

## SENATE—Wednesday, February 19, 1969

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chaplain will offer a memorial prayer.

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

Lord God of our fathers and our God, we lift our hearts to Thee this day for the good gift of life itself, for its wonder and its mystery, for its joys and its sorrows, for work to do and strength with which to do it and for the sacrament of memory. We thank Thee for the hallowed recollections of Thy servant who walked and worked with us in this place, and we pray that we may prize highly and guard carefully the gifts which his loyalty and devotion have passed on to us. Perfect in us the work of our fathers, and so fit us for our age that the values and virtues of the past may become the pure possession of our children. Accept anew our dedication that we may be true as he was true, loyal as he was loyal, that we may serve our country and our God all the days of our lives until at last with him we hear the triumphant word:

"Servant of God, well done."

"Blessed are the pure in heart for they shall see God."

In the name of the living Lord. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 18, 1969, be dispensed with.

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

## ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 91-74)

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

*To the Congress of the United States:*

The blight of poverty requires priority attention. It engages our hearts and challenges our intelligence. It can not and will not be treated lightly or indifferently, or without the most searching examination of how best to marshal the resources available to the Federal Government for combatting it.

At my direction, the Urban Affairs Council has been conducting an intensive study of the Nation's anti-poverty programs, of the way the anti-poverty effort is organized and administered, and of ways in which it might be made more effective.

That study is continuing. However, I can now announce a number of steps I intend to take, as well as spelling out some of the considerations that will guide my future recommendations.

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964

is now scheduled to expire on June 30, 1970. The present authorization for appropriations for the Office of Economic Opportunity runs only until June 30, 1969. I will ask Congress that this authorization for appropriations be extended for another year. Prior to the end of the Fiscