for the Social Sciences is designed to

serve the Congress so it may better serve the country.

Mr. President, the proposed Institute would be named after our first President for very special reasons. George Washington made a bequest of 50 shares of stock in the Potomac Navigation Co., for the establishment of a National University, with the Congress and the Treasurer of the United States as trustees. It was President Washington's wish "to see a plan devised on a liberal scale which would have a tendency to spread systematic ideas through all parts of this rising empire." It has been estimated that the 50 shares of stock were worth approximately \$25,000. Assuming that this amount were compounded at 5 percent semiannually the sum would exceed \$100 million today. Our Government failed to acknowledge or conserve the bequest: the securities are long since nonexistent.

I, therefore, believe the establishment of an Institute for the Social Sciences in honor of our first President is most appropriate and in keeping with his wishes.

ABUSES OF ESEA TITLE I FUNDS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, yesterday I discussed here on the Senate floor a report, prepared jointly by the Washington Research Project and the NAACP legal defense fund, on the misuse of title I funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The findings of the report are distressing, and they highlight the need for much more careful administration of ESEA title I funds if the goal which Congress has set—to provide effective assistance to school systems with high concentrations of low-income children—is to be met.

The report found, for example, that in many cases title I money has been used as general aid to all schools or to nontarget schools, rather than being concentrated in schools with educationally handicapped children who need assistance the most. Title I funds have been used to supplant, rather than supplement, State and local money. Many schools have spent the funds for construction and equipment which did not further the end of compensatory education and which were in violation of regulations and program criteria. Community involvement and participation have been systematically excluded, despite the clear intent of the law that parents and representatives of the community play a major role in title I decisions. Citizens have been denied access to audit reports, applications and other information—despite explicit regulations to the contrary. Mismanagement at all levels—Federal, State, and local—has been serious.

The import of these criticisms, Mr. President, is not that title I should be cut back, but rather that we should firmly and vigorously cut back on the abuses. As the report concludes:

This report is intended as a defense of title I. Our criticisms are offered in order to make its operation more effective and to ensure that the Congressional intent is implemented. We believe that Federal aid

to education is now firmly embedded in our system and should be encouraged and not weakened. We hope by bringing to light some of the more flagrant misuses of Title I funds that a concerted and continuing effort will ensue to help poor children get what the Nation promised them when the act was passed.

Mr. President, I strongly share those sentiments and feel that the recent report is an important contribution for reform and call for action I ask unanimous consent that the "Introduction" and also the "Summary and Conclusions" of the report, entitled "Title I of ESEA: Is It Helping Poor Children?" appear in the RECORD at this point.

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

TITLE I OF ESEA—IS IT HELPING POOR CHILDREN?

INTRODUCTION

In 1965 Congress passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), the most far reaching and significant education legislation in the history of this country. For the first time the national government recognized the necessity of providing Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools. For the first time, the special needs of poor children were recognized and effective ameliorative action promised through special assistance to school systems with high concentrations of low-income children.

Our hopes that the Nation would finally begin to rectify the injustices and inequities which poor children suffer from being deprived of an equal educational opportunity have been sorely disappointed. Millions of dollars appropriated by the Congress to help educationally deprived children have been wasted, diverted or otherwise misused by State and local school authorities. The kinds of programs carried out with Federal funds appropriated to raise the educational levels of these children are such that many parents of poor children feel that Title I is only another promise unfulfilled, another law which is being violated daily in the most flagrant manner without fear of reprisal.

We have found that in school systems across the country Title I—

Has not reached eligible children in many instances;

Has not been concentrated on those most in need so that there is reasonable promise of success;

Has purchased hardware at the expense of instructional programs;

Has not been used to meet the most serious educational needs of school children; and

Has not been used in a manner that involves parents and communities in carrying out Title I projects.

This study examines what has happened to Title I in the four school years since ESEA was passed. This is not an evaluation of compensatory programs, but a report on how Title I money has been spent and how Title I has been administered at the local, State, and Federal levels.

Since passage of ESEA, Congress has appropriated \$4.3 billion for the benefit of educationally deprived poor children—black, brown, white, and Indian children. Because most of these children attend inadequately financed and staffed schools, the windfall of Federal appropriations no doubt brings many improvements to these schools that these children never had. To hear the educational profession and school administrators talk (or write), Title I is the best thing that ever happened to American school systems. Educational opportunities, services, and facilities for poor children are provided. Some poor children are now well fed, taught by

more teachers, in new buildings with all the latest equipment, materials, and supplies. Early evaluations of academic gain have not been so optimistic. Some school systems report that despite the "massive" infusion of Federal dollars, poor children are not making academic gains beyond what is normally expected. Some report moderate academic gain in programs and some report real academic improvement.

Despite these reports, the almost universal assumption about Title I is that it is providing great benefits to educationally disadvantaged children from low-income families.

We find this optimistic assumption largely unwarranted. Instead we find that:

1. The intended beneficiaries of Title I, poor children, are being denied the benefits of the Act because of improper and illegal use of Title I funds.

2. Many Title I programs are poorly planned and executed so that the needs of educationally deprived children are not met. In some instances there are no Title I programs to meet the needs of these children.

3. State departments of education, which have major responsibility for operating the program and approving Title I project applications, have not lived up to their legal responsibility to administer the program in conformity with the law and the intent of Congress.

4. The United States Office of Education, which has overall responsibility for administering the Act, is reluctant and timid in its administration of Title I and abdicates to the States its responsibility for enforcing the law.

5. Poor people and representatives of community organizations are excluded from the planning and design of Title I programs. In many poor communities, the parents of Title I eligible children know nothing about Title I. In some communities, school officials refuse to provide information about the Title I program to local residents.

These practices should be corrected immediately. We recommend that:

1. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) and the Department of Justice take immediate action against school systems where HEW audits have identified illegal uses of Title I funds, and where indicated, restitution of misused funds demanded.

2. HEW enforce the requirement for equalization of State and local resources between Title I and non-Title I in schools in districts throughout the country; in Mississippi such equalization be required by the 1970-71 school year as recommended by the Commissioner.

3. HEW immediately institute an effective monitoring and evaluation system to insure proper use of Title I funds; the Title I office be given additional staff and status within the Office of Education; and a capable director be appointed forthwith and made directly responsible to the Commissioner of Education.

4. An appropriate Committee of Congress immediately conduct an oversight hearing and examine on a systematic basis the manner in which Federal, State and local school officials are using Title I funds.

5. The provision requiring community participation under Title I be maintained and strengthened.

6. Alternative vehicles for operation of Title I programs be provided where State and local officials are unable or unwilling to operate effective Title I programs. For example, private non-profit organizations are permitted to operate Title I programs for migrant children.

7. HEW enforce the law; States be required to approve only those projects which conform with the Title I Regulations and the Program Criteria.

8. Congress provide full funding under the Act in order to ensure sufficient resources to help poor children.

9. All efforts to make Title I a "bloc grant" be rejected.

10. Further study be undertaken on issues raised in this report including:

a. use of Title I to supplant other Federal funds;

b. equitable distribution of funds to predominantly Mexican-American districts;

c. Title I programs for migratory and Indian children; and

d. relation between Title I and all other food service assistance programs.

11. Local school systems make greater effort to involve the community, including disclosure of information regarding Title I programs and expenditures.

12. Private citizens demand information and greater community participation on local advisory committees; denial of information and illegal use of funds be challenged by community groups and, where appropriate, complaints made to local, State and Federal officials; law suits filed and other appropriate community action be undertaken to ensure compliance with the law.

13. States assure that Title I programs actually meet the educational needs of all poor children and recognize the cultural heritage of racial and ethnic groups.

The goal of Title I is simple. It is to help children of poor families get a better education. Accomplishing that goal, however, is not simple. Existing educational structures at the State and local levels are the institutions responsible for the administration of Title I, but often they are the institutions least able to respond to a new challenge or to respond to the needs of poor minorities. In order to accomplish the goal of Title I, many changes will be needed. But before we can understand the nature of the changes, we need to understand what the law provides and how in fact it is operating in school districts across the country. That is the substance of this report.

Why this review of Title I

Reviews and evaluations of Federal grant-in-aid programs are usually made by "experts." This review was not prepared by educational "experts", but by organizations interested in the rights of the poor. We make this review because we feel that the accepted experts have failed to inform honestly the public about the faulty and sometimes fraudulent way in which Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 is operating in many sections of the country.

In December, 1968, Federal education funds were terminated in Coahoma County, Mississippi, because of the school board's refusal to submit an acceptable desegregation plan under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. As a consequence of the termination of Federal funds, teachers, teacher-aides and janitors, all black, were fired. Their salaries had been paid by Title I, and their employment in the black schools was terminated along with the Title I funds. A group of parents and the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc., brought suit against the Coahoma County School Board charging illegal use of Title I funds as well as the unconstitutional operation of a racially dual school system. The lawsuit represented the first, and thus far the only, serious challenge to the manner in which a school system utilizes its Title I funds.

In the spring of 1969 a small group of private organizations involved in the struggle for equal educational opportunities for poor and minority children agreed that they needed to pool their resources to examine how Title I funds were being used and to what extent the educational needs of these children were being met as Congress intended. We knew that the situation in Coahoma County was not an isolated situa-

tion. Our decision to look at Title I was based not only on the incident in Coahoma County, but also on a number of complaints from individuals and organizations across the country about the operation of Title I in local districts.

We had three basic concerns about Title I. First, poor people knew little or nothing about the provisions of the law and had even less to say about how these Federal funds were being used in their school districts despite the fact that the Title I Regulations require that they be involved in the planning and execution of Title I programs. Secondly, we suspected that much of the Title I investment was not being spent in accordance with the law and Regulations, and that much of the money was being used as general aid and in place of State and local education revenues. Thirdly, we felt that an independent review was needed to determine whether the money was really being spent for the educational needs of educationally deprived children.

Some may think that by inquiring into Title I we risk renewing old battles over Federal aid to education. Some may think that criticism of how Title I money is spent or the program administered could jeopardize the entire legislation. Some may take the position that it is better to have Title I funds, even though they may not always be used exactly as Congress intended, than not have them at all. Still others may feel that any use of these funds helps in the process of educating children, even if the expenditures are in violation of the law.

We disagree. We believe poor and minority children should, indeed must, have the rights and benefits accorded them by law. We have decided to pursue our efforts because ultimately it is educationally deprived children who will be held accountable for the Federal investment. All the tests and evaluations to determine the effectiveness of Title I will be administered to poor children, not to school administrators or to State and Federal officials. Thus it seemed only right that poor people themselves, and private organizations working on their behalf, should make an attempt to find out what is happening to poor children as a result of the expenditure of billions of dollars.

This report is intended as a defense of Title I. Our criticisms are offered in order to make its operation more effective and to ensure that the Congressional intent is implemented. We believe that Federal aid to education is now firmly embedded in our system and should be encouraged and not weakened. However, we feel obliged to report to poor people, to minority people, to the President, to Congress and to the Nation what we have learned about children attending schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Nor does this report cover poor children in institutions for the neglected and delinquent, although they are all identified in the Act as beneficiaries of Title I. This does not mean that we feel that there are no problems connected with their operation. On the contrary, we know that there are problems and hope that these programs will receive early attention. Only because of their low dollar value and because of our limited resources, are they excluded here.

This report focuses on how Title I money has been spent, how Title I is administered and some of the consequences for poor children resulting therefrom. It does not attempt to evaluate the educational value of specific Title I programs nor the impact of various kinds of compensatory education programs, although when we have discovered Title I sponsored programs which we feel have no educational purpose at all we say so.

Chapter I explains briefly how Title I works and specific references to the Title I Regulations, the law, and the Program Cri-

teria will be found in Appendix A. Chapter II deals with the use of Title I as general aid in many school systems. Chapter III examines the illegal use of Title I in the North and South to supplant State and local expenditures and the relation between Title I and other Federal programs. The purchase of massive amounts of equipment and the excessive construction of facilities is the subject of Chapter IV. Chapter V deals with the failure of some Title I funded projects to meet the educational needs of poor children. Chapter VI deals with the exclusion of the poor community from decisions about use of Title I and the refusal of State and local school officials to provide information about Title I. Chapter VII examines how Title I is administered at the State and Federal levels.

Many organizations and individuals have contributed to this report. Although the Washington Research Project and the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc. assumed major responsibility for this report, other organizations contributing to the effort included the American Friends Service Committee, The Urban Coalition, the South Carolina Council on Human Relations, the Illinois Commission on Human Relations, the Delta Ministry of the National Council of Churches and the North Mississippi Rural Legal Services. We appreciate the help we received from the Office of Education and HEW Audit Agency staff. We are especially grateful for the financial support for this report from the Aaron E. Norman Foundation and the Southern Education Foundation. Numerous individuals in communities across the country gave their assistance. Chief among these individuals are the following: Winifred Green, Roger Mills, Michael Trister, Beatrice Young and Electra Price. Ruby Martin of the Washington Research Project and Phyllis McClure of the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc. had the responsibility for the final preparation of this report.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This is not a comprehensive report on Title I. We did not have to probe deeply to uncover violations of the law, Regulations and Program Criteria of Title I, or to learn that many Title I programs are poorly planned and executed. Many of the misuses of Title I funds are so gross that even non-experts can readily spot them. We hope that private organizations and/or public agencies will probe more deeply in attempts to correct the abuses pointed out here and others that we have not touched upon.

One of the major criticisms of some OEO Community Action Programs is that community people do not have the expertise to administer programs, particularly those involving the management of substantial amounts of money. The evidence is clear that there is a great deal of mismanagement connected with Title I, which is supervised by education experts. It might be worthwhile for someone to compare the administration of a Community Action Program and a Title I program in the same community.

In this report we have tried to spell out Title I requirements and match them against what is actually happening in many districts. We found that although Title I is not general aid to education but categorical aid for children from poor families who have educational handicaps, funds appropriated under the Act are being used for general school purposes: to initiate system-wide programs; to buy books and supplies for all school children in the system; to pay general overhead and operating expenses; to meet new teacher contracts which call for higher salaries; to purchase all-purpose school facilities; and to equip superintendents' offices with paneling, wall-to-wall carpeting and color televisions.

Though Title I funds are supplemental to regular money, there are numerous cases

where regular classroom teachers, teacher aides, librarians, and janitors are paid solely from Title I funds. New school construction and equipment, mobile classrooms, and regular classroom construction and equipment are common costs charged to local Title I budgets which should be paid for out of regular school budgets.

Title I funds are not to supplant other Federal program funds. But the extent to which Title I funds have been used to feed educationally deprived children, to purchase library facilities and books, to provide vocational education for disadvantaged students, raises serious questions as to whether Title I funds are being used to supplant National School Lunch, Child Nutrition Act, Title II ESEA and Vocational Education Act funds.

Title I funds are not for the benefit of non-poverty children, yet teaching personnel, equipment, supplies, and materials purchased with these monies are found in some of the most affluent schools where not a single educationally disadvantaged child is enrolled.

And Title I funds are not to equalize racially segregated schools. Yet many Southern school systems which have steadfastly refused to comply with the Constitutional mandate to desegregate use Title I funds to make black schools equal to their white counterparts. These funds are sometimes used actually to frustrate desegregation by providing black children benefits such as free food, medical care, shoes and clothes that are available to them only so long as they remain in an all-black school.

Community involvement in developing plans to utilize Title I funds to raise the level of educationally deprived children is non-existent in many school systems, although the Federal policies require community participation. Lack of community involvement is undoubtedly one of the reasons why so much misuse of these funds goes practically unnoticed by the public.

We believe that Title I can work if properly funded and administered. By pointing out some of the misuses of Title I funds, we hope this report will provoke private organizations, community people, and Federal, State and local officials to commit themselves to fulfilling a long-needed promise to our Nation's poor children.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I could not be in the Senate on the day when the Senate held its memorial session for the late Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen. Today, I would like to pay my respect, inadequate as it is, to our late colleague, leader, and friend.

It seems to me that Everett Dirksen symbolized, more distinctly than any modern political leader, the story of America. The son of immigrant parents, he made the hard and continuing struggle to help his family, for an education, and for a start in business life. Once finding the field—that of politics and participation in government which he loved—again he made his way, step by step, from local government to the House and Senate, to leadership of his party, and leadership in the country.

Everett Dirksen was ever conscious and appreciative of the truth that the United States had provided to him opportunity for growth and for a valuable life. He was proud that he had been able to contribute his endeavors and his abilities to our country, which, more than any country in the world, provides opportunity to those who seek it. This pride and ap-

preciation was stated by him in many ways and often on the Senate floor. He felt and believed in patriotism. Often he referred to his military service in Europe in World War I with pride, a service in which personal desires and plans had been submerged in a cause greater than himself.

Everett Dirksen was a man who held no grudges or enmities against those who opposed him. There was a gentleness in his nature—a gentleness which gave a completeness to a life and spirit which could fight hard for the causes in which he believed.

The people of Kentucky held Everett Dirksen in great affection. He came to Kentucky often, talked to the people, mingled with them and they felt that he was one of them.

Our thoughts turn to his great wife and to his daughter, to whom he was devoted, and to his grandchildren to whom he often referred in speeches, voicing his hopes for the future of our country. His life was the story of America.

STRATEGIC ARMS LIMITATIONS TALKS—NEED FOR A POSITIVE APPROACH

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, next Monday in Helsinki, representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union will begin the long-awaited series of talks on the crucial issue of the limitations on nuclear weapons. These strategic arms limitations talks—or SALT—are of vital significance to all nations and peoples of the world, and I believe that it is essential for the United States to adopt a progressive and forward-looking approach to the talks, an approach calculated to maximize their likelihood of success.

I was, therefore, troubled to read today that the administration apparently intends to enter these talks with no specific proposals, but will adopt a "wait-and-see" attitude designed to test the sincerity of Soviet intentions.

I believe that the approach we are adopting may be too cautious. The United States, as the leader of the free nations of the world and the greatest military power in history, has a special obligation to try to make the talks succeed. If we are sincere in our desire to avoid the risks of nuclear war, we must be willing to take some risks for peace.

Further, we must recognize that in the final analysis, no sane political leader in any nation of the world can afford to take the step of using nuclear weapons. The United States can enter into agreements with the Soviet Union to limit such weapons, without the danger of substantially altering the present balance of power. Surely, whatever agreement is reached could produce only a slight alteration in the current balance, so that any fears that the imminent negotiations may distort the balance are unrealistic.

Mr. President, last Sunday, the Washington Post carried two extremely perceptive articles on the negotiations. In the first article, Morton H. Halperin discusses a number of the most crucial issues involved in the upcoming talks in Helsinki. The second article, by Chalmers

M. Roberts, deals extensively with the diplomatic history of the issue over the past two decades. I believe that these articles will be of interest to all of us in the Senate who are concerned with the success of the talks, and who are hopeful that the administration will make every reasonable effort to insure their success. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed in the RECORD.

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

SPARRING WILL NOT DO AT HELSINKI

(By Morton H. Halperin)

(NOTE.—A senior fellow of the Brookings Institution, Halperin has served as a member of the senior staff of the National Security Council and as Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense with responsibility for arms control. The views expressed in this article are his own.)

The opening of the strategic arms limitation talks (SALT) in Helsinki, Finland, next week will culminate a 2½-year effort to get the United States and the Soviet Union to sit down together and talk about limiting their strategic nuclear forces.

For many, the desirability of such talks is obvious. The United States and the Soviet Union possess a nuclear capability that could destroy large parts of the world, and thus both have an interest in a treaty that would lower the risks of nuclear war—and reduce costs—by limiting and then reducing these forces.

But for others, SALT looms as a threat. Some would argue that the talks run a great risk of deluding Americans and their allies into believing that there is a detente, resulting in dangerous reductions in Allied defense efforts. Others feel that they will lead to unilateral slowdowns in our own strategic programs while the Soviets go ahead in ways that would adversely affect our security.

Perhaps the most persuasive argument against SALT is that an agreement is unnecessary. Paradoxically, even many of those eager for the talks agree with the skeptics that the Soviet and American strategic relationship is stable and is likely to remain stable for the foreseeable future.

By that they mean that neither the United States nor the Soviet Union is likely to attain the ability to disarm the other in a first strike. Assuming both sides make moderately sensible unilateral decisions, technological change will rob neither of its deterrent against a first strike. Hence the probability of nuclear war is exceedingly low and, it is argued, would not be further reduced by agreements.

Granting that calculations show the strategic balance to be stable and likely to remain so even without arms limitations, a strong case can be made for the President's giving high priority to constructive efforts at securing an arms limitation treaty.

A glance back at the strategic arms competition over the past 15 years reveals that on many occasions, leaders of both governments have been concerned about the future stability of the balance. This uncertainty has had several adverse consequences.

As Robert S. McNamara pointed out when he was Secretary of Defense, "If we had more accurate information about planned Soviet strategic forces, we simply would not have needed to build as large a nuclear arsenal as we have today."

COUNTERING A MYTH

To take the most dramatic example, the United States is proceeding with the program to deploy multiple independently targeted reentry vehicles (MIRVs) because several years ago it feared that the Soviet Tallinn system was an antiballistic missile (ABM) system and that the Moscow ABM

system would appear around other cities. Although administration officials have stated publicly that Tallinn is an *air*—not a missile—defense system, the United States is proceeding with its program to put MIRVs on Minuteman and Poseidon missiles on the ground that the Soviets could deploy a new ABM system.

Thus uncertainty has caused both sides to spend unnecessarily and, in turn, to stimulate the other side to respond.

More important than whether the balance looks stable to strategic analysts is the question of whether political leaders might be tempted to resort to use of nuclear force in a crisis. In part, the arms competition itself might generate pressure toward feeling that costly strategic forces must have some use in a crisis situation. Talks themselves, and a treaty more specifically, could help reinforce the feeling that strategic nuclear weapons are not useful even in crisis situations.

What we wish to avoid is a situation in which clever briefers could convince their political leaders in a crisis that a first strike might enable the attacking country to come off with little or no damage while destroying the other.

At present, it is inconceivable that such a briefing could be credibly written. But this was not true in the past, when both sides had highly vulnerable bomber forces, and might not be true in the future, particularly if both sides build large ABM systems.

If both sides have large offensive forces and substantial defensive capability to shoot down incoming missiles, either one could, in the panic of an intense crisis, come to believe that a first strike would destroy enough of the opponent's force so that the surviving missiles could not penetrate the attacking nation's defense.

Thus the supposedly stable balance could become unstable in a crisis, when decision-makers view all other options as exceedingly unattractive, if they could come to believe that there was a serious chance of avoiding substantial damage.

From this perspective, the desirability of avoiding large ABM systems—and the difficulty of limiting such systems unilaterally once deployments exist on both sides—provide the single most important incentive for seeking arms limitation at this time.

DANGERS OF SKEPTICISM

There are other factors that make arms control both possible and desirable during the current strategic relationship:

The United States is moving toward the deployment of MIRVs and the Soviet Union may be doing the same.

At least in terms of fixed land-based forces, the two sides are approximately equal.

Both are now using euphemisms that imply an acceptance of a rough degree of parity.

The ability of each side to verify existing strategic systems unilaterally suggests that the traditional stumbling block—on-site inspections—can be avoided, at least for some agreements.

While it would be undesirable for either country to go into the talks with an exaggerated expectation of quick success, it would be equally undesirable for skepticism to prevent the necessary efforts to have a constructive dialogue.

The question that is being frequently and publicly asked in both countries is whether the other is "serious." Secretary of State William P. Rogers, at his press conference following the announcement that the talks would begin, went to some lengths to emphasize that the United States was serious and, in answer to a question, stated his belief that the Soviets were also serious. We should ask, however, not whether the Soviets are serious but rather what approach stands the greatest chance of enabling those in the

Soviet government who want an agreement to win one.

PROBES OR PROPOSALS?

The problems that might be created by testing for seriousness can be seen by considering a hypothetical illustration of how such a discussion might proceed.

We might begin by explaining to the Soviets our current plans for MIRVs and ABMs and asking them to respond by explaining to us what the Tallinn system is and what their plans are for putting MIRVs on the SS-9 missile. Nothing that we disclosed about our plans could not be found by a careful reading of the press but we would be asking the Soviets to discuss subjects that they have never talked about publicly—and which the Soviet military might not even be prepared to discuss with the Foreign Office.

Such questions, while they look serious and responsible from our side, would only serve to strengthen the arguments of those in the Soviet Union who have been arguing that SALT has from the start been a fishing expedition designed by the United States to gain intelligence information about Soviet programs and to stall Soviet strategic programs until the United States is free from the burdens of Vietnam and could again step up its own strategic spending.

If this exchange were to take place, Soviet skeptics might also be reinforced in their view that we are not serious; their criterion may be whether the United States puts forward a serious proposal for limiting strategic arms. In Soviet eyes, the United States asked for the talks and, by doing so, led the Soviets to expect the United States to present a serious arms control proposal.

Thus, probing for seriousness, might lead both sides, within a very few months, to conclude that the other was not serious. The talks could then settle down into a propaganda exercise.

A CONCRETE PLAN

By offering a proposal consistent with U.S. and Soviet security interests, we would enable those in the Soviet leadership who want an agreement to argue that the United States is serious and not on a fishing expedition. U.S. interests suggest that we should do so.

A treaty or other means that will allow restraints is in our interest as well as the common interest of the two countries. Moreover, the United States has a substantial margin of safety in its strategic forces, and therefore can afford to be somewhat more forthcoming than can the weak and divided Soviet leadership.

Expecting that the Soviets first demonstrate their seriousness, or at least that they "meet us halfway" in getting the talks off to a constructive start, would not represent the approach most likely to lead to successful talks and therefore would not respond to the strong American interest in success.

Soon after the start of SALT, the United States should present a specific, concrete proposal for a treaty. It should be relatively simple. It should be one that could command wide support on the American political scene and leave both the United States and the Soviet Union with a deterrent capability in which they could have confidence.

One such proposal would call for a halt in the deployment of land- and sea-based offensive missiles and for an agreed limitation of ABMs on both sides—as close to zero as possible. Such an agreement could be verified by unilateral means, although additional observation would enhance our confidence. We should not make onsite inspection an obstacle to agreement.

Putting such a proposal on the table would cut through the suspicions about whether the talks were serious. It would enable us to raise more general strategic issues with the Soviets in an environment that would make

a Soviet response much more likely. It also would provide the Soviets with a framework in which they could indicate what forms of arms limitation interested them, and it would enhance prospects that the talks would contribute to tacit agreements on restraints.

NO BAN ON MIRV

This proposal does not include a ban on MIRVs. While a strong case can be made for seeking to limit MIRVs, the benefits of arms control in reducing the risk of war or the cost of the arms race does not depend on banning them. And an attempt to do so now would substantially complicate the negotiations.

Many Americans believe that the United States should deploy MIRVs as a hedge against Soviet cheating on ABMs and that we could not detect Soviet testing which would enable them to deploy MIRVs in violation of an agreement. Soviet leaders may believe that the United States could deploy MIRVs without further testing, and hence they may be reluctant to accept a MIRV ban. Thus an attempt to include MIRVs could generate very great controversy and lead to continued questioning of any agreement.

Banning MIRVs is not as critical as some have argued. It is true that if MIRVs were permitted, neither side could be sure exactly how many warheads the other actually had, but this would not be critical. Whether the number per missile was closer to three than ten, for example, would be known by observing tests and by the size of the missiles.

Freezing the number of Soviet SS-9 launchers would prevent a short-run Soviet threat to U.S. missiles even without a MIRV ban. Over the long run, great increases in the accuracy and reliability of strategic forces will increase the vulnerability of fixed land-based missiles even if MIRVs are banned.

Thus we should see any arms control agreement as a first step toward the total elimination of fixed land-based forces. If we are not depending on such missiles, MIRVs on sea-based forces are not in any sense destabilizing and give both sides confidence that any cheating by the other on an ABM limitation cannot upset the strategic balance, since a MIRV force could penetrate even a very large ABM.

While there is a strong case for the United States not pressing for the inclusion of MIRVs in a formal international treaty, there is also a case to be made for not going ahead now with the deployment of our MIRVs on the Minuteman or Poseidon.

We decided to deploy MIRVs because of the belief that the Soviets were constructing a large ABM system. We now know that the Soviets are not deploying such a system. We could begin deploying our MIRVs as soon as we began to see signs of a large Soviet ABM deployment and still have the MIRVs in place before the Soviet ABM deployment was completed. Thus, simply on cost grounds alone, we need not now go forward with MIRVs.

A QUID PRO QUO

For this reason, and to improve the climate for talks and keep open the option of banning MIRVs if we can get an effective ban, the United States could begin the talks by announcing a moratorium on MIRV testing and should postpone their deployment.

At the talks, we could tell the Soviets that we will not proceed with MIRVs unless they begin to deploy a large ABM system. Because of the connection between these two systems, we may also wish to tell the Soviets that we will not go forward with our ABM deployment, if they cease testing their SS-9 multiple warheads.

Even if we proceed in this manner, the negotiations will be long and difficult, and one should certainly not expect a treaty in a short time. But the introduction of a serious U.S. proposal would pave the way for a constructive dialogue between the two

countries, enabling both to manage strategic forces better. And it could lead to a strategic arms control agreement that would reduce the risk of war and improve the climate in which other issues could be discussed.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 9, 1969]

Ike's "OPEN SKIES" Was SPYING TO KREMLIN

However, the Baruch Plan provided that the U.N. Security Council could impose sanctions on a violator by majority vote. This meant denying the Russians the use of their veto in an organization then clearly dominated by the United States and its close friends.

In retrospect, it is apparent that to the Russians, the Bomb had upset the balance of power achieved by the end of World War II between the Red Army and the forces of the Western Allies. Hence, to Stalin, the Baruch Plan was an American attempt to impose on the world a nuclear Pax Americana, a device to relegate the Soviet Union forever to second-class status.

UNILATERAL DISARMAMENT

But in 1946, the world was weary of war and frightened at the monstrous blows only a few months earlier at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Thus Stalin's response was not outright rejection but counterproposal and obfuscation, moves designed to play for time. American action produced Soviet reaction.

Therefore Baruch's Soviet counterpart, Andrei Gromyko, today the foreign minister, countered with a Russian plan which would have annulled the American atomic monopoly. Gromyko called for a pledge by all nations not to use atomic weapons, a prohibition on producing and storing such weapons and an agreement to destroy existing stocks within three months. Two months later, Gromyko added that the inspection proposed by Baruch to assure compliance with the American plan was not reconcilable with the principle of national sovereignty.

Publicly, Stalin deprecated the bomb. In 1946, he said that "atomic bombs are intended to frighten people with weak nerves, but they cannot decide the outcome of a war since for this, atomic bombs are completely insufficient." But the next year, in private, he told Yugoslavia's Milovan Djilas that the bomb "is a powerful thing, power-ful!"

What was really in the Soviet mind was more candidly stated in 1945 by Foreign Minister V. M. Molotov who declared that it is not possible . . . for a technical secret of any great size to remain the exclusive possession of one country . . . We will have atomic energy and many other things, too."

The Soviet effort culminated Aug. 23, 1949, in Russia's first nuclear explosion. It would be a long time, however, before Moscow felt that it had enough nuclear weapons to deter Washington and thus make possible a balance of power in which arms control might be possible.

A TOUCHY PERIOD

By the time of the initial Soviet test, the Cold War was on in earnest. The United States had begun the Marshall Plan. President Truman had proclaimed the doctrine that "it must be the policy of the United States to support free people who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outright pressures . . ." The Truman administration had adopted George Kennan's policy for the "containment" of the Soviet Union. And five days before that first Soviet test, the North Atlantic Treaty (NATO) came into force.

The Korean war soon followed. The United States feared a Soviet attack in Western Europe, though there is no evidence that the Kremlin ever intended one. But Korea brought West Germany's rearmament and its membership in NATO.

There simply was no conjunction of Soviet-American interests to make possible any arms control measures. As Secretary of

State James F. Byrnes put it in 1947, the United States sought "collective security" whereas the Soviet Union's preference was "for the simpler task of dividing the world into two spheres of influence."

Thus the Baruch Plan was doomed from the first, although it was to remain the centerpiece of American nuclear disarmament policy for nine years. The disarmament meetings, once Gromyko had given Stalin's answer, degenerated into Cold War polemics. And both sides worked to develop their nuclear arsenals.

II. The era of reassessment

(President Eisenhower, Oct. 19, 1954: "Since the advent of nuclear weapons, it seems clear that there is no longer any alternative to peace if there is to be a happy and well world.")

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower entered the White House Jan. 20, 1953, and Joseph Stalin died March 6. These two events produced new looks in both capitals which, however, were not reflected at the conference table for another two years and not fully reflected until 1957.

When the two nations finally were prepared to negotiate, it was against a different backdrop, for the world meanwhile had moved from the atomic age to the themonuclear age. The first experimental American hydrogen bomb device had been exploded Nov. 1, 1952, three days before Gen. Eisenhower's election. The first Soviet H-Bomb test came nine months later.

In the Soviet Union, the post-Stalin debate on nuclear problems appears to have begun early in 1954. It was intertwined with the struggle for power in the Kremlin.

On March 12, 1954, Premier Georgi Malenkov declared that a third world war "with the existence of the modern means of destruction would mean the destruction of world civilization." But on Feb. 8, 1955, Malenkov "resigned" and Foreign Minister Molotov repudiated the Malenkov doctrine by saying that "what will perish" in a new war "will not be world civilization, however much it may suffer from new aggression," but the "rotten social system" of the capitalist nations.

This critical difference in doctrinal views, and thus in the Kremlin's approach to disarmament, does not appear to have been resolved until Nikita Khrushchev's ascendancy and his 1956 pronouncement at the 20th Communist Party Congress that "there is no fatal inevitability of war." Concurrently with this change in doctrine was the increasing stress in Moscow on "peaceful coexistence" between the two rival power groups.

The first reflection of the new thinking in the Kremlin came May 10, 1955, when the Russians unexpectedly tabled at a U.N. disarmament subcommittee meeting what the West took to be the first serious Soviet effort to deal with both nuclear and conventional weapons. It declared that "science and engineering" had produced "the most destructive means of annihilating people," a phrase which appeared to compromise the Malenkov-Molotov gap.

A POSITIVE APPROACH

The proposal had three key features. First, it divided the disarmament process into stages in place of the previous insistence that everything occur at once. Second, it proposed an end to nuclear tests with a vague international supervision. Third, it accepted for the first time the idea of having foreign control personnel stationed at "large ports, at railways and in aerodromes" in the Soviet Union (as well as in other countries) to check the arms control measures.

The United States, however, was caught unprepared. Gen. Eisenhower, seeking a positive approach, had rejected proposals to make public the grim facts about the effects of a nuclear war and instead made his "atoms

for peace" speech Dec. 8, 1953. In it he offered the thesis that to develop the peaceful atom would be a step toward diminishing "the potential destructiveness of the world's atomic stockpiles."

But this was no substitute for a full-scale arms control plan. Not until March 19, 1955, did he create the post of Special Assistant to the President for Disarmament and name Harold Stassen to fill it. In August, after the Soviet proposal, he gave Stassen negotiating as well as planning power. Action had produced reaction.

Gen. Eisenhower had dramatically demonstrated to the world that July his intention to give serious attention to disarmament. Sitting at the huge square table in the Palais de Nations in Geneva, the soldier-President laid his glasses before him, disdaining the prepared manuscript, and spoke directly to Soviet Premier Nikolai Bulganin, Communist Party First Secretary Khrushchev and Defense Minister Georgi Zhukov.

"I propose," he said, "that we take a practical step, that we begin an arrangement, very quickly, as between ourselves—immediately."

His "open skies" proposal called for a swap of military blueprints and, most importantly, of overflights by the planes of one nation across the territory of the other. But before the day was over, Khrushchev had told him that the idea was nothing more than a bold espionage plot against the Soviet Union.

"Open skies" remained an official American offer long after any chance of its acceptance had disappeared. Slowly, however, Stassen evolved, out of conflicting views within the Eisenhower administration, a response to the Russians' May 10, 1955, proposal which conceivably could produce agreement.

Thus at a London meeting of the U.N. disarmament subcommittee in 1957, both sides put forward new proposals. Serious negotiations got under way based on the thesis that some form of parity or risks must be found.

THE DULLES DOCTRINE

Stassen fought within the Eisenhower administration for acceptance of the thesis that an H-bomb-armed Soviet Union, even though it lacked the vast arms stockpile and the extensive delivery system of the United States, was a formidable potential foe and therefore should be granted equality in arms control discussions.

But at this point in history, 1957, the uncertainties in Washington about the nature and extent of Soviet nuclear power were many, and those who refused to accept Stassen's parity thesis were powerful, chief among them Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. As he had fought against the 1955 Geneva Summit Conference because it meant political parity for the Soviets with the United States, so he fought against Stassen's thesis on the grounds that the United States was incomparably the more powerful in nuclear weaponry.

In early 1954, Dulles had enunciated the doctrine that the United States would rely "primarily on the capacity to retaliate, instantly, by means and at places of its own choosing," whenever there was an attack. This became known as the "instant massive retaliation doctrine" and it dominated American thinking for most of the Eisenhower era. It was based, in part, on the budget limitations of the time, which led to what became known as "more bang for the buck"—a limitation on men in uniform and conventional weapons with the emphasis on America's growing nuclear arsenal.

Dulles also never lost sight of his political aims in considering any Stassen arms control plan. A major Dulles concern was the cohesion of the Atlantic alliance, and that meant close ties with West Germany and his friend Chancellor Konrad Adenauer.

Alarmed at the Stassen proposals, Ade-

nauer came to Washington to insist that disarmament should come after, not before, the reunification of Germany. Adenauer's rejection of any German role in a European aerial inspection zone or in a reduction of conventional weapons confined the London conference, in essence, to a possible agreement on suspension of nuclear tests.

The London conference, whatever its prospects may ever have been, was effectively killed in the summer of 1957 with a demonstration that the balance of power was shifting; that the Soviet deficiency was coming to an end with the introduction of a new weapons system.

On Aug. 26, 1957, the Soviet Union announced the first test of an ICBM. Six weeks later, on Oct. 4, came Sputnik. These events shook American confidence in its military and scientific superiority and opened for the Soviets an opportunity, eagerly seized by Khrushchev, to engage in rocket-rattling diplomacy which at times amounted to nuclear blackmail.

President Eisenhower, in what he later was to describe as "the current wave of near-hysteria" over Sputnik and the ICBM, created the Gaither Committee. Its findings pictured a rapidly arming Soviet Union with a capability by late 1959 of launching 100 ICBMs against the United States.

Later intelligence was to show that the Russians did not have a substantial ICBM capability until 1962. But the psychological damage had been done, and Khrushchev exploited it to the fullest. In the United States, such projections of Soviet strength formed the basis of the "missile gap" charge that John F. Kennedy used in the 1960 presidential campaign against then Vice President Richard M. Nixon.

THE TEST BAN

In London in 1957, the Soviets had showed a willingness to consider a nuclear test ban separate from other arms control measures. The United States long had argued that such a ban must be part of a much larger disarmament "package."

Stassen at one point did get Gen. Eisenhower's approval to untie the package. But by the time the London conference collapsed, the President had, at Dulles' urging, drawn the knot even tighter, arguing that if a test ban were "to alleviate rather than merely to conceal the threat of nuclear war," it "should be undertaken as a part of a meaningful program to reduce that threat."

But this was an untenable position. By 1958, with major American and Soviet tests further polluting the world's atmosphere, immense public pressure had built up in the United States and elsewhere outside the Communist bloc for a separate test ban agreement.

Dulles, fearing that he could not withstand such pressure, seized upon an Eisenhower proposal for convening a conference of technical experts on the practical problems of supervision and control of a test ban. The Soviet Union agreed to the meeting and an eight-nation "Conference on the Discontinuance of Nuclear Weapons Tests" was called. A 10-nation "Conference of Experts for the Study of Possible Means Which Might Be Helpful in Preventing Surprise Attack" also was agreed to by Moscow and Washington.

The former produced a Soviet-American agreement, backed by the six other participants, for a worldwide network of land- and ship-based control posts, including a degree of on-site inspection on the territory of the two superpowers. The latter conference ended in an impasse over how to separate the political from the technical issues; nonetheless, it served to force both sides to think through a mass of arms control problems.

These technical gatherings were followed by further negotiations in Geneva by the United States, the Soviet Union and Britain,

then the world's three nuclear powers. To give the conference a boost in advance, both Khrushchev and Gen. Eisenhower suspended their respective tests Nov. 1, 1958.

In the course of these talks, Gen. Eisenhower proposed that he and Khrushchev agree to ban only atmospheric tests which could be monitored by national detection systems, thus avoiding the thorny on-site inspection issue. This was to be the formula finally agreed on in the Kennedy administration, but the time was not yet ripe.

Khrushchev rejected Gen. Eisenhower's partial ban proposal, pressing for a total ban to include underground tests. There ensued a long, fruitless argument over the number of on-site inspections. The United States slowly whittled down the number it sought per year to 20 and eventually to 12 with a hint of less; the Soviets finally offered three.

In Washington the military largely opposed a total test ban on the grounds of necessary weapons development. Other American opponents contended that the scientists would leave their laboratories if barred from experimentation whereas Soviet scientists could be forced to continue work, thus getting a jump on the United States.

The test ban became a major domestic political issue, especially in the Senate. There Sen. Hubert H. Humphrey, who headed a disarmament subcommittee, was the leading advocate, with major help from Sen. Clinton P. Anderson, who headed the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. And American scientists divided vehemently on the test ban issue.

British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan flew to both Moscow and Washington attempting to arrange a compromise on the on-site inspection issue. Meanwhile, France, on Feb. 13, 1959, joined the nuclear club by conducting a test over Algeria.

The shattering blow which halted the test ban talks and all other disarmament discussions was the Russians' downing Gary Powers' U-2 spy plane May 1, 1960. In the wake of this sensational development, Khrushchev faced serious internal Kremlin opposition and aborted the about-to-begin Paris Summit Conference at which the test ban was to have been a major topic, saying he would have nothing more to do with President Eisenhower, who had refused to apologize.

Arms control and all other East-West issues were shelved. The world had to await the election of a new American President.

Before the U-2 affair occurred, however, there had been one advance in the arms control field. This was the Antarctic Treaty, signed in Washington Dec. 1, 1959, by the United States, the Soviet Union, Britain, France, Japan, South Africa, New Zealand, Australia, Argentina, Chile, Belgium and Norway. It provided for maintaining that region as a nuclear-free zone and for inspection without a veto. Subsequently such inspections were made by American officials—but not by the Soviet Union.

III. The era of limited agreements

(Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, Sept. 18, 1967: "What is essential to understand here is that the Soviet Union and the United States mutually influence one another's strategic plans.")

During his campaign for the Presidency, John F. Kennedy had promised to assemble a new disarmament group. By September, 1961, Congress at his urging had created the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA), the very name a compromise between those who hoped for the utopia of total disarmament and those who felt it more realistic to attempt to control the arms race.

Now, for the first time since Stassen's failure in 1958, the United States gathered together a full staff of experts under the direction, first of John J. McCloy and later, of William C. Foster. Adrian S. Fisher was the chief deputy to both.

The new President had discovered meanwhile that what he had said about a "missile gap" had been false. The "gap" was really the other way around, though at this point neither superpower had a substantial stock of missiles.

The crucial instrument in this determination was the observation satellite. In 1960, after Power's U-2 was downed, Gen. Eisenhower had promised that there would be no more such overflights, a promise that Mr. Kennedy repeated. What Gen. Eisenhower then knew and Mr. Kennedy soon found out was that there was a development and beginning use a far more sophisticated form of reconnaissance.

It was the "spy in the sky," which was to become the keystone of American intelligence up to the present day. Again, action had produced reaction and the results were to affect the arms talks.

Between Mr. Kennedy's election and inauguration, two men who were to become key members of his administration, Jerome B. Wiesner and Walt W. Rostow, met in Moscow with Soviet officials. They came away with the feeling that the Soviets might be ready for action on arms control. Their report led Mr. Kennedy to announce at his first press conference that he had ordered preparation of a new test ban proposal as well as a general disarmament scheme.

A BERLIN REACTION

President Kennedy's June 1961 meeting with Khrushchev in Vienna raised alarms about a new Soviet-American confrontation over Berlin, bolstering the view of the fearful that more missiles were essential.

The two men talked fruitlessly about a test ban treaty. Now Khrushchev declared that more than three on-site inspections would be espionage. Then on Aug. 30, Moscow announced that it was resuming tests in the atmosphere after the long mutual pause since November 1958.

Khrushchev was to contend in 1962 that the Soviet Union had been negotiating a test ban in good faith until Mr. Kennedy "announced a mobilization of the armed forces and started threatening us with war." He was referring to the measures taken to increase readiness to defend Berlin in the wake of Khrushchev's threats at Vienna.

But the feeling in the United States was that America had been tricked; that the Soviets had been feverishly preparing for a new round of tests even while talking test ban. Mr. Kennedy's response was to announce a renewal of American testing after Sept. 5, but only of underground tests. Not until the following April 15 did he order renewed atmosphere tests.

Khrushchev had hinted to McCloy at a July 27, 1961, meeting in Sochi that he was being pressured to resume tests by his scientists and military leaders. He also dropped a hint of an incredible 100-megaton bomb, and when the tests did resume, the Soviet explosions reached the 55-60 megaton range, far beyond anything essayed before or since by the United States.

Far more serious, however, was Khrushchev's attempt to redress the nuclear balance by secretly emplacing missiles in Cuba in the spring of 1962. By now, the "missile gap" was the other way around. One semi-official estimate in 1962 was that the Soviet Union had only 75 ICBMs compared to 276 American ICBMs plus 144 missiles aboard nine Polaris submarines. Emplacement of some 40 medium- and intercontinental-range Soviet missiles in Cuba would have seriously altered that ratio, especially since warning time for missiles fired from Cuba would have been nil.

Only after that effort collapsed, with the world on the brink of nuclear disaster meanwhile, did the Soviet leaders indicate a readiness to do business on a test ban treaty. But even then, the resumption of talks failed to break the old impasse over on-site inspection.

However, the President's American University speech of June 10, extending a post-Cuba friendly hand to the Russians, provided an opening for Khrushchev. His key response came July 2 when he accepted what he had long rejected; a treaty banning tests in the atmosphere and outer space but permitting underground tests, thus avoiding the inspection nettle.

Once this Kremlin policy was settled, it took only a few weeks to negotiate the remaining details so long under discussion by the United States, Britain and the Soviet Union.

The treaty was initiated in Moscow July 25. To win Senate approval, Mr. Kennedy rallied public opinion to overwhelm the doubters, resorting to television and press conferences as well as personal contacts with potential senatorial opponents.

The core of his argument was that while there are "risks inherent in any treaty, the far greater risks to our security are the risks of unrestricted testing."

The Senate ratified the treaty Sept. 24 by a vote of 80 to 19, far more than the necessary two-thirds.

This culmination of a long argument over a test ban, an idea first suggested by Vannevar Bush in 1952 as a means of preventing the initial H-bomb test, demonstrated that there could be exceptions to an axiom advanced by Lawrence D. Weiler, an arms control expert who still works at ACDA. The trouble has not been that the Soviets and Americans do not have the same position; the trouble is that they do not have it at the same time.

In the test ban case, the mutual interests of Moscow and Washington finally coincided. But even here, it is now quite clear that one factor not even mentioned at the bargaining table played an important role in the Soviet decision. That was the growing Sino-Soviet rift.

In 1957, Moscow had promised to help develop China's nuclear potential and even to provide "a sample of an atomic bomb." But in 1959 Khrushchev reneged and in 1960 he withdrew all Soviet experts from China.

Peking claimed that Khrushchev had canceled the agreements as "a gift" to President Eisenhower during Khrushchev's visit to the United States. China was on its own and the breach was irreparable.

AN "EXTRANEUS" WAR

Mr. Kennedy was assassinated less than two months after ratification of the test ban treaty. The new President, Lyndon B. Johnson, continued the American search for new arms control agreements with the Soviet Union. But like Presidents Truman, Eisenhower and Kennedy before him, Mr. Johnson found the range of possibilities limited both by the imbalance of power and by extraneous events. In Mr. Johnson's case, the latter was the war in Vietnam.

After Mr. Johnson's election to a full term in 1964, he sought to continue the Kennedy-Khrushchev post-Cuba detente with the new duumvirate in the Kremlin. Leonid Brezhnev and Alexei Kosygin. As part of this effort, in 1965-66 he pressed for a formal treaty to prohibit the use of outer space for military purposes. Mr. Johnson also worked for a treaty to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons beyond the nuclear club, which now had five members.

The space treaty negotiations were conducted at Geneva and the U.N., producing an agreement Dec. 8, 1966. The Senate consented to the treaty April 25, 1967, by a vote of 88 to 0. This, however, was far easier to achieve than a nuclear nonproliferation treaty (NPT) since the two superpowers alone had the ability to use space for military purposes.

Serious discussion of an NPT had begun as far back as 1956 but the proposal then had a lower priority than the test ban, which itself was a technique for inhibiting the

spread of nuclear weapons. A separate treaty on proliferation had differing appeals for different nations.

To the United States, it was a method of holding the nuclear club to three, then to four and then to five members, thus preventing national control in such inflammable areas as Central Europe, the Middle East and the Indian subcontinent. The Soviet Union's primary interest was, and remains, in keeping nuclear weapons out of West German hands.

Moscow had kept up a running barrage against the proposed multilateral nuclear force (MLF) for sharing operation of a sea-borne missile force among the Western allies, an idea initially advanced by Washington in the final year of the Eisenhower administration, chiefly to appease non-nuclear West Germany, and formalized in the early Kennedy period. Moscow contended that despite U.S. veto control over the nuclear weapons in the proposed MLF, the MLF would give the West Germans "a finger on the trigger."

Some of the nations which were being asked to sign a pledge of nuclear abstention in an NPT were adamantly opposed to such self-denial without some compensating security guarantee. Mr. Johnson attempted to find some formula to satisfy these desires by India and other nations; the firmest guarantee he came up with was a public statement after the first Chinese test in 1964, a pledge subsequently repeated many times:

"The nations that do not seek nuclear weapons can be sure that if they need our strong support against some threat of nuclear blackmail, they will have it."

A LOOPHOLE DISCERNED

The NPT became the central issue at the Geneva meetings of the Eighteen Nations Disarmament Conference. Created by the U.N. in March 1962, ENDC resumed in 1965 after a lengthy break. In August the United States tabled a draft nonproliferation treaty and the Soviets offered their version in September.

While the two drafts had a number of similar clauses, the negotiations soon became snagged over Soviet insistence that the "loophole" the Russians saw in the American draft for the MLF scheme be closed. The American argument was that the MLF did not constitute proliferation because the American veto meant that Germany could not possibly fire a nuclear weapon on its own decision.

The Chinese reaction in June 1966, to signs that the Soviet Union and the United States were serious about the proposed treaty was an intensification of charges that the two superpowers were in "collusion." By October 1966, when the Red Guard movement in Peking had reached a new high in anti-Soviet vitriol, the Kremlin leaders apparently decided to modify their position in order to obtain the treaty.

On Oct. 15, Brezhnev welcomed "certain headway which was lately taken place," adding that "such a treaty would serve as a definite obstacle on the road of the further growth of the danger of a nuclear war and would create a most favorable atmosphere for progress in disarmament talks."

Once again there was a conjunction of self-interest in Washington and Moscow on a step to control the arms race despite basically irreconcilable national objectives. By then, too, the MLF scheme was in fact, if not formally, dead by Mr. Johnson's decision.

INSPECTION INTRUDES AGAIN

By mid-1967, the Soviet and American drafts of a treaty were brought into line except for one key article on a traditionally troublesome subject: inspection. Both superpowers originally had favored use of the U.N. International Atomic Energy Agency as the inspector of peaceful atomic plants to be

sure their output was not being diverted to military use.

Several of the six European nations which comprised the European Atomic Energy Agency (Euratom), chief among them West Germany, opposed IAEA inspection on various grounds of security and competitiveness, insisting that Euratom inspectors were sufficient. Efforts at compromise within the Western alliance, to permit a period of Euratom control before an IAEA takeover, then encountered Soviet opposition.

At the Johnson-Kosygin summit conference at Glassboro, N.J., in June 1967, the two leaders agreed anew on the need for a non-proliferation treaty. But by then not only the inspection issue in Western Europe but serious reservations in India, Japan, Brazil, Israel and other nations threatened to prevent signature by key nuclear-potential nations even if the two superpowers could agree.

Furthermore, the 1967 Six-Day War between Israel and her Arab neighbors raised the specter of a later round in which Israeli nuclear weapons might be employed. There have been recurring reports, repeatedly denied, that Israel has been making its own nuclear bombs and there is the consequent fear that the Soviet Union might supply Egypt with such weapons.

China's first hydrogen bomb test, on June 17, 1967, intensified the doubts in India and Japan about the value of a nonproliferation treaty, since no absolute American, Soviet or Soviet-American guarantee against China seemed likely.

RUSSIA GIVES GROUND

Yet in the face of such developments, the Soviet-American conjunction of interests produced, on Jan. 18, 1968, a complete agreement on an NPT test. The Russians yielded on the IAEA-Euratom dispute in an apparent effort to force West German adherence, and a 25-year time limit on the treaty was accepted, rather than having it run indefinitely, to mollify several nations.

Later in the year, Moscow and Washington attempted to meet the demand of India and others for protection against nuclear blackmail by proposing that the U.N. Security Council agree to call on its members for action in case of a threat or an actual attack. Yet this amounted to no new binding commitment by either of the superpowers since they retain a veto in the Security Council against any action they might disapprove.

Thus the non-nuclear nations continued to shy away from the treaty with one excuse or another. Nationalism and national interest remained strong and many nations simply did not want to sign away the option of eventually joining the nuclear club themselves.

Soviet-American agreement on a draft treaty was reached Jan. 18, 1968. It has been signed by three nuclear powers—the United States, the Soviet Union and Britain—but not by the two others—China and France.

IV. The current era

Richard M. Nixon, Inaugural Address, Jan. 20, 1969: "After a period of confrontation, we are entering an era of negotiation. Let all nations know that during this administration our lines of communication will be open . . . I know that peace does not come through wishing for it—that there is no substitute for days and even years of patient and prolonged diplomacy."

On the balmy evening of Aug. 19, 1968, Secretary of State Dean Rusk was host to a group of ambassadors on a cruise down the Potomac aboard the Honey Fitz. In a quiet corner of the ship, Soviet Ambassador Anatoly F. Dobrynin told Rusk what he had been waiting to hear.

The Kremlin had just agreed, said Dobrynin, to the summit meeting that President Johnson had been seeking with Premier Kosygin. It was expected that they would meet

in Leningrad Sept. 30 and Mr. Johnson's idea was to give a spectacular start to what was to become known as the strategic arms limitation talks (SALT).

But the day after Dobrynin talked to Rusk, the Red army invaded Czechoslovakia. In such a climate, the meetings were impossible. And Republican presidential candidate Richard M. Nixon began calling for delay in ratification of the nuclear nonproliferation treaty as a sign of displeasure with the Soviet Union.

The delay in the SALT talks caused by the invasion may turn out to be a far greater tragedy for the world than even the Soviet suppression of the Czechoslovaks' liberal movement. For at that moment, it appeared that there was a conjunction of both interests and technologies that could have led to an important curb on the nuclear arms race.

It is now apparent that one of the first acts of the men who ousted Khrushchev in 1964 was to begin a massive buildup of their weaponry to close the Soviet "missile gap." It was some years, however, before Washington realized the sweeping importance of that decision.

In 1966, President Johnson had explored with Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara and Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the alternatives to no agreement with the Russians in the arms race. The result was a Johnson decision to make an approach to Moscow on talks about limiting ABM systems, which could preclude the necessity for building an American system.

At this point, McNamara had completed the Pentagon's program of "assured destruction" of the Soviet Union if ever the Kremlin were to order a first strike at the United States, but he had rejected a host of other military programs as unnecessary. One that he kept the lid on was an antiballistic missile system (ABM). For years, the Army had been pushing such a program, known first as Nike-Zeus and later as Nike-X.

In the 1960-62 period, while Khrushchev was still in power, there was evidence of Soviet deployment of an ABM system around Leningrad. This was enough to keep alive American ABM research, and in July 1962, an ABM missile fired from Kwajalein Island in the Pacific intercepted a missile fired from Vandenberg Air Force Base in California.

The problems of the ABM were many, however, and McNamara stuck to research and development only, despite pressures from Congress to go ahead with deployment. But on Nov. 7, 1964, three weeks after Khrushchev's ouster, the Russian's showed in their Moscow military parade what was thought to be a new ABM, the "Galosh." It was of such a size as to suggest that it had a warhead big enough to knock out several American missiles descending in a cluster.

At about the time of the Leningrad ABM reports, the United States had begun to consider how to penetrate such a defense. One result was the idea of several warheads on a single missile. This was the MRV, or multiple re-entry vehicle.

Some years later, the MRV was refined into the MIRV, a multiple and independently targetable re-entry vehicle atop a Minuteman ICBM or a Submarine-based Poseidon missile. Thus, it appears that the Soviets reacted to the big American missile lead by beginning an ABM defense, and the United States reacted to the Soviet ABM defense by developing MRVs and later MIRVs.

AN UNANNOUNCED DECISION

It was on Nov. 10, 1966, that McNamara told newsmen that there was "considerable evidence" of Soviet "action . . . to initiate deployment of such a (ABM) system . . ." He was talking about the Galosh, then being emplaced around Moscow. The Leningrad

system had come to a halt, it was believed in the West, because the Russian leaders had concluded that it would not be effective against American missiles.

McNamara announced two decisions but left the third unsaid. The first was what he called the "possible production" of Poseidon, whose development had been initiated "as an insurance program." The second was that it had been "concluded that it is much too early to make a decision for deployment" of an American ABM system against the Chinese missile threat and that "we have not arrived at a decision on any other deployment," meaning an ABM system to protect against Soviet missiles.

The third decision, one that did not surface for some time, was to approach the Soviet Union in hopes of agreeing on a limitation on ABM deployment by both superpowers.

On Jan. 27, Mr. Johnson wrote Kosygin asking for the ABM talks. The United States was asking the Soviet Union to forgo further ABM deployment at the same time McNamara was saying that the U.S. had 1446 land- and sea-based missiles compared to 470 for the Soviets. Furthermore, McNamara hinted in his defense posture statement Jan. 23 that the United States was developing MIRVs to penetrate the Soviet ABM system, though the term MIRV was still classified.

These signs of American determination to maintain a nuclear lead and counter the Soviet ABM apparently led to a long period of Kremlin discussion and delay in agreeing to the talks. Action-reaction was evident again.

THE RIGHT OF DEFENSE

On Feb. 10, 1967, while visiting London, Kosygin was asked about the American proposal for ABM talks. He justified a "defensive" weapons system this way: "Maybe an antimissile system is more expensive than an offensive system, but it is designed not to kill people but to preserve human lives."

Five days later, Pravda spelled out the Soviet position by saying that Kosygin had declared (though he actually had not done so) that "the Soviet government was ready to discuss the problem of averting a new arms race, both in offensive and defensive weapons."

On March 2, Mr. Johnson announced that he had had a reply from Kosygin saying that Moscow was willing to discuss "means of limiting the arms race in offensive and defensive nuclear missiles." But the Soviet agreement to talk was only in principle; no date was suggested. Meanwhile, Moscow kept building up its missile force.

At the Glassboro summit conference, Mr. Johnson pressed Kosygin for a date to start the talks and McNamara pressed his case on the disadvantage to both superpowers of deploying ABM systems. But Kosygin said he could not set a date at that time. The President concluded that this reflected disagreement in the Kremlin.

By mid-1967, Mr. Johnson apparently had decided to go ahead with some sort of ABM system, though it was not announced until Sept. 18 when McNamara accepted the idea of a "thin" ABM designed to repel Chinese missiles.

McNamara warned against the uselessness of a "heavy" ABM defense against Soviet missiles. The Russians "would clearly be strongly motivated to so increase their offensive capability as to cancel out our defensive advantage" from such a system, he argued.

Both sides would end up, having spent billions, "relatively at the same point of balance on the security scale that we are now." He noted that the Russians had increased their total of ICBM launchers to 720 from only 340 a year earlier. They also had tested a fractional orbital weapon, dubbed FOBS.

The evidence is uncertain, but some experts guess that our announcement of the anti-Chinese ABM system (which was called

Sentinel) was used in the Kremlin as the rationale for acceleration of the Soviet SS-9 missile program. The SS-9 is a massive ICBM estimated by the United States to be capable of carrying a warhead of 10 to 25 megatons.

By the end of 1967, the United States still had a large lead in the number of missiles but total Soviet megatonnage was estimated as on a par with or perhaps ahead of that of the United States. While McNamara argued that mere megatonnage was meaningless, that it amounted to "overkill" others demanded both more missiles and an ABM system as well.

Not until June 27, 1968, did the Soviet Union announce, through Gromyko, that it was "ready for an exchange of opinion" on "mutual restriction and subsequent reduction of strategic vehicles for the delivery of nuclear weapons—offensive and defensive—including antimissile."

Four days after Gromyko's speech, Mr. Johnson announced agreement with Moscow "to enter in the nearest future into discussions on the limitation and reduction of both offensive strategic nuclear weapons delivery systems and systems of defense against ballistic missiles." But the "nearest future" was not to be. It was negated by the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia Aug. 20.

Two other factors had entered the picture by now. A two-year American program to test MIRVs for the Poseidon and Minuteman III missiles had begun that same month, and about the same time the Russians began testing their own multiple warheads. However, the Russians slowed down in 1968 what Defense Secretary Clark M. Clifford called "the only positively identified Soviet ABM complex, that at Moscow . . ."

The other new factor was the American presidential campaign. After the invasion of Czechoslovakia, candidate Richard M. Nixon called for Senate delay in ratifying the nuclear nonproliferation treaty, and as a result, it was not ratified until after he became president.

SETTLING FOR "SUFFICIENCY"

There were two key elements in the Nixon approach to the missile talks: they must be fitted into a larger scheme of foreign policy, and the bargaining position must be Mr. Nixon's own, not the one left by Lyndon Johnson. The inevitable result was many months of delay.

As a prelude to the talks, the President at his first press conference abandoned his campaign call for nuclear "superiority," avoided the "parity" concept he had criticized and concluded that "sufficiency is a better term." And he told the NATO ministers in Brussels April 10: "The West does not today have the massive nuclear predominance that it once had, and any sort of broad-based arms agreement with the Soviets would codify the present balance."

Those most skeptical about coming to terms with Moscow on arms limitation began to suggest, however, that the Soviets were seeking more than parity in the nuclear field. There was talk by Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird of the Soviets' SS-9 missile as a "first-strike" weapon.

Despite the Jan. 20 Soviet initiative to sit down and talk, the new administration took an all-in-due-course posture. Mr. Nixon at that first press conference suggested what was to be called the "linkage" theory.

What he wanted, he said, was to have the SALT talks "in a way and at a time that will promote, if possible, progress on outstanding political problems at the same time." He mentioned the Middle East and he also had Vietnam in mind.

It was one thing, however, to say, as he did, that arms "reduction will not in itself assure peace." It was something else to attempt to use a carrot and stick technique with the Soviets. As to Vietnam, their influence with the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong was

limited. As to the Middle East, subsequent lengthy Soviet-American talks demonstrated that neither super-power was willing to press its clients very far toward a compromise.

The policy of attempting to play off what was seen as a Kremlin desire for SALT talks for concessions on other problems seemed an obvious failure by mid-1969. When the administration got around to suggesting July 31 as the date for starting talks, the Kremlin apparently was having serious second thoughts.

Meanwhile, Mr. Nixon faced the problem of what to do about the Sentinel antiballistic missile. On March 14, he announced that he had trimmed it down and renamed it Safeguard to go forward as "a measured construction on an active defense of our retaliatory forces."

Mr. Nixon reported that "we believe the Soviet Union is continuing their ABM development," most likely "making substantially better second-generation ABM components"; that the Russians were "continuing the deployment of very large missiles with warheads capable of destroying our hardened Minuteman forces," a reference to the SS-9s, and that they had "been substantially increasing the size of their submarine-launched ballistic missile force" and were developing their fractional orbital missile.

A ONE-VOTE MARGIN

The Nixon decision was to provide "for local defense of selected Minutemen missile sites and an area defense designed to protect our bomber bases and our command and control authorities" as well as to "provide a defense of the continental United States against an accidental attack" and "substantial protection against the kind of attack which the Chinese Communists may be capable of launching throughout the 1970s."

The decision set off a great debate in the Senate and across the nation, culminating Aug. 6 in approval of the Safeguard system by the margin of a single vote.

By the time the Senate voted, many ABM opponents had come to realize that far more important than the ABM system was the development of MIRVs. The strongest public proponent of MIRV and, indeed, of a whole spectrum of continuing efforts to ensure American superiority was Dr. John Foster, the Pentagon's development chief. His defined aim: "to make sure that whatever they (the Soviets) do of the possible things that we imagine they might do, we will be prepared . . ."

Foster argued that "an effective limitation on Soviet ABMs should be a precondition to a ban on further MIRV testing." He also cast doubt on the ability of the United States to verify a MIRV test ban.

The Soviet Union, however, was quickly aware from the American debate that just such a ban might be the initial United States proposal. Furthermore, it may have been that many of the administration arguments were found convenient by those in the Soviet Union who opposed a strategic missile agreement with the United States.

That there continued to be such opponents could be deduced from Gromyko's July 10 speech, which of course had to reflect the will of the Kremlin majority. Much of what he said was reminiscent of reasoning in the United States.

"There are problems connected with disarmament that require urgent solution," he said. "Among these problems, one of the most important is the problem of the so-called strategic arms. The point of the matter is primarily whether the big powers ought to come to an agreement to arrest the race of creating increasingly destructive means of attack and counterattack or whether each of them is to try to break out ahead in one sphere or another to obtain military advantage against his rivals, which will force the latter to mobilize even greater national re-

sources for the arms race; and thus add infinitum."

Then once again Gromyko said that the Soviet Union was ready for "an exchange of views" at the SALT talks. But it still would be more than four months before the talks could begin by mutual agreement.

Meanwhile, on both sides, scientific development raced on. By mid-1969, there had been nine flight tests of Poseidon submarine-borne missiles with MIRV warheads and nine of Minuteman IIIs. Foster said on Aug. 5 that he "would assume" that the Soviets "under normal circumstances would be ready to deploy the SS-9 triplet [three bombs in one warhead] some time in the latter half" of 1970, a date not far behind the American schedule.

The action-reaction phenomenon once again was evident in MIRV development. Had the two superpowers met in the fall of 1968 when testing was getting under way, they might have been able to agree on a mutual freeze and thus prevented escalation of the nuclear arms race to a new, more dangerous and more expensive level imperiling the "delicate balance of terror" so long in existence. Whether the same results could have been obtained had the Nixon administration been willing to start talks just after taking office is more debatable. But clearly, by the time the talks were finally set, the problem had grown far more difficult.

A NIXON UMBRELLA

One thing that Mr. Nixon did do in the arms control field was to give a go-ahead to Senate approval of the nuclear nonproliferation treaty. At the same time, the problem of nuclear protection for non-nuclear states was plainly on his mind.

In an exposition of his post-Vietnam policy at Guam on July 25, the President laid down the line that Asian nations would be expected to take responsibility for their own military defense with one exception: the threat of a major power involving nuclear weapons.

In short, the Nixon approach to the threat of nuclear blackmail was to hold an American nuclear umbrella over the noncommunist world. But it was doubtful that this ill-defined umbrella was any more satisfying to the non-nuclear nations than either Mr. Johnson's words or more formal statements at the United Nations by the United States and the Soviet Union.

Last month, the two superpowers reached one additional agreement: to insure that the world's seabeds be reserved for peaceful purposes only. Both Washington and Moscow easily agreed to the principle but each sought to protect its interests.

The Soviet Union called for complete demilitarization, a ban wide enough to preclude not only nuclear weapons emplaced on seabeds but also defensive mines and submarine detection devices which the United States has installed to track the expanding Soviet underwater fleet. The United States proposal was limited to a ban on nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, meaning chemical and biological weapons.

In mid-August, the Russians offered to accept the American version on the scope of the treaty if the United States would accept the Soviet proposal that the ban apply beyond the 12-mile off-shore limit rather than begin at the 3-mile limit which Washington had proposed. By fall, an agreement was reached.

On the core issue of offensive and defensive strategic nuclear weapons, agreement was finally reached Oct. 20 to have formal talks beginning Nov. 17 in Helsinki. On Oct. 25, Secretary of State William P. Rogers formally ended any "link" between the SALT talks and Soviet-American or East-West political issues. Nonetheless, the atmosphere of those political relationships in such crisis areas as the Middle East will have a bearing on what

the two superpowers may decide to do at Helsinki talks, just as political issues in the past have affected arms talks.

EPILOGUE

In the nearly 25 years since the Baruch Plan's conception, both the nuclear arms race and the effort to control it have achieved lives of their own. If the successes in the latter field to control the former have been largely peripheral, if the technological developments have forced endless changes in political negotiating positions by both Moscow and Washington, it is a fact that no nuclear weapon has been exploded in anger since Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945.

The 1962 Cuban missile crisis led Khrushchev to remark, when it was over, that "there was a smell of burning in the air." It was widely said at the time that both superpowers had learned something of crisis control and that the Moscow-Washington exchanges on the "hot line" during the 1967 Six-Day Arab-Israeli war showed a mutual sense of restraint.

But weapons development has raced on. "the delicate balance of terror" has been shaken and new possibilities of nuclear war, including a contest between the Soviet Union and China, have emerged. Efforts to control the nuclear arms race thus are inescapable for both the United States and the Soviet Union.

While little is known of the process of decision-making in Moscow, it is a fact that over the years the Kremlin has had at its command a group of men both skilled in negotiations and increasingly well-informed in arms control problems. Since 1946, when Gromyko first replied to Baruch, only six other men have been the chief negotiators and they have been well backstopped at the conference table.

In contrast, in the United States, expertise has waxed and waned with three high points: the early Baruch period, the Stassen era and since John F. Kennedy's creation of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The American personnel turnover, partly because of changes in administrations, has been far greater than that in the Soviet Union.

In the end, however, while it is the experts who provide the formulas, it is the political chiefs who make agreements. What, therefore, is critical is a President's dedication and the determination of at least a Kremlin majority.

No government in Washington or Moscow will take very much of a risk, as the record demonstrates. Each has a fear of the unknown and finds it easier to stand pat. But each is driven by economic pressures and ever recurring glimpses of the nuclear sword of Damocles to try and try again.

In 1950, the man whose formula ($E=MC^2$) made the bomb possible, Albert Einstein, appeared on American television to discuss the decision to produce the hydrogen bomb. He said:

"If these efforts should prove successful, radioactive poisoning of the atmosphere and, hence, annihilation of all life on earth will have been brought within the range of what is technically possible.

"A weird aspect of this development lies in its apparently inexorable character. Each step appears as the inevitable consequence of the one that went before. And at the end, looming ever clearer, lies general annihilation."

It has not happened, and men in both Washington and Moscow are still trying to see that it doesn't happen. They will try once again beginning Nov. 17 in Helsinki.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to Public Law 90-321, the

Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the Senator from Texas (Mr. Tower) to the National Commission on Consumer Finance, in lieu of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Brooke), resigned.

Pursuant to 67 Stat. 328 and 70 Stat. 966, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Packwood) to the Senate Office Building Commission, in lieu of the late Senator from Illinois, Mr. Dirksen.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Spong in the chair). Is there further morning business?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The BILL CLERK. A bill (H.R. 12307) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

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

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

RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 12:30 p.m. today.

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

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR MOSS AND SENATOR YOUNG OF OHIO

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that upon the expiration of the recess, the distinguished Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss) be recognized for not to exceed 30 minutes.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. And that after that there be a brief quorum call, and that at 1:15 p.m., the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio (Mr. Young) be recognized on behalf of the pending amendment.

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

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until 12:30 p.m.

On the expiration of the recess, the Senate reassembled, and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. Spang in the chair.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 12:30 having arrived, pursuant to the previous order, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss).

THE REAL ISSUE OF CIGARETTE ADVERTISING

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, last week the Senate Commerce Committee voted 10 to 9 to bar the Federal Trade Commission from requiring warnings in cigarette ads for at least 2½ years, thereby serving the will of the cigarette industry and turning its back on the Public Health Service and every major public health group in this country.

The committee also voted, by the same margin, to add the word "excessive" to the mandatory warning required on the cigarette pack label so that the warning is to read, "Warning: Excessive Cigarette Smoking Is Dangerous to Your Health." Is two packs a day excessive? One pack a day? A half pack a day? Even a half pack of cigarettes smoked per day creates a substantial risk of premature death and disease. Moreover, excessive use of any drug or food or fluid is dangerous to health. So the warning is gutted.

And then the broadcasters, those honored trustees of the Nation's airwaves haggled with the committee for every possible extra year, month and day of cigarette advertising revenues, turning a U.S. Senate committee into a Turkish bazaar. Instead of granting the cigarette companies request to withdraw from television and radio broadcast advertising by September 1970, as that industry itself had previously agreed to do, the committee voted to allow the broadcasters revenues from the 1970 football season; and voted to order the termination of broadcast advertising by January 1, 1971. But the broadcasters were not satisfied even with this act of the committee, and insisted that broadcasters be given until September 1971 to wean themselves from more than \$200 million annual revenue from cigarette advertising. There are times when service in this body leaves one cynical and depressed. This is such a time.

I will of course fight these moves of surrender by the committee when the bill is on the floor. Chairman Magnuson, the Senator from Rhode Island, (Mr. Pastore), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. Hart), the Senator from Nevada

(Mr. Cannon), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. Long), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. Tydings), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. Inouye), and the Senator from New York (Mr. Goodell) have indicated their support for my effort. Others have since come to us offering their help.

Since January 31 of this year I have been on record as promising to filibuster rather than see a bill pass the U.S. Senate which again would tie the hands of the Federal Trade Commission in its honest efforts to protect the American consumer—not by banning cigarettes from the market—but simply by bringing home to every American who chooses to smoke adequate notice that cigarette smoking is a substantial hazard to his health. If necessary, I will redeem that pledge.

But I have not risen in the Senate today to debate the provisions of the committee-passed bill. The time will come for that. I thought it timely, however, to remind my colleagues what it is we are talking about. We are not talking about the economic convenience of the broadcasters. We are not talking about economic dislocation of the tobacco industry—we are talking about the lives and the health of the Nation's 70 million smokers and the generations of smokers-to-be. I think it is entirely appropriate that we review for the record what it is that we know about the harmful effects of cigarette smoking so that the magnitude of this hazard can perhaps restore our balance of judgment in viewing the regulatory efforts which we seek.

Mr. President, there is not the slightest doubt in my mind that cigarette smoking is one of the most serious, if not the most serious, public health problems in the Nation today. What is astonishing, however, is that there still are so many people who do not share this view; who continue to smoke in the face of the increasingly ominous reports from the Public Health Service on the effects of this habit on human life and health. Everyone is familiar with the first of these documents, the Surgeon General's Report on Smoking and Health which came out in 1964. This was the first time the Federal Government had come out vigorously against a national habit—one that had become deeply ingrained in the fabric of our lives by practice and by the sheer force of advertising.

The evidence was damning: all cigarette smokers have a 70-percent higher death rate than nonsmokers; they have a 70-percent higher death rate from coronary heart disease; a 500-percent higher death rate from bronchitis and emphysema; and a 1,000-percent higher death rate from lung cancer.

All things considered, this report should have had a profound impact. It did—at first, but the net result was more like a soft landing. There was a brief drop in cigarette sales, but soon life went back to normal with the Nation's smokers puffing away, unmoved by the warning that they could be shortening their lives.

Subsequent smoking and health reports have come on stronger. Each new volume not only confirms that smoking is not a matter to be taken lightly. They

have pinpointed, in a much more positive way, what happens to the man or woman who smokes cigarettes.

For instance, we know today not only that man's life is shortened, but we know by how much. A heavy smoker is cutting short his life span by as much as 8 years. This is not an insignificant amount of time when you consider that the average life expectancy today is 70 years. Indeed, we have been warned by international experts that all the gains made in extending life expectancy through control of the communicable diseases are being wiped out by losses due to smoking.

We know today that one-third of all deaths among men in the age group 35 to 59—in the very prime of life—are excess deaths which would not have occurred if it were not for cigarette smoking. We know, too, that cigarette smoking can have a profound effect on women. Contrary to earlier views that women were somehow immune to the hazards of cigarettes, the new evidence has shown that women smokers have markedly higher death rates than women who do not smoke. One out of 14 deaths among women in those important years between 35 and 59 is associated with cigarette smoking.

The 1964 report established that male cigarette smokers have a higher death rate from coronary heart disease than nonsmokers. Current reports go further; they tell us that smoking is actually a significant risk factor in the development of this disease. Smokers who also have high blood pressure and high serum cholesterol have twice the risk of fatal heart attack as nonsmokers. Among men 45 to 54, this risk is more than three times that of nonsmokers. There is evidence now that cigarette smoking promotes hardening of the arteries.

Yet, all of these risks literally can be wiped out by the simple expedient of giving up smoking.

In 1964 cigarette smoking was considered the most important of all the causes of chronic bronchitis in the United States. At that time it was stated that smoking increased the risk of dying from emphysema. Current reports use stronger language: cigarette smoking is now considered the most important cause of bronchitis; and new research indicates it may also play a role in the development of pulmonary emphysema.

The relationship between cigarette smoking and lung cancer has long been an accepted fact. The link between the two was established many years before the 1964 Surgeon General's report. Scientific evidence accumulated in the intervening years not only confirms this relationship but now indicates that smoking is also a significant factor in the causation of cancer of the larynx and is associated with cancers of other areas of the mouth and throat. The latest Public Health Service report, issued this past summer, also points to cigarette smoking as a factor in the development of cancer of the bladder, the kidneys, and the pancreas.

Now, I cannot think of anything less appealing than the prospect of succumbing before my allotted 3 score years and 10 from one of these illness. Yet, you find

many confirmed smokers who feel that somehow this will not be their fate; it happens only to the other fellow. It is true that we are talking in terms of "risk"—the chance of developing a given illness. Nonsmokers do get lung cancer and heart diseases; a number of smokers do not.

What these smokers do not take into account is that even if they do not die of one of these smoking-related diseases, their bodies still suffer from the deleterious effects of this debilitating habit.

According to the National Health Survey smokers suffer more from both acute and chronic illness than do people who have never smoked. They spend more time sick in bed; they lose more days from work; they suffer more from such ills as peptic ulcers and sinusitis; they have more chronic illness. A new finding, reported for the first time in 1969, reveals that smokers have more noncancerous diseases of the mouth than nonsmokers. Those who both smoke and have poor oral hygiene are more likely to have periodontal disease and gingivitis. There is even some evidence that smoking leads to the loss of teeth.

One of the most tragic aspects of the smoking and health story is the effect that smoking can have on the health of others. Women who smoke during pregnancy may be harming their unborn children. Babies born to mothers who smoke generally come into this world weighing less than the normal average. Some studies indicate that an expectant mother's smoking habits may be related to spontaneous abortion, stillbirth, and neonatal death.

These smoking reports read like a litany of death and misery. Yet there is a theme of hope throughout. The smoker can be given a second chance, as it were, for many of the ill effects of cigarette smoking are reversible. By giving up smoking man can reduce his risk of illness and death. Indeed, if he turns back early enough, his chances of dying from such dread diseases as lung cancer, heart disease, emphysema, can be nearly on a par with those of the man who has never smoked at all.

The next logical question is, of course, why do we let this awful destruction of our human resources continue? Why do we not simply ban all cigarette manufacture and make smoking illegal? Those who are old enough to remember the Volstead Act can well verify that prohibition did little to discourage the consumption of alcohol in those unhappy days. Because millions of Americans are addicted or, at least, heavily habituated to smoking, the inevitable consequence of a cigarette ban in terms of a black market and the attendant law-enforcement chaos and social misery would make the experience of the twenties pale by comparison.

Eliminating tobacco from the American scene is not something that can be done by legislative edict. We must not forget that tobacco has always played an important role in our economic and political development. As the leading item of commerce to England it kept the colonies alive in pre-Revolutionary days. One of the earliest "protests" was

over the tobacco taxes levied by Parliament. Today, tobacco is still a major export crop and an important source of national income.

Tobacco has always been a popular item for taxation; the Federal Government has collected tobacco taxes for nearly a century. Last year, over \$4 billion entered Federal and State treasuries from cigarette taxes alone.

Needless to say, cigarettes add considerably to the income of the States, mainly in the South, where tobacco is grown and cigarettes are made. Thanks to Government acreage-poundage allotments and the tremendous demand for this product, tobacco has become one of the highest value-per-acre crops in this country. It is easy to imagine that the farmer who can get about \$1,350 per acre for his crop, before expenses, is not going to give up growing tobacco with any great eagerness.

Obviously, even without going into the areas of distribution and advertising, a total ban on cigarettes simply would not be economically feasible.

On the other hand, I do not think that a phaseout of tobacco production is outside the realm of possibility. Already there are straws in the wind which suggest that this, in time, will become a less important agricultural crop. It will not happen overnight, of course; it will be a gradual movement, but it will come because of changes which are going on right now. According to the Department of Agriculture, current changes in cigarette styles are already altering the demand for tobacco. The amount of leaf tobacco used for cigarettes has declined 28 percent since the midfifties.

There is, for instance, the trend toward the use of filter tips which account for about 73 percent of the market today. If this trend continues, 88 percent of the market will be filter tips by 1975. In order to maintain the level of "taste" in these filtered cigarettes, manufacturers use more tobacco stems and other scraps and less of the better quality leaf. We have also seen the recent introduction of two new "slim" style cigarettes which obviously need less tobacco for manufacture.

It goes without saying that the most important factor in the declining need for tobacco is going to be the decreasing demand for cigarettes which is now becoming apparent. This year, for the first time since 1964, both overall consumption and per capita consumption of cigarettes dropped. True, the percentages were small, but it is an indication that smoking is getting to be less popular than it once was. I believe this is a trend that is going to continue.

As the demand for cigarettes diminishes and the need for quality cigarette tobacco goes down, farmers, particularly those with small allotments, may find it less profitable to continue growing tobacco. Hopefully, then, they will be encouraged to turn to other forms of agricultural production. I have pledged my support, on the floor of the Senate, for any programs that will help alleviate the plight of the tobacco farmer and assist him in seeking new forms of income.

Stimulating the decline in cigarette consumption remains the first task at

hand and certainly, at this stage, the most effective way we can achieve our ultimate goals. Changing a national pastime to a thing of the past, again, will not be accomplished overnight. We must first change the climate of social acceptability that has allowed cigarette smoking to become almost a fetish among young and old alike. And we must continue to keep before the public the grim facts about the dangers of this habit.

I am very much encouraged by some events which will help in reducing the popularity of smoking. The decision of the tobacco industry to cease radio and television advertising next year is a significant step forward in this direction. TV, especially, with its animated, visual-audio impact has become the most powerful sales medium in history. The jingles and catch phrases of cigarette commercials have automatically become a part of the vocabulary of our younger generation. Future generations of children shall be spared this insidious form of brainwashing, and I am confident this will have a considerable influence on the decision of young people whether or not to smoke. Already the number of teenage smokers is going down. It should decline even more as a result of this action.

I am also pleased with the number of TV and movie personalities who are taking a firm and public stand against cigarette smoking. It would be most helpful if more of those who are in the public eye would follow this example.

The end of cigarette commercials on television may herald the beginning of increased advertising in newspapers and magazines. I must confess I am both encouraged and troubled by the attitudes of our leading newspapers toward this possibility. I am discouraged by the number which feel that there should be no inhibition on advertising a product that is legally sold, no matter how dangerous it is, and I am distressed by those newspapers who have indicated they will run antismoking ads only if they are purchased at the going rate. On the other hand, I am most encouraged by the many publications which have already halted cigarette advertising and by the number which have indicated they will cease to take such ads. One of our leading papers has solved the problem neatly by requiring a health warning in all cigarette advertisements. Needless to say, none of the tobacco manufacturers has been willing to accept this stipulation.

It is perhaps more important, however, that the pages of our Nation's newspapers and the airways be kept open for antismoking messages and continuing information on the health hazards of smoking. In this latter respect, I must say that the press has done a most commendable job already. We cannot stop now, however. We must tell the facts and tell them straight over and over again.

Virtually every product that comes into our homes has on the label a listing of the contents. Those which are especially dangerous are marked with a warning to keep out of the reach of children. We have "truth in packaging" legislation to protect the housewife. We should do no less for the consumer of cigarettes.

Every citizen has a right to know what is in his cigarette and what the consequences of his smoking may be.

I have recently called for legislation which would have required a full statement on the package of the quantity of tar and nicotine in each cigarette and in all advertising; and which would have required a stronger warning statement on cigarette packs. Regrettably, this legislation has not been enacted into law. By failing to act I believe the Congress is doing a disservice to the American public. We are, in effect, keeping from them basic information which is essential to making intelligent judgments about smoking.

I feel, too, we have done a disservice to our friends abroad to whom we sell tobacco and tobacco products without adequate health warnings. Surely people in other lands have just as much right to know of these hazards as our own citizens. Yet the Cigarette Labeling Act of 1965 specifically exempts cigarettes manufactured for export from carrying the caution label.

Our children, most especially, have a right to know the true facts about smoking. Although the external influences will be lessened with the absence of TV commercials, children will still be exposed to the lure of smoking. Educational programs in our schools and through our youth organizations must never be allowed to diminish. Smoking and health information should be an integral part of a health education program from kindergarten through high school. By the same token, health education on the hazards of smoking should continue for adults who, after all, set the patterns which youngsters so often follow. As adults give up smoking, children will be less likely to turn to cigarettes as the key to "instant maturity." And the end result, hopefully, someday will be a smoke-free world.

So I say to my colleagues: When the phone calls and the visits from the cigarette men and the broadcasters start and their pleas of impoverishment and the sophistry of their arguments begins to sound plausible, think of the enormous loss of human life to be weighed in the balance on the other side. And if the figures have no real meaning, think of just one close friend or loved one, languishing in the final agony of lung cancer or emphysema.

MEDICAL TREATMENT OF VETERANS—NOTICE OF HEARINGS

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, 51 years ago today the United States participated in the signing of an armistice ending a war that marked the close of an era for this country and for the world. America had for the first time entered a European war; the world had moved closer to a type of mechanized warfare that would recur with horrible regularity. But though it was fought with new weapons like airplanes and tanks, World War I still resembled warfare as the Greeks had known it. Young men gave up their lives in the Battle of the Marne in 1917 as they had at Thermopolae in 480 B.C.

One hundred sixteen thousand five

hundred sixteen Americans lost their lives in World War I. President Wilson, speaking on the first anniversary of Armistice Day in 1919, reminded his fellow countrymen that "the reflections of Armistice Day will be filled with solemn pride in the heroism of those who died in the country's service with the gratitude for the victory, both because of the thing from which it freed us and because of the opportunity it has given America to show her sympathy with peace and justice in the councils of the nations."

Armistice Day was declared a national holiday by an act of Congress in 1938, as the world was once more pushing toward war. The 20th century was only in its 45th year when America mourned her 405,399 World War II dead, and gratefully thanked those soldiers who were able to return home. The modernism and technology that had symbolized the hopes of the century had been used instead to create violence and destruction on a scale never before witnessed by man.

Despite our sincere desire for peace in the postwar world and our leadership in the creation of the United Nations which, we hoped would free mankind from the scourge of war, America was soon fighting again. The 33,629 Americans who died in Korea gave their lives in an effort to show that aggressors would be punished and aggression would be prevented. Taking such action in distant Asia, it was hoped, would keep aggressors from our shores.

The sacrifices of Americans killed in the First and Second World Wars and in Korea were honored when Congress changed the name of Armistice Day to Veterans Day in 1954. Now to this list of sacrifice we must also add Vietnam where 39,232 have been killed in action so far.

Today as we commemorate the end of earlier wars and honor the men who fought and died in the hope that freedom would flourish, we must not forget those who fought and lived.

Lincoln remembered the survivors of war as he spoke at the dedication of Gettysburg Cemetery and affirmed that "it is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced." When President Roosevelt signed the first GI bill of rights in 1944 it was in recognition that veterans hold a special place in our society because of their unique contributions to our country; because of the risks they have taken; because of the precious years they have spent away from their families, their homes, and their homeland; and because of their sacrifice of private pursuits while serving the public purpose of national defense.

On this Veterans Day, the doughboys of Pershing's Army are grand old men. The marines who landed at Leyte with MacArthur and the men who captured Pork Chop Hill in Korea are middleaged. Our Vietnam veterans who recently survived Khesanh, Hue, or other bloody battles in the Mekong Delta and Aschau Valley are young men in the prime of their lives.

I believe that these young veterans merit our special attention not only on

this day but on every day, throughout this year and throughout every year.

On October 23, the Senate recognized the needs of these young veterans by substantially increasing GI bill educational and training allowances and dramatically expanding veterans' education programs. But a great many Vietnam veterans must recover from the serious wounds they sustained in combat before they are able to take advantage of these added benefits. There are many who will never recover, many who will be helpless until they die.

On this Veterans Day, when our country honors its war dead, at a time when we are all gravely concerned over the weekly totals of those still dying in combat, I ask that we also consider the urgent needs of the living, and the half-living.

We must consider the unusual plight of the seriously wounded Vietnam veterans. We must consider the unprecedented number of young men suffering now—many of whom will suffer forever—from the severe but survivable injuries that uniquely characterize this war.

For example, new drugs, like sulfamylon, have dramatically reduced the death rate from severe burns. Nearly 60 percent of patients with burns covering almost half their bodies died previously; now, fewer than 30 percent die. But for men in that condition, life could be hell for a long, long time.

From January 1965 to June 1969, more than 235,000 U.S. servicemen have received nonfatal wounds in Vietnam. More than half of these men—approximately 120,000—have required hospitalization.

This war has been a terrible crippler. The fighting in Vietnam is producing total disability cases at a rate nearly double that of the Korean war and almost triple that of World War II. Out of every 100 veterans receiving compensation for wounds received in action in Vietnam, 12.4 percent are totally disabled. The comparable figure was 6.7 percent during the Korean war and only 4.4 percent during World War II.

Putting those percentages into more human terms:

That 12.4 percent reflects 11,778 totally disabled Vietnam veterans so far. Applied to the Korean war, it would have meant more than 28,000 totally disabled veterans—instead of the 15,943 who actually were totally disabled. And, applied to World War II, there would have been nearly 177,000 totally disabled, instead of the actual 62,683.

Conversely, had the Korean war rate applied in Vietnam, there would have been only 6,300 totally disabled—instead of 11,778. And the World War II rate, applied in Vietnam, would have meant less than 4,200 totally disabled.

Twice as many Vietnam veterans compared to those who fought in World War II—and Korea—are receiving disability separations as a result of crippling bone diseases which affect the arms and legs. It is estimated that this category of discharge accounts for fully 50 percent of all U.S. Army disability separations from the Vietnam war.

The ferocity of the war in Vietnam can be measured unfortunately by a

stark and staggering increase, grim year by grim year, in the number of men suffering major amputations. Strangely, the rate in this year of deescalation engagement is running far, far ahead of earlier Vietnam years.

The rate of neuropsychiatric cases has doubled since 1965.

The reasons for these startling and alarming statistics appear to be twofold. First, the nature of this war, and of the new weapons and devices used in it, produce wounds of profound severity.

Second, our wounded soldiers in Vietnam are airlifted by helicopters moments after they fall and rushed to medical stations and hospitals only minutes away. This innovation—along with the new drugs and treatments rapidly administered—saves the lives of countless men who would otherwise have perished. We all rejoice that 10 percent more of our servicemen survive their wounds in the Vietnam war than did during the Korean conflict. But for many of our survivors, life is a painful, tragic ordeal. Let us remember that many of these will be forever handicapped, and many will be forever helpless.

And when these men are brought back to the United States, is the same urgency evident in the treatment and rehabilitation? Do hospitals have adequate staffs? Large enough budgets? Do they have enough beds and rehabilitation facilities to treat them?

Are they given the compassionate care and the careful attention they so desperately need as they lie in our veterans hospitals?

Do our military and veterans medical establishments have the capacity to do what must be done for our gravely wounded soldiers, in view of the increasing burden they face due to the heavy increase in disabled survivors of this war?

My concern for our Nation's ability to provide adequate treatment for our wounded men is deepened by the following disturbing facts:

The present administration has cut \$70 million from the VA hospital and medical care budget estimate for this fiscal year.

If approved by the Congress, this cut would require a 3,586-person drop in hospital personnel, and the deletion of certain key hospital modernization projects.

The Veterans' Administration's full-time employment of nurses and doctors is now at approximately the same level as it was in fiscal 1965 although the number of hospitalized Vietnam veterans has increased more than 400 percent and total U.S. military troop strength has tripled during that period.

The number of part-time doctors and nurses, along with residents and interns at VA hospitals, has increased substantially—from a 1965 level of 4,463 to 7,198 at the close of fiscal year 1969. But I seriously question whether part-time personnel and doctors still in training can meet the enormous increase in casualties over the last 4 years.

Because of these stark and staggering facts, as chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on

Labor and Public Welfare, I am today announcing that the subcommittee will hold hearings beginning November 21 to investigate the subject of the medical treatment available to the veteran. The hearings will explore unprecedented medical problems facing our veterans today. These problems really face each of us and all of us, for we are responsible now for the well-being of those who in Vietnam sought to shoulder the responsibility for our well-being.

I do not question the high dedication and professionalism of the men and women who care for our soldiers in military and veterans hospitals. In fact, I want to commend them at this time for their devotion.

But, along with other Senators on the subcommittee, I am concerned whether we are able to give intensive care to all who need it and call upon the full spectrum of specialized services from all who can provide them.

I want to be sure that the Veterans' Administration has an adequate number of plastic surgeons, neurosurgeons, and other highly skilled specialists to care for the increasing numbers of patients who require corrective medical treatment over a period of several years.

I want to be sure, too, that our boys—our men—are given the compassionate care and careful attention they so desperately need as they lie in our veterans hospitals.

I want to determine if the technology of rehabilitation is keeping pace with the advanced medical technologies that save so many of our men and with what we are learning about the human emotions and the mind of man.

I want to be sure that hospital budgets are large enough to provide the best possible care and the most rapid possible rehabilitation.

And we must be certain that the seriously wounded veteran is helped back into society as quickly as possible after he has lost a limb, or his sight, or his mental stability after brain surgery. Prolonged institutionalization itself creates a psychological disability.

The subject is not a happy one. But it must be faced, it must be a vital concern to the Congress, and to all the American people.

On a day of solemn remembrance of the heroic war dead—of those who made the supreme sacrifice—we must not forget our everlasting obligation to the heroic war living.

I know that a grateful nation joins me in wanting to guarantee that the young men who have made such great sacrifices for their country will receive the very finest medical care and the best rehabilitation that their country can provide.

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

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

THE NOVEMBER 15 MARCH AGAINST THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, no issue more vitally concerns Americans today than the Vietnam war and the search for peace. Last month, many Americans joined in their communities to voice their opposition to the war. While I do not participate in Vietnam demonstrations, I deeply respect the constitutional right of our people to assemble peacefully—whether or not they happen to agree with administration policy.

The Vietnam march scheduled for November 15 in Washington has raised fears of a violent confrontation. Nothing could more damage the basic interests of the peace movement in America than violence in our Nation's Capital. In all such confrontations, reason is forgotten, innocent people suffer, and a legacy of distrust remains, thus weakening our political institutions.

A central issue between the organizers of the march and the Government's representatives appears to be the right to march past the White House. Unquestionably, the physical security of the Executive Mansion—the center of American political life—is paramount. Yet, could not a limited number of marchers be permitted to pass by? Could not their symbolic aspirations be met without raising the dangers inherent in an emotional mass gathering? And could not the pressure for violence be released through such a procedure?

Within the great body of peaceful demonstrators, there undoubtedly resides a hard-core minority that seeks to provide a confrontation and a subsequent violent clash. But we must not be panicked by these extremists, and we must not let them prevail.

In fulfilling its unquestioned duty to maintain security and order in the Capital, the Government also has a clear responsibility not to multiply the occasions for misunderstanding and conflict through its own actions or overreactions.

It would be a grave mistake to assume that the heartfelt desire for peace in Vietnam is the exclusive property of a relatively small handful of violence-prone extremists.

The strength of the peace movement in our country lies in its very diversity of backgrounds, views, and programs. It encompasses Republicans as well as Democrats, blacks as well as whites, young people as well as their elders.

The administration has wisely committed itself to reversing a long tide of military escalation in Vietnam by adopting a new policy of phased withdrawal from our combat role there.

Wisdom and restraint are needed in Washington on Saturday on the part of all concerned.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. TAL-

MADGE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12307) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations; agencies, offices and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized on the pending amendment, No. 272, under an order previously entered, the time of 1 hour on the amendment to be equally divided.

AMENDMENT NO. 272

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, briefly stated, my amendment would reduce the civil defense appropriation to the precise amount approved by the House of Representatives.

My amendment involves a total reduction of \$8.3 million, slightly more than 11 percent of the amount recommended by the Committee on Appropriations.

It would reduce the recommended appropriation for operation and maintenance for civil defense from \$50.7 million to \$47.7 million; and the recommended appropriation for research, shelter survey, and marketing from \$21.8 million to \$16.5 million.

I can think of no other single means whereby we could more clearly manifest our desire to save taxpayers' money than by reducing appropriations for the civil defense boondoggle. In my judgement, and I have spoken out on this matter in every year since early in 1959, the entire civil defense program should be scrapped. However, I am taking a realistic view and the amendment that I ask Senators to support, and I am hopeful that they will support, is a modest amendment that would save at least \$8.3 million of taxpayers' money so sorely needed for domestic problems that deserve top priority. Surely \$64.2 million should suffice for the civil defense program for fiscal year 1970.

How can we in good conscience increase the civil defense appropriation above the amount approved by the House of Representatives when we are either cutting, or being asked to cut, appropriations for aid to education programs, water and air pollution programs, antipoverty programs, and a multitude of other vital welfare programs. Vital health programs of the National Institutes of Health have been curtailed by \$70.5 million; \$120 million has been cut from Headstart; \$75 million from the emergency food and medical services program; \$16 million from legal services to the poor.

Those programs have all been cut, and the administration has approved those cuts. How can we justify increasing even slightly the utterly wasteful civil defense appropriation? Yet, this amended bill we shall vote on later today proposes to increase the amount for civil defense as

passed in the other body by \$8.3 million. I appeal to every Senator to vote for my amendment and to stop this further raid on the Public Treasury.

I am hopeful that those Senators who have been speaking out for economy in Government and who support the budget cuts that have been made in response to the wishes of the White House will take kindly to my amendment.

More than \$1,700 million of taxpayers' money has been wasted in two decades of so-called planning on civil defense. What have we to show for it? No American is one bit safer today in the event of a nuclear holocaust than he was in 1951 despite that vast expenditure of taxpayers' money.

By the way, this morning, when I desired a little further information, I telephoned the head offices of the civil defense organization, but there was no answer. If they are so important, this would really be a good time for the Soviets to attack our Nation and hurl missiles at Washington.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield at that point?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Today is a national holiday. We are the only ones meeting. That is why there is no answer from civil defense. It is a holiday.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Well, the Japanese struck us at Pearl Harbor on a Sunday in 1941, which was also a holiday.

Mr. PASTORE. The civil defense people in Rhode Island are on the alert and may be called out on any days. The lines of communication are always open to the office of civil defense.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I am glad to know that they are on the alert in Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. If the Senator did not receive a reply to his telephone call, it is because today is a holiday.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the civil defense program offers nothing whatever—absolutely nothing—toward our national security or toward the maintenance of our defense posture. It has been an utter waste of taxpayers' money since its inception.

First, there was an evacuation plan whereby people would flee from one city to another city. For example, in the event of a nuclear attack, they were to flee at the sound of sirens from Cleveland, Ohio, toward Lorain, Ohio, 25 miles west, on the Lake Road. Then, the Lorain civil defense authorities, under their evacuation plan, would have people flee east from Lorain toward Cleveland on the same road. Finally, that silly scheme was abandoned. Now they have this inane shelter-marking program.

Mr. President, today, more than 24 years after the atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima, and after the expenditure of almost \$2 billion of taxpayers' money, the United States has no civil defense program worthy of the name. Most of what exists consists of absurd plans on paper; the rest is confusion.

The fact is that reliable American observers in the Soviet Union have reported they have not noted any civil defense shelter program or any sort of civilian defense program in the Soviet Union.

In recent years the Soviet Union has become a "have" nation and is no longer a "have-not" nation. It is veering towards capitalism. The leaders in the Kremlin seem to be determined to raise the standard of living of their people, and are erecting huge apartment buildings in the cities of the Soviet Union. A correspondent for the New York Times in the Soviet Union has reported that there are no shelters whatever marked off, in those buildings. The Soviet Union does have some survival training courses and some courses in guerrilla warfare. They also have courses of instruction in house-to-house combat, but no provision has been made for fallout shelters in newly built structures within the Soviet Union or within the huge subway system in Moscow. Evidently, the Soviet leaders have had the good sense not to squander their country's resources on futile programs that would add nothing whatever to the defense of their nation.

None of our allies—England, West Germany, France, Italy, Japan, to name a few—have civil defense programs whatever. I have ridden on the famous London underground, and there are no markings there whatever of any civil defense nature.

Still, year after year, the Congress has continued to appropriate huge sums for civil defense in piecemeal fashion, but not for any serious plan of action. I am certain that we will again hear the time-worn argument that we should have at least a minimum civil defense program "just in case." What we are being asked to do is to maintain a myth that there is such a thing as real protection in a nuclear holocaust. This fantasy has cost taxpayers huge sums of money.

With this amendment, I am hopeful that we shall at least make a little progress and save our taxpayers some money.

The fact is that there is no civil defense program imaginable that would be of real protection in the terrifying event of a nuclear attack against us. Last year more than \$60 million was spent on civil defense. Do we have any more civil defense today than we had a year ago? The answer is, of course, an emphatic "No." The record of the civil defense boondoggle has been one of complete waste and inefficiency. Millions of dollars of stockpiled medicine has been permitted to spoil; food rotted; and hospital beds and equipment mildewed in one silly scheme after another. The list is endless. Hospital beds and equipment in my State of Ohio, and I am sure in every other State in the Nation, beds and equipment which could be used in Vietnam and elsewhere, have been allowed to mildew and to become useless. A few years ago, millions of dollars worth of medicines stockpiled for civilian defense purposes had become too dangerous to use. In fact, they were dumped into Lake Erie.

Does anyone really believe that these so-called fallout shelters, which are in reality apartment house corridors, office building basements, parking garages, and the like, are going to be of any real protection? Even if one could possibly accept this premise, how much more of the taxpayers' money must be spent on little

black and yellow signs telling citizens where to go to meet their deaths in the horrible event of a nuclear Armageddon?

Public apathy could not be greater. Those citizens who were duped into building fallout shelters years ago today are using them as storage spaces, playrooms, or just letting them deteriorate. No citizen today would seriously consider building a fallout shelter. The very idea is ridiculed. Mayors of city after city have either completely discarded their local civil defense programs or have ignored them to the point where for all practical purposes they have been abolished.

In my city of Cleveland, seven policemen have been assigned to civil defense duty, and aside from occasionally going around and speaking to high school assemblies, they are doing nothing except sitting around, waiting for the bomb to drop. This, in a city where crime is rampant and where seven policemen, doing their job, could render needful service.

The Appropriations Committee has recommended more than \$50 million for operation and maintenance of the civil defense bureaucracy. The fact is that in that agency with only 316 full-time permanent personnel, more than half receive \$17,000 a year up to \$38,000 a year in salaries.

Think of that—a median salary of \$17,000 a year.

Miss Jane Hanna, of Missouri, had been a very personable Democratic political worker in Missouri. I knew the lady personally, and have met her socially on occasions. She had never been active in civil defense matters in Missouri, but she was appointed Deputy Director for Operations of Civil Defense, a post she held for nearly 4 years, until last January, with the change in administration. Her salary was \$33,495 a year. She is now in forced retirement.

That is understandable to any of us here. She has been supplanted by a Republican lady who, no doubt, is very personable also.

The lady who took Miss Jane Hanna's place, close to the top of the bureaucracy of 316 full-time permanent personnel, is Mrs. Georgiana Sheldon. Before her appointment she was a secretary in the offices of a very fine gentleman, Representative ROGERS MORTON, who is presently the chairman of the Republican National Committee. Mrs. Sheldon was a secretary in his office. Now she, a Republican worker, and a fine lady, has succeeded Miss Jane Hanna. She too now enjoys a salary of \$33,495 a year.

The median salary of all those 316 full-time employees and officials of civil defense—and this is from the director to the lowest paid filing clerk—is \$17,000 a year.

Let us contrast that with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. This is an agency with many scientists and highly skilled and educated technical personnel. I happen to be a member of Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. I have frequently attended hearings in which we were addressed by the scientists of NASA. Some of them, it seems to me, had as many university degrees as a Fahrenheit thermometer. The men and women in NASA

are highly educated. They have to be. They are scientists. However, the average salary of all of them is \$13,700 a year. That is \$3,300 a year less for each person, on the average, than is paid to officials and employees of civil defense.

The average salary for officials and employees in the Atomic Energy Commission is \$13,400 a year. Contrast that to the average salary paid in civil defense. In the Bureau of the Budget the average salary is \$15,300.

It would be a gross understatement to say that the functions of NASA, the AEC, and the Bureau of the Budget are more important than those of the civil defense section of the Department of the Army. It is, therefore, astonishing that the average salary of the officials and employees of NASA, the AEC, and the Bureau of the Budget is substantially lower than that of those in the Civil Defense Agency.

There are a great many overpaid and underworked employees in all the Federal agencies, but those in civil defense are among the highest paid in the entire Federal bureaucracy. In fact, the civil defense section of the Department of the Army has a well-deserved reputation as a haven for retired Army officers and defeated officeholders.

In my State of Ohio I regretfully report there are a great many political hacks of the Democratic Party as well as the Republican Party who were never any good for either party, as I know from the experience of having run for office many times in the State of Ohio. They are the ones occupying the highest paid civil defense jobs in my State of Ohio. The same is true of both Democrats and Republicans in many States.

I said a few moments ago that Mayor Stokes having been recently reelected I am again going to call his attention to the fact that there are seven able bodied policemen doing nothing but sitting around waiting for the bomb to drop. I hope he will put them on active service.

I am hopeful we shall have an economy vote on this amendment. When I started to speak out in 1959 against civil defense, I had only two or three Senators voting with me. Last year there was a very close vote. I hope we shall have a very real economy move this afternoon in favor of my amendment.

Civil defense officials not only detract from our national defense effort, but also foster the illusion that there is such a thing as a defense against the hydrogen bomb and other deadly atomic weapons. To continue doing this is to render a disservice to all Americans except for those few civil defense characters in the Department of Defense who enjoy fancy salaries while sitting around sending messages to each other and devising costly schemes and fancy propaganda pamphlets while waiting for the bomb to drop.

These civil defense schemes were announced by Miss Jane Hanna, while drawing a salary of \$33,495, and they will be announced by Mrs. Georgiana Sheldon, who was secretary to ROGERS MORTON, a Representative from the State of Maryland, now the chairman of the Republican National Committee. She sud-

denly acquired vast knowledge of civil defense.

It would be far better to spend this money in attempts to avert a nuclear holocaust than in absurd little schemes concocted by civil defense bureaucrats who have nothing better to do with their time than to formulate such absurdities. The Nation would be better served if this money were spent for improving homes in slum areas, for the Headstart program for underprivileged children, or for any of a multitude of other needed projects to improve the welfare of millions of Americans.

Then perhaps some of those political hacks in my party and the Grand Old Party of which I am not a member, who have been living a life of ease as civil defense workers in Washington, D.C., and in the various States, would have to get some constructive and worthwhile employment.

Let us not be misled by any assertions that in time of disaster such as floods and fires, civil defense workers are necessary to come to the aid of the people. It is in the tradition of our great Nation that in times of natural disasters citizens have always come to the aid of their neighbors in distress. We do not need a lot of civil defense workers paid high salaries for this purpose.

If my amendment is adopted and \$3 million is cut from the appropriation for operations and maintenance, I am sure that the civil defense bureaucrats will certainly be able to struggle along on more than \$47 million for fiscal year 1970.

No one need be sorry that they are not receiving enough money. It may even be necessary to transfer some of these high-salaried boondogglers to agencies where they can perform a needed public service—if they have the ability to do so. I doubt that there is another agency in the Federal Government where so many employees have done so little for so much—so much money that goes into their pockets every month.

Mr. President, I hope that my amendment will be seriously considered. We are talking about \$8.3 million of taxpayers' money. We are debating and voting here on two amendments en bloc. In voting on these amendments, those Senators who vote "yea" on this rollcall will be voting to save the taxpayers of this country \$8,300,000, without in any manner whatsoever impairing our national security or vital public services.

I know that we will probably hear the old argument that the civil defense budget amounts to but a fraction of 1 percent of the total defense budget. That is true. However, translated into dollars, that percentage exceeds \$60 million this year—a huge sum of money that could be diverted to really essential programs, and will be if a majority of Senators vote "yea" on my amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield myself whatever time I may require.

First of all, Mr. President, I certainly shall not indulge in making a comparison of how minuscule this appropriation for civil defense is in comparison to our defense budget. That is not my argument

at all. My argument will be directed toward the essentiality of the program.

Mr. President, if we carry my distinguished friend's logic to its ultimate conclusion, we should eliminate this item completely, because if it is a boondoggle and all those who are connected with it are boondogglers, the program should be eliminated completely.

But what are we confronted with here? This world has gone mad with atomic and hydrogen bombs. We have enough nuclear and thermonuclear weapons to burn the world, and until the day comes when we can put those weapons under international control, or dismantle them and drop them all to the bottom of the sea, we must be concerned about our population.

I am told that Russia has enough atomic bombs so that, on the first surprise strike, she could kill one-half of our population, or about 100 million people.

The argument is that nothing has happened since the bomb was dropped on Nagasaki in August 1945, and for that reason we can abandon all our protection. That is like saying, "Cancel your fire insurance on your house because there has not been a fire. Or cry about it, after 20 years, because your house did not burn down and you had to pay the premium for 20 years."

I say thank God that nothing happened, but the big question is, what if something does happen?

The argument is made that someone picked up the telephone and called the office downtown, and could not get an answer. Well, today is a holiday, but I want to assure Senators that it is not a holiday for the civil defense of this country, because we have a duty officer on duty all the time in Washington as well as in each regional office, and the duty officer in Washington has direct contact with the war room in the Pentagon. That is how serious it is.

I repeat, I hope the day will never come that anyone dares, in an act of madness, to fire a missile at our population. But, God forbid, what if it does happen? What do we do, just sit down and die? Or are we going to do something about protecting the people of this country?

I do not care what street you walk on, or what building you go into, you see these markings, called "shelter." That means a place where people can go, and we have down there fresh water and emergency supplies. To do what? To save all population from contamination and from being burned to death. That is the purpose of it. That is the purpose of civil defense.

What have they done? They have developed one of the best communications systems in this country, and it has been used every time we have had a natural disaster. Any time we have had a tornado, any time we have had a flood, any time we have had any kind of a national catastrophe, the civil defense people have been out there with their helmets—you have seen them with their white helmets—as public-spirited citizens, doing their jobs, to meet the emergency, and right the wrong.

That is what this is all about, Mr.

President. We have scrutinized the civil defense budget very carefully. The Civil Defense Office asked for \$125 million. The Bureau of the Budget allowed them \$75,300,000. We have cut that figure slightly, but we restored a little bit over the House figure.

Our figure is a very modest one. I think it will help them mark up some of the shelter places that have been neglected because the budget has been cut in the past.

The former Governor of North Dakota, Mr. Davis, who has struck me as being a public-spirited man, was recently appointed Director of Civil Defense. He is not a boondogglers; at least he did not appear that way to me; and I do not care whether he is a Republican, a Democrat, or an independent, to me he is a great American. I hope that, in the public interest, the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. PASTORE. I will give the Senator whatever time he needs.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in this crowded Chamber so many Senators have heard the remarks of both the Senator from Rhode Island and myself that I do not think it will be necessary for me to take any time from the Senator from Rhode Island; but I am very thankful to him for offering me additional time.

Mr. President, I simply say again, the House of Representatives appropriated \$64,200,000 for civil defense, and the Senate Appropriations Committee has recommended the amount be increased to \$72,500,000. We have had civil defense in the United States since 1951, and \$1,700,000,000 of the taxpayers' money has been spent on civil defense in those years intervening. I assert that no additional protection has been given to the people of this Nation by reason of that huge expenditure.

With reference to the nuclear attack on Hiroshima in August of 1945, and in the event of any nuclear attack on this Nation, our defense is certainly not civil defense workers scattered around the Nation. Our real and only defense is our power of instant complete retaliation. We are no better off for all our past civil defense expenditures, and I urge that my colleagues support my amendments. A "yea" vote will be a vote for economy, and will bring us back to the appropriation figure as passed by the House of Representatives.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in accordance with the statement of the majority leader yesterday, I understand that the vote will not take place before 2 o'clock.

I am perfectly ready to yield back the remainder of my time, but time is running under the unanimous-consent agreement. Therefore, 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. PASTORE. 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. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota whatever time he may desire.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I oppose the cut that is being proposed. This is one of the few budgets that the Senate has been considering in recent days that has not been increased sharply from the estimate of the Bureau of the Budget. The amount of money allowed by the committee is still less than the amount of the budget estimate. We have an excellent administrator. He happens to come from my own State, so I admit to being a bit prejudiced. However, he is a man who has an excellent war record. He has been the national commander of the American Legion and twice Governor of North Dakota. He is familiar with the problems of the States—and the States do have many problems under this program.

The Civil Defense Administration has been most helpful when the States have experienced disasters, such as floods. Those who have never lived through a real flood disaster do not know or do not really appreciate the work that is done by the Civil Defense Administration.

Civil defense is a very important program, one which I do not believe should be cut further than it already has been cut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield back the rest of his time?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PASTORE. I understand that at 2 o'clock the Senate will vote on the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock has arrived. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG). The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE), the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Senator from Arkansas

(Mr. McCLELLAN), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS) are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) is paired with the Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN). If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan would vote "yea," and the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senators from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN and Mr. GOLDWATER), the Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. SMITH) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa (Mr. MILLER) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. SAXBE) are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. MILLER), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. SMITH), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 49, as follows:

[No. 146 Leg.]

YEAS—19

Bayh	Fulbright	Randolph
Brooke	Goodell	Schweiker
Church	Hatfield	Symington
Cook	McGovern	Williams, Del.
Cooper	Moss	Young, Ohio
Cranston	Nelson	
Ellender	Proxmire	

NAYS—49

Aiken	Harris	Pastore
Allott	Holland	Pearson
Anderson	Hruska	Pell
Baker	Hughes	Percy
Bellmon	Inouye	Prouty
Bennett	Jackson	Ribicoff
Bible	Javits	Russell
Boggs	Jordan, Idaho	Scott
Cotton	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Curtis	Magnuson	Spong
Dodd	Mansfield	Stennis
Dole	McGee	Stevens
Dominick	Montoya	Talmadge
Ervin	Mundt	Thurmond
Fong	Murphy	Young, N. Dak.
Gore	Muskie	
Griffin	Packwood	

NOT VOTING—32

Allen	Gurney	Metcalf
Burdick	Hansen	Miller
Byrd, Va.	Hart	Mondale
Byrd, W. Va.	Hartke	Saxbe
Cannon	Hollings	Smith, Ill.
Case	Jordan, N.C.	Sparkman
Eagleton	Long	Tower
Eastland	Mathias	Tydings
Fannin	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Goldwater	McClellan	Yarborough
Gravel	McIntyre	

So the amendment of Mr. YOUNG of Ohio was rejected.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr.

RIBICOFF in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 40, line 24, strike out the figure \$6 million and insert \$8 million.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes. If I may have the attention of the Senate I can explain the amendment in a very short time.

The amendment would increase the appropriation for fair housing and equal opportunity under the Office of Housing and Urban Development from \$6 million to \$8 million, which has been requested by the administration.

Mr. President, the amendment is co-sponsored by Senators JAVITS, HART, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, BROOKE, DOMINICK, SCHWEIKER, PERCY, MATHIAS, RIBICOFF, STEVENS, MONDALE, and GOOD-ELL.

As a matter of legislative history, this Office, under the Johnson administration requested \$14.5 million. The review by the Nixon administration cut the amount to \$10.5 million. The House committee appropriated \$3 million, which was raised to \$5 million on the floor of the House. The Senate subcommittee has recommended \$6 million. Under the pending amendment the amount would be raised to \$8 million.

As I have said, the amendment has the support of the administration, pursuant to the testimony of Secretary Romney, which is set forth in the hearings on page 513.

Actually, support of the amendment would rest upon two principles: First, that it is a national civil rights program; and second, that it is a program designed to give the black minority and other minorities economic opportunities. This office administers the Federal fair housing law which was passed by Congress last year. It has a caseload now of about 140 cases per month, and increasing, not on a sectional basis. Testimony indicated that there were almost twice as many regional offices in Chicago as in Atlanta and Fort Worth, although that number is increasing now. In general, coverage of law will almost double in the number of housing units—

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield at that point?

Mr. PEARSON. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Kansas has recited the precise chronology of the amendment. There is no question that the money can be used properly. If the Senator from Kansas would modify his amendment—I have already discussed it with my counterpart, the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT), the Ranking Republican on the committee—if the Senator from Kansas would modify his amendment to read an increase of \$1 million instead of \$2 million, we would be happy to take it to conference.

Mr. PEARSON. I thank the Senator. I know of his deep interest in this matter. I should like just to make a further comment and then I shall modify the amendment as suggested by the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. President, this is not an appropriation of money for a great number

of added personnel. There are about 285 people in the office now. The request would be for only 40 more. Really, the great amount of money being requested here is for education and technical assistance in the States so that we can approach the problem on an educational and a conciliatory basis rather than on an inspection by force.

Thus, with great appreciation to the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Colorado, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment and have it read from \$7 million, instead of \$8 million.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the right to modify his amendment. The amendment will be so modified.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has now been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified of the Senator from Kansas.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to, as follows:

On page 40, line 24, strike out the figure \$6 million and insert \$7 million.

AMENDMENT NO. 274

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), I call up his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 4, line 4, strike out "\$105,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof \$107,500,000."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the oral statement made by the Senator from Virginia (Mr. BYRD) on the floor of the Senate yesterday be printed in the RECORD.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 274

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be printed.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I should like at this point to make a brief explanation of my amendment. I cannot be here tomorrow because of official business which will require my presence elsewhere, and for that reason I have offered this amendment today. I have talked with the majority leader about the amendment, and he will call up the amendment on my behalf tomorrow.

My amendment would add \$2.5 million for the non-highway programs under the funds appropriated to the President, for Appalachian regional development programs.

For the non-highway programs, the Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member, has recommended restoration of \$10 million above the House allowance of \$95 million, which would make a total of \$105 million. This is \$7.5 million below the budget estimate. The reclama, as I understand it, was in the amount of \$2.5 million more than the Senate Appropriations Committee allowed. My amendment would bring the total restoration up to the full amount that was appealed.

These programs are designed to help the poorer communities of Appalachia participate in regular Federal grant-in-aid programs. Many communities in Appalachia lack the tax base to provide the matching share required for basic Federal grants. Per capita local revenue in 1962 for the United States was \$149, but in Appalachia it was only \$85.

Back in 1965, when the Appalachian Regional Development Act was passed, Appalachia, with almost 10 percent of the Nation's population, was receiving only a little over 7 percent of Federal grants in aid. This year, thanks to this program, Appalachian communities are receiving almost their fair share of national grants in aid.

However, tight money conditions have imposed a new burden upon many of our smaller communities. The rise in interest rates has foreclosed many of them from being able to raise needed funds in the bond market for local improvements unless some assistance can be provided to them through grants under the Appalachian programs to reduce the amount they will have to raise in the private market. It is because of these increases in the cost to localities of borrowing money that an additional \$2.5 million is required.

The Appropriations Committee has recommended restoration of \$10 million over the amount recommended by the other body, and I am grateful to Mr. Pastore and Mr. Allott and others on the committee but this is still \$7.5 million below the budget estimate. Of this restored amount, the committee recommends that \$5 million be used to provide the full amount of the budget estimate of \$35 million for the Appalachian health program and that \$5 million be restored to provide the full amount of the budget estimate of \$25 million for vocational education facilities.

In recommending the addition of \$2.5 million to the supplemental grant program, I wish to point out that most of the supplemental grants—80 percent of them, in fact—are used to assist communities to build schools, hospitals, and other education and health facilities. If we fail to provide these needed additional funds, a number of urgently needed health and educational services and facilities cannot be provided and, thus, some of the momentum we have achieved in this effort will be lost. I hope that the Senate will agree to my amendment on tomorrow.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. Young) be again laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this amendment, which has just been called up, is being offered by the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Byrd), who is away from the Senate today on official business. This is one of the few days he has ever missed attendance in this body.

On yesterday, at the close of the day, however, he introduced an amendment which has now been called up for consideration. At the time he introduced the amendment, Mr. Byrd explained its purpose. It would add \$2.5 million to the funds appropriated to the President for Appalachian regional development programs. The Senator from West Virginia made a statement supporting the amendment at the time of its introduction yesterday, and it appears in yesterday's RECORD.

Senator Byrd has informed me that, if his amendment is adopted, it will bring the full amount for the nonhighway programs up to \$107.5 million. The House

had allowed \$95 million, the Senate Appropriations Committee restored \$10 million, to provide a total of \$105 million, which, I am advised by the Senator from West Virginia, is \$7.5 million below the budget estimate and \$2.5 million below the full amount stated in the reclama to the committee. The amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia would restore the full amount appealed.

Mr. President, I ask the Senate to agree to this amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, this is another amendment that I have discussed with the Senator from Colorado (Mr. Allott). The facts are as the Senator has stated. If we do not put the money in here, we will have to do it with a supplemental appropriation; then we are perfectly willing to take it to conference and take our chances there.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has now been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, for the benefit of Senators, the Senator from California (Mr. Cranston) was going to introduce an amendment that had to do with severe injuries received by veterans in Vietnam and the building of facilities for them, and the difference between the Johnson estimate and the Nixon estimate. He was going to explain it, then we were going to discuss it, and then he was going to withdraw it. I do not know whether he is in the Chamber at the moment, but right after that, I believe we will be ready for third reading and final passage of the bill.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 273

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, No. 273, and ask that it be stated. Let me announce, before the clerk reports, that the cosponsors of this amendment are Senators GOODELL, HART, MUSKIE, PERCY, CASE, MONDALE, SCHWEIKER, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 34 strike out line 1 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$500,000,000 to remain available until expended".

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this amendment would increase the amount

available for urban renewal by \$250 million. This contrasts with the efforts made yesterday to increase the same item by some \$587 million.

There were two reasons for offering this amendment today. First, the urgent need; and, second, the defeat of yesterday's amendment by only 2 votes. This very narrow defeat indicated that perhaps a somewhat lower figure would be adopted. In the absence of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. Hart), who carried the principal load yesterday, I undertook to introduce the amendment today.

We face a very serious situation in the cities. Practically every housing program depends upon the availability of land.

I think we are all aware of the critical situation which faces the cities, including the major cities of my own State of New York. There has almost been a shut-down of low- and middle-income housing.

Mr. President, I understand the problem of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Pastore). Those of my colleagues who are sponsoring this amendment and I have discussed it with him. Senator PASTORE, himself, is very strongly disposed toward the very item we are discussing now. He even points out, quite properly, that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Byrd), chairman of the Subcommittee on Supplemental Appropriations, voted for the amendment yesterday for the full amount of the authorization. However, Senator PASTORE does not have a budget estimate. In view of the urgency of the need—I think it was very clearly and without any question demonstrated yesterday—he thinks we should first try to get the administration to recognize the critical nature of the situation and that all the other objectives which HUD seeks depend upon adequate urban renewal funding. Senator PASTORE, therefore, believes that we should first seek a budget estimate for a supplemental bill from the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Quite frankly, I must say that I am motivated, also, by the fact that it is rather difficult and rough constantly to put the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Pastore) in the position where, although he is personally disposed toward an item of this character, he must oppose it, because he is managing the bill.

Therefore, after discussing this matter with those who joined me in this amendment, we have determined not to press it. Instead, we will do our utmost to bring the administration to the realization that its other programs, such as rent supplements, homeownership and rental assistance, are based on urban renewal, and to obtain from HUD a firm appraisal of what the administration is forced to reject, because the amount made available by this bill is insufficient. We will then do our utmost to get a supplemental appropriation.

I think it is quite extraordinary for the Senator from Rhode Island, who is quite senior on the Appropriations Committee, to inform us that, if we do not get it, he himself will move the additional amount. He is satisfied of the real need for urban renewal funds, for it is

the underpinning of all the housing programs contained in the bill.

In light of the situation as I have described it to the Senate, my colleagues and I feel we are better advised not to press the amendment at this time.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. It is not a question of seniority; it is a question of the merit of the legislation. There is tremendous merit to this legislation. I discussed it yesterday. What I am opposed to is making a compromise on the basis of cutting it in half, on the chance that it will pass because it lost by only two votes yesterday. But the danger there is that we have already cut a meritorious proposal in half. I do not want to see that. We should proceed in the regular order. We should appeal to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to get an estimate and to have it included in the supplemental bill. As I told my colleagues, I would be the first to support it.

I hope the sponsors of the amendment will withdraw it because, very frankly, I think we are all in accord on the objective. It is a question of how we should do it. I think the wise way to do it is in the regular order.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am in accord with what is sought to be achieved here, too. The Senator from Rhode Island has stated a desire to proceed in a fashion which may bring to the attention of the Secretary and to the committees involved the great seriousness of the problem which the mayors of our country have presented to us so earnestly. Therefore, I very much hope that something further can be done; but I am inclined to believe, in view of this colloquy, that we are proceeding in the right direction if we agree with the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the amendment, I should like to indicate my support for this action. There is no question in my mind that not only does the Senator from Rhode Island fully support this amount as one that is justified and could be substantiated, but that the Senator from West Virginia by his vote yesterday indicated that, as manager of the supplemental bill, he would stand behind this amount.

I would like to join in whatever letter of request is prepared to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and will lend my full support in the Banking and Currency Committee and the Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee of that committee to this very important item. This is the best way to work the matter out.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the consideration which the Senator from New York and his associates are showing to our distinguished

chairman. I want the record to show very clearly that the amount now in the bill is sizably larger than it was when it came over to us. The reason for that was the insistence of the Senator from Rhode Island that it be raised \$150 million. The committee agreed to go along with him in that insistence. I do think the way we propose to take care of the matter is much more considerate of him, because he has been the leader of this cause in the Appropriations Committee.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes just to say to the mayors of the country—and they are the ones who are on the frying pan, as it were, now—they should understand very clearly, first, that we will have another opportunity on the supplemental, on any supplemental bill that comes up. Second, and very important, they are interested in delivery, not performances on the floor of the Senate. I am convinced, and my colleagues who join me in this are convinced, that the best way to get performance for them is in this way. I think it is very important that they understand that, especially since it deals with their planning and reliance on adequate urban renewal money.

I am confident we will find ourselves able to finance, through urban renewal, any project which is really worthy that any of our cities have, and that they will not be stymied by any absence of appropriations at this time.

Under the circumstances, I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I have been very much interested in the discussion which has taken place here. Of course, this in conjunction with the discussion that took place yesterday afternoon, constitutes the record on this matter.

I think my friend from New York, as well as others here, should understand that there was no real controversy in our committee about the full amount being put in the bill. As a matter of fact, when the distinguished chairman and I met to talk over what possible areas we would recommend to the subcommittee, this was included. The distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota evidenced a very strong interest in it.

From the discussion which has occurred here, I would not want the implication left that there were, perhaps, Senators unknown who were opposing it.

I say this, therefore, to make the record perfectly clear: There was no objection to it; and it was supported by the senior Senator from Colorado, the senior Senator from North Dakota, and others.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for just one observation?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. It should also be made clear, because this is the record, that in the reduction I was not taking account of the merits, or acting substantively at all. We were just trying to get something in terms of a rescue mission for what is really a desperate situation. The Senator

from Rhode Island and the Senator from Colorado are absolutely correct; we need the total amount. I am very grateful to them for their position.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, may I speak now about an amendment I shall offer at the end of my remarks?

Mr. PASTORE. I will give the Senator whatever time he needs on the bill, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time on the bill.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I shall offer an amendment to this bill that would restore the original sum requested by the Johnson administration for the full Veterans' Administration's hospital and medical care budget. The House of Representatives, in its deliberations, restored 34 million of those dollars. The Senate committee has restored only 20 million of those dollars. The present administration recommended a cut of about \$70 million, my amendment would fully restore.

I feel that underlying this budgetary situation is a very serious problem, of which I have become aware only in the past month. I apologize to the chairman of the subcommittee presenting the matter to us today for not having appeared before his subcommittee when the hearings were held on the matter. But the fact is that I was not fully aware of the dimensions of the problem we face in attempting to meet the obligations we owe to the men who have gone to Vietnam and have suffered wounds there that, in many cases, will be everlasting in terms of totally disabling them, disfiguring them, or restricting their ability to live the types of lives men who have not suffered such wounds live in our society.

This war in Vietnam, with relationship to the wounds suffered by the men who serve there, is totally different from any other war we have fought. This is true for two reasons. The first reason is the nature of the weapons used in this war. New, modern destructive devices, ranging from high caliber rifles which inflict shattering wounds the moment someone is hit by a bullet fired from them to light caliber weapons and new types of mines and other traps used in close combat and guerrilla warfare. These new weapons are creating wounds that are unprecedented in their destructive and crippling nature.

The second reason for the problem we face together with these men, and which hence our country faces, is that due to our ability, now, with helicopters to lift fallen men from battle the moment they have fallen, and fly them in a matter of minutes to field hospitals, these men receive medical care far earlier than in prior wars. And they receive better care, due to new medical advances and wonder drugs which were not available before.

For these reasons, more badly wounded men—10 percent more—are surviving this war than ever before in the history of any war we have fought. Let me state

two startling, staggering, and alarming statistics.

Of the totally disabled veterans among our wounded, only 4 percent of those wounded who survived in World War II were totally disabled. In the Korean conflict, 6 percent of those wounded and surviving were totally disabled. Now, in Vietnam, we find that 12 percent of those wounded and surviving are totally disabled for the rest of their lives.

Another statistic is this: In World War II, when men in combat were burned over more than half their bodies, 60 percent died. Now, in Vietnam, due to one new drug, only 30 percent of the men so burned are dying. So that twice the proportion of men with the disfiguring, terribly hurtful, shattering experience of having more than 50 percent of their bodies burned—a total of 70 percent of these so burned—are surviving this war. But they need our assistance; they need our care, and I am now talking about what happens when they get back from Vietnam, totally disabled, disfigured, upset psychiatrically, and so on.

I seriously question whether we are now giving these men lying in our veterans' hospitals the careful care, the intensive care, the compassionate attention and the totally modern sort of medical assistance that they need for recovery and rehabilitation, if they can be rehabilitated, to restore their spirits, if they can be restored. I am sure all Americans would want for them only the best care and rehabilitation assistance in light of the sacrifice they have made and the risks they have run on orders from our Government, if they were not volunteers, in behalf of the rest of our society.

My Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will begin hearings on November 21 to explore this matter, to determine what is the situation in these Veterans' Administration hospitals. What are we doing, and what are we failing to do?

I do not know whether the amendment that I shall now offer is even adequate to provide the funds that we need for this purpose. So I am simply, at this point, offering what the Johnson administration, after very careful study, felt would be adequate. The \$70 million cut-back that was proposed by the current administration would mean that we would fall back 3,600 in the number of personnel helping the men in our hospitals. It would mean a great reduction in the development of hospitals and other facilities needed for these purposes. Even if, in accordance with my amendment, we restore the full sum requested by the previous administration, I do not know that that will be enough, but I suggest it as a starting point, and I therefore send this amendment to the desk, and ask that it be read.

Several Senators addressed the Chair. Mr. CRANSTON. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the amendment be stated first.

The legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 27, line 10, strike out "\$54,638,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$59,638,000".

On page 27, line 18, strike out "\$16,950,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$17,327,000".

On page 28, line 2, strike out "\$220,865,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$223,065,000".

On page 28, lines 12 and 13, strike out "\$55,217,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$96,368,000".

On page 28, lines 17 and 18, strike out "\$4,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,000,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Senator quoted the statistics about the totally disabled. I think it would be interesting if he could tell us about the relationship between the killed and the wounded. I mean, is it not a fact that the number of wounded in this war, relative to the number killed, is far higher than in any previous war in our history? If I recall correctly, the proportion used to be about 3 to 1, and it is now approaching 9 or 10 to 1, of wounded to killed. Is that not correct?

Mr. CRANSTON. I do not have the exact figures available, but there certainly are more of the wounded surviving in this war than hitherto.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that is the approximate percentage.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I happen to have the exact figures here.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am sure they would be interesting.

Mr. CRANSTON. I am delighted to have a leader always equipped with the exact figures.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The total number of wounded in this war, up to November 6—that is less than a week ago—is 256,785. The total number of dead is 39,232 battle deaths, and 6,880 U.S. casualties not a result of action by hostile forces, but in Vietnam. So the total number dead is 46,212, and the total number wounded 256,789. The overall total for casualties combined is 302,901, as of last week.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am sure that is accurate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is. I ask unanimous consent that the table from which I have been reading be printed in the RECORD.

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

VIETNAM CASUALTIES STATISTICAL SUMMARY

The Department of Defense released today the cumulative casualties reported in connection with the conflict in Vietnam, as of 1 November 1969.

U.S. CASUALTIES RESULTING FROM ACTION BY HOSTILE FORCES

Total U.S. deaths from actions by hostile forces is the sum of the following categories: killed in action, died of wounds, died while missing and died while captured. Lines 1 through 4 subdivide casualties by cause or category. Line 5 provides an additional breakdown of the same totals by environment (air or ground). Totals are cumulative from January 1, 1961 through 1 November 1969.

	Army	Navy ¹	Marine Corps	Air Force	Total
1. Killed.....	20,794	941	10,912	387	33,034
2. Wounded or injured:					
(a) Died of wounds.....	2,795	123	1,319	36	4,273
(b) Nonfatal wounds:					
Hospital care required.....	78,145	3,500	47,691	638	129,974
Hospital care not required.....	84,528	5,059	35,192	2,032	126,811
Total.....					256,785
3. Missing:					
(a) Died while missing.....	1,413	172	5	325	1,915
(b) Returned to control.....	52	7	6	24	89
(c) Current missing.....	192	106	88	525	911
4. Captured or interned:					
(a) Died while captured or interned.....	9			1	10
(b) Returned to control.....	36	3	4	6	49
(c) Current captured or interned.....	50	140	23	201	414
5. Deaths:					
(a) From aircraft accidents/incidents:					
Fixed wing.....	72	153	127	583	935
Helicopter.....	1,359	52	365	40	1,816
(b) From ground action.....	23,580	1,031	11,744	126	36,481
Total deaths ²	25,011	1,236	12,236	749	39,232

B. COMBAT DEATHS FOR OTHER FORCES IN VIETNAM—SINCE JAN. 1, 1961

Force	RVNAF ^{3,4}	Other free world forces	Enemy ⁴
6. Total deaths.....	96,456	3,433	566,501

C. U.S. CASUALTIES NOT THE RESULT OF ACTION BY HOSTILE FORCES—SINCE JAN. 1, 1961

	Army	Navy ¹	Marine Corps	Air Force	Total
7. Current missing.....	117		3		120
8. Deaths:					
(a) From aircraft accidents/incidents:					
Fixed wing.....	217	117	40	217	591
Helicopter.....	1,136	23	198	8	1,365
(b) From other causes.....	3,015	528	1,186	195	4,924
Total deaths.....	4,368	668	1,424	420	6,880

¹ Navy figures include Coast Guard.

² Sum of lines 1, 2(a), 3(a), and 4(a).

³ Does not include paramilitary losses.

⁴ Includes adjustment from previous period and is subject to later adjustment in turn.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The point is that because of the reasons the Senator from California has stated in the other wars in which we have been engaged, there have never been so many who have survived. That is, a great many of those wounded in this war do survive for the reasons he has given. I think his amendment has a great deal of merit, and I support it.

Mr. CRANSTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator will yield, may I say that those figures cover the period from January 1, 1961, to November 1, 1969.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, first of all, I wish to make it abundantly clear that I do not think there is a Member of the Senate who is inclined to supply anything less than adequate and complete support for our wounded veterans.

No matter what amount of money is needed and no matter whether we have to take the money out of any existing program, I know that this country is not going to abandon or neglect any veteran or the widow of any veteran. I am sure of that. It has traditionally been the history of our country that we have taken care of these people.

I congratulate the Senator from California for bringing this very important problem to our attention. However, we do have a problem here. First, these wounded veterans, of course, go to military base hospitals. They do not go to veterans hospitals. Once they are released from military hospitals, they might go to veterans hospitals. That does not change the problem.

I suggest that if the Senator will withdraw the amendment, the matter should be explored exhaustively. We should go into it in depth and find out exactly what the problem is, what needs to be done, and then to do it and do it immediately.

I would hope that is the case, because whether or not the amendment is agreed to, I do not think it will reach the problem that faces us.

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

Mr. CRANSTON. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I feel about this matter as does the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from California. However, I do think we ought to be very careful that we put the money in the proper place.

Wounded soldiers and all other members of the Armed Forces are taken to base hospitals and treated. Once they are honorably discharged from the military, they have the right to apply to a veterans' hospital if they need care.

If sufficient care is not being afforded to the wounded while in the military, it seems to me that we ought to investigate the matter as the Senator's committee is doing and see to it that appropriations are voted for this purpose.

The Veterans' Administration by law—and they only have so many beds in the 166 VA hospitals—can take care of only those who have actually been honorably discharged.

There might be some medical expertise in a veterans' hospital which could cause the military to suggest that a man go

there. However, that would be an unusual case.

I am so glad that the Senator is going to go into this very important matter.

The pending bill provides for \$1,541 million for medical care, which is \$17 million over the budget request. I would not want to see this money used incorrectly.

The Veterans' Administration hospitals do a fine job particularly in the research field. However, they are available to the veteran only after he is discharged.

I hope that the Senator will go into another matter. Very few people in this country realize that every other bed in the 166 veterans' hospitals is for an m.p. case. They use tranquilizers on these patients and perform a great deal of outpatient care for them.

I want to be sure that we are doing the right thing with the money and spending it in the right place because of the importance of this program.

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

Mr. CRANSTON. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I think we are more or less acting in a vacuum here. No matter what we say, we have to do it. The best way for us to do it is to get on our bicycles and do something about it. This is not a proper way in which to do it. This is merely a vehicle to bring the matter to our attention.

I think that every Senator is alert and stands ready to do everything that needs to be done, knowing that it has to be done.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I ask the Senator when it will be possible for the Appropriations Subcommittee to launch hearings.

Mr. PASTORE. I would suggest, inasmuch as the Senator is the chairman of a Subcommittee on Authorization, that he begin hearings tomorrow. Once he finishes the hearings, he can come to us and tell us what needs to be done. The Senator has to do the job first.

Mr. CRANSTON. When will it be possible for the Senator's committee to consider the matter?

Mr. PASTORE. A supplemental bill will probably be up in January. That is about 2 months from now.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, another committee has a responsibility for exploring matters pertaining to military hospitals. That is the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. PASTORE. Why does the Senator not write a letter and I will countersign the letter.

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

Mr. CRANSTON. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, there may be a tendency here to mix up the actual military hospital care and the veterans' hospital care.

The distinguished Senator from Washington and I have been following this particular matter for many years. The Senator from Rhode Island has done so very assiduously this year.

We thought we had every place covered in the bill. That is why we went \$17 million over the budget on medical care.

I think we have everything covered at this time. However, we do have another bill coming up.

No Senator will deny our veterans access to the veterans' hospitals.

I do not know what the Senator has heard. I received a call last night at midnight from a veteran who praised the hospital he was in to the skies because of the excellent care he receives. Perhaps we are fortunate in Colorado because we do have a wonderful hospital and the research in many areas there has stepped ahead into the very far horizons of scientific investigations.

There is no Senator who would not want to include appropriations for what is needed. If we need it, we will do it.

But I must say that as of this moment, based upon the evidence and the letters that have come to my attention and to the attention of the committee, that the legislation should take care of this for the immediate future.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I believe it is particularly appropriate that this matter came before the Senate on Veterans Day and that we launched consideration of this problem anew on this day when we pay tribute to the war dead. This is a time when we might most appropriately dedicate ourselves to assuring that we are doing whatever needs to be done for those who survive their wounds but are among the half living in our society at the present time.

Recognizing that three committees would be involved in this matter—the Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs, the Appropriations Committee, and the Armed Services Committee—recognizing that there has not been an adequate opportunity for all members of the appropriate committees to consider the matter in the light of what I believe are new signs that we may not be doing what we should do, and recognizing the dedication of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) and of their committees in this area, along with the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) and the members of our full committee, I withdraw my amendment with the understanding that all three Senate committees involved will, as rapidly as possible, see to it that we do whatever needs to be done to meet our obligations to these men.

I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 28, lines 12 and 13, strike out "\$55,217,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$56,958,000".

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the purpose of my amendment is to raise the figure of \$55,217,000 recommended by the committee for the construction of hospital and domiciliary foundations by \$1,741,000 for the purpose of providing modernization and air conditioning for

the Muskogee, Okla., Veterans Hospital, an item which was included in the bill which came from the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I can testify to the great need for this item and for the excellent care being provided the veterans in the hospital at Muskogee.

It is very important that, as other facilities have been closed down or other activities curtailed, we improve the facilities and modernize the facilities at the remaining veterans' hospitals, one of which is Muskogee, one of the larger and one of the best such facilities anywhere in the country.

I would hope that this item might be reinserted into this bill, and I would appreciate any comments that the distinguished manager of the bill might have.

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

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The issue is in conference, and the recommendation for its deletion was made by the Veterans' Administration because it exceeded the budget estimate. That was our reason for deleting the item. But it is in conference, it will be discussed there, and we hope that justice will be done.

Mr. HARRIS. On this one item alone, which refers only to my State, I would not want to press for a rollcall vote, because, since Senators have not had an opportunity to hear the discussion. I think the chances might be that the amendment might not carry, and our case thereby might be prejudiced in the conference. Especially, since the administration has recommended against the appropriation as the Senator from Rhode Island has pointed out, I do not agree with the administration that this item should be deleted, because I am convinced of its merits.

On the assurance of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, however, that consideration will be given to this matter in conference, I would not want to request a rollcall vote, and I would hope that the Senator would take another look at it in conference.

Mr. PASTORE. I would hope that the Senator would not weaken his case. I would hope that if he would ask for a rollcall vote, it would be adopted. But I hope he would rely on the astuteness of the conferees to carry out his intention.

Mr. HARRIS. The counsel of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island is wise. I want the strongest possible case for this item when the matter goes to conference. It is one of great merit.

With that record having been made, Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Packwood in the chair). The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, yesterday I was necessarily absent from the Senate when the explanation of the funding of programs for the Appalachian Regional Development Commission was discussed by Senator PASTORE, the able manager of the pending appropriations bill. He said there was an unusual situa-

tion as he discussed the Appalachian program. That situation referred to the clarification of the deletion of the amount of \$350 million in obligational authority for highway construction in the Appalachian States for fiscal 1970 and 1971.

The statement made by the able manager of the bill, of course, is sufficient. But the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER) and I have discussed the matter, as the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, with jurisdiction over the authorization for the Appalachian measure, and we are hopeful that the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island will further clarify whether the funds previously appropriated for the obligational authority could be used for the liquidation of the new contract authority.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, this has to do with the highway program for the Appalachian Regional Development Commission. The House did fund the money, \$350 million, which was advance funding. The authorizing committees—that is, the legislative committees—authorized, through contractual authority, the building of the highway, which means, of course, that we defer the funding at this time. The funding will have to be made up, but it will not in any way impede the highway program. Everything is going to be the same. The only trouble is that, rather than put the money in now, we will put the money in when the bill comes due. They have a right to make commitments under the contract authority granted in legislation that has already been sent to the President for his signature.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the Senator. We are grateful for this further explanation.

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

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I listened with interest to the remarks of the senior Senator from Oklahoma concerning the need for consideration by the conferees on this measure of the need for moderation of the veterans' hospital at Muskogee, Oklahoma, in relation to the amounts appropriated for the purpose in the House version and the Senate version of the pending bill.

In the absence of the distinguished chairman of my committee, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), I should like to say what I know he would say, were he present. Given his fervent dedication to the welfare of our Nation's veterans, I feel sure he would beseech and plead with the members of the conference to consider also the needs for modernization and air conditioning for a Veterans' Administration hospital in Waco, Tex. There is apparently a great need, which the House version would meet.

I simply want to ask, on behalf of the senior Senator from Texas, that the conferees do all they can for that facility in the conference.

HUD APPROPRIATIONS AND RURAL PROGRAMS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in connection with the appropriations bill for independent offices and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, I wish to point out an aspect which I find disturbing.

I do not wish to imply that I do not support this bill as reported by the committee. I do, and I intend to vote for it. I offer these remarks in a spirit of promoting in this body the desire to maintain our perspective in all matters. I know this desire is shared by all my colleagues—that in the infinitely complex matters with which we deal daily, we do our best to keep all things in a proper perspective to each other and to the environment in which they exist; that by careful consideration of the full context of facts, and with all the reason and wisdom we can bring to bear, we reach our judgments in such a way as to make the laws reflect the ultimate good of our nation. A part of this, obviously, is the proper division of our fiscal resources in bringing them to bear on a myriad of pressing problems. This, of course, is in all our minds whenever we consider an appropriation bill. We are striving for a proper balance, a reasoned perspective.

I point out to my colleagues that in the bill we are considering, it is proposed that there be appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development over \$1,896,000,000. Of this very imposing sum, and with advanced funding provided last year, there will be \$1 billion for urban renewal programs. For metropolitan development there will be \$276 million. Of this latter figure, and with a carryover of \$15 million, there will be \$150 million in grants. These are grants to be made to local public bodies to finance basic water and sewer facilities. This is a large sum, and it is not for loans; it is for grants.

I should like to comment, by way of fostering balance and perspective in all things, that we might examine what is being done for the rural people of this country, in the matter of funds for water and sewer facilities.

The Farmers Home Administration makes loans to farmers and to nonprofit rural associations for water supply and waste disposal systems. Association members, through a fee system, repay the loans.

The FHA also makes grants for rural water and sewer systems. They can make grants, up to an authorized annual total of \$5 million for preparation of plans for water and sewer systems.

They also can make development grants to nonprofit rural associations for water and sewers, up to half the cost of the project.

In the appropriations bill for the Department of Agriculture, now in conference, there was provided by the other body the sum of \$40 million for rural water and waste disposal grants. I proposed a larger sum, and with the support of the committee, which I greatly appreciate, the amount proposed to and voted by the Senate was \$46 million. I trust at least a substantial part of the increase will be held in conference. I might

add that the budgeted amount was \$28 million.

We have, then, a rather revealing comparison of the Federal funding of urban projects and rural projects made for similar purposes—\$150 million for urban grants and a maximum of \$46 million for rural grants, both for water and sewer systems.

I would ask that my colleagues devote some thought to this allocation of priorities on funds, to reach a reasoned judgment as to whether in fact we have achieved the balanced perspective I am sure we all seek.

I have devoted thought to it, and in my view there is a danger that the somewhat overwhelming problems of vast urban areas are allowed to divert too much attention from the very real problems of rural America. In the great urban areas there is a concentration of problems, but a concentration of resources as well. Our rural areas frequently have the problems without the resources. Let us remember that the development of rural areas is a part of the answer to the problems of metropolitan sprawl, of overpopulated centers, of outmigration from the farm and countryside.

I ask your thoughtful consideration of the comparative actions we take with respect to our great urban centers and to the heart strength of our country in the rural areas.

When the authorization and appropriation bills for the Department of Agriculture again come before the Senate, I intend that they will carry amendments, which I shall submit, to increase substantially the activities of the Farmers Home Administration. I will ask that you review the perspective to be given the whole subject, and that you support me in this cause.

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

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE), the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND),

the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. MCCLELLAN), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. MCCLELLAN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE), the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) would each vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senators from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN and Mr. GOLDWATER), the Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. SMITH) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa (Mr. MILLER) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. SAXBE) are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. MILLER), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. SMITH) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 68, nays 1, as follows:

[No. 147 Leg.]

YEAS—68

Aiken	Fong	Nelson
Allott	Fulbright	Packwood
Anderson	Goodell	Pastore
Baker	Griffin	Pearson
Bayh	Harris	Pell
Bellmon	Hatfield	Percy
Bennett	Holland	Prouty
Bible	Hruska	Proxmire
Boggs	Hughes	Randolph
Brooke	Inouye	Ribicoff
Byrd, Va.	Jackson	Russell
Case	Javits	Schweiker
Church	Jordan, Idaho	Scott
Cook	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Cooper	Magnuson	Spong
Cotton	Mansfield	Stennis
Cranston	McGee	Stevens
Curtis	McGovern	Symington
Dodd	Montoya	Talmadge
Dole	Moss	Thurmond
Dominick	Mundt	Williams, Del.
Ellender	Murphy	Young, N. Dak.
Ervin	Muskie	

NAYS—1

Young, Ohio
NOT VOTING—31

Allen	Hansen	Miller
Burdick	Hart	Mondale
Byrd, W. Va.	Hartke	Saxbe
Cannon	Hollings	Smith, Ill.
Eagleton	Jordan, N.C.	Sparkman
Eastland	Long	Tower
Fannin	Mathias	Tydings
Goldwater	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Gore	McClellan	Yarborough
Gravel	McIntyre	
Gurney	Metcalf	

So the bill (H.R. 12307) was passed.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes thereon, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. PASTORE, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ALLOTT, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. HRUSKA, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the past 2 days the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE) has devoted his unsurpassed skill and ability to handling the funding measure for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the independent offices of the Government. May I say that Senator PASTORE need take his hat off to no one when he leads a proposal through the Senate. I think the record speaks for itself. The near unanimous acceptance of this appropriations bill is a fine tribute to Senator PASTORE. His strong advocacy, his deep understanding his splendid presentation assured this great success. The Senate is grateful.

The Senate is grateful as well for the contributions of the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT). As the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Subcommittee covering HUD and independent offices, he cooperated magnificently to make certain that this measure was disposed of swiftly and efficiently.

Other Senators added immensely to the discussion of this measure. Notably may be said for the efforts of the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) and the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE). They urged their own strong and sincere views on certain features of the proposal with great skill and ability. The same may be said for the efforts of the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG), the distinguished senior Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON) and many others.

So again, to Senator PASTORE, to Senator ALLOTT and to their subcommittee goes our sincere thanks for their outstanding efforts on this highly important appropriations measure.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, first I wish to express my thanks and appreciation to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) for allowing us to proceed with the next order of business, in spite of the fact he had an agreement to speak at approximately this time.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
AUTHORIZATIONS, 1970

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 520, H.R. 13018. For the information of the Senate I have been informed by the chairman, the manager of the bill, the distinguished Senator from Washington, that there will be a rollcall vote on this proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 13018) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

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

TITLE I

Sec. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

UNITED STATES CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND
(First Army)

Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, research, development, and test facilities, hospital facilities, and utilities, \$4,316,000.

Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania: Community facilities, \$145,000.

Fort Dix, New Jersey: Community facilities, and utilities, \$1,539,000.

Fort Eustis, Virginia: Training facilities, \$1,825,000.

Fort Hancock, New Jersey: Utilities, \$625,000.

A. P. Hill Military Reservation, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, \$364,000.

Fort Holabird, Maryland: Administrative facilities, \$489,000.

Fort Knox, Kentucky: Training facilities, troop housing and utilities, \$4,006,000.

Fort George G. Meade, Maryland: Administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$4,845,000.

Fort Monroe, Virginia: Utilities, \$534,000.

Fort Story, Virginia: Training facilities, \$430,000.

Fort Wadsworth, New York: Utilities, \$545,000.

(Third Army)

Fort Benning, Georgia: Utilities, \$2,391,000.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Maintenance facilities, \$915,000.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Maintenance facilities and community facilities, \$1,176,000.

Fort Gordon, Georgia: Training facilities,

maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$10,286,000.

Fort Jackson, South Carolina: Troop housing, and utilities, \$12,372,000.

Fort Rucker, Alabama: Training facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, \$7,023,000.

(Fourth Army)

Fort Bliss, Texas: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$4,309,000.

Fort Hood, Texas: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$21,050,000.

Fort Sam Houston, Texas: Utilities, \$378,000.

Fort Polk, Louisiana: Training facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$2,851,000.

Fort Sill, Oklahoma: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$738,000.

(Fifth Army)

Fort Carson, Colorado: Maintenance facilities, \$6,865,000.

Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana: Administrative facilities, and utilities, \$4,120,000.

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Medical facilities and troop housing, \$502,000.

Fort Riley, Kansas: Utilities, \$934,000.

Fort Sheridan, Illinois: Administrative facilities, \$2,210,000.

(Sixth Army)

Presidio of Monterey, California: Troop housing, \$2,125,000.

Presidio of San Francisco, California: Community facilities, and utilities, \$745,000.

(Military District of Washington)

Fort McNair, District of Columbia: Training facilities, \$929,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Training facilities and utilities, \$2,312,000.

Aeronautical Maintenance Center, Texas: Maintenance facilities, \$1,178,000.

Anniston Army Depot, Alabama: Maintenance facilities, \$1,053,000.

Atlanta Army Depot, Georgia: Supply facilities, \$572,000.

Badger Army Ammunition Plant, Wisconsin: Utilities, \$203,000.

Charleston Army Depot, South Carolina: Utilities, \$143,000.

Detroit Arsenal, Michigan: Operational facilities, and research, development and test facilities, \$4,070,000.

Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Operational facilities, and research, development and test facilities, \$420,000.

Granite City Army Depot, Illinois: Utilities, \$237,000.

Holston Army Ammunition Plant, Tennessee: Utilities, \$344,000.

Iowa Army Ammunition Plant, Iowa: Utilities, \$503,000.

Joliet Army Ammunition Plant, Illinois: Utilities, \$4,643,000.

Letterkenny Army Depot, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$2,457,000.

Michigan Army Missile Plant, Michigan: Utilities, \$354,000.

Fort Monmouth, New Jersey: Research, development, and test facilities, and community facilities, \$1,778,000.

New Cumberland Army Depot, Pennsylvania: Supply facilities, \$560,000.

Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey: Utilities, \$989,000.

Pueblo Army Depot, Colorado: Maintenance facilities, \$1,026,000.

Radford Arsenal, Virginia: Administrative facilities, \$1,641,000.

Red River Army Depot, Texas: Operational facilities, and utilities, \$1,396,000.

Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois: Operational facilities, \$425,000.

Savanna Army Depot, Illinois: Utilities, \$274,000.

Sunflower Army Ammunition Plant, Kansas: Utilities, \$251,000.

White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico: Research, development, and test facilities, \$3,218,000.

Fort Wingate Army Depot, New Mexico: Utilities, \$217,000.

Yuma Proving Ground, Arizona: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, \$734,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

United States Various Locations: Operational facilities, \$27,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY SECURITY AGENCY

Vint Hill Farms, Virginia: Utilities, \$136,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Troop housing, and community facilities, \$3,740,000.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York: Training facilities and community facilities, \$17,421,000.

ARMY MEDICAL DEPARTMENT

Brooke Army Medical Center, Texas: Training facilities, \$9,891,000.

Fitzsimons Army Hospital, Colorado: Production facilities, \$776,000.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Army Map Service, Maryland: Operational facilities, \$134,000.

MILITARY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AND TERMINAL SERVICE

Military Ocean Terminal, Bayonne, New Jersey: Utilities, \$1,134,000.

Military Ocean Terminal, Kings Bay, Georgia: Utilities, \$177,000.

Sunny Point Army Terminal, North Carolina: Operational facilities and utilities, \$1,871,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, ALASKA

Fort Greely, Alaska: Utilities, \$743,000.

Fort J. M. Wainwright, Alaska: Training facilities, \$322,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, HAWAII

Schofield Barracks, Hawaii: Community facilities, \$1,524,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

UNITED STATES ARMY, PACIFIC

Korea, Various: Operational and Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$23,678,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES, SOUTHERN COMMAND

Canal Zone, Various: Medical facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$1,756,000.

UNITED STATES SAFEGUARD COMMAND

Kwajalein Missile Range: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, \$3,273,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY SECURITY AGENCY

Various locations: Operations facilities, \$2,951,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, EUROPE

Germany, various: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$22,323,000.

Various locations: For the United States share of the cost of multilateral programs for the acquisition or construction of military facilities and installations, including international military headquarters, for the collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Area, \$50,000,000: *Provided*, That, within thirty days after the end of each quarter, the Secretary of the Army shall furnish to the Committees on Armed Services

and on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a description of obligations incurred as the United States share of such multilateral programs.

UNITED STATES ARMY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

Taiwan, Formosa: Operational facilities, \$154,000.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (a) unforeseen security considerations, (b) new weapons developments, (c) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (d) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next Military Construction Authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1970, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 103. (a) Public Law 89-188, as amended, is amended, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES, Less Army Materiel Command (Fourth Army)" with respect to "Fort Sam Houston, Texas", strike out "\$1,300,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,510,000".

(b) Public Law 89-188, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602 "\$260,925,000" and "\$317,786,000" and inserting "\$261,135,000" and "\$317,996,000", respectively.

SEC. 104. (a) Public Law 90-110, as amended, is amended, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" section 101 as follows:

(1) Under the subheading, "UNITED STATES CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND (First Army)" with respect to "Fort Dix, New Jersey", strike out "\$2,585,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,471,000".

(2) Under the subheading "UNITED STATES CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND (First Army)" with respect to "Fort Lee, Virginia", strike out "\$1,646,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,727,000".

(3) Under the subheading "UNITED STATES CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND (First Army)" with respect to "Fort George G. Meade, Maryland", strike out "\$4,510,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,198,000".

(4) Under the subheading "UNITED STATES CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND (Military District of Washington)" with respect to "Fort Myer, Virginia", strike out "\$1,680,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,935,000".

(5) Under the subheading "UNITED STATES ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND" with respect to "Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois", strike out "\$320,000" and insert in place thereof "\$492,000".

(6) Under the subheading "UNITED STATES ARMY AIR DEFENSE COMMAND" with respect to "Detroit Defense Area, Michigan" strike out "\$130,000" and insert in place thereof "\$201,000".

(7) Under the subheading "CORPS OF ENGINEERS" with respect to "Army Map Service, Maryland", strike out "\$156,000" and insert in place thereof "\$201,000".

(8) Under the subheading "MILITARY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AND TERMINAL SERVICE" with respect to "Sunny Point Army Terminal, North Carolina", strike out "\$70,000" and insert in place thereof "\$138,000".

(b) Public Law 90-110, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 802 "\$282,359,000" and "\$385,752,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$284,625,000" and "\$388,018,000", respectively.

SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 90-408 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 101 as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES (First Army)" with respect to "Fort Knox, Kentucky" strike out "\$727,000" and insert in place thereof "\$888,000".

(2) Under the subheading "UNITED STATES MATERIEL COMMAND" with respect to "New Cumberland Army Depot, Pennsylvania", strike out "\$638,000" and insert in place thereof "\$811,000".

(b) Public Law 90-408 is amended in section 101 under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "UNITED STATES ARMY SECURITY AGENCY" with respect to "Various Locations", by striking out "\$5,386,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$6,928,000".

(c) Public Law 90-408 is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 802 "\$363,471,000", "\$85,610,000" and "\$449,081,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$363,805,000", "\$87,152,000" and "\$450,957,000", respectively.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

FIRST NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Shipyard, Boston, Massachusetts: Utilities, \$7,682,000.

Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Troop housing, \$685,000.

Naval Underwater Weapons Research and Engineering Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Research, development and test facilities, \$754,000.

Naval Air Rework Facility, Quonset Point, Rhode Island: Maintenance facilities, \$1,063,000.

THIRD NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut: Utilities, \$1,455,000.

Naval Hospital, Saint Albans, New York: Utilities, \$214,000.

FOURTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Navy Ships Parts Control Center, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania: Administrative facilities, \$215,000.

Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, \$10,828,000.

Naval Air Engineering Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Utilities, \$222,000.

Navy Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Administrative facilities, \$834,000.

Naval Damage Control Training Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Utilities, \$1,210,000.

Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pennsylvania: Utilities, \$47,000.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Utilities, \$3,468,000.

National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Maryland: Hospital and medical facilities, \$3,591,000.

Naval Ship Research and Development Center, Carderock, Maryland: Utilities at Annapolis Division, \$186,000.

FIFTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Fleet Anti-Air Warfare Training Center, Dam Neck, Virginia: Operational facilities, \$493,000.

Naval Air Rework Facility, Cherry Point, North Carolina: Maintenance facilities, \$2,308,000.

Naval Shipyard, Norfolk, Virginia: Utilities, \$2,319,000.

Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Troop housing, community facilities, and real estate, \$17,548,000.

Naval Air Rework Facility, Norfolk, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, \$9,303,000.

Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Virginia: Utilities, \$111,000.

Naval Communication Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facilities, \$1,400,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, \$1,686,000.

SIXTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida: Operational facilities, and troop housing, \$1,135,000.

Naval Station, Mayport, Florida: Operational and training facilities, \$251,000.

Naval Station, Key West, Florida: Troop housing, \$2,130,000.

Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida: Training facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$12,909,000.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida: Operational facilities, \$1,321,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Pensacola, Florida: Utilities, \$923,000.

Naval Air Station, Saufley Field, Florida: Operational facilities and real estate, \$349,000.

Naval Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida: Training facilities, \$808,000.

Naval Supply Corps School, Athens, Georgia: Training facilities, \$2,920,000.

Naval Air Station, Glynnco, Georgia: Utilities, \$252,000.

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Gulfport, Mississippi: Operational facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$11,988,000.

Naval Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi: Supply facilities, \$277,000.

Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$5,932,000.

Naval Supply Center, Charleston, South Carolina: Supply facilities, \$1,271,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Charleston, South Carolina: Supply facilities, \$510,000.

Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee: Troop housing, \$5,233,000.

EIGHTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Station, Chase Field, Texas: Operational and training facilities, and real estate, \$2,769,000.

Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas: Utilities, \$496,000.

Naval Air Station, Kingsville, Texas: Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$3,876,000.

NINTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Utilities, \$1,060,000.

Naval Avionics Facility, Indianapolis, Indiana: Research, development and test facilities, \$157,000.

OMEGA Navigation Station, La Moure, North Dakota: Operational facilities, \$5,690,000.

ELEVENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California: Utilities, \$1,793,000.

Naval Station, Long Beach, California: Utilities, \$511,000.

Navy Fuel Depot, San Pedro, California: Utilities, \$90,000.

Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, California: Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$554,000.

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, California: Troop housing, and utilities, \$2,254,000.

Naval Air Station, North Island, California: Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$7,687,000.

Fleet Training Center, San Diego, California: Utilities, \$1,335,000.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Troop housing, \$3,335,000.

TWELFTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Operational and training facilities and, troop housing, \$6,007,000.

Naval Air Station, Alameda, California: Maintenance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$6,094,000.

Naval Hospital, Oakland, California: Utilities, \$74,000.

Naval Shipyard, San Francisco Bay, California: Maintenance facilities, and utilities at Hunters Point Site and at Mare Island Site, \$12,494,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada: Troop housing, \$3,463,000.

THIRTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Washington: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities and utilities, \$7,467,000.

Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$5,101,000.

FOURTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$3,557,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Utilities, \$6,519,000.

Naval Facility, Barbers Point, Oahu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, \$2,467,000.

SEVENTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Station, Adak, Alaska: Troop housing, \$4,067,000.

VARIOUS LOCATIONS

Various Naval and Marine Corps Air Activities: Operational facilities, \$766,000.

Various Naval Communication Stations: Utilities, \$2,030,000.

MARINE CORPS FACILITIES

Marine Corps Development and Education Command, Quantico, Virginia: Troop housing, and utilities, \$1,711,000.

Marine Corps Auxiliary Landing Field, Bogue, North Carolina: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$620,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$3,879,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina: Training facilities, and troop housing, \$1,983,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, New River, North Carolina: Operational facilities, \$256,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Carolina: Troop housing, \$5,943,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona: Operational facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$6,418,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California: Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$4,150,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California: Community facilities, \$2,536,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, California: Troop housing, \$5,601,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Hawaii: Utilities, \$460,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

TENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Navy Public Works Center, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities, \$2,898,000.

Naval Facility, Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, \$65,000.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Troop housing, \$3,995,000.

Naval Communication Station, San Juan, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, \$87,000.

ATLANTIC OCEAN AREA

Naval Facility, Eleuthera, Bahama Islands: Community facilities, and utilities, \$283,000.

Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland: Community facilities, \$2,834,000.

EUROPEAN AREA

OMEGA Navigation Station, Bratland, Norway: Operational facilities, \$2,954,000.

PACIFIC OCEAN AREA

Naval Communication Station, Finegayan, Guam, Mariana Islands: Troop housing, \$1,422,000.

Naval Facility, Guam, Mariana Islands: Operational facilities, \$4,419,000.

Naval Hospital, Guam, Mariana Islands: Hospital and medical facilities, \$1,354,000.

Naval Hospital, Yokosuka, Japan: Hospital and medical facilities, \$746,000.

Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Republic of the Philippines: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,062,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines: Utilities, \$1,770,000.

Naval Station, Sangley Point, Republic of the Philippines: Supply facilities, \$120,000.

VARIOUS LOCATIONS

Various Naval Air Activities: Operational facilities, \$235,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by acquiring, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the amount of \$1,254,000.

SEC. 203. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop Navy installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (a) unforeseen security considerations, (b) new weapons developments, (c) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (d) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1970, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section to that date.

SEC. 204. (a) Public Law 89-568, as amended, is amended in section 201 under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "NAVAL AIR SYSTEMS COMMAND (Field Support Stations)" with respect to the Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia, by striking out "\$1,466,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$1,861,000".

(b) Public Law 89-568, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 201

tion 602 "118,769,000" and "\$142,932,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$119,164,000" and "\$143,327,000".

SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 90-110, as amended, is amended in section 201 under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "FIFTH NAVAL DISTRICT" with respect to the Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Virginia, and the Fleet Training Center, Norfolk, Virginia, strike out "\$6,220,000" and "\$65,000", respectively, and insert in place thereof "\$6,456,000" and "\$97,000", respectively.

(2) Under the subheading "SIXTH NAVAL DISTRICT" with respect to the Naval Station, Charleston, South Carolina, strike out "\$4,048,000" and insert in place thereof "\$6,058,000".

(3) Under the subheading "NINTH NAVAL DISTRICT" with respect to the Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, strike out "\$6,869,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,760,000".

(4) Under the subheading "ELEVENTH NAVAL DISTRICT" with respect to the Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, and El Toro, California, strike out "\$2,133,000" and "\$4,918,000", respectively, and insert in place thereof "\$2,179,000", and "\$5,410,000", respectively.

(5) Under the subheading "THIRTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT" with respect to the Naval Supply Depot, Seattle, Washington, and the Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington, strike out "\$252,000" and "\$2,626,000", respectively, and insert in place thereof "\$645,000" and "\$3,122,000".

(6) Under the subheading "FOURTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT" with respect to the Navy Public Works Center, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii, Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Hawaii, and the Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Hawaii, strike out "\$7,636,000", "\$2,554,000", and "\$1,170,000", respectively, and insert in place thereof "\$8,121,000", "\$3,268,000", and "\$1,619,000", respectively.

(7) Under the subheading "MARINE CORPS GROUND FORCES FACILITIES" with respect to the Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, strike out "\$12,507,000" and insert in place thereof "\$12,754,000".

(b) Public Law 90-110, as amended, is amended in section 201 under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "TENTH NAVAL DISTRICT" with respect to the Naval Hospital, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, by striking out "\$6,283,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$8,181,000".

(c) Public Law 90-110, as amended, is amended in clause (2) of section 802 by striking out \$415,108,000", "\$39,515,000" and "\$461,407,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof, "\$422,599,000", "\$41,413,000", and "\$470,796,000".

SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 90-408 is amended in section 201 under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "SIXTH NAVAL DISTRICT" with respect to the Naval Hospital, Charleston, South Carolina, strike out "\$13,356,000" and insert in place thereof "\$15,687,000".

(2) Under the subheading "ELEVENTH NAVAL DISTRICT" with respect to the Naval Air Station, Imperial Beach, California, strike out "\$5,674,000", and insert in place thereof "\$8,517,000".

(b) Public Law 90-408 is amended in clause (2) of section 802 by striking out "\$229,726,000" and "\$236,591,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$234,900,000" and "\$241,765,000".

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation,

appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AERONAUTICAL CHART AND INFORMATION CENTER
Aeronautical Chart and Information Center, Saint Louis, Missouri: Utilities, \$357,000.

AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND

Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Maintenance facilities, and community facilities, \$225,000.

Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, California: Hospital facilities, troop housing, and real estate, \$4,647,000.

Kingsley Field, Klamath Falls, Oregon: Operational facilities, \$303,000.

NORAD Headquarters, Colorado Springs, Colorado: Operational facilities, \$20,800,000.

Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, \$157,000.

Peterson Field, Colorado Springs, Colorado: Administrative facilities and troop housing, \$1,992,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, \$1,540,000.

Volk Field, Camp Douglas, Wisconsin: Operational facilities, \$208,000.

AIR FORCE LOGISTICS COMMAND

Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Research development, and test facilities, \$315,000.

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Maintenance facilities and administrative facilities, \$525,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$5,863,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$8,735,000.

Newark Air Force Station, Newark, Ohio: Administrative facilities, \$835,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, \$2,086,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$2,165,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Research, development, and test facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$14,380,000.

AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tennessee: Research, development, and test facilities, \$1,440,000.

Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Research, development, and test facilities, \$736,000.

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Operational and training facilities, \$394,000.

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$6,651,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, \$2,446,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico: Research, development, and test facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$1,903,000.

Los Angeles Air Force Station, Los Angeles, California: Research, development, and test facilities, and administrative facilities, \$781,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$1,108,000.

Eastern Test Range, Cocoa, Florida: Operational facilities, \$43,000.

Satellite Tracking Facilities: Operational facilities and utilities, \$1,021,000.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Operational and training facilities and maintenance facilities, \$635,000.

Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Alabama: Training facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, \$1,139,000.

Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi: Training facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, \$3,118,000.

Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Training facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$13,107,000.

Laredo Air Force Base, Laredo, Texas: Operational facilities, and administrative facilities, \$496,000.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, \$1,771,000.

Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, \$8,241,000.

Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operation facilities, and troop housing, \$2,223,000.

Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta, Georgia: Operational facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, \$816,000.

Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Troop housing, \$1,151,000.

Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas: Operational facilities, administrative facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, \$954,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, \$3,829,000.

Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Administrative facilities, \$152,000.

Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Operational facilities, \$435,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Administrative facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing, and real estate, \$4,462,000.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

Eielson Air Force Base, Fairbanks, Alaska: Utilities, \$578,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base, Anchorage, Alaska: Operational and training facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$3,528,000.

Various Locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$6,370,000.

HEADQUARTERS AIR FORCE RESERVE

Ellington Air Force Base, Houston, Texas: Operational facilities and real estate, \$957,000.

HEADQUARTERS COMMAND

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational facilities and utilities, \$813,000.

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$5,358,000.

Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, South Carolina: Operational facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$3,192,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, utilities and real estate, \$7,519,000.

McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, \$1,699,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown,

New Jersey: Operational facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$1,664,000.

Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$3,134,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Troop housing, \$329,000.

Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California: Operational and training facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$11,460,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Maintenance facilities, \$209,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Administrative facilities and operational facilities, \$549,000.

Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Maintenance facilities, \$126,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, \$236,000.

Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Troop housing, \$597,000.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$2,459,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota: Community facilities and utilities, \$1,028,000.

Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyoming: Community facilities, \$587,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, \$5,236,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota: Maintenance facilities, \$178,000.

Grissom Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Maintenance facilities and utilities, \$231,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Maintenance facilities, \$186,000.

Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$800,000.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana: Operational facilities and utilities, \$284,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Maintenance facilities, \$265,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Operational facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,532,000.

Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, \$263,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York: Maintenance facilities, \$174,000.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, Lompoc, California: Utilities, \$394,000.

Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Massachusetts: Utilities, \$488,000.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Knob Noster, Missouri: Administrative facilities, \$157,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Maintenance facilities, \$415,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas: Hospital facilities, and troop housing, \$1,793,000.

Cannon Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico: Maintenance facilities and community facilities, \$939,000.

England Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, \$617,000.

Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$1,608,000.

George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Operational facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing,

ing, community facilities, and utilities, \$3,234,000.

Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Troop housing, \$198,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Operational facilities and administrative facilities, \$560,000.

Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Arizona: Operational facilities, and troop housing, \$5,636,000.

MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$642,000.

McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Troop housing, \$231,000.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$1,476,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$6,514,000.

Pope Air Force Base, Fayetteville, North Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, \$2,097,000.

Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North Carolina: Maintenance facilities, \$137,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Operational and training facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, \$1,835,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

United States Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs, Colorado: Training facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$551,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various Locations: Maintenance facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$1,324,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE SECURITY SERVICE

Goodfellow Air Force Base, San Angelo, Texas: Troop housing, \$957,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND

Various Locations: Maintenance facilities, \$407,000.

AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND

Western Test Range: Research, development, and test facilities, \$2,292,000.

Satellite Tracking Facilities: Utilities, \$287,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCE

Various Locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$7,904,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities and community facilities, \$1,265,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

Germany: Operational facilities and supply facilities, \$3,620,000.

United Kingdom: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, \$9,895,000.

Various Locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$678,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES SOUTHERN COMMAND

Howard Air Force Base, Canal Zone: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$3,246,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE SECURITY SERVICE

Various Locations: Operational facilities, and utilities, \$300,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or in-

stalling permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$29,234,000.

SEC. 303. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (a) unforeseen security considerations, (b) new weapons developments, (c) need and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (d) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next Military Construction Authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$10,000,000: Provided, That the Secretary of the Air Force or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1970, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 304. (a) Public Law 90-110, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND" with respect to Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Illinois, strike out "\$2,523,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,507,000".

(2) Under the subheading "PACIFIC AIR FORCE" with respect to Hickham Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii, strike out "\$2,566,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,034,000".

(3) Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND" with respect to Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan, strike out "\$1,053,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,628,000".

(4) Under the subheading "TACTICAL AIR COMMAND" with respect to Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia, strike out "\$2,243,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,744,000".

(b) Public Law 90-110, as amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301 as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND" with respect to Goose Air Base, Canada, strike out "\$90,000" and insert in place thereof "\$136,000".

(c) Public Law 90-110, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 802 "\$312,050,000", "\$26,904,000", and "\$398,376,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$314,578,000", "\$26,950,000", and "\$400,950,000", respectively.

TITLE IV

SEC. 401. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, for defense agencies for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

DEFENSE ATOMIC SUPPORT AGENCY

Sandia Base, New Mexico: Supply facilities and utilities, \$495,000.

Manzano Base, New Mexico: Utilities, \$36,000.

DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Headquarters Defense Intelligence Agency, Arlington Hall Station, Arlington, Virginia: Operational facilities, \$28,236,000.

DEFENSE SUPPLY AGENCY

Defense Construction Supply Center, Columbus, Ohio: Supply facilities, \$300,000.

Defense Depot Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania: Supply facilities, \$318,000.

Defense Depot, Memphis, Tennessee: Supply facilities, \$827,000.

Defense Depot, Ogden, Utah: Supply facilities and utilities, \$1,052,000.

Defense General Supply Center, Richmond, Virginia: Supply facilities and utilities, \$468,000.

Defense Industrial Plant Equipment Facility, Atchison, Kansas: Utilities, \$39,000.

Defense Personnel Support Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Supply facilities, and utilities, \$1,099,000.

Defense Depot, Tracy, California: Utilities, \$882,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

Fort Meade, Maryland: Troop housing facilities and utilities, \$4,678,000.

Vint Hill Farms Station, Virginia: Supply facilities, \$1,000,000.

Classified Location: Operational facilities, \$3,564,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

DEFENSE ATOMIC SUPPORT AGENCY

Johnston Island: Operational facilities, \$1,903,000.

SEC. 402. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities which he determines to be vital to the security of the United States, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment in the total amount of \$25,000,000: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including real estate actions pertaining thereto.

SEC. 403. (a) Public Law 90-408 is amended in section 401 under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY" with respect to Fort Meade, Maryland, by striking out "\$2,121,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$2,609,000".

(b) Public Law 90-408 is amended in clause (4) of section 802 by striking out "\$81,696,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$82,184,000".

TITLE V

MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING

SEC. 501. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to construct, at the locations hereinafter named, family housing units and trailer court facilities in the numbers hereinafter listed, but no family housing construction shall be commenced at any such locations in the United States, until the Secretary shall have consulted with the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, as to the availability of adequate private housing at such locations. If agreement cannot be reached with respect to the availability of adequate private housing at any location, the Secretary of Defense shall immediately notify the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate, in writing, of such difference of opinion, and no contract for construction at such location shall be entered into for a period of thirty days after such notification has been given. This au-

thority shall include the authority to acquire land, and interests in land, by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

Family Housing units—

(a) The Department of the Army, twelve hundred units, \$25,060,000:

Fort Huachuca, Arizona, one hundred units.

Fort Carson, Colorado, one hundred and fifty units.

Fort Benning, Georgia, three hundred and forty units.

Fort Polk, Louisiana, two hundred and sixty units.

Fort Meade, Maryland, two hundred and fifty units.

Vint Hill Farms Station, Virginia, one hundred units.

(b) The Department of the Navy, one thousand nine hundred and fifty units, \$47,517,000.

Naval Station, Adak, Alaska, one hundred units.

Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, one hundred units.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, one hundred and two units.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, one hundred and ninety units.

Naval Station, Key West, Florida, two hundred units.

Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River, Maryland, two hundred units.

Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, Rhode Island, one hundred units.

Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk, Virginia, forty-eight units.

Naval Complex, Bremerton, Washington, two hundred units.

Naval Facility, Pacific Beach, Washington, ten units.

Naval Station, Guam, two hundred units.

Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland, one hundred units.

Naval Station, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines, three hundred units.

Naval Communication Station, San Miguel, Republic of the Philippines, one hundred units.

(c) The Department of the Air Force, one thousand six hundred and fifty units, \$33,855,000:

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona, three hundred units.

Luke Air Force Base, Arizona, one hundred and fifty units.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Arkansas, two hundred units.

Eglin Air Force Base, Florida, three hundred units.

McConnell Air Force Base, Kansas, one hundred units.

Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada, three hundred units.

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Texas, one hundred units.

Clark Air Force Base, Republic of the Philippines, two hundred units.

SEC. 502. Authorization for the construction of family housing provided in this Act shall be subject, under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, to the following limitations on cost, which shall include shades, screens, ranges, refrigerators, and all other installed equipment and fixtures:

(a) The average unit cost for each military department for all units of family housing constructed in the United States (other than Hawaii and Alaska) and Puerto Rico shall not exceed \$21,000 including the cost of the family unit and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

(b) No family housing unit in the areas listed in subsection (a) shall be constructed at a total cost exceeding \$35,000 including the cost of the family unit and the proportionate

costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

(c) When family housing units are constructed in areas other than those listed in subsection (a) the average cost of all such units shall not exceed \$32,000 and in no event shall the cost of any unit exceed \$40,000. The cost limitations of this subsection shall include the cost of the family unit and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

SEC. 503. Except as provided in section 504 of this Act, and notwithstanding the limitations contained in prior Military Construction Authorization Acts on cost of construction of family housing, the limitations on such cost contained in section 502 of this Act shall apply to all prior authorizations for construction of family housing not heretofore repealed and for which construction contracts have not been executed by the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 504. Nothing contained in this Act and nothing contained in section 603 of Public Law 90-408 (82 Stat. 367, 388) shall be deemed to affect the cost limitations provided in subsection 602(d) of Public Law 90-408 (82 Stat. 367, 388) with respect to construction of family housing units at George Air Force Base, California.

SEC. 505. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to accomplish alterations, additions, expansions or extensions not otherwise authorized by law, to existing public quarters at a cost not to exceed—

(a) for the Department of the Army, \$1,577,000.

(b) for the Department of the Navy, \$4,146,000.

(c) for the Department of the Air Force, \$4,500,000.

(d) for the Defense Agencies, \$439,000.

SEC. 506. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to construct, or otherwise acquire, in foreign countries, thirty family housing units. This authority shall include the authority to acquire land and interests in land, and shall be limited to such projects as may be funded by use of excess foreign currencies when so provided in Department of Defense Appropriation Acts. The authorization contained in this section shall not be subject to the cost limitations set forth in section 502 of this Act: *Provided*, That no family housing unit constructed or acquired pursuant to this authorization shall cost in excess of \$60,000, including the cost of the family unit and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

SEC. 507. Section 515 of Public Law 84-161 (69 Stat. 324, 352) as amended, is amended by (1) striking out "1969 and 1970" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "1970 and 1971", (2) inserting "and the Naval Supply Corps School, Athens, Georgia," immediately after "Kansas," in the last sentence, and (3) adding at the end of such section a new sentence as follows: "In no case may any housing unit be leased under authority of this section at a monthly rental in excess of \$250, including the cost of utilities and maintenance, and operation."

SEC. 508. Section 507 of Public Law 88-174 (77 Stat. 307, 326) as amended, is amended by striking out "1969 and 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "1970 and 1971".

SEC. 509. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to relocate four hundred and forty-four family housing units to military installations where there are housing shortages, from installations as follows: two hundred relocatable units from Kincheloe Air Force Base, Michigan, eighteen relocatable units from Sundance Air Force Station, Wyoming; and two hundred and twenty-six United States manufactured units from a classified overseas location: *Provided*,

That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the proposed new locations and estimated costs, and no contract shall be awarded within thirty days of such notification.

SEC. 510. (a) Section 7574 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(f) The maximum limitations prescribed by subsections (a), (d), and (e) may be increased up to 15 per centum if the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, determines that such increase is in the best interest of the Government to permit award of a turnkey construction contract for family housing to the contractor offering the most satisfactory proposal."

(b) Sections 4774 and 9774 of title 10, United States Code, are amended by adding the following new subsection at the end of each:

"(h) The maximum limitations prescribed by subsections (a), (f), and (g) may be increased up to 15 per centum if the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, determines that such increase is in the best interest of the Government to permit award of a turnkey construction contract for family housing to the contractor offering the most satisfactory proposal."

SEC. 511. The third clause of section 501(b) of Public Law 87-554 (76 Stat. 223, 237) as added by section 606 of Public Law 90-110 (81 Stat. 279, 304), is amended to read as follows: "and (3) notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of debt service, proceeds of the handling and the disposal of family housing of the Department of Defense, including related land and improvements, whether handled or disposed of by the Department of Defense or any other Federal Agency, but less those expenses payable pursuant to section 204(b) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 485(b)), to remain available until expended."

SEC. 512. Notwithstanding any other provision of law limiting the term of a contract, the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, may enter into contracts for periods of not more than three years for supplies and services required for the maintenance and operation of family housing for which funds would otherwise be available only within the fiscal year for which appropriated.

SEC. 513. Subsection 601(b) of Public Law 90-408 (82 Stat. 367, 387) is amended by striking out "\$15,725,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$17,000,000."

SEC. 514. There is authorized to be appropriated for use by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, for military family housing as authorized by law for the following purposes:

(a) for construction and acquisition of family housing, including improvements to adequate quarters, improvements to inadequate quarters, minor construction, rental guarantee payments, construction and acquisition of trailer court facilities, and planning, an amount not to exceed \$124,955,000, and

(b) for support of military family housing, including operating expenses, leasing, maintenance of real property, payments of principal and interest on mortgage debts incurred, payments to the Commodity Credit Corporation, and mortgage insurance premiums authorized under section 222 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1715m), an amount not to exceed \$563,685,000.

TITLE VI

HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE

SEC. 601. Section 701 of Public Law 90-110 (81 Stat. 279, 306) is amended by changing

the semicolon to a period after "\$27,000,000" and deleting all language thereafter.

SEC. 602. Section 1013 of Public Law 89-754 (80 Stat. 1255, 1290) is amended as follows:

(a) In the third sentence of subsection 1013(c) after the word "installation" delete the phrase "and prior to the one hundred and twentieth day after the enactment of this Act."

(b) At the end of subsection 1013(d) delete the period, substitute a colon therefor, and add the following: "Provided further, That no properties in foreign countries shall be acquired under this section."

TITLE VII

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529) and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 702. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, IV, and V shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, \$170,476,000; outside the United States, \$104,135,000; or a total of \$274,611,000.

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, \$241,121,000; outside the United States, \$24,244,000; section 202, \$1,254,000; or a total of \$266,619,000.

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, \$218,529,000; outside the United States, \$29,894,000; section 302, \$29,234,000; or a total of \$277,657,000.

(4) for title IV: A total of \$69,897,000.

(5) for title V: Military family housing, \$688,640,000.

SEC. 703. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), any of the amounts specified in titles I, II, III, and IV of this Act, may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum when inside the United States (other than Alaska), and by 10 per centum when outside the United States or in Alaska, if he determines that such increase (1) is required for the sole purpose of meeting unusual variations in cost, and (2) could not have been reasonably anticipated at the time such estimate was submitted to the Congress. However, the total cost of all construction and acquisition in each such title may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated in that title.

(b) When the amount named for any construction or acquisition in title I, II, III, or IV of this Act involves only one project at any military installation and the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, determines that the amount authorized must be increased by more than the applicable percentage prescribed in subsection (a), the Secretary concerned may proceed with such construction or acquisition if the amount of the increase does not exceed by more than 25 per centum the amount named for such project by the Congress.

(c) Subject to the limitations contained in subsection (a), no individual project au-

thorized under title I, II, III, or IV of this Act for any specifically listed military installation may be placed under contract if—

(1) the estimated cost of such project is \$250,000 or more, and

(2) the current working estimate of the Department of Defense, based upon bids received, for the construction of such project exceeds by more than 25 per centum the amount authorized for such project by the Congress, until after the expiration of thirty days from the date on which a written report of the facts relating to the increased cost of such project, including a statement of the reasons for such increase has been submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(d) The Secretary of Defense shall submit an annual report to the Congress identifying each individual project which has been placed under contract in the preceding twelve-month period and with respect to which the then current working estimate of the Department of Defense based upon bids received for such project exceeded the amount authorized by the Congress for that project by more than 25 per centum. The Secretary shall also include in such report each individual project with respect to which the scope was reduced in order to permit contract award within the available authorization for such project. Such report shall include all pertinent cost information for each individual project, including the amount in dollars and percentage by which the current working estimate based on the contract price for the project exceeded the amount authorized for such project by the Congress.

SEC. 704. Contracts for construction made made by the United States for performance within the United States and its possessions under this Act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, or the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Department of the Navy, or such other department or Government agency as the Secretaries of the military departments recommend and the Secretary of Defense approves to assure the most efficient, expeditious and cost-effective accomplishment of the construction herein authorized. The Secretary of the military departments shall report annually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives a breakdown of the dollar value of construction contracts awarded by each of the several construction agencies selected, together with the design, construction supervision, and overhead fees charged by each of the several agencies in the execution of the assigned construction. Further, such contracts shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

SEC. 705. (a) As of October 1, 1970, all authorizations for military public works (other than family housing) to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in titles I, II, III, IV, and V of the Act of July 21, 1968, Public Law 90-408 (82 Stat. 367), and all such authorizations contained in Acts approved before July 22, 1968, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed except—

(1) authorizations for public works and

for appropriations therefor that are set forth in these Acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) authorizations for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisitions in whole or in part before October 1, 1970, and authorizations for appropriations therefor; and

(3) notwithstanding the repeal provisions of section 805(a) of the Act of July 21, 1968 (82 Stat. 367, 390), authorizations for the following items which shall remain in effect until October 1, 1971:

(a) utilities in the amount of \$1,800,000 at Fort Richardson, Alaska, that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 21, 1967 (81 Stat. 281).

(b) operational facilities and utilities in the amount of \$846,000 for the United States Army Air Defense Command in CONUS, Various Locations that is contained in title I, section 101 of the Act of October 21, 1967 (81 Stat. 281).

(c) maintenance facilities in the amount of \$528,000 for Naval Shipyard, Norfolk, Virginia, that is contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "FIFTH NAVAL DISTRICT" of the Act of October 21, 1967 (81 Stat. 285).

(d) supply facilities in the amount of \$110,000 for Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Virginia, that is contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "FIFTH NAVAL DISTRICT" of the Act of October 21, 1967 (81 Stat. 286).

(e) maintenance facilities in the amounts of \$260,000 and \$585,000 for Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii, and Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Hawaii, respectively, that are contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "FOURTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT" of the Act of October 21, 1967 (81 Stat. 287).

(f) utilities in the amount of \$612,000 for Fort Lee, Virginia, that is contained in title I, section 101, under the heading "UNITED STATES CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND" of the Act of October 12, 1967 (81 Stat. 279).

(b) Effective fifteen months from the date of enactment of this Act, all authorizations for construction of family housing, including trailer court facilities, all authorizations to accomplish alterations, additions, expansions, or extensions to existing family housing, and all authorizations for related facilities projects, which are contained in this or any previous Act, are hereby repealed, except—

(1) authorizations for family housing projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisitions or manufactured structural component contracts in whole or in part before such date; and

(2) notwithstanding the repeal provision of section 805(b) of the Act of July 21, 1968 (82 Stat. 367, 391), authorizations for two hundred family housing units at George Air Force Base, California, and for two hundred and fifty family housing units at Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, that are contained in the Act of July 21, 1968 (82 Stat. 367, 387); and

(3) authorizations to accomplish alterations, additions, expansions or extensions to existing family housing, and authorizations for related facilities projects, as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts before such date.

SEC. 706. None of the authority contained in titles I, II, III, and IV of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction projects inside the United States in excess of a unit cost to be determined in proportion to the appropriate area construction cost index, based on the following unit cost limitations where the area construction cost index is 1.0:

(1) \$36 per square foot for cold storage warehousing;

(2) \$9 per square foot for regular warehousing;

(3) \$2,750 per man for permanent barracks;

(4) \$10,000 per man for bachelor officer quarters; unless the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that because of special circumstances, application to such project of the limitations on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the limitations contained in prior Military Construction Authorization Acts on unit costs, the limitations on such costs contained in this section shall apply to all prior authorizations for such construction not heretofore repealed and for which construction contracts have not been awarded by the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 707. Section 607(b) of Public Law 89-188, as amended, is amended by deleting the words "December 31, 1970" wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1973".

SEC. 708. Notwithstanding the restriction imposed by section 809 of the Act of October 21, 1967, Public Law 90-110 (81 Stat. 309), the Secretary of the Army is authorized to make available to the Post Office Department a site on Fort DeRussy, Hawaii, located northeast of Kalia Road and not to exceed two acres, for the construction of a post office, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Army deems necessary.

SEC. 709. Titles I, II, III, IV, V, VI, and VII of this Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Authorization Act, 1970."

TITLE VIII

RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

SEC. 801. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or develop additional facilities for the Reserve Forces, including the acquisition of land therefor, but the cost of such facilities shall not exceed—

(1) For Department of the Army:

(a) Army National Guard of the United States, \$10,950,000.

(b) Army Reserve, \$6,000,000.

(2) For Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, \$8,500,000.

(3) For Department of the Air Force:

(a) Air National Guard of the United States, \$11,500,000;

(2) Air Force Reserve, \$4,000,000.

SEC. 802. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this title without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 803. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to convey to the city of Grand Prairie, Texas, under such terms as he deems appropriate, the one hundred and ten acres, more or less, together with the improvements thereon, in the city of Grand Prairie, Texas, which is presently licensed to the State of Texas, for the use of the Army National Guard, subject to the condition that said city provide alternate

facilities for the Army National Guard in accordance with Department of Defense criteria, title to which alternate facilities shall vest in the State of Texas: *Provided*, That such alternate facilities be constructed without additional cost to the Federal Government: *And provided further*, That should the fair market value of the said one hundred and ten acres be in excess of the actual cost of design and construction of such alternate facilities to said city, exclusive of any contribution made by the State of Texas, the city shall pay to the Federal Government an amount equal to such excess.

SEC. 804. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to convey to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico under such terms as he deems appropriate the forty-three acres, more or less, together with any improvements thereon, formerly known as the Air Force San Patricio Fuel Storage site, subject to the conditions that the Commonwealth provide new facilities for the Army National Guard in accordance with the Department of Defense criteria, title to the facilities which vest in the Commonwealth Government: *Provided*, That such facilities be constructed without additional cost to the Federal Government: *And provided further*, That should the fair market value of said forty-three acres be in excess of the total cost of design and construction of such facilities to the Commonwealth, exclusive of any contribution which would normally be required to be made by the Commonwealth, the Commonwealth shall pay to the Federal Government an amount equal to such excess.

SEC. 805. (a) The Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey by quitclaim deed to the State of Washington all right, title, and interest of the United States, except as retained in this section, in and to a certain parcel of land located in the city of Seattle, King County, Washington, containing fifteen acres, or less, together with all buildings and improvements thereon, being part of the property known as the National Guard facility, pier 91, Seattle, Washington, as shown more particularly on a map on file in the office of the district engineer, United States Army Engineer District, Seattle, Washington.

(b) The conveyance authorized by this section shall be in consideration of and subject to the following terms and conditions:

(1) The property to be conveyed shall be used primarily as a site for the construction of a nine-unit or larger National Guard Armory and related facilities for National Guard training and other military purposes, and in the event construction of the armory is not completed within five years from the date of the conveyance, or if, thereafter, the property conveyed hereby ceases to be used for National Guard purposes during the period of twenty-five years from the date of the acceptance of the completed armory, title thereto shall immediately revert to the United States and all improvements made by the State of Washington during its occupancy shall vest in the United States without payment of compensation therefor.

(2) All mineral rights, including gas and oil, in the lands authorized to be conveyed by this section shall be reserved to the United States.

(3) The Secretary of the Army shall reserve from the conveyance such easements and rights-of-way for roads and utilities as he considers necessary for the operations of the military facilities in the vicinity.

(4) In time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress, or national emergency declared by the President, and upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense that the property, or any part thereof, is use-

ful or necessary for national defense and security, the Secretary of the Army on behalf of the United States shall have the right to enter upon and use the property or part thereof, including any and all improvements made thereon by the State, for a period not to exceed the duration of such war or emergency and six months. Upon termination of such use, the property shall revert to the State, in equally good condition less wear and tear, together with all improvements placed thereon by the United States and subject to the terms, conditions, and limitations on use and disposition previously imposed. Such use by the United States under this provision shall be without obligation or payment on the part of the United States.

(5) The Secretary of the Army is also authorized to include in the conveyance such other terms and conditions as he may deem necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2233 of title 10, United States Code, the State of Washington shall construct an armory on the property to be conveyed under this section without contribution of Federal funds therefore, in lieu of paying monetary consideration for said conveyance.

(d) The cost of any surveys necessary as an incident of the conveyance authorized herein shall be borne by the grantee.

(e) The Secretary of the Army is authorized to determine and enforce compliance with the conditions, reservations, and restrictions contained in this section and any related documents.

SEC. 806. This title may be cited as the "Reserve Forces Facilities Authorization Act, 1970."

Mr. JACKSON obtained the floor.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I want to say, on behalf of the committee and the Senate as well, that I thank the Senator from Washington and all members of the subcommittee for the great work they did on this military construction bill. Their consideration of the bill extended over many months. A tremendous amount of work was done on the bill. There was more work concerned with the bill than appears on the surface. I commend the Senator most highly. This is a very fine bill which has the unanimous support of the committee.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I thank the able chairman of the committee. I want to express, at the outset, my appreciation to him, to the distinguished ranking minority member, Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, and the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina, Senator THURMOND, and all members of the committee for the unanimous support given the bill which is now before the Senate.

Mr. President, the bill provides construction and other related authority for the military departments and Defense agencies within and outside the United States, including authority for military family housing and the construction of facilities for the Reserve components. The sum total of new authority granted by this bill is \$1,618,374,000 and in addition thereto, approval is granted for an increase in prior years' authority in the amount of \$23,677,000 for a total author-

ization of \$1,642,051,000. The amount granted is \$275,215,000 or 14.3 percent below the budget requested.

The Army is authorized \$274.6 million; the Navy \$266.6 million; the Air Force \$277.7 million; Defense agencies \$69.9 million; military family housing \$688.6 million; and \$40.9 million for the Reserve components. The bill as submitted to the Congress last January was the product of the Johnson administration and called for a total authorization of about \$2.5 billion. The new administration, after a review of this proposal, reduced the original request by about \$600 million for a total authorization of \$1,917,266,000, consisting of \$1,893,339,000 in new authority and an increase in prior years' authority of \$23,927,000. The difference in the program resulted primarily from the realignment of the Sentinel system to the Safeguard system.

Dollarwise, the construction program this year approximates that of last year, but there is a substantial difference in the makeup of the programs. Last year substantial amounts were provided for Southeast Asia, the Sentinel system, and for contingencies which is not true in this year's program. Accordingly, there is provided in the bill this year \$445 million more for brick and mortar at established military installations than was contained in the bill last year. This year special emphasis has been given to replacing or modernizing a considerable number of obsolescent and inefficient structures which will form a large part of the military physical plant.

In considering the bill the committee took into consideration the President's order of September 4, 1969, temporarily suspending 75 percent of all Government construction and the announcement by the Secretary of Defense on October 29 concerning some 307 actions to be taken affecting military installations and activities. In order that the military departments might follow an orderly construction program once the President's moratorium is lifted, it was decided to consider the bill on its merits and the need for each construction item was carefully evaluated and approval was granted or denied on that basis. As to the President's action in reducing, closing, or otherwise adjusting the missions of various installations, the committee has deleted from the bill any project affected thereby.

Now, Mr. President, I should like to mention a few items in the bill which have excited some special interest. In the Army portion of the bill approval has been granted for a cadet activities building at the West Point Military Academy and the administrative and classroom building for the Brooke Army Medical Center in Texas. Both of these projects were denied by the House, but are high-priority items which the committee believes should be included in the bill. The Marine Corps desires to expand their badly overcrowded barracks here in the District of Columbia and have requested authority to purchase about a half acre of land adjacent to the barracks in order to accomplish the expansion. The com-

mittee does not question the need for this expansion, but the acquisition of the property in question would result in the necessity to relocate several families now residing on the property. This presents a serious problem and the request has been deferred for the present.

It will be recalled about 3 years ago the Congress approved the establishment of a third recruit training center for the Navy at Orlando, Fla., which is still in the process of being built. In considering the bill the House of Representatives denied a request for additional recruit barracks and a messhall which the committee has approved as essential if this training center is to carry out its mission. Two projects of considerable interest to the Air Force which were denied by the House have been approved; namely, a materials laboratory at the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Ohio, and the composite recruit training and housing facility for the Air Force Recruit Training Center at the Lackland Air Force Base in Texas.

As to military family housing, approval has been granted for 4,800 units of new housing, which is 2,800 units more than was approved last year. A new average unit cost for housing of \$21,000 has been established as opposed to \$21,500 requested by the Department of Defense. This increase is deemed essential in order to keep pace with the rising cost of construction. The present average unit cost is \$19,500, which was established in 1967. Construction costs have risen considerably since that time and will undoubtedly continue to rise even more. The Department likewise requested authority to procure 2,000 units of housing in Japan to be financed by private capital over a 15-year period on a pay-as-you-go plan. The average monthly payments would not exceed \$185 per month and the housing would be assigned as public quarters. The House of Representatives, during their consideration of the bill, added an additional 4,000 such units for the Philippine Islands. Should this proposal be approved, it would create a contingent liability of about \$200 million. The committee denied the proposal in its entirety, particularly because of the potential liability that would be created in areas where troop strength and our tenure are in doubt.

Now, Mr. President, I should like to mention two actions the committee has taken to afford the Congress better control over cost and to reduce the cost of military construction. Contained in each annual authorization bill is a provision that permits operations not to exceed 5 percent of the base total in the United States, other than Alaska, and 10 percent outside the United States and in Alaska under certain circumstances. There is no limitation, however, on individual items as long as the base total is not exceeded by the limitations just mentioned. This year we have amended this provision to require an annual report to the Congress on all contracts awarded where the current working estimate based upon bids received exceeds the amount authorized by more

than 25 percent. In those instances where the cost of the project is \$250,000 or more and the current working estimate exceeds by 25 percent the amount authorized, the Department of Defense must advise both Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives of all the facts related to the increase in cost, 30 days prior to entering into a contract.

This will give the committees an opportunity to evaluate the reasons for the increased cost and to express opposition if need be. It is believed this procedure will result in more careful planning and better cost estimates on the part of the various services. We have long been concerned over the high cost of military construction, part of which may be attributable to the high cost of design, inspection, and overhead on the part of the construction agencies. Here again a provision is carried in each annual authorization bill providing that all construction authorized must be executed under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, or the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Department of the Navy, unless the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that it is wholly impracticable to do so. Then the construction may be executed under the jurisdiction of another Government agency or department.

This year the provision has been amended to permit the Secretary of Defense to assign the construction work to either the Corps of Engineers, the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, or such Government agency or department as he deems advisable to assure the most efficient, expeditious, and cost-effective accomplishment of the construction. The Secretaries of the military departments will be required to report annually to the Congress the dollar value of the construction contracts awarded to each agency, together with the design, construction supervision, and overhead fees charged by such agency in the execution of the assigned construction. Frankly, this will increase competition among the construction agencies by permitting the Department of the Air Force to handle more of their own work which is within their present capability if they can do so more cheaply and expeditiously. It is likewise conceivable that some work might be assigned to the General Services Administration if it comes within their capability. The committee is convinced that the increased competition and the reporting procedure will eventually result in a reduction in design, overhead, land inspection costs which are now believed to be exorbitant.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I should like to state that all overseas construction requests were scrutinized most carefully. Very substantial reductions were made on requests for various locations, particularly Europe and the Far East. For example, I have previously mentioned the denial of certain housing in Japan and the Philippine Islands, and all construction requests for Okinawa were denied pending clarification of our future base rights. Also denied was the start of a new facility at a classified loca-

tion which would eventually have cost many millions of dollars.

Mr. President, I believe that I have fairly summarized the military construction program for fiscal 1970 and I am convinced the essential construction needs of the Department of Defense are adequately provided for during fiscal year 1970.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, as ranking minority member of the Military Construction Authorization Subcommittee I fully support this legislation which has been ably presented to the Senate by the subcommittee chairman, the distinguished Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON).

This bill covers authorization for construction projects of the military departments and defense agencies, within and outside the United States, including authority for military housing and some construction of our Reserve components.

Fortunately, the subcommittee was able to reduce the budget request by 14.3 percent leaving a total authorization of \$1,642,051,000. This includes an increase in prior years' authority in the amount of \$23,677,000.

Mr. President, one of the most significant accomplishments of this bill is that special attention has been given to replacing or modernizing a large number of obsolescent and inefficient structures which make up a large part of our military plant. This has been a need of long standing and this year's bill provides \$445 million more than the bill for last year for permanent-type construction at established military installations in this country.

Another point worthy of attention is the decision of the subcommittee to continue the expansion program at the Military Academy by authorizing funds for construction of a cadet activities center. This is an essential requirement in connection with the expansion of the Academy and was strongly supported by Army witnesses before the subcommittee.

In keeping with the efforts of the full Committee on Armed Services to tighten military spending to the barest essentials the Military Construction Subcommittee has taken some steps in this bill to better control cost overruns and to reduce the cost of military construction.

Mr. President, the work of the subcommittee has gone most smoothly because of the outstanding leadership of the chairman, the distinguished Senator from the State of Washington. Able assistance has been provided, as in past years, by Mr. Gordon A. Nease, professional staff member, and his efficient secretary, Miss Mary E. Keough. It was a pleasure for the minority members to work with them and I urge favorable consideration of this bill by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 80, after line 14, insert: "Naval War College, Newport, Rhode Island: Training facilities, \$2,113,000."

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, this item was in the House bill and passed by the House, but was deleted by the Senate committee. I seriously hope the Senate will accept the amendment.

It was my pleasure this past summer to address the graduating class of Newport Naval College. It is in my State. The college does an exemplary job. It trains officers for greater service to their country.

I seriously hope the Senate will accept the amendment.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, this was a very close question in the committee. I am very pleased to accept the amendment at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

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

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

The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON) and myself, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 70, line 18, after "\$934,000", insert "and road, Custer Hill to Camp Forsyth, \$1,023,000".

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, this amendment would provide a two-lane road vehicular access from Custer Hill to Camp Forsyth and Junction City.

Upon completion of EM barracks, now under construction in the fiscal year 1968 MCA program, there will be about 10,500 men living in the troop housing area. Over 4,500 military vehicles will be assigned to the units. There are also 1,426 family quarters in the area with about 5,700 occupants. The total aggregate population housed in the area will be about 16,200 persons. The proposed road is urgently needed to provide improved vehicular access for military vehicles traveling between Custer Hill and Camp Forsyth and for all personnel traveling between Custer Hill and Junction City. Present conditions indicate that Camp Forsyth will remain fully active for many years. The new road will expedite military missions and provide for much safer travel for all affected personnel. A recent traffic engineering—

planning study by the Army Transportation Engineering Agency denotes serious congestion on K-18 in the Main Post—16,000 vehicles in a 24-hour period. Their report urgently recommends that the proposed road be constructed. The travel distance between Custer Hill and Camp Forsyth will be reduced by 3½ miles. The present route cannot continue to be the only access because of traffic congestion, safety hazards, and loss of time in travel.

The amendment is offered by myself and my colleague (Mr. PEARSON).

I may say to the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON) that I have had an opportunity to visit the area and am appreciative of the need for the road. I would appreciate favorable consideration of the amendment.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I do know the area. We had a real problem in committee because of the matter of priority on various construction items. This is a matter on which I would defer to the judgment of the able junior Senator from Kansas and the able senior Senator from Kansas, and be very happy to accept the amendment at this time and take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed to the committee amendment, the question now is on adoption of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I note that the military construction authorization bill as reported by the Senate committee recommends the deletion of \$410,000 which was included in the bill as it passed the other body for upgrading of air conditioning, cleanliness, and power distribution in the avionics shop at Tinker Air Force Base. Upgrading of these facilities is considered necessary in order to support more stringent requirements of new type weapons systems avionics components. The projects as recommended by the Air Force, and funded by the House will reduce reject rates and reduce lost time due to necessary shutdowns when proper environmental control cannot be maintained. Because of these potential savings, Mr. President, I would hope the Senate conferees would accept the \$410,000 as approved by the other body for this needed project and agree to the House position in conference.

MILWAUKEE—INTERNATIONAL AIR SHOW LEADER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there is one provision of the military construction bill, as passed by the House, about which I wish to comment. That is the House provision which authorizes such sums not to exceed \$750,000 for an international air show.

For a variety of reasons this provision is not in the Senate bill. No hearings were held on it. Some objected that it should

not be in the military construction bill. The Department of Defense opposed the provision in this bill. Because of that, there is no reason to believe that an amendment restoring the provision or any funds would pass in the Senate. I do not propose that action. A more orderly way would probably be to treat it as an individual bill and to hold hearings on it by the appropriate committee.

However, it is very possible that this provision will survive the conference. We face a fact, not a theory. In that case I want to suggest a course of action which could save a great deal of money and also provide one of the finest air shows for the country.

For the past 5 years the city and county of Milwaukee have had an annual air show. For the last 3 years it has been international in nature. Dignitaries from more than 15 foreign countries have attended. Planes from Canada, Great Britain, and Guatemala, to name a few, have been in attendance.

Last year more than 500,000 people attended the Milwaukee International Air Show. Two and one-half days of technical exhibits and technical meetings were held. On two and one-half further days the public took part. The show has been the most successful of shows in the country.

Milwaukee will hold its air show again in 1970 and in 1971. It will be held, as usual, under nonprofit auspices. Major air and aerospace firms will send planes and exhibits. Huge crowds are again expected.

I propose, in order to save money, that, instead of spending \$750,000 as seed funds to determine whether an international air show should be held, as the House bill authorizes, that the Milwaukee International Air Show be designated as a trial run or as a model for this endeavor. I also suggest that this could be done for as little as \$100,000. This would save at least \$650,000 and would be a most constructive endeavor.

Milwaukee has the facilities. It has the people. It is the home of Gen. Billy Mitchell for whom the airfield is named. It has a 5-year tradition of a huge, successful show. I urge this course of action on the Government if the provision in the House bill survives the conference.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, before passage of the bill, I should like to make a brief comment.

As in the past, we have had joint meetings with the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction, chaired by the able senior Senator from Montana and majority leader. This has been a very helpful procedure. I think it has clearly expedited the hearings and made it possible to move expeditiously on the appropriations to support the authorization.

I want to express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Montana for his cooperation and to the members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations who were so helpful.

We all know that the key to the successful operation of our committee systems rests with the able professional staff. Mr. Gordon Nease, of the Senate

Armed Services Committee, has been handling the authorization items for military construction for many years. As in the past, he has been extremely helpful with his wise and able counsel. He has worked very closely with his counterpart on the Appropriations Committee, the able staff director, Mike Rexroad, who is extremely helpful to all of the members of the committee and who has worked from the very inception with the Armed Services Committee staff member, Mr. Nease, in making possible the bill which we have presented today.

On behalf of the committee, I express my deep appreciation to Gordon Nease and Mike Rexroad, who have done an outstanding job.

Mr. President, I ask for third reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE), the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. MCCLELLAN), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS), are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from Michi-

gan (Mr. HART), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. MCCLELLAN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE), the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) would each vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senators from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN and Mr. GOLDWATER), the Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. SMITH) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa (Mr. MILLER), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. SAXBE) are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. MILLER), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. SMITH) would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 69, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 148 Leg.]

YEAS—69

Aiken	Fong	Packwood
Allott	Goodell	Pastore
Anderson	Griffin	Pearson
Baker	Harris	Pell
Bayh	Hatfield	Percy
Bellmon	Holland	Prouty
Bennett	Hruska	Proxmire
Bible	Hughes	Randolph
Boggs	Inouye	Ribicoff
Brooke	Jackson	Russell
Byrd, Va.	Javits	Schweiker
Case	Jordan, Idaho	Scott
Church	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Cook	Magnuson	Spong
Cooper	Mansfield	Stennis
Cotton	McGee	Stevens
Cranston	McGovern	Symington
Curtis	Montoya	Talmadge
Dodd	Moss	Thurmond
Dole	Mundt	Tower
Dominick	Murphy	Williams, Del.
Ellender	Muskie	Young, N. Dak.
Ervin	Nelson	Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—31

Allen	Gurney	Metcalf
Burdick	Hansen	Miller
Byrd, W. Va.	Hart	Mondale
Cannon	Hartke	Saxbe
Eagleton	Hollings	Smith, Ill.
Eastland	Jordan, N.C.	Sparkman
Fannin	Long	Tydings
Fulbright	Mathias	Williams, N.J.
Goldwater	McCarthy	Yarborough
Gore	McClellan	
Gravel	McIntyre	

So the bill (H.R. 13018) was passed.

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

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments

and request a conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes thereon, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. STENNIS, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. CANNON, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. DOMINICK conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON), the able floor manager of the military construction authorization bill, for the outstanding manner in which he handled this proposal. The unanimous vote speaks best for the fine efforts applied. May I say that the result was not unexpected. Senator JACKSON devoted to this measure the same competent legislative skill that has characterized his many years of service in this body. We are most grateful.

The distinguished Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) is similarly to be commended along with the distinguished Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH) who respectively serve as chairman and ranking minority member of the Armed Services Committee. Their contributions, of course, were indispensable to this great success. I must add that the distinguished Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) is likewise to be singled out for his splendid efforts on this measure this year which were so typical of his strong efforts in years past.

The Senate may be proud of another fine achievement, obtained expeditiously and with full regard for the views of all Members.

PUBLIC WORKS FOR WATER, POLLUTION CONTROL, AND POWER DEVELOPMENT AND ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 521, H.R. 14159. I do this so that the bill may become the pending business.

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

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 14159) making appropriations for public works for water, pollution control, and power development, including the Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Panama Canal, the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, the Bureau of Reclamation, power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, and related independent agencies and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is not the intention of the Senate to pro-

ceed further with the consideration of this bill tonight. However, it will be the pending business tomorrow at the conclusion of the morning business. There will be no further votes tonight.

SALT—THE STRATEGIC ARMS LIMITATION TREATY TALKS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty talks begin in Helsinki on November 17. These negotiations are of the greatest importance to the United States and the world. A favorable outcome could result in a much more secure United States and world. For the United States, a favorable outcome would mean a considerably lower defense budget which would free moneys for our important domestic needs.

One of this country's most distinguished nuclear scientists, Dr. Wolfgang H. Panofsky, delivered a paper in the Quantrell Lecture Series yesterday at the University of Chicago on the subject of "Strategic Arms Limitation." It is a realistic statement of the difficulties faced, but with the clarity that he demonstrated so effectively during the ABM debate, Dr. Panofsky outlines in his speech the basic issues that confront the United States in these negotiations. Dr. Panofsky points out that a total freeze of all nuclear delivery systems would preserve the existing strategic balance. A freeze on existing weapons systems could be maintained and the problem of inspection could be carried out under existing technology, he believes.

In Dr. Panofsky's words:

A "freeze" would tend to perpetuate for the time being many of the asymmetries between the U.S. and the Soviet Union: the Soviets are "ahead" of the U.S. in terms of total megatonnage of nuclear arms; we are ahead of them in number of bombers and missiles. Both nations could destroy the other's civilization many times over; neither side could hope to attack the other without risking its own survival. The strategic arms race would be halted and the way might be paved for future reductions.

The final paragraph of Dr. Panofsky's address is of importance. It reads:

The nature of the questions underlying SALT is very profound; although many technical factors enter the decisions each nation faces are basically political. We must not identify narrow military planning with the "National Interest"; we should not confuse superiority in arms with "Security". SALT offers a new opportunity to redirect our national priorities from an unproductive and dangerous technological contest to the solution of urgent problems at home. At stake is the survival of civilization on this earth. There is very little time.

Because of the importance of Dr. Panofsky's address toward an understanding of the issues that confront the United States in the impending SALT talks, I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

STRATEGIC ARMS LIMITATION

(By W. K. H. Panofsky)

After World War II representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union have sat down together 5,000 times to discuss the

limitations of armaments of their two nations. In spite of these efforts to do something about the arms race both countries combined have spent \$1 trillion, that is one thousand billion dollars, on military expenses. This sum is so enormous that it is difficult to visualize: It represents approximately the total productive effort of the U.S. for a period of two years.

Why can't we do better? It is obvious that both countries have overriding interests to do something about this madness; both countries could have used this enormous effort on more constructive pursuits than escalating the threat of one against the other. Both countries would have in fact greater security if neither had engaged in this arms race.

The achievements stemming from these 5,000 meetings have been woefully inadequate, although not totally negligible: We have the Limited Test Ban Treaty, we have the U.N. resolution banning nuclear weapons in space, and we have the beginnings at least of a treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. Yet all this is very small relative to the rate at which the arms race is progressing, and it does not take much mathematics to predict that the further we go along the road of military build-up on both sides the harder it will be to turn back without disaster.

Most arms limitation negotiations involving the Soviets and Americans have involved many other nations also; however the "strategic" arms race, that is the build-up of those weapons of mass destruction involving long-range nuclear weapons, is the province of the Soviet Union and the United States only; America and Russia possess a nuclear arsenal greatly in excess of any other nation and an arsenal vastly more than they would need to inflict total destruction on one another. It should therefore be more productive to hold bilateral talks, that is directly between the Soviet Union and the U.S., to limit the strategic arms races rather than to negotiate in as complicated a forum as the 18-nation disarmament conference (ENDC) which has been going on in Geneva for several years.

The idea of bilateral talks between the Soviet Union and the U.S. was first proposed over three years ago and personally introduced to Mr. Kossygin by President Johnson and Mr. McNamara at their meeting in Glassboro, New Jersey. It appeared the talks on strategic arms limitation, generally known as the SALT talks, would have a good chance to materialize before the end of the Johnson Administration, but the cooling off of relations brought on by the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia intervened and the Nixon Administration has taken its time to formulate plans of its own. Now the U.S. officially had been prepared to start talking for some time but the Soviets have just now agreed to a specific time and place for preliminary talks, to begin at Helsinki in mid-November. All this delay has occurred in the face of the formal treaty obligation assumed by both nations in connection with the nuclear non-proliferation treaty to pursue seriously steps to limit their strategic weapons.

Clearly all this hesitation in the face of an overriding common interest to get rid of the burden and dangers of strategic weapons must be the result of some serious indecision and infighting on both sides of the Iron Curtain. What the conflicts are in the Soviet Union in arriving at definite plans we can only surmise—on the other hand from Congressional Hearings, public statements and newspaper "leaks" it is becoming fairly clear how the sides are drawn in the United States in trying to influence the U.S. position in the forthcoming SALT talks.

Both sides in the strategic arms race suffer from the lack of a clearly defined policy on their strategic objectives, and how each side is willing to modify its strategic objec-

tives as a result of the SALT talks. U.S. strategy has been described in many public statements and Congressional Hearings by such jargon as deterrence, damage limiting capability, first strike capability, second strike capability, counterforce, countervalue, etc. What does all this mean? All this jargon is really a symptom of a dilemma. All military planners know "in their hearts" that should nuclear war break out, prediction of the outcome is really a hopeless task. The amount of destructive power available to both sides is so enormous that with all the computers and "think tanks" in the world one has little confidence in most conclusions of "war game" calculations. Therefore the primary stated policy of both nations has been prevention of nuclear war through deterrence, that is maintaining armaments at such a level that, should the one side attack first, then the other could strike back and destroy the opponent's society. Yet the lingering problem remains—what should be done in case deterrence fails, that is if war should break out anyhow by accident, by gradual escalation, or by inadvertent involvement of the two super powers in conflicts stirred up by third parties. To counter this possibility the strategists have invented "damage limiting" as a strategic objective, that is they would like to be prepared to minimize damage to the home country if deterrence should fail.

What does a strategy of "damage limiting" imply? It means that we attempt to protect our population through Civil Defense and ABM, and that we direct some of our airplanes and missiles to destroy those few airplanes and missiles which have not yet been launched against us.

But here we have the dilemma: the very things we would have to do to limit damage to the U.S. in nuclear war are qualitatively the same steps we would take if we planned a "first strike" against the USSR. As we increase the "damage limiting" forces we possess, the Soviet side would conclude that we would be more difficult to deter from a sudden attack against them; in other words, if we protect our population if war should break out, then the other side would have to raise its total destructive power in order to be convinced that we would be "deterred" from striking first. Clearly this argument applies equally whether you discuss it from the point of view of the Soviets or the Americans. Therefore the strategy of deterrence and the strategy of damage limitation effectively countermand one another, yet in all official pronouncements both ourselves and the Soviets espouse both.

This ambiguity in official attitude reflects of course an internal struggle on both sides of the Iron Curtain among the traditional military men who want to retain the ability to "fight a war and prevail" even in the nuclear age, and the group of advisors, among them the majority of civilian scientists, who see sanctuary only in prevention of nuclear war. It is clear that one can not hope for much progress in the SALT talks unless both sides implicitly or explicitly agree that reducing strategic arms to a minimum deterrent level is the common objective worth striving for at this time. But even with such a consensus there can be a wide margin of opinion as to how large a "minimum deterrent force" should be.

The current, much publicized debates on ABM and a moratorium on testing of MIRV's directly reflects the ambiguity of U.S. thinking. Let me elaborate on these controversies and how they relate to SALT.

As you know, ABM was first discussed as a defense of the cities and their population against Soviet long-range ballistic missiles. The opponents of massive deployment of ABM to defend cities, and I among them, have concluded that such a defense would be an enormously expensive technical enterprise and would buy very little; the protec-

tion offered could be negated by an increase of Soviet offensive forces at less cost than what we would have spent in providing the defense; therefore the result would simply be another step in the arms race with no increase in protection for anyone, and with much greater destruction, should war break out. This type of criticism had apparently been accepted by the Nixon Administration and accordingly the President withdrew the Johnson "Sentinel" city defense plan and instead substituted the "Safeguard" system which is intended primarily to protect the Minuteman land-based missile forces in North Dakota and Montana. In this new role ABM would increase U.S. deterrence by defending our Minuteman forces: a first attack by the Soviets could not result in destroying the ability of Minuteman to strike back. Unfortunately this strategic decision was not paralleled by a corresponding shift in engineering of Safeguard—the actual system which is now approved for deployment will do very little in protecting Minuteman, and also can easily be interpreted to be actually a first step for a city defense. Safeguard Phase II actually is intended to be a "thin" city defense against China, but its configuration is such that the Soviets may be forced to conclude that their deterrence against the U.S. is to some extent impaired.

The situation illustrates that ABM can and does have an ambiguous role: It can either serve a purely deterrent role such as defending Minuteman, or it can assist in a damage-limiting role if it defends cities, and it is very difficult for an opponent to tell which is which.

Our view of Soviet ABM is even more confusing since we can only interpret the limited information which we have; the only ABM system which we definitely know about is a very marginal deployment around Moscow; there have been "on again, off again" systems, and there are anti-aircraft defenses which may or may not also have a potential ABM role.

The situation with MIRV is similarly ambivalent as we shall see. The term MIRV stands for "Multiple Independent Re-entry Vehicles." This is a fancy way of saying that a single missile can carry a number of independent warheads carrying nuclear weapons which can be targeted against several objectives at once. MIRV's again have a dual function: On the one hand they can be used as a "penetration aid" against the enemy's defenses: the enemy's ABM can be penetrated if he has too many incoming warheads to shoot at. For this particular mission MIRV's would not need high accuracy. On the other hand if MIRV did have high accuracy then it would become a threat against the other side's retaliatory force; high accuracy would make it possible to take out simultaneously such a large number of the other side's implied missiles in a single strike to keep most of them from striking back. It is for this reason that widespread deployment of MIRV, combined with high accuracy raises a spectre of a first strike.

This MIRV threat was pointed out by Secretary Laird when he advocated the Safeguard as a defense against the Soviet SS-9, which he described as a potential MIRV. Actually the SS-9 missile as far as we have observed, lacks essential elements to make it a MIRV; some versions of the SS-9 carry three separate warheads, but there is doubt whether each can be independently directed at separate targets. Nevertheless, because of the high explosive power of the SS-9 it would become a great threat against the U.S. Minuteman silos should it be developed into a full-fledged MIRV. A halt on MIRV testing would eliminate this danger.

The U.S. position in relation to its MIRV's has been far from unambiguous also. Historically the decision to develop MIRV's in the U.S. came as a response to penetrate a surmised Soviet ABM system which, however,

did not make anywhere near as much progress as we had feared; yet our MIRV plans continued. U.S. MIRV tests appear further advanced than those of the Soviets—we have successfully tested MIRV's both for Poseidon and Minuteman; if forced to discontinue MIRV testing as a result of SALT, or a MIRV moratorium, we could still produce these devices with sufficient performance to serve in a deterrent role, i.e. to penetrate Soviet defenses.

As I mentioned above, if penetrating Soviet defense remained the only motive, then low accuracy for U.S. MIRV's would have been sufficient. However last year the U.S. not only undertook extensive tests of its MIRV's but also proposed a program to increase the accuracy of U.S. missiles. This would be very difficult to justify if penetrating Soviet defenses were really the only objective. In fact Secretary Laird candidly testified in the Senate that the purpose of increasing accuracy was to improve our efficiency against "hard targets." This is clearly inconsistent with the strategy of deterrence and unquestionably will give rise to Soviet fears of U.S. intent against striking first against their missile force.

Dr. John Foster, Director of Defense Research and Engineering, tried to back-paddle from Secretary Laird's statement that upgrading of MIRV accuracy was intended against hard strategic targets: He testified in Congress that this increased accuracy was needed against such items as industrial targets such as steel mills. This statement is technically insupportable. Even if one gives industrial targets a rather substantial resistance to blast, the presently programmed yields and accuracy for both Poseidon and Minuteman III are fully adequate to give a very high probability to destroy such targets.

The first slide shows a picture of the damage to a machine shop at Hiroshima caused by the first 20 KT nuclear bomb at a miss distance over half a mile. The presently programmed MIRV's for Poseidon and Minuteman have explosive power considerably larger than that of the Hiroshima bombs and are designed for accuracy higher than the "miss" which caused the devastation in the picture. It appears difficult to justify an improved accuracy program to do better than this!

What does all this discussion of MIRV and ABM have to do with the problem of formulating a U.S. position for SALT? We can now understand that, depending on how MIRV's and ABM's are deployed, and depending on their physical characteristics they can be viewed either as protecting the domestic deterrent forces or as threatening the deterrent forces of the other side. Specifically deployment of ABM by the Soviets has given the incentive for U.S. development of MIRV, deployment of multiple warheads by the Soviets has given an excuse for U.S. deployment of Safeguard, the possible role of Safeguard in protecting cities will give rise to Soviet fears of being able to maintain their deterrent against us, the possibility of improving the accuracy of American MIRV's appears to threaten Soviet missile silos etc. In short, because of this ambiguity, the whole ABM and MIRV complex becomes an inextricable part of the next large step of the arms race and the world would be better off without either.

It is much easier to assure compliance with treaty terms which prohibit a weapons system entirely than with a provision which permits a specified number of weapons. A "zero ABM" provision in SALT would be much easier to enforce than an agreement limiting both sides to a level corresponding to the U.S. Safeguard. Since ABM and MIRV's pose an inter-related set of problems we can see that the Safeguard decision greatly complicates the SALT talks.

It is this intertwined situation which

makes the conclusion clear that a small step in arms limitation may be harder to negotiate and be in fact more dangerous to U.S. and also Soviet security than a large step: Because of the multiple strategic roles of these systems impeding development of just one of them may be dangerous to either side. The more restrictive the SALT treaty can be on the further evolution of MIRV's and ABM, the more substantial will be the success of the treaty in achieving stability.

Starting from this conclusion we are immediately thrown into the complex question of policing the terms of a treaty. We are living in an era of mutual mistrust between the Soviet Union and the U.S. This circumstance, combined with the long-standing tradition of the Soviet Union for secrecy, raises both the question of *cheating* by the Soviet Union against the provisions of a treaty, and of *abrogation* of such a treaty following clandestine preparations. We know relatively little about the decision-making processes in the Soviet Union's military strategic issues; although our technical information on Soviet systems is remarkably good, it is nowhere as detailed as we think the information is which the Soviets have about our systems.

Most people are quite pessimistic that we will be able to negotiate into the SALT treaty a substantial amount of "on-site inspection" of Soviet installations, although this possibility cannot be excluded; most of you know that lack of agreement on such inspections proved to be the stumbling block which prevented the partial nuclear test ban treaty to become a comprehensive treaty, including prohibition of underground nuclear explosions. Therefore a great deal of attention has been given to evaluating the extent to which the SALT treaty could be verified on the basis of "unilateral intelligence," that is from information which we gather through our miscellaneous surveillance techniques of Soviet activities. How effective these techniques are in detail is impossible to discuss in public; suffice it to say here that even in private there is substantial disagreement as to how good a job we can really do in verifying Soviet activities. The opponents of a far-reaching SALT treaty tend to emphasize the ease by which the Soviets could clandestinely develop and test forbidden military systems and then suddenly "trot out" completely developed military systems which would endanger the strategic balance between the Soviet Union and the U.S. The spectre of "instant ABM" and "instant MIRV" suddenly appearing, followed by a Soviet ultimatum, is being raised. The fear of a superhuman clandestine effort on the part of the Soviets resulting in a sudden shift in the strategic balance under a treaty, has caused our more conservative military planners to oppose far-reaching arms limitation moves in the past and they are expected to do so in relation to SALT.

Yet it is true in general that under the more restrictive arms limitation agreements cheating will be much less dangerous toward upsetting the strategic balance than if the arms race continued with only small restraints. This point was illustrated above in relation to ABM and MIRV.

If one carries conservatism in military matters viewed in isolation to the extreme, any basis for a negotiable position is, of course, destroyed. The degree of absurdity to which this kind of thing can lead became apparent recently when one compares the testimony given by the Defense Department witnesses in support of the Safeguard ABM system with the testimony given to justify continued MIRV testing and deployment as needed to penetrate certain Soviet air defense systems (the SA-2 and SA-5 systems) in a possible ABM role. Specifically the SA-2 system is a very simple but very extensively deployed anti-aircraft defense in the Soviet Union; it has also been used in Viet Nam. The

possibility was raised that the SA-2's would have some potential of shooting down incoming U.S. ICBM's and thereby would protect Soviet cities; the U.S. deterrent would then be endangered. At the same time when justifying the Safeguard System Defense Department witnesses maintained that a system as complex as the one proposed would be required to carry out the much simpler task, namely the job of protecting the hardened Minuteman sites.

A similar degree of "one way" conservatism pervades the argument relating to our ability to verify possible Soviet violations of a SALT treaty. One of the frequently proposed measures to control the further evolution of MIRV technology and deployment would be to prohibit testing of intercontinental ballistic missiles which appear to carry MIRV warheads, or even to prohibit or severely restrict the test firing of such missiles entirely. The question then naturally arises as to how well we can monitor the firing of such vehicles by the Soviet Union, both in regard to the total number of firings and in terms of the characteristics of the devices under test. Naturally the experts differ in their assessment of our ability to find out what the Soviets are doing. However, as was again revealed in recent Congressional testimony, most of the debate deals with the wrong subject, namely whether we can correctly identify a few single test firings carried out clandestinely or specifically designed to hide their true purpose. What is ignored in these discussions is the total picture in which such "cheating" would have to be carried out: The Soviets would have to make a deliberate decision in the face of their treaty obligation to man a large-scale program starting from design and engineering, through a clandestine test program and leading to secret deployment, and they would then have to have the confidence that the resulting system would be reliable enough that it could be used in a first strike role against the U.S. to inflict so much damage that the U.S. could not retaliate. Even if single tests escape detection, the likelihood that this long sequence of events will remain unnoticed and will have an important military consequence is very, very small.

Focusing these discussions on the physical detectability of a single test tends to obscure the basic issue: Are the kind of risks which would be involved in pursuing cheating on the scale required affecting the strategic balance acceptable to the Soviet Union?

What we face here is a symptom of the wrong avenues we are apt to pursue when purely technical reasoning, combined with highly conservative military planning, are being considered in isolation. We are contriving situations in which the Soviets could accomplish technological feats which we could not conceive of performing ourselves and we are visualizing complex scenarios where the normally conservative Soviet military planners are pursuing a long-range, clandestine course which would shift their strategic pattern overnight once the covers were removed.

Any decisions on arms limitations involve a balance of risks to the survival of the U.S. and the World. We cannot rationally pursue a course where we are willing to take no military risks at all in pursuing arms control negotiations, while we are willing to expose ourselves to the ever-increasing risk of war and annihilation which the unchecked growth of the arms race implies.

This conclusion is again part of the general pattern demonstrated before: *The more far-reaching the prohibition of the SALT treaty, the less important the question of cheating becomes.* A second, equally important conclusion is: A freeze of the "status quo" at present levels of strategic armaments is easier to police than a treaty specifying agreed numbers of components (missiles, radars, etc.) of permitted strategic sys-

tems. It is easier to recognize changes than to interpret in detail what is discovered.

A "freeze" would tend to perpetuate for the time being many of the asymmetries between the U.S. and the Soviet Union: the Soviets are "ahead" of the U.S. in terms of total megatonnage of nuclear arms; we are ahead of them in number of bombers and missiles. Both nations could destroy the other's civilization many times over; neither side could hope to attack the other without risking its own survival. The strategic arms race would be halted and the way might be paved for future reductions. Yet only the future will tell whether in the present atmosphere of mistrust and under the spectre of large-scale Soviet clandestine programs, agreement on such far-reaching, but simple, treaty terms can be reached.

The spectre of sudden emergence of hitherto secret Soviet ABM or MIRV systems developed clandestinely under a treaty has given rise to another debate which is possibly of even more far-reaching significance than the debate about the SALT treaty itself. This is the controversy about the controls on the growth of technology. All of you have been exposed to the increasing clamor about man's need to put reins on the technology of his own creation lest technology control him. We have become painfully aware that when we make decisions to improve our standard of living through new technological devices we are often very short-sighted in assessing the consequences of each new step. We are apt to balance the short-range benefits of a new device only with the immediate monetary cost. What we tend to ignore are the long-range social as well as financial costs of many of our decisions in terms of disturbing the environment through pollution, through ecological damage, etc.

In the military area we are now being faced with the claim of some of our military spokesmen that we must not impede development of new military technology in order to be prepared to cope with unexpected clandestine military developments of an opponent. To put it in blunt terms—the military technicians maintain that evolution of military technology is inexorable and that we must adjust our lives and political and strategic decisions to live with that evolution. I claim that such an assumption is both dangerous to man's very existence and is also insupportable on its own merit. Our knowledge of science will indeed increase continuously—the facts of nature are there to be explored and they will not remain hidden, nor should they remain hidden. However, the step from science to military technology involves a protracted series of planned deliberate steps extending over many years; man can decide through his political processes to either undertake such steps or not to.

Although the Limited Test Ban prohibiting atomic explosions in the atmosphere and in outer space has been only a relatively minor move in the field of arms control it nevertheless is a major milestone in demonstrating that a barrier against unchecked evolution of military technology can be erected. This, of course, was the real reason why the Limited Test Ban was fought so vigorously. I see no reason why we should acquiesce to the development of the ever-increasing lethality of our weapons; if we subscribe to the belief that technology has a life of its own and that its progress in any direction, however anti-social, cannot be impeded, then it is indeed true that man has lost control over his own destiny.

I have gone far afield in discussing the specific issues underlying the debate involving the U.S. preparation for the SALT talks, and of course I do not know in detail what the issues are which are being debated in the Soviet Union and which keep the Soviets from responding to the U.S. requests to establish a firm beginning date for the nego-

tations. Part of the controversial issues within the Soviet Union, I am sure, are similar to the ones debated in the U.S.; some of them may well have to do with the special problems which the Soviets are facing in regard to China, that is, how to design a possible treaty which reduces the level of armaments in the bilateral race between the Soviet Union and the USA while leaving the Soviet Union freedom of action against China. Maybe the Soviet military planners are quoting Lenin who said:

"Everyone will agree that an army does not train itself to wield all arms, all means and methods of warfare that the enemy possesses, or may possess, is behaving in an unwise or even in a criminal manner."

This sounds disturbingly similar to the philosophy of some of the U.S. military spokesmen; if such views prevail in either the USA or the Soviet Union, we will see the Arms Race continue unabated by the results of SALT. Whatever the real conflicts are on both sides of the Iron Curtain, it is clear they involve questions which both societies have to resolve internally before meaningful negotiations can result.

I hope I have demonstrated to you that the nature of the questions underlying SALT is very profound; although many technical factors enter the decisions each nation faces are basically political. We must not identify narrow military planning with the "National Interest"; we should not confuse superiority in arms with "Security." SALT offers a new opportunity to redirect our national priorities from an unproductive and dangerous technological contest to the solution of urgent problems at home. At stake is the survival of civilization on this earth. There is very little time.

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW ACCEPTS CAPTIVE NATIONS MEDAL ON BEHALF OF PRESIDENT NIXON

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I had the high privilege today of being with the Vice President in his office at a ceremony at which, on behalf of the President of the United States, he accepted the Captive Nations Medal.

This medal was originated in honor of the captive nations at the end of World War II as an outgrowth of some of the ideas and thoughts of President Eisenhower.

Present at the meeting were Mr. Viktors Vikshins, chairman, Captive Nations Committee; Mr. James Howard, president of the board of directors, Captive Nations Committee, and Mrs. Howard; Mrs. Frances Kay, secretary, Captive Nations Committee; Mr. Mel Hoffman, chairman, medal committee; and Mr. Laszlo Pasztor, director of the Heritage Group.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the Vice President in accepting this medal be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REMARKS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT, CAPTIVE NATIONS MEDAL CEREMONY, NOVEMBER 11, 1969

It is a privilege to receive you and to accept the Eisenhower Proclamation Medal on behalf of the President as well as for myself.

Today, it is fitting to remember President Eisenhower's thoughts about the captive nations proclamation. He said, "this, to our way of thinking, is quite important not only because it is a matter of simple justice and human concern for all these people, but when

you come down to it this country is made up of a great many of those people. . . . And it becomes sort of a personal thing with us and would be almost unusual for us to be silent all the time."

Today is also a most appropriate time for this ceremony—for today is Veterans' Day—a day to remember America's goal of peace and mark the end of the first world war.

We entered that conflict "to make the world safe for democracy." We fought for "the self-determination of peoples," and with our sacrifices, shared in the liberation of many small nations long lost within the political boundaries of great empires.

For a while they lived as free nations, politically and spiritually. Then their political independence was again abridged but their spirit was not extinguished. No force can eliminate the desire for freedom.

Nor were our sacrifices made in vain, for they provided the foundation of hope and the proof that all around the world men are concerned not only with their own freedom but all men's freedom.

Today the struggle continues. But the fact that liberty must be eternally secured is not a signal for despair but for renewed commitment.

Our Nation alone cannot win freedom for all nations. But through alliances, we can prevent aggression from without; and through concern, our prayers and our example encourage freedom within.

On Veterans' Day, 1969, America believes as deeply in the self-determination of peoples as it did on Armistice Day, 1918. And we know that while many nations are still deprived of this right, none can eternally be held captive in spirit.

Thus, I accept these medals in the abiding confidence that freedom and free men everywhere will ultimately prevail.

OREGON'S EDUCATIONAL NEEDS DAMAGED BY CUTBACKS IN APPROPRIATIONS — EDUCATION MUST BE GIVEN THE EXTRA \$1 BILLION

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I rise in support of the continuing resolution (S.J. Res. 966), cosponsored by 46 Senators, which would permit our Nation's schools to receive money from the Office of Education at the increased rate of funding which was passed by the House of Representatives on July 31.

At that time, the House voted an extra \$1 billion for various education programs, and I believe that it will be the will of the Senate to concur. The Senate Appropriations Committee has not, however, completed action on the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations bill, and the departments are operating at the underfunded levels of the old budget.

This continuing resolution is unprecedented, but necessary. The normal processes of legislating are being disrupted by this House-passed resolution—it passed the House October 28—and I am reluctant to go against the wishes of the committee chairmen on appropriations.

However, the crisis which faces the Nation's schools, and the desperate need to spend greatly increased amounts from the Federal Treasury is, I think, reason enough to take this step.

Congress should have voted on the education budget this spring, and certainly not after July 31. We should not find ourselves facing the falling leaves of

November—4 months into the school term—with our schools and colleges still in doubt as to the amounts of money they will be receiving. How can they plan? How can they hire sufficient or skilled teachers, purchase equipment, update their programs, if they are constantly left in doubt as to the funds they will receive?

Our schools are being battered and badgered at every turn. They are criticized for doing an inadequate job in training the vast majority—about 80 percent—of students who do not graduate from college and who face the world of work, untrained for the space age. The schools have also felt the full impact of the taxpayers' revolt all across the Nation, as city after city fails in its attempt to pass school bond issues—over 50 percent last year.

Mr. President, we use the term "crisis" so often when we plead for more money for our schools, that I fear that those who prepare the national budgets are no longer listening.

We face a crisis in most areas of domestic need: Crime prevention, health care, air and water pollution control, job training, old-age assistance, to name but a few, which cry for attention and more money.

But the crisis in education is very real, particularly in the long-neglected areas of elementary and secondary education in the major cities of this country. The explosive upswing of juvenile delinquency and crime—just in the Nation's Capital alone—is real evidence of the terrible neglect of the young. The median age of those arrested for robbery in the District is 16 to 17. These are the dropouts, the pushouts from school, who begin to fall in the elementary grades when they are herded into the overcrowded, dilapidated inner city schools of Washington.

It is, however, not just the dropout, but the average youngsters of our Nation who are being shortchanged. We are not halfway meeting their needs in programs ranging from preschool to college. And the property taxpayers all across the country who are defeating school bond issues are telling those of us in politics that funding to meet the increased population demands of our towns and cities must come from the States and the Federal Government.

But the Federal Government is cutting back, not expanding to meet the demands for school construction, pay raises for teachers, better planning, and updated curriculum to meet the challenges of the new space technology.

Let us use vocational education as an example. Congress last year authorized expenditures of over \$500 million for the Vocational Education Act for fiscal 1970. Yet, the administration's budget request was for only \$279 million—less than the Job Corps.

The House Appropriations Committee raised this inadequate figure to \$357 million. The will of the House on July 31 was to overrule its own Appropriations Committee, and they voted to appropriate \$488 million for vocational education.

In 1968, \$265 million was appropriated

by Congress for vocational education, with almost \$10 million included for work-study. These funds are necessary for on-the-job training for thousands of youngsters who will stay in school only if they are given opportunities to work and study at the same time. However, in 1969 the total appropriation for vocational education was \$255 million, with no money available for work-study.

This continuing resolution would allow the vocational education agency to fund the State programs at the \$488 million level if Congress votes for it.

Mr. President, we are paying a high price for neglecting to provide in our schools the vocational training that is necessary for gainful employment. Aside from the costs of welfare and the human misery that accompanies unemployment, the remedial training programs that our Nation has undertaken since the early 1960's have required more resources than would have been required if we had attacked the problem initially in our schools.

For example, it costs about \$6,400 per

student per year to prepare for employment through the Job Corps program. But we could be setting up residential vocational schools which could be operated by the State school systems to train disadvantaged boys and girls at a cost less than \$2,900 per student per year. This is being done in several States.

In any democracy, stability and progress depend upon the intelligence, not of just the few, but of all the people. The intelligence can be developed fully only by a system of education which serves the interests, needs, and aptitudes of everybody. Our present system does not do this; we have downgraded vocational education too long; and this Nation cannot continue to do so.

The Vocational Education Act as amended in 1968 is still inadequately funded. It will go a long way toward achieving these goals, but only if adequately funded.

If we are ever to receive enough money for this program, we will have to use all our persuasive power to convince the administration that it is the will of Con-

gress that the President allow the Office of Education to spend this money, not withhold it as it threatened.

Mr. President, in anticipation of Senate debate on Senate Joint Resolution 966, I have asked educators in Oregon to send me hard facts and figures to justify increased spending for the schools. These Oregonians have responded with wires and letters which dramatically illustrate and fully justify increasing the appropriations bill to provide another \$1 billion for the Office of Education programs.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point statistics which show amounts of money Oregon received for various programs in 1968 and 1969. They are placed alongside budget requests from the administration and the amounts of increase the State of Oregon, its students and schools would receive under the July 31 House-passed bill.

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

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF OREGON

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1979	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					
Basic grants	\$8,417,750	\$8,094,552	\$8,243,687	\$8,243,687	\$9,133,814
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	0
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	998,243	485,416	407,753	0	501,940
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	1,911,000	1,723,476	1,797,312	1,267,496	1,709,568
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	332,551	392,527	382,604	382,604	382,604
Grants for special projects	30,000	0	0	0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	745,215	745,867	0	0	739,672
Loans to non-profit private schools	11,645	11,645	0	0	0
State administration	19,157	18,609	0	0	18,340
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	240,909	166,454	115,803	0	164,054
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	12,844,825	11,788,546	11,097,159	10,043,787	12,649,992
School Assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874)	2,430,000	2,535,000	1,453,000	791,000	3,076,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal, SAFA	2,430,000	2,535,000	1,453,000	791,000	3,076,000
Education professions development: Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)	0	194,038	242,301	242,301	242,301
Training programs (EPDA, pts. C and D)	2,123,269	0	0	0	0
Subtotal, education professions development	2,123,269	194,038	242,301	242,301	242,301
Teachers Corps	359,678	276,091	0	0	0
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	142,845	0	0	0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	192,040	188,978	192,058	192,058	192,058
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	189,903	198,461	0	0	0
Construction:					
Public community colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I, sec. 103)	1,020,884	972,067	502,615	502,615	502,615
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104)	2,571,233	1,641,185	1,072,916	0	403,333
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	1,859,065	0	0	0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105)	104,015	84,837	84,837	84,837	84,837
Student aid:					
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	1,901,170	206,165	992,230	992,230	730,733
Direct loans (NDEA II)	2,529,398	2,570,323	2,041,571	2,031,571	2,925,829
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds	16,034	111,571	0	0	0
Interest payments	0	0	0	0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	3,423,605	1,451,453	1,520,570	1,520,884	1,520,884
Special programs for disadvantaged students: Talent search	70,000	0	0	0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	1,745,800	0	0	0	0
Training programs (EPDA pt. E)	50,000	0	0	0	0
Subtotal, higher education	15,812,992	7,425,040	6,406,797	5,324,195	6,360,289
Vocational education:					
Basic grants	2,500,861	2,503,962	2,410,600	2,410,600	3,704,727
Innovation	0	0	224,845	224,845	224,845
Work-study	100,578	0	0	0	100,527
Cooperative education	0	0	234,845	234,845	234,845
Consumer and homemaking education	0	0	152,108	152,108	152,108
Subtotal, vocational education	2,601,439	2,503,962	3,022,398	3,022,398	4,417,052

Footnote at end of table.

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF OREGON—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate, 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—Continued					
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	\$388,844	\$388,844	\$388,844	\$218,650	\$388,844
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	217,203	387,922	128,092	0	128,092
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	41,323	41,566	41,566	41,566	41,566
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	4,735	25,136	25,136	25,136	25,136
College library resources (HEA II-A)	313,195			0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	75,044			0	0
University community service programs (HEA I)	147,325	142,684	142,684	142,684	142,684
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	203,568	225,639	241,935	241,935	241,935
Special projects and teacher education	151,391			0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities				0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community services	1,580,628	1,251,300	1,007,766	709,480	1,007,766
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	128,794	279,058	279,058	279,058	279,058
Teacher education and recruitment	694,331			0	0
Research and innovation	429,454	363,867		0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	4,699			0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	1,257,278	642,925	279,058	279,058	279,058
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories	1,543,500	1,690,000		0	0
Research and development centers				0	0
General education	907,859	64,723		0	0
Vocational education	281,229	50,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
Evaluations				0	0
National achievement study				0	0
Dissemination	143,921			0	0
Training	81,898			0	0
Statistical surveys				0	0
Construction	21,825			0	0
Subtotal research, and training	2,980,232	1,804,723	15,000	15,000	15,000

¹ Not available.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, the administration as well as the Congress is not being fair to our schoolchildren, the teachers, and the administrators responsible for planning and spending the money to meet their needs when these programs are cut.

I call attention to the excellent and hard-hitting letters of Oregon's superintendent of public instruction, Dr. Dale Parnell; of the new superintendent of schools in Portland, Dr. Robert W. Blanchard; and the president of Portland Community College, Amo De Bernardis.

It is worth attention to read the letters and wires in full, as well as the cold statistics, keeping in mind that these statistics represent human beings whose educational and job prospects will be diminished if we do not spend more money.

I shall read a few excerpts from a letter from Dr. Parnell:

The greatest weakness in education is inadequate planning. Federal programs are the biggest offenders in helping us be good planners, due to their funding patterns.

The haphazard way in which funds are received now makes planning nearly impossible.

We are four months into the present school year and still don't know how much money is available for vocational education.

Effective, efficient programs demand that services, supplies, and materials are available when needed: they cannot be dependent on funds available after programs have started or the school year is half over. It takes time to plan programs, to recruit instructors, to obtain equipment and to schedule students. These cannot be done until adequate funding is assured.

Even at full funding of vocational education amendments, all funds are needed for program operation—at least \$3 million per year addition is needed for facilities for

minimum program growth . . . No federal funds can be spared now for developing exploratory programs—greatly expanded opportunities for Oregon youth are critical—\$1 million per year is needed.

Present Title I, Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) is \$5,781,872 for providing needed supplementary services for 50% of the 49,078 disadvantaged children . . . To provide adequate services for all such children, a minimum of \$9,816,000 would be required.

Mr. President, I draw your particular attention to the following excerpt from Dr. Parnell's letter. Oregon is an important food-producing State, and each year over 30,000 migrant laborers are involved in picking our crops. Their children have extraordinary educational needs. We have been aware of the neglect of these children which has continued since "The Grapes of Wrath" novel and dustbowl depression days.

Oregon has pioneered in the education of these children, but the funds are always insufficient for the need. The State spent \$1.1 million in 1968-69. Coupled with Federal funds, this only meets half the need. Dr. Parnell continues:

Present ESEA title I migrant amendment funding in the amount of \$890,951 will provide nominal educational and ancillary services for fifty-five percent of the 7000 school-age migrant children. To provide adequate services for all migrant children, a minimum allocation of \$1.5 million would be required.

At this point in the RECORD I ask unanimous consent to have printed Dr. Parnell's entire letter, which speaks as well of the hardships caused by the cutbacks—to zero funding—in the administration's 1970 budget for libraries and for school equipment.

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

SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,

Salem, Oreg., October 31, 1969.

Hon. MARK O. HATFIELD,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Re your request October 30, I have three big ideas that need your help in putting across:

1. The Oregon Board of Education has adopted some priority objectives to improve instruction. If we are to really "zero in" on these management objectives, the following additional amounts are estimated to be needed in Oregon per year for at least three years:

Early childhood primary education development	\$42,330,000
Improving education for the disadvantaged	11,316,000
Adding the fourth "R" responsibility to curriculum (character and citizenship education)	2,500,000
Career education development (vocational education)	19,259,000
Improve teacher education and certification	11,000,000
Community college development to match State money for:	
Operating	11,000,000
Construction	23,000,000
Total	120,405,000

(A copy of our organization chart and objective is enclosed.)

2. The greatest weakness in education is inadequate planning. Federal programs are the biggest offenders in helping us be poor planners due to their funding patterns. The haphazard way in which funds are received now make planning nearly impossible. For example, we are four months into the present

school year and still don't know how much money is available for vocational education.

Evaluation of and accountability for programs will never be possible until we get lead time for identifying problems, setting objectives, establishing baselines and all the other planning steps necessary.

3. Let's face it, the greatest ability to raise money is at the Federal level. 161 local property tax levy defeats in Oregon school districts this year are vivid testimony of property tax limitations. Overall, Oregon elementary and secondary education is now financed 71 percent locally, 21.8 percent by the State, and only 7.2 percent by Federal funds. I returned today from public hearings on education in eastern Oregon. I sense a dramatic swing in public sentiment toward wanting the Federal income surtax dedicated to the support of education. Our sales tax proposal that was defeated eight to one last spring would have raised \$100-114 million per year. Whereas Oregon's share from the Federal surtax might amount to as much as \$140 million per year. Let's let education be controlled at the State and local level but let more of the burden of financing fall at the Federal level with its great ability to raise revenue. What would be wrong with a one-third local, one-third State and one-third Federal partnership in funding elementary and secondary education?

Some additional backup statements follow. Thanks for the opportunity to provide information. Good luck next week.

DALE PARNELL.

OREGON BOARD OF EDUCATION,
Salem, October 31, 1969.

HON. MARK O. HATFIELD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Following statements re your request October 30:

1. Effective, efficient programs demand that services, supplies, and materials are available when needed: they cannot be dependent on funds available after programs have started or the school year is half over.

2. It takes time to plan programs, to recruit instructors, to obtain equipment, and to schedule students. These cannot be done until adequate funding is assured.

3. It is estimated that at least 600 Oregon high school students were denied vocational instruction in 1968-69 because no assurance of funding for proposed classes could be given to local educational agencies.

4. Even at full funding of vocational amendments, all funds are needed for program operation—at least \$3 million per year addition is needed for facilities for minimum program growth. Also see Leonard Kunzman's letter to you of October 29, 1969.

5. No Federal funds can be spared now for developing occupational exploratory programs—greatly expanded opportunities for Oregon youth are critical—\$1 million per year is needed.

6. In connection with NDEA title V-A, 189 out of the 315 secondary schools in the state and only 128 out of the 987 elementary schools in the state have counseling and guidance programs meeting requirements. On hand and ready for final approval if and when Federal funds become available are applications from 62 schools (35 elementary and 27 secondary) involving a total expenditure of \$598,828 of which \$239,531 would be reimbursed by Federal funds.

7. Present title I ESEA funding of \$5,781,872 for LEA's provides needed supplementary services for 50 percent of the 49,078 disadvantaged children comprising the base formula for allocations to school districts. To provide adequate services for all such children, a minimum of \$9,816,000 would be required.

8. Present title I ESEA migrant amendment funding in the amount of \$890,951 will provide nominal educational and ancillary services for 55 percent of the 7,000 school-age migrant children. To provide adequate services for all migrant children, a minimum allocation of \$1,500,000 would be required.

9. During 1965 to 1969 Oregon schools meeting minimum library standards increased from 20 percent to 56 percent by aid of ESEA title II. Funding of title II is essential to continued progress in meeting the goal of adequate school library services for all pupils.

10. On April 18, 1969, the Oregon board of education approved eight innovative projects (three for handicapped children) for funding under ESEA title III. The total budget for the eight projects is \$450,000 which is equal to the proposed reduction in Oregon's allocation under the President's budget. The eight districts that submitted these projects will not receive funds during fiscal year 1970.

11. Of Oregon's 36,627 handicapped children, 18,727 or 51 percent are receiving needed special education; \$2,576,495 in State support and \$279,058 in title VI-A of ESEA were spent on special education last school year. To provide necessary programs for all handicapped children, an additional \$2,750,000 is needed.

12. A doubling of the \$750,000 per year now received under NDEA title III is required to replace obsolete, worn-out equipment and meet new equipment demands.

Re telephone request October 30, the following is provided:

1. During the past year the following districts have had bond election defeats:

West Linn No. 3J, Clackamas.
Eugene No. 4, Lane.
Pendleton No. 16, Umatilla.
Myrtle Point No. 41, Coos.
Scappoose No. 15, Columbia.
Rainier No. 3, Columbia.

2. During the past year the following districts have had repeated bond election defeats:

Bethel No. 52, Lane.
Crook County Unit.
Coos Bay No. 9, Coos.
Rogue River No. 35, Jackson.
Linn-Benton IED.

3. Using the U.S. Office of Education definition of current expenditures for elementary and secondary day schools, Oregon's actual and estimated expenditures are:

1965-66, \$257,485,000—\$622 per pupil in average daily attendance.

1966-67, \$272,000,000—\$647 per pupil in average daily attendance.

1967-68, \$303,788,000—\$715 per pupil in average daily attendance.

Estimated 1968-69, \$347,700,000—\$807 per pupil in average daily attendance.

Estimated 1969-70, \$384,955,822—\$882 per pupil in average daily attendance.

4. There is a noticeable contrast in the ability of urban and rural areas to support an educational program. The following data, representing averages taken at the intermediate level, illustrate this.

School millages, 1968-69

Sherman	5.58
Morrow	11.45
Gilliam	10.16
Multnomah	15.18
Lane	21.22
Marion	15.33
Washington	15.87

5. The expenditure data below is based on 1967-68 audits. Essentially the same pattern continues regardless of year, however. Note the inverse relationship between the dollars spent in these regions and the local tax effort that the region must make in raising

those dollars. One could conclude that the concentration of people in a given area creates educational problems but does not necessarily produce the wealth necessary to finance the solution to those problems.

Current operating expenses per average daily memberships, 1967-68

Sherman	\$1,083.82
Morrow	1,002.32
Gilliam	953.51
Multnomah	597.02
Lane	689.31
Marion	560.41
Washington	648.11

Finally, two general observations:

1. A basic fallacy in the Federal funding exists in the assumption that the States through the local districts will pick up the costs of the federally initiated programs when the Federal funding is discontinued or reduced.

2. Teacher preparation is an essential part of the Federal programs. The uncertainty of the amount and kind of Federal funding discourages this aspect of the program.

DALE PARNELL.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I call your attention to the House debate on this continuing resolution, which took place October 28. I was gratified to learn that the House leadership—including Chairman GEORGE MAHON of the Appropriations Committee—promised that the appropriations bill for education next year would be cleared by the House by next April.

This promise should reassure those of us in the Senate who are fearful of setting an unwanted precedent in voting on such continuing resolutions as Senate Joint Resolution 966. If these education appropriations bills are cleared by April, there will be no need for such continuing resolutions again. The Senators supporting this continuing resolution—and we are in the majority I believe—know this is unprecedented, but the needs of the schools warrant such action.

It is clear notice to the administration, particularly the Budget Bureau, that Congress insists that this money be spent for education, not impounded. We need some reordering of national priorities, as I have been pointing out in the past—particularly my vote against the recent \$20 billion military procurement bill for military weaponry—and education is but one area in which more attention and money should be lavished.

Mr. President, I plan to write to President Nixon this week and will be including these wires and letters in support of increased spending for education.

I will urge him to reconsider his warning to Congress that he will not permit the Office of Education to spend the extra \$1 billion if we vote the increase.

The Congress, for several years past—at least since the revamped Vocational Education Act of 1963 was passed, followed by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and the Higher Education Act of 1963-65—has been clearly telling the administration and its Budget Bureau that Congress wants increased amounts of money spent for education.

But in the years intervening since 1963, we have seen the Johnson and then the

Nixon administrations cut authorized amounts almost precisely in half. Our cities are reaping the whirlwind now because of this and decades of past neglect. Attention must be paid.

Mr. President, I wish to read excerpts from the letter of Dr. Robert W. Blanchard, superintendent of schools in Portland, Oreg.:

Cutbacks and lateness in federal funding have stricken our already (hard) pressed schools another blow. . . . Early notification of funding can provide for the sound long-range planning that assures efficient use of money.

Title I (ESEA) funds in 1965 for Portland were \$1.9 million; and that year Congress indicated there would be an annual increase of 10%. However, instead of an increase we have experienced a continued reduction in these funds, accompanied by runaway inflation that has reduced their dollar value. . . .

The Portland Public Schools' 1968-69 Title I ESEA allocation amounted to about \$1.48 million. Estimated for 1969-70 is \$1.34 million, a reduction of 10%.

In order that these funds may be concentrated sufficiently to make an impact, many youngsters in desperate need of compensatory education must be excluded from programs.

Although nearly 20,000 students in Portland have been identified as disadvantaged and could qualify, only a fourth of these students are allowed to benefit, because their inclusion would disperse the limited funds so widely that the impact would be totally ineffectual.

The great need for the most costly vocational education is so acute that the District has been increasing money allocated to the development and strengthening of vocational education programs at the expense of preventive, compensatory and remedial programs for younger students.

Please notice the above, Mr. President, for the experts in early childhood education have been telling us for years that we must concentrate on the elementary grades—and preschool programs—but we do not have the money to spend.

Dr. Blanchard continues:

The educational and cultural handicaps exhibited by our disadvantaged students can be far more crippling and socially damaging than physical handicaps, yet we spend far less per pupil for treatment.

A youngster alienated from society will cost us \$4800 or more per year, for life perhaps, in custodial or welfare care. Surely the expenditure of a few hundred dollars per student now can serve as an ounce of prevention.

Mr. President, Dr. Blanchard tells us that—

A second critical need is in the area of dropout prevention. School officials and the community alike are alarmed by the numbers of students who are not completing high school and thus are barred for life from entry into most vocations. Last year 1387 students left the Portland Public Schools to face a future dimmed by lack of a high school diploma.

Reductions in Title I and Vocational funds mean that the schools are limited in the efforts they can make to rectify the problem. "Vocational Village" a "last chance" school for actual dropouts, can handle an enrollment of but 250. An additional 300 youngsters currently remain on a waiting list, and additional hundreds have been discouraged from applying. Funds to operate this pro-

gram amount to \$294,000, including approximately \$204,000 in local funds and \$90,000 from federal vocational funds.

Mr. President, until we pass a desperately needed general school construction bill, the impact aid legislation will have to suffice. Impact aid meets a need; it is not equitable, but it helps. If the administration attempt to cut back on impact aid is successful, Oregon will lose needed resources for its schools. Dr. Blanchard wired me as follows:

Portland receives \$400,000 for PL 874 (Category) B students. If HJR 966 fails to pass Senate these funds would be dried up.

At this point in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent to have printed the full text of Dr. Blanchard's letter to me.

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

Cutbacks and lateness in federal funding have stricken our already (hard) pressed schools another blow. In reference to delayed notification of funding, school personnel responsible for planning have repeatedly stated that it is nearly impossible to plan adequately without the assurance of funds. Supplemental allocations of Title I funds result in "add on" programs. Early notification of funding can provide for the sound long-range planning that assures efficient use of money.

It is significant to note that Title I funds in 1965 for Portland were \$1.9 million and that Congress indicated there would be an annual increase of 10%. However, instead of an increase we have experienced a continued reduction in these funds accompanied by runaway inflation that has reduced their dollar value. The Portland Public Schools' 1968/69 Title I, ESEA, allocation amounted to about \$1.48 million. Estimated for 1969/70 is \$1.34 million, a reduction of 10%. In order that these funds may be concentrated sufficiently to make an impact, many youngsters in desperate need of compensatory education must be excluded from programs. Although nearly 20,000 students in Portland have been identified as disadvantaged and could qualify for Title I services, only a fourth of these students are allowed to benefit because their inclusion would disperse the limited funds so widely that the impact would be totally ineffectual. Yet, these other thousands of children should have the help necessary for their success. The great need for the more costly vocational education is so acute that the District has been increasing money allocated to the development and strengthening of vocational education programs at the expense of preventive, compensatory and remedial programs for younger students. The average cost per pupil in schools outside the Model Schools is \$695. In Portland's Model School area comprising ten of the lowest achieving inner city schools, local and state funds are being used to shore up federal monies. The chart on the following page will show resources of funding for the Model School Program:

Per pupil costs, model school program	
Average district per pupil cost.....	\$695
Title I.....	200
State fund.....	190
Local supplement.....	100
Total.....	1,185

The Portland Schools average from \$1,600 per pupil in the program for deaf children to \$2,600 per pupil in the crippled children's center for education for the physically handicapped. The educational and cultural handicaps exhibited by our disadvantaged students can be far more crippling and socially dam-

aging than physical handicaps, yet we spend far less per pupil for treatment. A youngster alienated from society will cost us \$4,800 or more per year, for life perhaps, in custodial or welfare care. Surely the expenditure of a few hundred dollars per student now can serve as "an ounce of prevention."

Areas other than compensatory education for the disadvantaged will be crippled by reduced federal funding. Carefully developed programs such as those for "dropouts" or the behaviorally distressed child have had to be shelved and discarded for the lack of funding. It is frustrating to both school people and the community to develop programs in anticipation of funding, only to be let down when federal resources dry up.

Were increased federal resources available, two general areas would assume high priority. Presently OEO funds are used through a contractual arrangement to conduct programs in early childhood education. Approximately 340 four year old children are served by our Early Childhood Education (Headstart) program and 400 kindergarten, first grade and second grade children by Follow-Through. An additional 600 four year olds are shut out of Headstart by the lack of funds and the entire three year old population of 1,000 children meeting the poverty criteria is not served in any way. We, in the Portland Public Schools, would like to see substantial increases in funding to cover these shortcomings and strongly urge that such funding be through the State Department of Education, as is the ESEA. Although Headstart technically has been transferred to the U.S. Office of Education, in reality the same OEO people who are social action, rather than education, oriented are determining policy and procedure.

A second area of critical need is in the area of dropout prevention. School officials and the community alike are alarmed by the numbers of students who are not completing high school and thus are barred for life from entry into most vocations. Last year 1387 students left the Portland Public Schools to face a future dimmed by lack of a high school diploma. Reductions in Title I and vocational funds mean that the schools are limited in the efforts they can make to rectify the problem. Vocational Village, a "last chance" school for actual dropouts, can handle an enrollment of but 250. An additional 300 youngsters currently remain on a waiting list and additional hundreds have been discouraged from applying. Funds to operate this program amount to \$294,000, including approximately \$204,000 in local funds and \$90,000 from federal vocational funds. Additional funds must be found to expand Vocational Village which is having phenomenal success in helping youth become productive, employed, responsible people, and start other programs as alternatives for the dropout prone.

Schools are facing increasing reluctance on the part of the public to fund budgets locally. This, as you know, is especially true in Oregon where state aid from the basic school fund provides the minor part of the cost of education and particularly in Portland where only about 18% of school costs come from the state. The property tax burden has been increased to the point of rebellion and property tax relief has become an important issue. School boards must pare budgets to critical levels to reach voter acceptance.

For the reasons mentioned in the above statements, we should like to urge the Senate to give high priority to educational legislation, particularly to the proposed addition of \$1,000,000,000 to the education budget for ongoing programs. Further, we would urge consideration of funding in advance for subsequent years to assure timely and efficient use of federal monies.

FEDERALLY FUNDED PROGRAMS, PORTLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS PORTLAND, OREG.

	1968-69	1969-70
Elementary and secondary education act:		
Title I, Compensatory education for disadvantaged students.....	\$1,480,000	\$1,340,000
Title II, School library resources.....	78,000	0
Title III, Innovative programs:		
Grow program (Columbia school).....	42,700	0
Supplemental services for blind children.....	35,200	38,000
Title IV, research and curriculum development:		
Kindergarten perceptual motor experiment.....	9,100	0
Language arts AIDS (grades 1-6).....	12,400	0
Child program (kindergarten).....	9,200	0
High school pilot project.....	15,000	0
PREP (handicapped children).....	35,900	0
Title V, High School Planning:		
Adams High School planning assistance.....	21,845	0
Research.....		15,000
Title VI, Handicapped children:		
Deaf-blind preschool children.....	18,000	27,000
Summer programs, 1969.....	14,300	
Economic Opportunity Act:		
Early childhood education (Headstart).....	397,700	263,000
Follow-Through (K-2).....	177,200	239,000
Neighborhood Youth Corps.....	282,100	231,200
Teacher Corps.....	76,900	131,600
New careers (teacher interns).....	(1)	(1)
National Defense Education Act:		
Title III-A, equipment and materials.....	16,600	(2)
Title V-A, counseling program (Arieta School).....	7,000	0
Federally Impacted Areas (Public Law 81-874):		
Allotment based on students who are children of Federal employees.....	367,100	350,000
Vocational Education Act:		
Assistance with general vocational education and special programs such as Vocational Village.....	220,000	320,000
Education Professions Development Act (approved in 1968-69):		
Title II-B, urban teacher education project (Adams).....		65,200
Teacher aide and training program (Ball).....		14,850
Title V-B, secondary education institute, Adams.....		153,900
Prescriptive education for handicapped children.....		86,300

¹ 24 aides.² Unknown.

[Telegram from MARK HATFIELD]

Need your help in Senate fight to add \$1,000,000,000 to total new education budget for ongoing programs. Please wire or write immediately on effects of cutbacks and lateness in federal funding on the following programs. Also give amounts received 1968, estimated 1969, and expect to receive Nixon budget 1970 for Elementary and Secondary Education Act (all titles illustrating effects of the cutbacks on your programs, not only remedial, but all), give number of children affected by cutbacks, those left out Title I program, for example, plus the needs which are not being met, even if restoration of money is made. Also, list other programs affected: NDEA, EPDA, vocational education, etc. Give me dropout figures from schools and what cutbacks do to your programs aimed at keeping students. This and any other information you develop, plus a strong statement on needs of more federal education money would be put to use next week in the battle with the Appropriations Committee and the Budget Bureau and will be great help in making the case for extra education money. Thanks very much.

MARK HATFIELD.

PORTLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Portland, Oreg.Senator MARK O. HATFIELD,
Washington, D.C.:

Approval HJR 966 now pending before the U.S. Senate Committee is of vital importance to Portland and other city school districts. Portland receives about \$400,000.00 annually from P.L. 874 for so-called "B" students. If HJR 966 fails to pass Senate these funds would be dried up. The already financially hard pressed Portland School District would find itself again without a needed and significant source of revenue. Your support of HJR 966 would be greatly appreciated and would be of great help to the students and taxpayers of the Portland public schools. Would you notify my office as to date Senate committee will report HJR 966 and date of Senate floor action?

ROBERT W. BLANCHARD,
Superintendent.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD another letter from Dr. Dale Parnell, Oregon's superintendent of public instruction, which calls particular attention to the needed funding for vocational education.

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

SUPERINTENDENT OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
Salem, Oreg., October 13, 1969.HON. MARK O. HATFIELD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MARK: I appreciated very much your letter of September 30, 1969, and your request for more specific information relative to Oregon's educational needs. I will respond to your inquiries in the order in which they appeared in your letter.

1. Effect of late funding of federal programs:

(a) Local school districts can give no assurance to staff working in these programs that they will have a job, so the better teachers seek other assignments that they can count on and not have to chance a break in their employment. Consequently, the federal programs tend to get the poorer, less qualified teachers when they should have the very best because of these programs' difficulty, unique requirements (e.g., programs for migrants, educationally-disadvantaged, handicapped).

(b) Project applications have to be based on minimum funding levels. If funding levels improve later during a given year, programs are expanded or added on a patchwork basis resulting in less effective use of funds. Time loss and additional paperwork are also involved.

(c) Lack of lead time means that there is inadequate planning for facility use, staff assignment, and materials and equipment acquisitions. Less than optimum programs are the result.

(d) Federal appropriations, even when made in November, are 12 months late. Local school districts start planning programs and

budgets in November for the fiscal year commencing the subsequently July 1.

2 Effect of cutbacks in ESEA Title I:

The President's budget for programs for educationally-deprived children is \$180 million less than the House action on this item. Cutting back to the President's budget would mean a loss of approximately \$1,980,000 for Oregon for 1969-70. Since about 50,000 educationally-deprived children in Oregon will need special programs in 1969-70, the loss would amount to approximately \$39 per child. (A copy of a document "Distribution of Children From Low-Income Families in Oregon" is enclosed.) The loss of these funds would mean:

a. The reduction of the number of teacher aides working in these special programs

b. Decreasing the number of social workers and teachers in some of the larger programs

c. Loss of some of the special instructional materials and equipment required in these programs

d. Reduction of salaries that can be paid these special teachers, resulting in hiring teachers with less experience and training

e. Reduction in in-service training for teachers and (in larger programs) loss of some coordinators, resulting in less supervision of programs

f. Loss of instruction in some special instructional areas. For example, a local math or reading program might have to be cut out, thus reducing the effectiveness of the total local program.

3. Amount needed to give primary education (K-3) the attention it requires:

a. The estimated cost of providing kindergartens for 26,389 Oregon children of kindergarten age, for which this program is not now available, is \$7,412,406 per year. This is exclusive of 12,019 children now enrolled in district-supported kindergarten programs. The estimate is conservative because it is based on 1967-68 per-pupil costs.

b. The estimated cost of reducing the pupil-teacher ratio in grades 1-3 from the present average ratio of 23:1 to 19:1 (the average for high schools in Oregon) is \$13,657,169 per year.

c. The estimated cost of helping to upgrade teacher quality for grades 1-3 by requiring master's degree teachers instead of baccalaureate degree teachers for these grades is \$11,260,681 per year (computed on the basis of a pupil-teacher ratio of 19:1).

The assumption in both b. and c. above is that the primary grades in Oregon ought to have at least the same pupil-teacher ratios and quality of teachers as the secondary schools.

4. Vocational education and comprehensive high school programs:

a. Estimated expenditures for vocational education programs in Oregon high schools and community colleges in 1969-70:

(1) Expenditures directly identifiable for Federal reporting purposes:

State	\$5,900,000
Local	4,130,000
Federal	2,410,000
Total	12,440,000

(2) Capital expenditures for construction, equipment, etc.:

State	\$3,500,000
Local	4,000,000
Total	7,500,000

b. Application of additional Federal funds for vocational education for 1969-70, if restored:

(1) Restoration of 1968-69 level of support of continuing programs as budgeted by local education agencies..... \$1,480,000

(2) Increasing the scope and effectiveness of developmental programs now underway-----	60,000
(3) Expansion of teacher recruitment and training program-----	45,000
(4) Curriculum development:	
Secondary-----	80,000
Postsecondary-----	40,000
(5) Program planning for 1970-73—secondary programs-----	\$30,000
(6) Instructional equipment:	
Secondary-----	160,000
Postsecondary-----	180,000
(7) Administration and development at State level-----	24,000
(8) New program operation cost support-----	210,000
Total-----	2,309,000

c. Estimated additional funds needed to develop an adequate statewide program of career oriented, relevant education over a three-year period:

(1) High school programs:	
(a) Support of excess operating costs of vocational programs over other programs-----	\$8,400,000
(b) Curriculum and curriculum materials development (based on a career cluster approach)-----	650,000
(c) Development and support of occupational exploration programs-----	2,500,000
(d) Improvement and expansion of occupational guidance-----	1,500,000
(e) Facilities, construction, and equipment-----	3,500,000
(f) Demonstration programs-----	500,000
Subtotal-----	17,050,000

(2) Community college (postsecondary and adult) programs:

(a) Support of excess costs of program operation-----	\$7,000,000
(b) Improvement and expansion of occupational guidance and exploration-----	1,200,000
(c) Curriculum and program development-----	200,000
(d) Facilities, construction, and equipment-----	5,500,000
(e) Demonstration and developmental programs-----	350,000
Subtotal-----	14,250,000

(3) Ancillary services:

(a) Teacher recruitment and educational and professional personnel development-----	\$600,000
(b) Action research projects and program studies-----	250,000
(c) Program administration, supervision, development-----	300,000
Subtotal-----	1,150,000
Total-----	32,450,000

The \$32,450,000 for the three-year period ought to be funded approximately as follows:

1970-71-----	\$6,950,000
1971-72-----	10,500,000
1972-73-----	15,000,000

I hope I have responded adequately to each of your inquiries, Mark. Your testifying before the Appropriations Committee will be greatly appreciated by all of us. If you or your staff have questions or wish additional information, please call or write any time. We want to give you all the ammunition possible.

Best personal regards.
Cordially,

DALE PARNELL,
Superintendent, Public Instruction.

Distribution of children in schools for handicapped children operated or supported by a State agency, P.L. 89-10 as amended by P.L. 89-313

School or institution:	Number of children
Board of Control:	
Clackamas Child Training Center, Oregon City-----	17
Fairview Hospital and Training Center, Salem-----	502
Oregon State School for the Blind, Salem-----	90
Oregon State School for the Deaf, Salem-----	274
Department of Education:	
Children's Farm Home School, Corvallis-----	51
Crippled Children's Hospital School, Eugene-----	28
Dammach Hospital School, Wilsonville-----	17
Eastern Oregon State Hospital, Pendleton-----	3
Oregon State Hospital, Salem-----	46
Shriner's Hospital for Crippled Children, Portland-----	43
University of Oregon Medical School Hospital, Portland-----	27
Total-----	1,098

Distribution of children in schools for neglected or delinquent children for whom a State agency is directly responsible for free public education, P.L. 89-10 as amended by P.L. 89-750

Board of Control:	
Hillcrest School of Oregon, Salem-----	130
MacLaren School for Boys, Woodburn-----	437
Subtotal-----	567
Oregon Board of Education: Wynne Watts, subtotal-----	52
Total-----	619

Migratory children of migratory agricultural workers, P.L. 89-10 as amended by P.L. 89-750

Department of Education, total-----	7,000
State totals:	
Low-income children-----	40,361
Handicapped children-----	1,098
Neglected or delinquent children-----	619
Migratory children-----	7,000
Total-----	49,078

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, Oregon receives about \$2.5 million from the Federal Government, and State and local contributions bring the total to \$12 million. Capital expenditures are about \$7.5 million.

Dr. Parnell has told me that the State should be spending about \$32 million during the next 3 years to meet the needs of the majority of our youngsters who need vocational education either in the high schools, or the technical training which could be made available to them in our community colleges if \$32 million became available. Oregon could use at least \$10 million from the Federal Treasury, he said, instead of \$2.5 million a year.

President Amo De Bernardis, of Portland Community College has a stringent comment to make regarding educating these young people which we in the Congress and in the executive branch need to ponder and act upon:

I hope that Congress will understand that the educational component is probably one

of the most important when it comes to developing the economic and social system which all of us cherish. Without each individual reaching his full potential in his chosen area of life's work, our economy will continue to have problems.

Many students are assisted in obtaining an education which will make them more productive and useful citizens. In this period of high school dropouts and disenfranchised people, it is important that a community college meet its commitment to all its people. In our experience the financial aid and work-study monies have been most important elements in keeping students in school.

But, Mr. President, what do we find? Construction cutbacks for these vitally needed community colleges means that places will not become available for the students who need vocational training. Administration cutbacks for work-study and loans and grants for students guarantees that poor and lower income students will not receive adequate training.

These cutbacks, which affect the high schools and community colleges at a time they are being challenged to expand opportunities for minority groups, especially, to compete in the space age, should be changed to expansion of opportunity. Private industry is telling us that postsecondary education is necessary for employment these days. A high school diploma is no longer enough.

The Portland community has invested heavily in the Portland Community College and has voted substantial sums for bonds to build this needed facility. It is a new college. In 1968-69 PCC applied for approximately \$1.5 million but received no funds from the Government. In 1969-70 PCC applied for approximately \$500,000 and received \$388,000. In 1970-71, President De Bernardis advises me:

The college is eligible for \$3.5 million, but no funds in sight.

Lack of federal funds has delayed construction of our college facilities.

De Bernardis continued:

We are still housing students in buildings over fifty years old and many of them are in substandard facilities.

For work-study programs, De Bernardis tells us that—

We made application for \$226,000 and received \$73,642.

It was the same cutback story for the equal opportunity grants—and these two programs are especially aimed at qualified low income students who otherwise would have no chance at college:

We applied for E.O.G. totaling \$151,000 and received \$50,720 . . .

In 1970-71 we have requested college work-study of \$405,792, Educational Opportunity Grants of \$234,500, National Defense Loans of \$72,000, for a total of \$712,292.

We must receive very close to this full amount if we are to satisfy the needs of the students of our Metropolitan Area and cannot afford to be cut back at a percentage equaling that of past years. We need a minimum of \$500,000 to keep pace with our present program.

Approximately 150 to 200 students seriously needing financial aid to secure financial education were deprived because of lack of funds.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the full text of President De Bernardis' letter.

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

PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE,
Portland, Oreg., October 30, 1969.

HON. MARK O. HATFIELD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HATFIELD: In reply to your telegram of October 30, we are forwarding the following information which may be of help to you as you attempt to get additional funding for HEW educational programs. Federal funds are an important item in our budgetary process.

Many students are assisted in obtaining an education which will make them more productive and useful citizens. In this period of high school dropouts and disenfranchised people it is important that a community college meet its commitment to all its people. In our experience the financial aid and work-study monies have been most important elements in keeping students in school.

I hope that Congress will understand that the educational component is probably one of the most important when it comes to developing the economic and social system which all of us cherish. Without each individual reaching his full potential in his chosen area of life's work, our economy will continue to have problems.

In the area of construction, federal funds are an important factor in helping us complete our campus. At the present time we are contemplating a Health Science Building and I understand that no funds are available for assisting us in the construction of this most important facility. Because of limited funds we will be delayed in the construction of this building and our Communications building. We are still housing students in buildings over fifty years old and many of them are in substandard facilities.

I know of your tremendous interest in the matter of education and I again want to point out that we as a nation better take a look at our priorities.

A summary of what I sent to you in the telegram is as follows:

1. In 1968-1969 we applied for approximately 1.5 million dollars and received no funds.

2. In 1969-1970 we applied for approximately \$500,000 and received \$388,000.

3. In 1970-1971 we will be eligible for approximately 3.5 million dollars for construction of Health Science and Communications Buildings.

4. Because the money has not previously been available, the Health Science and Communications Buildings have been delayed one to two years. It is impossible for us to have these facilities available before we must vacate our present temporary facilities.

5. Facilities approved for funding during 1970 will not be completed until 1972, at which time we will have an anticipated growth of 3,000 full-time students. In addition, we must provide facilities for approximately 1,000 full-time students now housed in temporary facilities which will not be available to us after June 1972.

The following summarizes the Financial Aid Implications:

WORK-STUDY

1. In 1968-1969 we made application for \$226,000 through the work-study programs and received \$73,642.

2. In 1969-1970 we asked for \$306,000 in work-study and received \$150,098. We applied for Educational Opportunity Grants totaling \$151,000 and received \$50,720. The total received for 1969-1970, therefore, was \$256,182 less than the requested funds.

3. In 1970-1971 we have requested college work-study of \$405,792, Educational Opportunity Grants of \$234,500, National Defense Loans of \$72,000, for a total of \$712,292. We must receive very close to this full amount if we are to satisfy the needs of the students of our Metropolitan Area and cannot afford to be cut back at a percentage equaling that of past years. We need a minimum of \$500,000 to keep pace with our present program.

4. By June, 1969, we had encumbered all anticipated Financial Aid funds for the 1969-1970 school year. Approximately 150-200 students seriously needing Financial Aid to secure further education were deprived because of the lack of funds.

Sincerely yours,

AMO DE BERNARDIS,
President.

P.S.—I am sending you a copy of a paper I have written on "The Role of The Community College in Vocational Education."

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, Oregon's community colleges serve a need for continuing education for adults in our cities and towns, as well as to provide the technical training which our young men and women must have if they are to have the qualifications necessary for our increasingly complex technological society. Let me quote to you from some of the wires and letters I have received from the community colleges of Oregon.

From President Harry Jacoby, Umpqua Community College, Roseburg, Oreg.:

Figures indicate the amounts we hoped to receive and placed in our budget in order to continue normal operation. However, we now estimate this will be cut by 50 percent which would be a decrease of \$67,534.

We have applied for and can document need for \$61,865 in student aid, even though we probably receive only \$25,000 this year and have been told to expect a cut.

We are assisting one out of every 375 of our students in a county where over one out of every seven people is on public assistance or social security.

Mr. President, I contend that the above wire is a dramatic illustration of the desperate need for more assistance for vocational education and community colleges.

President Frederick H. Boyle, Central Oregon Community College, Bend, Oreg., writes:

Reductions in and inadequate funding of financial aid programs have affected about 75 students (about 10% of our full-time enrollment) this Fall. We expect this number to reach 150 to 200 students next year as our enrollment increases. While the guaranteed student loan program has taken up some of the slack resulting from these reductions, it has not solved the most serious financial problems because banks have been very selective in the students to whom they will lend money.

Construction funds to the State of Oregon have been severely limited. Consequently, the amount available for community colleges has been minimal and none available to Central Oregon Community College.

The area of funding most critical to CCC has been the reduction under the Vocational Education Act. This reduction (about 40 percent) has meant that no new programs have been introduced and that the local taxpayer has had to pay an increasing portion of these more expensive programs.

Mr. President, the authorizing committees of Congress and the Congress itself last year, as I have previously stated clearly indicated that it wanted the

President and the appropriating committees to spend well over \$500 million in fiscal 1970 for vocational education, and part of that money was set aside for post-secondary education. The full amount should be funded.

From President Jack E. Brookings, South Western Oregon Community College, Coos Bay, Oreg.:

Received 1968 for construction zero. Expect to receive 1969 and 1970 zero. Could use \$330,000.

From Alan Goodell, administrative assistant to president of Mount Hood Community College, Gresham, Oreg.:

Anticipate and need \$1,183,000 1970 to continue building program, purchase vocational equipment, student loans. Cutback would seriously hamper allied health and other vocational building progress . . .

President E. J. Skinner, Treasure Valley Community College, Ontario, Oreg.:

Federal cutbacks show significant reductions that seriously affect program . . . many students unable to attend from lack of money (14% current enrollment).

From President Wallace W. McCrae, president, Blue Mountain Community College, Pendleton, Oreg.:

Our first building project in the year 1964-65 was given 25% federal funding. The second building project in 1965-66 was given 17% federal funding. Our third project in 1968-69 which is now occupied received no federal funding. We are now faced with postponement of the final phase of our construction at Blue Mountain Community College due to cutbacks in state funds and total elimination of federal funding.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the wires received from the Oregon community colleges.

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

PORTLAND, OREG.,
October 30, 1969.

MARK O. HATFIELD,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Federal funds critical to operation of Portland Community College. Construction grants 68-69 applied 1.5 million, no funds received, delayed construction; 69-70 applied 500,000, received 388,000; 70-71 eligible for 3.5 million, no funds in sight; lack of Federal funds has delayed construction of our college facilities. Financial aid 68-69 applied 226,000, received 73,642, 69-70 applied in work study 306,000; received 150,098, educational opportunity grants applied 151,000, received 50,720; 70-71 requested work study 405,792, educational opportunity grant 234,500, National Defense Loan 72,000. Lack of financial aid funds will deny 200 students further education. Airmail letter following.

AMO DE BERNARDIS.

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

OREGON TECHNICAL INSTITUTE,
Klamath Falls, Oreg.

HON. MARK O. HATFIELD,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

HEW education funds received 1968, \$217,786; 1969, \$275,837, and estimate \$375,169 for 1970. Cutbacks in 1969 has affected unduplicated 47 students because of inadequate allocations. Estimated request for HEW funds in 1970 showed an increase, although this

amount is still inadequate. HEW guidelines has prevented requesting adequate funding. We estimate that 70 unduplicated students will be affected by the 1970 guideline restrictions.

WINSTON D. PURVINE,
President.

MOUNT HOOD COMMUNITY COLLEGE,
Gresham, Oreg.

Senator MARK O. HATFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Mount Hood Community College received \$606,000 Federal money 1968; \$751,000, 1969. Anticipate and need \$1,183,000 1970 to continue building program, purchase vocational equipment, student loans. Cutback would seriously hamper allied health and other vocational building progress. Urge your assistance in adding one billion dollars to HEW education budget.

Regards,

ALAN GOODELL,
Administrative Assistant to President.

CLATSOP COMMUNITY COLLEGE,
Astoria, Oreg.

Senator MARK HATFIELD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Replying your wired request 30 October, (1) have committed all funds allocated to us under the E.O.G. and N.D.S.L. programs. Expect to have between 25 and 30 qualified students who will not receive aid. Requested \$17,700 for the E.O.G. program this year and were allocated \$9,412. The N.D.S.L. request was \$13,725 with an allocation of \$8,359. (2) Oregon formula for distribution of Federal construction funds eliminates eligibility of small community college. No Federal funds received or anticipated for said category. (3) Federal funds for operation and capital outlay in voc-tech programs reduced approximately fifty percent since 1967. 1969-70 reduction approximates \$18,000. (4) Title II funds for library instructional material appears firm.

STEWART F. MCCOLLOM,
President.

LANE COMMUNITY COLLEGE,
Eugene, Oreg.

The Hon. MARK O. HATFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

In response to your wire for information, we are pleased to provide the following:

	Needed	Received
Fiscal 1967-68:		
Construction.....	\$2,800,000	\$881,935
Student aid.....	204,200	135,899
Library books.....	15,000	13,201
Adult basic education.....	24,000	21,193
Total.....	3,043,200	1,052,228
Fiscal 1968-69:		
Construction.....	2,000,000	310,870
Student aid.....	281,650	171,592
Library books.....	22,500	13,175
Adult basic education.....	39,888	22,208
Total.....	2,344,038	517,845
Fiscal 1969-70:		
Construction.....	2,000,000	(9)
Student aid.....	592,900	149,132
Library books.....	25,000	15,629
Adult basic education.....	39,270	
Total.....	2,657,170	164,761
Fiscal 1970-71:		
Construction.....	1,600,000	
Student aid.....	873,000	

Estimated receipts.

Applications have not been filed on others. If there is further information needed, most happy to provide it.

Dr. ROBERT L. PICKERING,
President.

TREASURE VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE,
Ontario, Oreg.

Hon. MARK O. HATFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Re telegram October 30, Federal money cutbacks for TVCC show significant reductions that seriously affect program.

Vo-tech support, 1968, \$57,760; 1969-70, \$65,600; 1969-70, estimate, \$40,200—38.7% decrease.

Library funds, 1968, \$7,965; 1969-70, est., \$6,907. Down 13.3%. Student aids, 1968, \$129,107; 1969-70, \$165,012; 1969-70, est., \$94,947, down 42.5%.

Students assisted, 1968-69, 232; est. 1969-70, 85 to 100; decrease over 50%. Drop in student aid has affected anticipated enrollment. Many students unable to attend from lack of money. Follow-up study shows approximately 100 students not attending for financial reasons (14% of current enrollment).

We have been discouraged from applying for much needed library facility due to apparent absence of funds.

Thank you for your interest in our school problems.

E. J. SKINNER,
President.

SOUTHWESTERN OREGON COMMUNITY COLLEGE,
Coos Bay, Oreg.

Senator MARK HATFIELD,
Washington, D.C.:

Re your telegram October 30. Received 1968 for construction, zero. Expect to receive 1969 and 1970, zero. Could use \$330,000. Received 1968 for student financial aid, \$15,000. Expect to receive 1969, \$20,000 and 1970, \$20,000. Could use \$35,000 to \$50,000. 35 to 50 students affected by cutback in aid. Vocational cutback this year was \$30,000 to \$40,000.

JACK E. BROKINS,
President.

CENTRAL OREGON COMMUNITY COLLEGE,
Bend, Oreg.

Hon. MARK O. HATFIELD,
Washington, D.C.:

Reductions in and inadequate funding of financial aid programs have affected about 75 students (about 10 percent of our full-time enrollment) this fall. We expect this number to reach 150-200 students next year as our enrollment increases. While the guaranteed student loan program has taken up some of the slack resulting from these reductions, it has not solved the most serious financial problems because banks have been very selective in the students to whom they will lend money.

Construction funds to the State of Oregon have been severely limited. Consequently the amount available for community colleges has been minimal and none available to Central Oregon Community College.

The area of funding most critical to Central Oregon Community College has been the reduction under the Vocational Education Act. This reduction about 40 percent has meant that no new programs have been introduced and that the local taxpayer has had to pay an increasing portion of these more expensive programs.

Letter detailing Federal programs, figures, follows.

FREDERICK H. BOYLE,
President.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I received a letter from Mr. Leonard E. Kunzman, State director of vocational education, Salem, Oreg., I will quote a bit from its text and include the rest for the RECORD.

There is a dire need for an expansion of funds for the 1968 Vocational Education Amendments because of the restriction on use of money for the handicapped, disadvantaged and auxiliary services. These restrictions on funds have reduced considerably the total funds that can be devoted to basic types of vocational education and, of course, the need to expand the total vocational education program.

There has been a trend in recent months from parents and taxpayers to in general support the expansion of vocational training. There is greater sympathy to train and educate the 80 percent who do not go on to college.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print the letters of the same date from Mr. Kunzman in the RECORD.

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

OREGON BOARD OF EDUCATION,
Salem, Oreg., October 29, 1969.

Mrs. YVONNE FRANKLIN,
Special Assistant to Senator Mark O. Hatfield,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. FRANKLIN: During my recent visit to Washington, D.C., I discussed with you the need for Senator Hatfield's support in providing sufficient federal funds to implement the 1968 Vocational Education Amendments. It is my understanding that appropriation of funds for this act will be acted upon between now and some time in December.

There is a dire need for an expansion of funds for the 1968 Vocational Education Amendments because of the restriction on use of money for the handicapped, disadvantaged, and auxiliary services. These restrictions on funds have reduced considerably the total funds that can be devoted to base types of vocational education and, of course the need to expand the total vocational educational program.

There has been a trend in recent months from parents and tax payers in general to support the expansion of vocational training. There is greater sympathy to train and educate the 80 percent that do not go on to college. In order to accomplish this we need your understanding of the problem and the support from Senator Hatfield.

We believe vocational education has done a good job, in spite of the shortage of funds, and if given the projected federal funds has the organization and know how to move quickly into providing vocational training for all the people.

If I can be of any help in providing additional information, please get in touch with me.

It was indeed a pleasure to visit with you while in Washington, D.C.

Sincerely,
LEONARD E. KUNZMAN,
State Director, Vocational Education.

OREGON BOARD OF EDUCATION,
Salem, Oreg., October 29, 1969.

Hon. MARK O. HATFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HATFIELD: During my recent visit to Washington, D.C., I discussed with you and your Special Assistant, Mrs. Yvonne Franklin, my concern for vocational education. I have written Mrs. Franklin of

the necessity for obtaining sufficient funding to complement the 1968 Vocational Education Amendments and to solicit your support.

In addition I wish to reiterate my feelings for vocational education and the Manpower Development and Training Program as it relates to bills introduced in the Congress calling for a Comprehensive Manpower Program. Senate Bill 2838 was introduced by Senator Javits and is referred to as the Administration Bill on Manpower Training, called the Manpower Training Act of 1969, to implement the President's far-reaching domestic program outlined in his address to the nation. This bill would give complete authority to the Secretary of Labor to assign educational responsibility to any agency throughout the country and could completely bypass the state boards of education.

We in vocational education are especially concerned since there appears to be a willingness in Congress for the first time to adequately provide necessary funds to provide the kind of out-of-school vocational training we have always wanted, and now they want to take the authority away from education.

Because of a recent persistent effort being made to take the out-of-school vocational education phase of education away from the established state and local public education systems in Oregon we believe:

1. Vocational education has capability, years of experience and know-how to do the job of manpower education.
2. There is need for full funding the 1968 Vocational Education Amendments.
3. Vocational education must remain a part of the total educational system.
4. The education function of the manpower programs is education.
5. The function of all vocational education, including the education under the manpower and development and training program, should be under the control of the State Board of Education.
6. Vocational education, in conjunction with all education, should work for the establishment of a separate Department of Education and Manpower at the federal level.
7. That two agencies can participate and cooperate when duties and responsibilities are clearly defined and assigned.
8. Long-range vocational education goals must emphasize prevention rather than remediation.
9. Vocational education has done a good job, in spite of a shortage of funds, and if given the projected federal funds has the organization and know-how to move quickly into providing vocational training for all the people.
10. Vocational education has not been given enough money in the past to complete the job and, now that funds are to be provided, the job of vocational training should not be given to another agency.

I also believe these issues are complex and constitute a crisis with respect to our role in education and manpower development, and deserve your consideration to see that the responsibility of providing out-of-school vocational training is not taken away from the state boards of education.

For your information, I have just been informed that our State Plan for Vocational Education has been approved. As soon as we get a supply printed, I will send you a copy.

It was indeed a pleasure to get to visit with you while in Washington, D.C., and I appreciate your taking time from your busy schedule to meet with me without previous arrangements.

Sincerely,

LEONARD E. KUNZMAN,
State Director, Vocational Education.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I should also like to place into the RECORD,

and ask unanimous consent to do so, an article by Doug Baker, columnist for the Oregon Journal, on one of the fine innovative vocational education programs which has begun at Jefferson High School in Portland.

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

[From the Oregon Journal, Oct. 30, 1969]
JEFFERSON HIGH BOASTS FIRST "WORK-IN" CAFE

(By Doug Baker)

It's surely too early in the school year for any copper-bottomed predictions about anything, but the educators believe Jefferson High School may have turned the corner.

"There's a new spirit in the air," said Dr. William Proppe, Jeff's principal, at luncheon the other day. "You can feel it in the corridors and throughout the school."

"You know, it's hard to believe," added Proppe, "but I have three letters on my desk today, all saying nice things about Jeff. People are actually taking pride in the school."

At the luncheon table was Dr. Kenneth Erickson, onetime principal at Franklin and now with the University of Oregon. He had a sage comment. "Before people can be conservative, they must have something to conserve," he said.

And the student body at Jeff does have something material to conserve this year—a whole new approach to vocational education with some posh facilities good enough for bragging on. There's a new automotive shop with five bays, for instance.

And perhaps most remarkable of all, there's a restaurant. It's a real restaurant with fancy oak furniture and menus and a gleaming chromium kitchen with all the latest gadgets and it's all run by students. As far as anybody knows, it's the only true commercial restaurant inside a high school anywhere in the United States.

"We spent more than \$100,000 converting two classrooms into the T.J. Room," said Jim O'Gara, director of vocational education for the Portland public schools. "Everybody said it wouldn't work. They said the kids would throw Coke bottles through the windows and write dirty words on the walls. You know, there hasn't been so much as a scratch?"

It's not hard to see why the Jeff student body takes pride in the T.J. Room. (The initials, naturally, stand for "Thomas Jefferson.") Designed by architects Norman & Stanich, it is an attractive blend of natural lumber, purple formica and brilliant banners in school colors draped to hide the old classroom ceiling. The kitchen is a model of new equipment of which any restaurant would be proud. "Sid Stanich has kids here," said Proppe, "and he came in to make sure this place had more than a green paint and bleached birch decor."

Thirty-nine juniors and seniors staff the T.J. Room in two shifts each day. They are preponderantly female and black and nearly all of them are enthusiastic about the project. Each of the 39 must perform all of the restaurant tasks on a rotating basis. One week a student will be assigned to the dishwashing detail and the next to acting as maitre d'. The students do their own baking and are even learning meatcutting. The program, thus far, has been remarkably free from absenteeism and dropouts.

Students in the restaurant skills program also take regular classes, but the subject matter is specially designed to fit into a study of the restaurant industry. Vocational Education Supervisor George Kalman explained, "In a mathematics class, for instance, the students might be assigned a problem involving a ham. They would compute the initial weight and cost of the ham, the shrinkage involved in cooking and would then be asked

to determine the portion and cost control factors." In their English classes the students will work on menu preparation and, conceivably, will learn something of French terms used in the culinary arts.

To whom does the restaurant cater? To just about anyone who has the price of the luncheon. Cafeteria meals cost students only 40 cents, so there is little student demand for regular restaurant luncheons at \$1.25. But on special days students are offered cut prices so they can sample the restaurant fare and service. Ordinarily, the T.J. Room caters to faculty and school visitors.

Evenings, the room is available for special meetings and banquets. The other night the students prepared Beef Wellington for a banquet of 40 persons. They are paid nominal wages for such duty.

Floyd Hewitt, a 16-year-old junior, is typical of students who want to make the restaurant business a career. When he finishes the course at Jeff he plans to take the restaurant management course at San Francisco State. "Floyd made the peach cobbler this week," said one faculty member. "He was on Cloud 9 with all that pastry."

While the facility is peerless, the backbone of the project is the supervision by experienced restaurant personnel. Mrs. Rae Knox, formerly a waitress at Mr. C's Hippopotamus in the Lloyd Center, supervises the front end of the business. "The kids all call me Rae," says Mrs. Knox. But she oversees the restaurant on a no-nonsense basis. "Every day the girls learn things which I've just picked up through experience," says Mrs. Knox. "Today I told them how to use ice to clean the coffee urn, a trick I've known for years."

Perhaps even tougher with the class is Lawrence Sanders, the professional chef who supervises the kitchen. Sanders has been with such restaurants as Jake's Crawfish and Timberline Lodge and insists the students learn the culinary arts from the ground up.

"They want to use the potato peeling machine," said Sanders. "They'll use it after they've learned to work with their hands. They'll make their own soup stocks and their own dressings—no pre-prepared foods here."

So far, Sanders says he thinks only 16 of the 39 enrolled students will "make it" this year. "I don't know that we'll be giving any 'A's' or 'B's' this year," he said. "Maybe we'll give some 'C's'."

Sanders probably won't be as tough on grading as he advertises, but he and Mrs. Knox will undoubtedly turn out the kind of restaurant trainees which Portland restaurants are eager to employ.

Meanwhile, vocational education people such as Kalman are pleased as punch with the whole concept. Kalman points out that by the 1980s it will still be true that fewer than 20 per cent of the nation's job opportunities will be four-year college graduates. The real need will continue to be for technical skills and Kalman and his colleagues see vocational education as part and parcel of the newest wave in American education.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I call your attention to the excerpts of a letter I have received from Mr. Lee DeLance, supervisor of early childhood education, Oregon public schools, Portland.

Early childhood training is especially crucial to the children of the disadvantaged, and its benefits are such that preschool training should be made available to all.

Mr. Lee DeLance wrote:

We know, through recent studies and research, that the early years of a child's life (those before four) are the most formative and perhaps have the most bearing on the eventual life style of each individual. Due to . . . broken homes, poor nutrition, over-

crowding, lack of suitable educational materials (especially books), many children from poverty homes enter school deprived of the experiences which would enable them to reach their maximum potential and who upon entering kindergarten are already one to two years behind their more advantaged peers. Many of them never catch up. By fifth grade many have become mental if not physical dropouts.

We calculate there are roughly 3,000 three and four year old children who are eligible to be enrolled in Early Childhood Education classes. The Portland Early Childhood Education Program as currently funded by O.E.O. has an enrollment of 345 with 147 applicants on the waiting list. As you can immediately see, about 21% or less than one-fourth of the needy children of Portland have access to the Early Childhood Education Program.

Mr. President, these facts illustrate the heartbreak in these cutbacks. The Federal money is so inadequate that it is spread too thin; meanwhile little children lacking this early break, are destined to become the dropouts of tomorrow, the statistics on the welfare roles and juvenile delinquency lists if attention is not paid at an early age.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. DeLance's letter printed in the RECORD.

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

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

The following is excerpted from October 23, 1969 letter from Portland, Oregon Public Schools, Dept. of Elementary Education, Lee DeLance, Supervisor, Early Childhood Education:

We know, through recent studies and research, that the early years of a child's life (those before four) are the most formative and perhaps have the most bearing on the eventual life style of each individual. Due to varying factors such as broken homes, poor nutrition, over-crowding, lack of suitable educational materials (and especially books), many children from poverty homes enter school deprived of the experiences which would enable them to reach their maximum potentials and who upon entering kindergarten are already one to two years behind their more advantaged peers. Many of them never catch up. By the fifth grade many have become mental if not physical dropouts.

Although children of poverty most often are identified as disadvantaged, there are many youngsters equally disadvantaged from so-called "affluent" or "good" homes. Therefore, we believe that Early Childhood Education should be available for every child who meets the age criteria regardless of family income.

We calculate there are roughly 3,000 three and four year old children who are eligible to be enrolled in Early Childhood Education classes. The Portland Early Childhood Education Program is currently funded by O.E.O. has an enrollment of 345 with 147 applicants on the waiting list. As you can immediately see, about 21% or less than one-fourth of the needy children of Portland have access to the Early Childhood Education Program.

Because the largest number of needy youngsters seemed to be located in the Albina district, this area was selected as the original major target area to be served. Later, one additional center in southeast Portland was added. The ethnic composition of the program is approximately 70% Negro and 30% white, with perhaps a single child or two each year of Oriental, Indian, or Mexican descent.

Those children who still need a chance at a Headstart are primarily those from four other predominantly white target areas of

the city—especially St. Johns in north Portland, Lent in the Southeast area, and the new Hillsdale Public Housing Project in southwest Portland.

Mr. HATFIELD. At this point in the RECORD I should like to include copies of letters received by me from Mrs. Forrest E. Rieke, a respected member of the Portland School Board, a hardworking lady who is concerned for the educational needs of our children. She is angry at these cutbacks, especially those having to do with the cutbacks in funds for training elementary school teachers in the basic subjects. To me, it seems ludicrous that we have the Commissioner of Education calling for an end to illiteracy in this country and a concentration on reading programs, yet at the same time the administration is cutting into badly needed funds to train these teachers of basic subjects.

Attached are letters received protesting cutbacks from the basic studies budget from Mr. John M. Fessant, industrial arts specialist, Oregon Board of Education, and from Mr. James W. Simmons, director of libraries, Eastern Oregon College, protesting the cutbacks in the administration budget for libraries. Also attached are correspondence from Eloise Ebert, State librarian, and Gaylord Thorne, protesting the cutbacks for libraries.

I ask unanimous consent that the communications I have referred to be printed in the RECORD.

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

Portland, Oreg., October 18, 1969.

HON. ROBERT H. FINCH,
Secretary, Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: On October 4, the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development noted that a line item cut of eight million dollars from a thirteen million dollar program resulted in the practical elimination of funds for Basic Studies. Cutting out basic studies components of any training program makes no educational sense whatever. So the Council made careful inquiries. The decision was made by budget analysts in the Department, USOE appealed the decision and suggested areas where the cut could be made with less disastrous effect. The appeal was denied. The Council took the only route open to it and reported to the President and the Congress that more funds were needed if the policies of the new administration were to be put into effect.

In short, the educational and administrative problems highlighted by that budget cut were matters of concern to me as a member of the Council.

Since my return to Oregon, I have found that the political effect of that decision is perhaps even more serious. As an individual (independent of the Council) and as a Republican, I am writing to call your attention to the widespread negative reaction I discovered here. It is far beyond the size of the cut in relation to total funds for EPDA. The hostility is directed toward EPDA generally, and toward your administration of HEW. People believe that basic studies have been eliminated from federal policies, and that EPDA funds will be concentrated in the South. Neither assumption is true, but I urge you to do what you can to alleviate the immediate problem in budget allocation, and to correct the system which made this kind of distortion possible.

I have been a member of a core city school

board for 12 years. I recognize the problems created when funds are cut, and I know what can happen to policy in a system of 6000 employees. It is presumptuous to relate that experience to the enormous structure of your office, but it seems to me that the mistake resulted from three questionable practices:

1. At no time were policy people invited to advise the analysts on the effect of the cut. I doubt that your immediate staff were consulted. Consulted, and I know that EPDA officials were not consulted. It's impossible to run the railroad when someone is removing pieces of the track at random.

2. Decisions were made without assessing the effect on the overall policies for EPDA, or on the relationships between programs. EPDA is a great mechanism for getting the personnel training job done, using all other agencies and resources in the field. But its strength is in its flexibility and its ability to focus on needs. To do this it must have every possible chance to strike a balance among programs and resources. Arbitrary decisions from outside the mechanism only pull the rug out and cause an imbalance.

3. It appears that the decision was made with incomplete information about the nature of the programs and cost per student. The old summer institute programs were high cost-low yield, and there are better ways to achieve the desired results. But throwing out the basic studies in the effort at instant reform simply threw out the baby with the bath.

EPDA is apt to be unpopular with special interest groups in education which thrive on direct pipeline funding from the Congress. Outside of those groups, the EPDA idea has broad appeal and great potential for effective use of federal funds in cooperative partnership with other levels of government and all kinds of educational institutions. I hate to see it tarred for the wrong reasons by all the people who are normally friendly.

I have enjoyed working on EPDA. It has been very exacting and very hard work. I am the only school board member, but all of the Council members believe, as I do, that programs succeed or fail depending on the competence of the people involved. All of our educational goals as a nation depend on the quality of the personnel, including their competencies in the basic studies.

I hope you will place this problem on the "urgent" list, and do what you can to keep EPDA alive and healthy.

Sincerely,

MARY W. RIEKE.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION,
AND WELFARE, OFFICE OF
EDUCATION.

Washington, D.C., October 27, 1969.

Mrs. MARY W. RIEKE,
Portland, Oreg.

DEAR MRS. RIEKE: Secretary Finch has asked me to respond to your letter regarding the Basic Studies Program supported by the Education Professions Development Act.

As you are aware, the necessity for reducing Federal expenditures for fiscal year 1970 has made it necessary for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to curtail the amount of money to be obligated in fiscal year 1970 in many of its programs. The overriding concern is the need to combat inflation. The quality and importance of the programs sustaining cuts were and are not at issue. After much deliberation, the decision was made in DHEW to cut the amount of money to be obligated for the Basic Studies Program from \$13 million to \$5 million.

This reduction does not indicate that there is any lessening of concern about teachers knowing the subjects they teach. Emphasis on content runs throughout BEPD programs. Nor does the reduction imply any fundamental changes in BEPD's relations with colleges and universities. In fiscal years 1970 and 1971, for instance, the great majority of

the training projects in such priority areas as Early Childhood, School Administration, TTT, Special Education, Pupil Personnel Services, and Media Specialists will be college based. More importantly, however, we will continue to encourage institutions of higher education to work in partnership with the schools and the communities they serve as in TTT projects, the Teacher Corps and the Career Opportunities Program.

May I also point out, that a reduction in the Basic Studies budget does not affect EPDA projects already funded and under way in the 1969-70 academic year. Nor does it affect a variety of other programs planned for 1970-71, to be conducted by State and local education agencies and colleges and universities.

Sincerely,

DON DAVIES,
Associate Commissioner.

Portland, Oreg., November 5, 1969.

HON. ROBERT H. FINCH,
Secretary, Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have before me your reply to my letter of October 18, 1969, written at your request by Dr. Don Davies, Associate Commissioner, BEPD. I have attached copies of both letters with key sentence underlined.

I submit that quality and importance of programs are at issue. PL 90-35 states clearly and repeatedly that these values are precisely the issue, even if it were possible to defend the position that Basic Studies Program is somehow 60% more inflationary than other programs.

Someone who analyzes budgets in your department has missed the vital responsibility of EPDA as set forth in PL 90-35. In two years of hard work since 1967 eight critical needs have been identified, including Basic Studies. A "critical need" is not adequately served by other agencies of the Federal, State, or Local Governments. EPDA must use its funds and programs to encourage a different balance.

I direct your attention to Program Information, Basic Studies Program, EPDA Parts C and D, Page 11, which states the problem:

"EMPHASIS ON THE ELEMENTARY GRADES

"Without minimizing the needs of high school teachers, the Bureau clearly could offer a better balanced program if those institutions capable of designing strong programs in relevant academic disciplines for teachers of earlier age groups—the elementary and junior high schools—would seriously consider this possibility.

"It is usually easier for college teachers in academic departments to design programs for secondary school teachers than for teachers in the elementary school. Consequently, nearly four-fifths of the proposals for NDEA institutes have been designed for secondary school teachers. Furthermore, the institutes in mathematics and science conducted by the National Science Foundation are by law directed at the secondary level. Yet there are many more elementary teachers, serving in the Nation's schools, their need for sounder academic preparation in the wide variety of subjects they are called upon to teach is immense, and their success or failure in teaching the children at this age affects the children's interest in and capacity for further learning to an extent that defies description."

If the judgment of BEPD and the National Advisory Council for Education Professions Development is insufficient, I call your attention to the position of Dr. James Allen regarding the importance of reading instruction. Neither the prestige nor the money of the Universities, profession, or public has yet been directed to the critical function of teachers in the elementary grades.

Eight million dollars should be restored to the Basic Studies Program immediately.

Sincerely,

MARY W. RIEKE.

OREGON BOARD OF EDUCATION,
Salem, Oreg., November 3, 1969.

HON. MARK O. HATFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HATFIELD: I am concerned, and the 759 industrial arts teachers in Oregon are concerned about the \$8,000,000 cut in the basic studies budget.

This program funded institutes attended by industrial arts teachers in Oregon. The benefits to education of Oregon youth cannot be measured. Several Oregon teachers attended a variety of these institutes. The reports they brought back to fellow educators were invaluable.

If there is any way you can help restore any of these funds it would upgrade education in our state. This program was originally started during the Eisenhower administration as Title XI, NDEA, and was sponsored by Republicans.

Please let me know if I can help in any way in this effort.

Cordially,

JOHN M. FESSANT,
Industrial Arts Specialist.

EASTERN OREGON COLLEGE,
La Grande, Oreg., November 3, 1969.

HON. MARK HATFIELD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MARK: It is my understanding that both this year's education bill and the 1971 budget will be considered in the Senate between now and December for presentation in January.

I am sure you realize how vital to our continuing development of educational resources funds from the Higher Education Act have been, particularly Title II (library resources and training), and I am writing to ask your support for passage of the appropriations.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES W. SIMMONS,
Director of Libraries.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Salem, Oreg., October 29, 1969.

HON. MARK O. HATFIELD,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HATFIELD: We would like to urge you to give special attention to the proposed Administration budget cuts in Labor-HEW Appropriations Bill—H.R. 13111 for libraries. Those of us in state government conducting research will be severely penalized by such action. We cannot conduct research into new treatment programs and program modifications without the availability of current, relevant scientific literature. The whole question of national goals and the bringing of systematic study to priority setting is ultimately involved in such proposed reductions.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely yours,

GAYLORD L. THORNE, Ph. D.,
Institution Research Coordinator.

SALEM, OREG.,
November 4, 1969.

Senator MARK O. HATFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Oregon State Library is experiencing severe fiscal difficulty in lack of specific information on appropriations for fiscal 1970 which will be available for library programs. We will appreciate your support of H.J. Res. 966 when it comes to the Senate floor. Thank you for co-sponsoring S.J. Res. 163 supporting House action on education funding.

ELOISE EBERT,
State Librarian.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, the article which I will now place in the

RECORD is by a fine Oregon education writer, John Guernsey of the Portland Oregonian. It tells what is happening to the private colleges in my State. Their enrollments are dropping at a time when the enrollments at our public colleges are increasing tremendously. They are being hardpressed financially to meet the needs of today's youth, and they are falling behind in the competition for funds, not only for construction, but needed expansion of education programs and, particularly student aid. The Federal Government has encouraged these colleges to seek out well qualified youth, promising to help the colleges with a combination of aid programs: loans, grants and work-study, and now we are placing these colleges in an embarrassing and precarious position by inadequate Federal funding. Allowing the Office of Education to spend higher amounts for loans, grants and work-study would be of tremendous value to these colleges.

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

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

OREGON'S PRIVATE COLLEGES, UNIVERSITIES
HURT BY STEEP DECLINE IN FALL ENROLLMENT

(By John Guernsey)

KLAMATH FALLS.—The crisis facing some of Oregon's privately operated colleges and universities was pointed up Monday when fall term enrollments for all institutions were reported by the State Board of Higher Education.

The 18 independent colleges and universities this fall have a total enrollment of 12,086 students, down about 5.5 per cent from their fall term total last year.

In the past four years, the combined independent institutions have fallen about 13 per cent from their peak total enrollment of 13,627 in the fall of 1965.

This year's enrollment reports indicate that while the independents fell 5.5 per cent, the public four-year colleges gained 5.4 per cent, and the number of community college students taking academic college transfer courses climbed nearly 24 per cent.

The big losers in the independent college field are Northwest Christian College of Eugene, down 12.6 per cent from 460 students last year; Marylhurst College, down 17.3 per cent from 750 students last fall; Mount Angel College, down 10.3 per cent from 370 last year; and Linfield College, down 7 per cent from 1,147 last year.

Lewis and Clark College climbed 6.1 per cent to 1,989 students; Reed College gained 7.3 per cent to 1,379; University of Portland is up 5.2 per cent to 1,879 students; and Willamette University is up 3.9 per cent to 1,632.

The over-all college enrollment declined in spite of enrollment-luring innovations such as new study programs on many of the campuses and despite state scholarship support for private college students.

The issue of state fund assistance for the independents is expected to be a major one during the 1971 Oregon legislative session.

The enrollment reports also alerted legislators and educators to keep a close eye on the two-year community colleges, to see that they do not become strictly academic-flavored junior colleges, with little or no attention paid to vocational-technical courses and students.

Whereas the number of community college students taking academic courses climbed nearly 27 per cent to 14,991 students, the total community college enrollments gained only 15 per cent this fall.

The history of community colleges and

junior colleges in other states indicates they are inclined to develop into academic institutions, with vocational instruction having only the country cousin role.

Legislators have made it clear that they do not intend this to happen in Oregon.

Total enrollment in the nine public colleges and universities has reached about 54,000, up 5.4 percent over last fall.

The figures indicate that 1969 legislative action to curb the number of graduate students has produced the desired effect.

The System of Higher Education now has about 8,240 graduate students, up about 2.7 per cent over the 8,023 of last year.

More than 9,000 had been anticipated before legislative restrictions went into effect.

There are about 6,468 out-of-state students in the public four-year colleges this fall, up about 12.5 per cent over the 5,755 of last year.

Even though the out-of-state number is up considerably, the legislative intent of not having more than 900 new out-of-state freshmen at the University of Oregon and Oregon State University has been accomplished.

FACILITIES SOUGHT

In other business, the board:

1. Voted 5-1 for installation of nine covered tennis courts and nine covered handball courts at the University of Oregon. Cost will be about \$630,000. The project will have to be approved by the State Emergency Board.

Board member Elizabeth Johnson objected on grounds she believes the cost is too high, that dormitory students will have to pay too big a share of the cost, and because she does not believe tennis and handball courts come within the "emergency" category.

Board member and ex-Gov. Robert Holmes contended the courts are badly needed for general student use, and that the university is woefully short of such recreational facilities when compared with need and the number of such courts at other large universities.

2. Approved basic plans for a \$4.8 million agriculture and Division of Continuing Education building at Oregon State University. The proposed project will be brought before the 1971 Legislature.

COST \$16 MILLION

3. Completed specifications for the sale of \$16 million in bonds, to finance part of the higher education building program during the next two years.

4. Approved expansion of the Eastern Oregon College boundary by 15.7 acres, bringing the total camps to 120 acres. The expansion will be north of Gekeler Lane, to accommodate long-range building plans at the La Grande campus.

5. Reported that three low-cost housing units are now in operation at Portland State University, and five others will be by January, 1970.

Student corporations, with some support from the System of Higher Education, have taken over old apartment buildings in the campus area until they have to be razed within two years to make way for new campus buildings.

About 739 students will be accommodated by the apartment rooms, with rents ranging as low as \$25 per month.

Mr. HATFIELD. Included as well for the RECORD is an Associated Press story by Matt Kramer listing another blow to the small private colleges, failure to qualify for State funds, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

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

PRIVATE COLLEGES FAIL TO QUALIFY FOR FUNDS

(By Matt Kramer)

SALEM.—The state set aside \$1.3 million to help private colleges in 1969-70, but now it

is finding the schools cannot qualify for even 50 per cent of that.

This is a blow to the private schools, which are hard-pressed for cash.

The Legislature budgeted \$648,000 for this year—the money to go at \$100 a head for Oregon residents who are full-time students in the private colleges.

With registration almost complete, the schools have found only 3,188 students who can qualify. That means the schools will get only \$318,000 or less than half of the money available.

Jeffrey Lee, executive director of the State Scholarship Commission, says the reason is in the tight language the Legislature wrote on residency.

The colleges estimated 6,484 of their students this year would be Oregon residents. That was based on the students' own declaration of where they resided.

But the Legislature said they also must be graduates of Oregon high schools. This ruled out many students who have come to Oregon since high school and consider themselves residents.

The scholarship commission has sent partial payments to the schools and expects to write a final check about Nov. 1.

The list:

George Fox College, 170 students.

Lewis and Clark, 636 students.

Linfield, 415.

Mt. Angel College, 142.

Marylhurst, 197.

Museum Art School, 55.

Pacific University, 303.

Reed, 137.

Portland University, 536.

Willamette, 523.

Warner Pacific, 64.

Mr. HATFIELD. Let me read a partial quote from Associate Dean of Admissions Kenneth B. Mayer, Pacific University, Forest Grove, Ore.:

There is no question that expectations had begun to rise. In low-income areas there is widespread distrust of the news media and government agencies. But, as students who left these areas to go to colleges and universities under federal and state programs, returned, the truth began to be believed, i.e., higher education was available to all who prepared for it. Hope was beginning to filter through many communities, albeit slowly.

Because of cutbacks, Mr. Mayer writes:

Pacific University had to revise its admissions policies. Plans for recruiting more low-income and minority students had to be abandoned. Pacific had the highest percentage of black students in the Northwest, and we had felt we could do even better. We had planned to recruit more Mexican-American and Indian students and to begin giving the forgotten man, the low-income white, a better chance at higher education.

Instead, we had to discard these plans and return to concentrating on recruiting in middle income and upper-class secondary schools where students would not require financial aid.

Many low-income students with good potential who did apply had to be rejected for admission because neither personal nor public funds were available. We advise these students to try for Guaranteed Student Loans but they were refused by the banks in almost every case.

The tragedy here as far as Pacific University is concerned, lies in the fact that this year we have rooms available in our dorms, space available in our classes, and hours of staff-time available that could have been put to use by students who had a dream but who

were forced to resort to the bitter alternatives to education that exist for the poor.

The tragedy as far as the low-income communities throughout the United States are concerned is that a few dramatic personae on the college campuses may be permitted to squelch the aspirations of hundreds of thousands of people for themselves and for their children. The promises which have been so hard to convince them to believe are in danger of being withdrawn as are so many other promises.

The poor need hope—hope that their aspirations will become reality. Pacific University would like to resume its program and be permitted to play a strong role in raising the educational level and thus the prosperity and well-being of our Nation.

President Miller F. Ritchie, Pacific University, sent me the following wire, from which I quote:

A significantly smaller sum is expected to serve a significantly larger student body. We enter this year anticipating an operating loss of \$140,000 almost entirely attributable to under-realized enrollment. In turn, almost entirely attributable to 70 students who did not come because we could not offer them aid at anticipated levels. No less than 25% of our students on aid are funded at less than the level recommended by the college scholarship service.

Unless the Federal Government makes some large scale commitment to increase aid to students, we are going to have very serious problems.

President E. P. Weber, Concordia College, Portland, Ore.:

Twenty-five to thirty additional students presently enrolled at Concordia College could benefit from Federal student aid programs if funds were available. Since they are not available, Concordia College must supply these funds through its own resources, and thereby complicate an already difficult financial picture.

Because financial aid funds are limited it is impossible to recruit larger numbers of disadvantaged students who could profit from the educational program at Concordia College.

Mr. President, in a moment I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD wires and letters which I have received from private colleges as well as public colleges and universities in Oregon. But first I wish to read quotations from a few of them.

President David C. LeShana, George Fox College, Newberg, Ore.:

Under encouragement of intent of Higher Education Act of 1965, and similar Act, George Fox has greatly improved its program through the few resources provided. When they are reduced or not increased to meet growing needs, we must either cut back or absorb these costs . . . we will exceed budget by about \$20,000 on student aid . . .

President Gordon C. Bjork, Linfield College, McMinnville, Ore.:

In 1969-70 over 500 applications for NDSE, EOG and WORK-STUDY (National Defense Student Loans, Equal Opportunity Grants) funds were received from students who had substantial need. Only 275 grants could be awarded. The shortage of EOG funds made it necessary for Linfield to use its own funds to meet prior commitments to students originally funded under the EOG program.

Students are desperately short of money. The cutback in federal aid coupled with the difficulty in securing guaranteed student loans because of tight money . . . has forced a sizeable number of students to drop out of school.

Mr. President, Oregon is a small State. There are about two million residents, and over one-quarter of our population is enrolled in some form of education, from preschool to college and graduate school. In 1968 Oregon received about \$50 million for all its educational needs. The bulk of the money went to our universities, about \$30 million, for research and other programs.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point wires and letters from public and private colleges and universities in Oregon.

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

LINFIELD COLLEGE,
McMinnville, Oreg., October 31, 1969.
HON. MARK O. HATFIELD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HATFIELD: In response to your telegram of Thursday, October 30, the following are figures for funds received for 1968, estimated for 1969, and proposed for 1970:

1968 Federal allocations

NDSL	\$99,461
EOG	62,400
Work-study	47,358

Year	Library			Construction			Education opportunity grant			College work-study			NDEA loan		
	Requested	Granted	Deficit	Requested	Granted	Deficit	Requested	Granted	Deficit	Requested	Granted	Deficit	Requested	Granted	Deficit
1968	\$5,968	\$5,277	\$691				\$10,625	\$5,515	\$5,110	\$11,616	\$5,854	\$5,762	\$4,950	\$3,610	\$1,340
1969	5,107	5,050	57				10,800	6,061	4,739	10,505	6,734	3,771	3,885	3,200	685
1970	6,000	5,800	200	\$138,700		\$138,700	9,800	5,500	4,300	12,765	6,000	6,765	6,000	4,000	2,000
Total			948			138,700			14,139			16,298			4,025

Because financial aid funds are limited it is impossible to recruit larger numbers of disadvantaged students who could profit from the educational program at Concordia College.

Twenty-five to thirty additional students presently enrolled at Concordia College could benefit from federal student aid programs if funds were available. Since they are not available, Concordia College must supply these funds through its own resources, and thereby complicate an already difficult fiscal picture.

REED COLLEGE,
Portland, Oreg., November 3, 1969.
HON. MARK O. HATFIELD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HATFIELD: In answer to your telegram, no money was received for construction by Reed College from the government in 1968, 1969, nor is it expected for the year 1970.

Student aid includes federal work study: 1967-68, \$72,843; 1968-69, \$75,013; July to December 1969, \$35,869; educational opportunities grants: 1967-68 \$45,850, 1968-69, \$60,350, 1969-70, \$58,088; institutional assistance for Master of Arts in Teaching: 1967-68 and 1968-69, \$10,300 each year; Prospective Teachers Program Inner City Fellowship: 1967-68, \$67,600, 1968-69, \$50,600, 1969-70, \$34,210; Libraries: 1967-68 \$5,000, 1968-69 \$6,469, 1969-70, \$5,444.

The number of students affected by cutbacks is 325, including 305 student loans and 20 EO grants.

A four million dollar building program,

CXV—2125—Part 25

1969 Federal allocations

NDSL	\$87,699
EOG	48,846
Work-study	30,485

1970 requested allocations

NDSL	\$189,000
EOG	86,145
Work-study	62,402

Sincerely,

GORDON C. BJORK,
President.

OREGON COLLEGE OF EDUCATION,
Monmouth, Oreg., October 31, 1969.

HON. MARK O. HATFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HATFIELD: In response to your telegram, information on Federal money for construction and for personnel development and libraries is as follows:

PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT AND LIBRARIES

Grants awarded	Construction	Personnel development and libraries
1968	\$571,667	\$45,476
1969	0	10,080
1970 (estimated)	25,571	10,000

¹ Science building.

STUDENT FINANCIAL AIDS

Amount received	College work study	NDSL	EOG initial awards	EOG renewal awards
1968-69	\$153,620	\$217,792	\$80,880	\$72,550
1969-70	158,521	152,256	60,299	108,974
1970-71 (requested)	352,773	257,690	105,028	117,432

Financial aid was denied approximately 250 OCE students for lack of funds so far in the 1969-70 year. Funds were not in adequate amounts for those receiving awards. The number of students applying for federal financial aid has increased in excess of 125% during the past five years.

Thanks for your efforts.

Sincerely,

LEONARD W. RICE,
President.

CONCORDIA COLLEGE AND
HIGH SCHOOL,
Portland Oreg., October 30, 1969.

HON. MARK O. HATFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HATFIELD: Thought it would be better to send this airmail special delivery so that you would have all the figures available. Kindest regards.

Cordially,

E. P. WEBER,
President.

LEWIS AND CLARK COLLEGE,
Portland, Oreg., November 5, 1969.
Senator MARK O. HATFIELD,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Total HEW funds received 1968 was \$1,059,968 estimate for 1969 is \$1,504,184 projection for 1970 is \$458,000 or a reduction of 70 percent students receiving aid reduced by 76 this year. Freshman on EOG reduced from 45 to 9 cutback in construction funds may halt law school building before completion Building and equipping of science center delayed indefinitely because Federal assistance not available.

JOHN D. PHILLIPS,
Vice President for Administration.

LINFIELD COLLEGE,
McMinnville, Oreg., November 4, 1969.
Honorable MARK O. HATFIELD,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Additional student aid information 32,000 NDSL loans quoted in excess of allocation enabling fifty students to attend college.

LLOYD R. SWENSON,
Director Financial Aid.

MT. ANGEL COLLEGE,
Mt. Angel, Oreg., November 4, 1969.
HON. MARK O. HATFIELD,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Student aid in fiscal year 1969, \$84,800; in 1970, \$100,300; in 1971, \$110,300. Estimated increase in number of students aided over 3 year period, 195 to 228. No grant for developing institutions 1968 to 69. Present grant \$59,900, this year must be maintained.

Senator MARK O. HATFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Federal funds for Eastern Oregon college total student financial aid:

Received fiscal year 1968	\$178,228.99
Received fiscal year 1969	178,055.00
Expected fiscal year 1970	150,438.00
Applied for 1970	250,055.00
Students affected	191
Construction received fiscal year 1968	78,461.00
Construction received 1969	None
Expected fiscal year 1970	52,900.00
Eligible projects not yet funded	343,286.00

Others:

Library fiscal year 1968	7,710.00
Library fiscal year 1969	7,800.00
NDEA Institutes 1968-69	47,634.00
NDEA Institutes 1969-70	None
Migrant program 1968-69	87,552.00
Migrant program 1969-70	119,451.00
NSF Institutes 1968-69 Boleb	42,686.00
NSF Institutes 1969-70 Bolen	14,327.00
NSF Institutes 1969-70 Hermans	8,416.00

Library grant of approximately \$6,000 also of indispensable assistance to academic programs.

Dr. THOMAS SULLIVAN,
Chairman, Administrative Team.

ASHLAND, OREG.

HON. MARK O. HATFIELD,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Received and estimated Federal receipts follow:

	1968	1969	1970
Construction.....		\$558,333	
Student aid.....	\$420,170	636,350	\$750,000
Personnel development.....			
Libraries.....		11,287	50,000

Cutbacks could affect 1,500 to 2,000 students. Substantial dropout of students would occur without Federal support. This help urgently needed.

JAMES K. SOURS,
President.

FOREST GROVE, OREG.,
November 1, 1969.

Senator MARK O. HATFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Pacific University in 1968 received construction grants totaling \$647,000. There were none in 1969 and none are anticipated for 1970. In 1968 Pacific University received a 1.2 million dollar 3 percent loan. In 1969 a \$250,000 3 percent loan. None is expected for 1970.

Except for anticipated construction cutbacks we would have expected to qualify for grants and loans sufficient for a one million dollar project in 1968. Various forms of student aid at Pacific University totaled \$302,500. In 1969 the total was up to \$350,000 and in 1970 \$333,000 is presently expected. The increase for 1969 was commensurate with enrollment and for 1970 a significantly smaller sum is expected to serve a significantly larger student body. We enter this year anticipating an operating loss of \$140,000 almost entirely attributable to under-realized enrollment. In turn, almost entirely attributable to 70 students who did not come because we could not offer them aid at anticipated levels. No less than 25 percent of our students on aid are funded at less than the level recommended by the college scholarship service. Letter follows.

M. A. F. RITCHIE.

WILLAMETTE UNIVERSITY,
Salem, Oreg., Nov. 1, 1969.

Senator MARK O. HATFIELD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Willamette received in 1968 for library \$6,307; student loans \$90,837; grants \$67,575, work study \$34,888. Estimated for 1969 for library \$15,358; student loans \$95,647; grants \$51,515; work study \$28,187. Estimated for 1970 for library \$16,000; student loans \$103,120; grants \$50,200; work study \$67,832. Willamette received no Federal monies for personnel development or construction during this period. Have faint hope to qualify for \$500,000 for either 1970 or 1971 fiscal budget for proposed physical.

Education building. Please note present regulations penalize institutions which practice sound fiscal policies. Willamette's eligibility for construction grant therefore very doubtful and have anticipated physical plant needs by raising money from private sources. Student aid cutbacks of \$22,000 ('68) \$47,500 ('69) and \$61,200 ('70) have drastically reduced help for 260 well qualified students of whom 110 are Oregon residents. Appreciate your fighting for education. Howard Runkel shares good news that you will be

speaker on January 31 to honor Herb and Eugenia.

ROGER FRITZ,
President.

Senator MARK O. HATFIELD,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Here is the information that you have asked for. Hope that it will be of help to you in developing new education budgets. Under encouragement of intent of higher education act of 1965 and similar act George Fox has greatly improved its program thru the few resources provided. When they are reduced or not increased to meet growing needs we must either cut back or absorb these costs. We can only absorb cut backs by deficit spending. During current 69-70 fiscal year we will exceed budget by about 20,000.00 on student aid. Due to cutback involving adjusting aide program of about 70 students with a student body of 400 this amounts to \$50.00 per student. Title three commitments not covered costs additional \$5000.00. George Fox moved the music department from only remaining war surplus frame buildings. Sufficient appropriation would make this grant available. Figures requested follow:

CONSTRUCTION, FISCAL YEAR 1968-69, FISCAL YEAR 1969-70

	Requested	Received	Received	Nixon
Requested.....		0	0	\$450,000
Higher Education Act, 1965:				
Title II.....	\$5,326	\$5,400		5,400
Title III:				
Requested.....	75,000	75,000		80,000
Received.....	47,000	41,000		(1)
Title IV:				
Requested.....	228,098	185,206		200,669
Received.....	137,086	111,695		(1)

1 Pending.

With warmest regards,
DAVID C. LE SHANA.

WARNER PACIFIC COLLEGE,
October 31, 1969.

Senator MARK O. HATFIELD,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Reference your wire regarding new education budget for Oregon programs following Warner Pacific College participation in Federal aid. Received 1968 construction \$112,900. Student aid \$79,597. Development \$47,900. Libraries \$5,492. 1969 estimate student aid \$84,891. Development \$41,000. Libraries \$5,000. 1970 student aid \$158,156. Development \$60,000. Libraries \$5,000. 100 students lost from F.I.S.L. failures arrears \$150,000. From cutbacks student aid and development 1969. Immediate need construction student union, classroom and dormitory we heartily encourage you in this pursuit. If we can assist further please advise. Best regards.

E. JOE GILLIAM, President.

UNIVERSITY OF PORTLAND

Construction projects	1967-68 Received	1968-69 Received	1969-70 Needed- deferred	1970-71 Needed
Title I.....		\$579,571	\$650,000	\$600,000
Title II.....		152,600		
Title III.....		970,000	850,000	1,300,000
Total.....		1,702,171	1,500,000	1,900,000

UNIVERSITY OF PORTLAND

Federal student aid programs	1967-68 Received	1968-69 Received	Requested	1969-70 Authorized	No. of students effected	1970-71 Authorized needs
NDSL.....	\$77,653	\$90,177	\$140,000	\$80,848	60	\$150,000
EOG:						
Initial awards.....	16,950	22,150	37,100	22,977	15	40,000
Renewals.....	19,600	24,500	49,750	33,362	17	55,000
CWS.....	26,736	22,960	40,650	24,198	40	60,000
Nursing:						
Scholarships.....	10,350	20,400	31,000	17,158	11	40,000
Loans.....	20,000	44,000	89,250	55,229	30	120,000
Total.....	171,289	224,187	387,750	194,072	173	465,000

MUSEUM ART SCHOOL,
Portland, Oreg., Nov. 3, 1969.

HON. MARK O. HATFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Construction grant awarded 1968 under title I for \$542,352. To date \$177,186 has been drawn from this grant. Received 1968 for C.W.S. \$5419. Received 1968 for E.O.G. \$6640. Awarded for 1969-70 \$9022. Awarded for 1969-70 E.O.G. \$7345. Awarded for 1969 library grant of \$1046. Requested for 1970-71 C.W.S., \$13,616. Requested for 1970-71 E.O.G. \$10,800. Request for 1970 library grant \$1500. Thank you for assistance in our behalf.

WILLIAM H. GIVLER.

UNIVERSITY OF PORTLAND

1. Effects of student aid cutbacks: (1970)
(a) 173 students who had been receiving some kind of aid through Federal loans, EOC, or work-study—could not be assisted in this current year. The university used its reserve funds to help 82 of these students; the others were unable to continue in school.

(b) An estimated 225 additional students applied for help and did not attend the university when we were unable to assist them.

(c) We have a serious problem with the nursing scholarships and loans; since we had been led to believe that there would be a 20% increase for 1970 in this program, we committed \$23,800 in scholarships and \$53,600 in loans. The actual amount we have received is \$15,529 for loans, and \$8,579 in scholarships. We were told that the scholarship figure was approximately one-half of what we would receive, but that the loan figure was the total for the year. Hence we are faced with a deficit of \$44,713 to make up from some other sources.

2. Effects of cutbacks in construction grants:

In April 1969, a fire destroyed three buildings, housing our music department, drama department, theater, Air Force ROTC offices, student government and publications offices.

We need to replace these immediately and have begun architectural drawings. The insurance will provide about one-fourth of the estimated cost of replacing these academic facilities.

Our library must be expanded by 1971 as it is just about at capacity.

We need in 1969-70:

Title I assistance: Music, theater, fine arts building.....	\$650,000
Title III loan: Music, theater, fine arts building.....	850,000
During 1970-71, we estimate a need for:	
Title I: Student offices, study areas.....	\$300,000
Library addition.....	300,000
Title III: Loan student center.....	800,000
Library addition.....	500,000

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY,
November 1, 1969.

Senator MARK HATFIELD,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

CONSTRUCTION

1968-69 asked for and got \$1,230,259. Formula would have provided \$400,000 more—precluded for lack of Federal funds. Asked for \$362,967—lack of Federal funds precluded. Asked for \$904,000 title 11 graduate facilities—lack of Federal funds precluded—petition on our behalf continued.

1969-70 asked for nothing—no projects.

1970-71 asked for nothing—no legislative approval of our projects.

Grant programs	Personnel development	Library	Equipment
1968-69	\$1,158,672	\$32,496	\$20,000
1969-70	1,448,340	87,000	45,000
1970-71	1,810,425	115,000	45,000

¹ Awarded and pending.

² Projections

Student financial aid	NDSL	EOG	GWSP
1968-69	\$149,924	\$111,330	\$8,808,636
1969-70	141,117	135,741	1,536,160
1970-71	269,600	250,200	1,195,200

¹ Plus estimated \$236,041.

² Applied for.

Note: 1969-70 received only 49 percent of request for NDSL and EOG and 39 percent of GWSP funds. For 1969-70 unable to fund 200 EOG requests and 350 NDSL's; so far 86 percent of initial EOG's given to students from disadvantaged grounds and in special programs.

The CWSP allocation for January-June 1969, was cut back so much that we knew the 1,500 students on the program could not continue to work through that period without causing a deficit. We hoped our summer allocation would cover this. When we learned that the summer allocation had been cut we were forced to reduce work hours of the 1,500 students from 15 to 10 hours per week during spring quarter. Approximately 700 of these students continued to work from the end of spring term until June 30 at 10 hours per week instead of the usual 40. We were not able to accept any new applications during this time. We cut back our summer program to include only the most needed students. Our immediate concern is whether the students employed now will be able to continue the "second half" January through June. The impossibility of planning a student's aid package from fall quarter into the second half has always been a serious problem because of the two-part CWSP funding pattern. The inability of assist students who qualify both as to need and academically is a contributing factor to unrest in the campus. Federal funding, at a level which will allow continued assistance to these 1,500 qualified students and others whose applications have been deferred is of the utmost importance.

GEORGE B. WOLFE,
President.

OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY,
November 1, 1969.

Senator MARK HATFIELD,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

HEW budget amounts received and expected in categories you named are as follows: 1968 student aid, \$772,000; fellowships, \$371,800. Libraries, \$41,000. 1969 Student aid \$791,000. Fellowships \$462,000. Libraries \$43,000; 1970 student aid, \$643,000; fellowships \$401,000. Libraries zero.

240 students qualified for grants of \$150,000 who were not funded; 320 students qualified for loans of \$280,000 who were not funded.

Cutback of construction funds eliminated badly needed agricultural sciences building.

R. A. YOUNG,
Acting President.

Mr. HATFIELD. The quotations which follow are from communications received from presidents of some of our public colleges and universities.

From President R. A. Young, Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oreg.:

240 students qualified for grants of \$150,000 which were not funded; 320 students qualified for loans of \$280,000 which were not funded. Cutbacks of construction funds eliminated badly needed agricultural sciences building.

President George B. Wolfe, Portland State University, Portland, Oreg.:

Received only 49% of request for NDSL (National Defense Student Loans) and EOG (Equal Opportunity Grants) and 39% of College Work-Study funds. 1969-70 unable to fund 200 EOG and 350 NDSL's so far 86% of initial EOG's given to students from disadvantaged backgrounds and in special programs . . . The impossibility of planning a student's aid package from Fall quarter into the second half has always been a serious problem because of the two-part work-study funding pattern.

The inability of assisting students who qualify both as to need and academically is a contributing factor to unrest in the campus. Federal funding at a level which will allow continued assistance to these 1500 qualified students and others whose applications have been deferred is of the utmost importance.

Mr. President, I quote at length from the letter of President Paul E. Waldschmidt, University of Portland:

Enclosed is a more detailed listing of the problems we face. The cutback in student aid programs hurt us badly since we were counting on the EOG, NDSL and CWS funds to assist us in our efforts to enroll students from low income and minority groups.

We began this program last year, and could not in conscience cut off these students whom we had motivated and who were doing such a great job in college.

We dipped into our very slim reserve to help them, but we certainly cannot keep on doing this. We over-committed \$44,713 to our nursing students. The amount these students could borrow was raised to \$1,500 and we had been led to believe that the amount of the funds would be increased to enable us to continue with at least the same number of students on the programs as last year.

As I wrote you earlier, Congress has to recognize that some lead time is required if student aid programs are to be phased out or curtailed. There should be some way to indicate a two-year level of funding for the EOG, NDSL, and CWS and Nursing Scholarship-loan programs at least since these programs directly and immediately affect the lives of thousands of students.

The colleges are placed in an impossible situation and so are the students. Even if we could be given at least a basic funding level for a two or three year period; this would be helpful. Congress could then decide the preceding year whether or not to increase this funding level. The colleges could counsel students properly and not accept students who will need help for a four-year period, but direct them to some other institution which may have sufficient funds available to provide the help the students will need.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the complete text of Father Waldschmidt's letter.

There being no objection, the letter

was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF PORTLAND,
Portland, Oreg., October 31, 1969.

Senator MARK O. HATFIELD,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HATFIELD: Thank you very much for your dedicated efforts in behalf of education. I hope that the information I wired you will be of some help.

Enclosed is a more detailed listing of the problems we face. The cut-back in student aid programs hurt us badly since we were counting on the EOG, NDSL and CWS funds to assist us in our efforts to enroll students from low income and minority groups. We began this program last year, and could not in conscience cut off these students whom we had motivated and who were doing such a great job in college. We dipped into our very slim reserves to help them, but we certainly cannot keep on doing this. We over-committed \$44,713.00 to our nursing students. The amount these students could borrow was raised to \$1,500.00 and we had been led to believe that the amount of the funds would be increased to enable us to continue with at least the same number of students on the programs as last year. As I wrote you earlier, Congress has to recognize that some lead time is required if student aid programs are to be phased out or curtailed. There should be some way to indicate a two-year level of funding for the EOG, NDSL, CWS and Nursing Scholarship-loan programs at least—since these programs directly and immediately effect the lives of thousands of students. The Colleges are placed in an impossible situation and so are the students. Even if we could be given at least a basic funding level for a two or three year period; this would be helpful. Congress could then decide the preceding year whether or not to increase this funding level. The Colleges could counsel students properly and not accept students who will need help for a four-year period, but direct them to some other institution which may have sufficient funds available to provide the help the students will need.

If I can be of any further help, please do not hesitate to call on me. Again, my prayerful good wishes for the continued success of your efforts.

Cordially,
Rev. PAUL E. WALDSCHMIDT, C.S.C.,
President.

Mr. HATFIELD. President Leonard W. Rice, Oregon College of Education, Monmouth, Oreg.:

Financial aid was denied approximately 250 OCE students for lack of funds so far in the 1969-70 year. Funds were not in adequate amounts for those receiving awards. The number of students applying for federal financial aid has increased in excess of one hundred twenty five percent the past five years.

From President James K. Sours, Southern Oregon College, Ashland, Oreg.:

Cutbacks could affect 1500 to 2000 students. Substantial dropout of students would occur without federal support. This help urgently needed.

Mr. President, all these messages I have received have an urgency about this which I wish could be felt as strongly downtown as I feel as I read them.

The following is an excerpt from a letter received from Mr. W. N. McLaughlin, business manager, of the University of Oregon, Eugene, Oreg.:

For the State system as a whole, the impact of the cutback in Federal capital con-

struction support for the 1969-71 biennium is dramatic. In 1967-69, the total State authorization for capital construction was \$55,742,000. In 1969-71, the authorization has dropped to \$37,945,000, a nearly \$18,000,000 (-33%) decrease in support. This decrease is principally the direct result of the continuing cutback in Federal grant funds which would normally be received by the State.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the entire letter, dated October 31, 1969, from Mr. W. N. McLaughlin, business manager, University of Oregon.

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

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON,
Eugene, Oreg., October 31, 1969.

Re Telegram addressed to President Robert D. Clark, dated October 29, 1969.

HON. MARK O. HATFIELD,
The U.S. Senate, Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HATFIELD: The following information is furnished in order that you may have additional information regarding HEW appropriations bill coming up on the Senate floor next week:

1. *Construction.*—The following monies were received for construction: 1967-68—PHS Clinical Services Building—\$968,928; 1968-69—Title I, Women's P. E. Building—\$414,317, Title II, Law School—\$766,316, NIH Neuro Biology Lab—\$50,000; 1969-70—Title I Science III—\$299,222, NIH Science III—\$1,222,000; 1969-70—Requested funds—Title II College of Education—\$988,549; in process pending State approval NIH Behavioral Science—\$1,237,278.

2. *Student aid.*—Monies received for NDEA Loans: 1967-68—\$510,500, aiding 1429 students; 1968-69—\$500,300, aiding 1148 students; 1969-70—\$341,700, aiding 783 students—this figure was estimated taking into consideration inflation and Federal monies available.

Monies received for NDEA Fellowships: 1967-68—\$1,400,500 aiding 191 students; 1968-69—\$1,279,000, aiding 219 students; 1969-70—\$848,100, aiding 157 students.

EOG monies received: 1967-68—\$275,550; 1968-69—\$320,210, aiding 536 students; 1969-70—\$320,759, aiding 500 students.

CWSP monies received: 1967-68—\$102,735; 1968-69—\$576,857, aiding 2,266 students; 1969-70—\$406,581, aiding 1528 students. A combined figure of 1176 students aided by EOG and CWSP funds for 1967-68.

3. *Personnel Development.*—

Monies received for Training of Professional Personnel in the Training of Handicapped Children, Experienced Teacher Fellowship Programs and Prospective Teacher Fellowship Program grants and Career Development Awards—1967-68—\$857,821; 1968-69—\$985,242; 1969-70—\$1,034,075.

Monies received for SRS grants—1967-68—\$466,027; 1968-69—\$570,280; 1969-70—\$724,155.

4. *Library.*—

Monies received for grants: 1967-68—\$71,634; 1968-69—\$112,657; 1969-70—\$246,206.

Monies received under College Library Resource Section of HEA of 1965, amended: 1967-68—requested \$235,000 and received \$24,305; 1968-69—requested \$205,000 and received \$41,751; 1969-70—requested \$77,000 and received \$40,978. Also 1969-70 the State System of Higher Education combined request—\$285,000; nothing received.

The University Graduate School reports cutbacks caused by lack of HEW funds as follows: College of Education—cut 35 graduate students; Department of Sociology—9 students can be funded for only 9 months instead of 12 months; Molecular Biology—cut 5

undergraduates and 2 graduate students; Chemistry—cut 17 graduate students and 7 postdoctorals; Psychology—training grants cut 40 percent, and 35 students will not receive adequate equipment and supplies; Biology—cut 16 graduate students and 2 postdoctorals.

The Graduate School also reports that the University has received no new NIH grants or competitive renewals, even when approved scientifically by NIH, since July 1.

In the 1967-69 biennium the State Legislature authorized \$10,681,351 for capital construction projects at the University of Oregon. Of this total the University received \$3,812,841 in Federal Funds for partial support of these projects. The balance of \$6,868,510 was from both State general funds and State bond revenues. The construction of the eight University projects in this biennial program could not have been undertaken without this Federal support.

For the 1969-71 biennium the Legislature authorized \$8,466,800 for capital construction projects at the University, considerably less than in 1967-69. Of this total it was not anticipated that any Federal funds would be available in view of the cutbacks that had been experienced and those anticipated. The Governor had stated in his budget message that if Federal matching funds became available they would be used to enable the State to go further down the priority list. This would have been especially important in funding of the Marine Science Center at Charleston which was not reached by the Legislature in the capital projects priority list. Currently the University has two Federal grant proposals pending in a total amount of \$2,203,827. These would add significantly to the University building program in needed areas. We believe that because of the bleak Federal funding prospect for 1970-71, there is little chance of success for support of these proposals.

For the State System as a whole, the impact of the cutback in Federal capital construction support for the 1969-71 biennium is dramatic. In 1967-69, the total State authorization for capital construction was \$55,742,000. In 1969-71, the authorization had dropped to \$37,945,000, a nearly \$18,000,000 (-33%) decrease in support. This decrease is principally the direct result of the continuing cutback in Federal grant funds which would normally be received by the State.

Sincerely,

W. N. McLAUGHLIN,
Business Manager.

Mr. HATFIELD. In closing my comments today, I should like to add a few words by way of reiteration.

I think we must realize that we are not dealing with the problems of education for the sake of the educators, or even just for the exclusive benefit of the students who are the recipients from such educational programs. I think we must realize, as was eloquently stated in one of the letters to which I have referred, that our entire outlook and social patterns of this country, and the problems we face in connection with these patterns and life styles, will be corrected only as we find adequacy of funding for educational programs.

I am not one who believes in education for education's sake, necessarily. I think there are too many who think we, in providing educational funds, are benefiting only those direct recipients, the students and teachers.

I believe the welfare of our entire Nation is dependent upon an educational program the adequacy of which meets the needs of the people of all our com-

munities; and that is why I urge Senators to support the resolution to add the \$1 billion which can be effectively, economically, and efficiently expended in behalf of our educational needs.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I compliment my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon, for calling attention to some of the factors which have made it so difficult for our educational institutions, and particularly one thing that seems to have been constantly overlooked: the need for advance information and advance planning, which has been very much absent from many of our educational assistance programs.

It would make it much easier for everyone concerned if we could do this and take this into consideration as we go into these programs, from here on out.

The Senator has made a very fine contribution this afternoon.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I should like, in expressing my appreciation for the comments of the Senator from Colorado, to draw an analogy to an area in which the Senator is expert, and has served with great distinction in this body. He is the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The analogy is that when we are dealing with natural resources, we very obviously recognize the need for planning, much planning, and long-term planning. We do not undertake to support, or even introduce the idea for a project into Congress, without adequate planning and program, in order to be able to defend and justify the project. We use such terms as "cost-benefit ratio," which are but part of the measurement of the planning that goes into all these projects.

I think the Senator from Colorado certainly focuses upon one of the most important problems of education today, and that is the inability of education to look ahead and to make the same kind of planning and programing in dealing with human resources that we do with respect to natural resources.

We are very cautious in reference to the need for natural resources. I hope that we can sense the same need and support the program in the area of human resources.

I appreciate the comments made by the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I believe what he says is true. Too often Congress formulates a program and acts upon it while it somewhat blithely ignores the fact that our educational institutions do begin in the fall, except for their summer sessions, and terminate in June. That fact seems to be ignored.

Ignored also is the fact that during the 3, 4, or 5 months prior to the time the institutions begin their school year, the colleges have to begin accepting applications and making plans for the coming year.

It is quite analogous to the situation involved in natural resources.

The remarks of the Senator have been very contributive to the information available on the matter.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M. TOMORROW

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR ALLOTT

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, after conferring with the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that the previous order for the adjournment of the Senate to 11 o'clock tomorrow morning be vacated, that when the Senate completes its business, it adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, and that immediately after the prayer and the disposition of the Journal the senior Senator from Colorado be recognized for a period of not to exceed 1½ hours.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I understand it is certainly not the intention of the Senator from Colorado to interfere with regular committee meetings.

Mr. ALLOTT. Not in any way. I had my back turned to the Senator and did not realize he was in the Chamber. I realize that the Senator should have made the request. However, the majority leader had left the Chamber, and I was making it in his absence.

There would be no interference with committee meetings in any way. There is a unanimous-consent agreement that all committees may meet tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate adjourn until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.) the Senate

adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 12, 1969, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 11, 1969:

IN THE AIR FORCE

Maj. Gen. Jammie M. Philpott, ~~xxx-xx-xx...~~ R, Regular Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the grade of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10, of the United States Code.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning Thomas J. Brantley, to be major, and ending Roland J. White, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on October 28, 1969.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations beginning Peter F. Angle, to be major, and ending Joseph J. Yetter, to be major, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on October 27, 1969.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FRANK C. CARLUCCI, OF PENNSYLVANIA, NAMED AS ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 11, 1969

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, an outstanding young man from Pennsylvania has been appointed assistant director for operations, a key post in the Office of Economic Opportunity. He is Frank C. Carlucci III, who, at 38, is coming to OEO after a distinguished career in the Foreign Service.

A native of Scranton, he resides in Bear Creek, Luzerne County, near Wilkes-Barre and Scranton. Just as he made his mark in the Foreign Service in several posts in Africa, I am confident that Mr. Carlucci will be a credit to the new team at OEO being assembled by the Director, Donald Rumsfeld.

In his hometown, the Scranton Tribune recently announced Mr. Carlucci's appointment in an article by Frank Froncek describing in some detail Mr. Carlucci's exciting career in the Foreign Service. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of that article, so that Senators may learn more about this new official at OEO.

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

[From the Scranton (Pa.) Tribune, Sept. 24, 1969]

DISTINGUISHED, BUT VIOLENT DIPLOMATIC CAREER: SCRANTON NATIVE GETS OEO POST

(By Frank Froncek)

A Scranton native who has led a turbulent and at times a violent life in the foreign diplomatic service will be appointed assistant director of operations in the Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington.

The intention of President Nixon to appoint Frank Charles Carlucci III to the post was announced jointly Tuesday by Pennsylvania Senators Hugh Scott and Richard Schweiker in Washington. It was not disclosed, however, when the appointment would take effect.

As the director of operations, Carlucci's function will be to create and maintain a liaison between the Washington headquarters of the OEO and the bureau's regional offices. Simply expressed, Carlucci will control the reins of the office and see to it that people who are supposed to benefit from the OEO's programs do so through effective management.

At 38, Carlucci comes to the job with a wealth of experience in the diplomatic corps, which he entered after graduating from Princeton University with a bachelor of arts degree, a year of study in the Harvard School of Business, service in the Navy and a brief career in private business.

For his exploits, Carlucci had earned nationwide recognition and a fitting tribute in the New York Times at the time of his appointment as charge d'affaires in Zanzibar.

Carlucci first came into the national spotlight in 1960 when he was stabbed in the left shoulder by a mob of screaming Congolese while attached to the U.S. Embassy in Leopoldville. The incident was touched off when the car in which Carlucci was riding along with three other Americans, including an embassy second secretary and a chief warrant officer, accidentally struck and killed a cyclist. The mob of about 80 Congolese rushed the car, burned it, dumped it in a ditch and looted the trunk of luggage.

Taking danger in stride, Carlucci was ready to move on to his next assignment in Zanzibar. On that occasion the New York Times said of him:

"If Frank Charles Carlucci III, the new United States charge d'affaires in Zanzibar, finds things a bit difficult in his new post, it will be no new experience. Trouble was his steady diet for two years in the Congo, and he met it in a manner to do credit to the class of 1952 at Princeton University.

"Carlucci hardly fits the popular image of a diplomat . . . but his youth and athletic energy have been assets in posts where courage and physical agility have sometimes counted as much as statesmanship."

Continuing, the article mentioned the stabbing incident.

"In this period he was stabbed and beaten by an angry Congolese mob, challenged at bayonet point by Congolese soldiers and threatened with arrest by the breakaway leftist regime of Antoine Gizenga in Stanleyville.

"On that occasion, he marched into the office of the provincial president of the Gizenga regime, Jean Foster Manzikala, to demand assurances for the safety of the 50 Americans still living in territory it controlled. His audacity so surprised the Gizenga forces that they gave the sought-for assurances and did not molest him personally." The article went on for several more paragraphs to describe more of Carlucci's daring adventures.

True to the New York Times prediction, Carlucci encountered much difficulty in Zanzibar and on Jan. 16, 1965 he was given 24 hours to leave the country on government charges of subversive activities.

The United States at the time explicitly denied the charges and privately expressed concern that the action foreshadowed a switch to active anti-American activities.

Before going to the Congo in 1962, Carlucci had been stationed in Washington for about six months after spending three years as vice consul in Johannesburg, South Africa.

Now a resident of Bear Creek, Luzerne County, Carlucci is married to the former Jean Anthony, Seattle, Wash., and is the father of two children.

In 1962 the State Department presented him with the Superior Service Award, its highest honor for foreign service.

THE 80TH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF PRESIDENT ZALMAN SHAZAR OF ISRAEL

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 11, 1969

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, the modern State of Israel has been blessed with a number of outstanding leaders

whose hard work and vision have helped make possible the tremendous achievements Israel has made in such a short time.

One such leader is the current President of Israel and head of state, Mr. Zalman Shazar, who is today marking his 80th birthday. I wish to join with members of the American Jewish community who are honoring President Shazar on this occasion.

Mr. Shazar became Israel's third President in 1963. His position is largely

ceremonial, since the Prime Minister is actually the chief executive of the Government. However, in Mr. Shazar's case the office of President came after an active and history-making role in the founding and development of the new state.

Mr. Shazar was born in Russia and came to Palestine in 1924. He became editor of a major newspaper in Tel Aviv and was active in the Mapai Party headed by David Ben-Gurion. He wrote the Declaration of Independence for Israel

in 1948, and became the first Minister of Education in the new Government. He is well known both as a crusader for women's rights in Israel and as the father of the Israel law making education compulsory. As an avocation he has been a devoted scholar of the Bible.

I wish to extend to President Shazar of Israel my warm greetings on his 80th birthday anniversary, and I salute the many accomplishments of this man who now occupies a revered position in the State of Israel.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, November 12, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Joseph M. Champlin, associate director, Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy, Washington, D.C., and Syracuse, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

O God, give these men the help they need.

Make them—

Courageous: Speaking when this entails a risk.

Patient: Bearing with those who misunderstand or unjustly accuse.

Noble: Placing the common good over personal gain.

Wise: Weighing the needs of constituents with the welfare of our Nation.

Healthy: Coping with frantic schedules and unending pressure.

Firm: Standing alone, if necessary, for what is right and true.

Open: Willing to listen, learn, and change.

Flexible: Accepting what is possible and better, instead of desirable and best.

Laugh: At themselves and with others, to ease tension, heal wounds, keep perspective.

With such gifts, Lord, they may lead us to be truly free at last; to become a country of justice, a people at peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, November 6, 1969, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 14030. An act to amend section 358a(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to extend the authority to transfer peanut acreage allotments.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 11363. An act to prevent the importation of endangered species of fish or wildlife into the United States; to prevent the interstate shipment of reptiles, amphibians, and other wildlife taken contrary to State law; and for other purposes;

H.R. 12307. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 13018. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 12307) entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. PASTORE, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ALLOTT, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. HRUSKA, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 13018) entitled "An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. STENNIS, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. CANNON, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. DOMINICK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 329. An act for the relief of Dr. Paolo (Paul) Genoese Zerbi;

S. 614. An act for the relief of Franz Charles Feldmeier;

S. 823. An act to enable consumers to protect themselves against arbitrary, erroneous, and malicious credit information;

S. 1442. An act to amend section 131 of title 23 of the United States Code, relating to control of outdoor advertising along Federal-aid highways, in order to authorize one or more pilot programs for the purpose of such section;

S. 1456. An act to amend section 8c(6) (I) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 and sub-

sequent legislation, so as to permit marketing orders applicable to apples to provide for paid advertising;

S. 1786. An act for the relief of James Harry Martin;

S. 2339. An act for the relief of Dr. Maria Luisa Gorostegui de Dourron;

S. 2353. An act for the relief of Dr. Leonardo M. Cabanilla;

S. 2354. An act for the relief of Dr. Bernard Weston March;

S. 2363. An act to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon L. Cpl. Andre L. Knoppert;

S. 2426. An act for the relief of Dr. Delsa Evangelina Estrada de Ferran;

S. 2481. An act for the relief of Dr. Farid M. Fuleihan; and

S.J. Res. 131. Joint resolution to welcome to the U.S. Olympic delegations authorized by the International Olympic Committee.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 90-321, appointed Mr. TOWER to the National Commission on Consumer Finance in lieu of Mr. BROOKE, resigned.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to 67 Stat. 328 and 70 Stat. 966, appointed Mr. PACKWOOD to the Senate Office Building Commission in lieu of Mr. DIRKSEN, deceased.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

NOVEMBER 7, 1969.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
U.S. House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to authority granted on November 6, 1969, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate today the following message:

That the Senate agree to the Report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11271) entitled "An Act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes."

Respectfully yours,

W. PAT JENNINGS, Clerk.
By BENJAMIN J. GUTHRIE.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Thursday, November 6, 1969, he did on Friday, November 7, 1969,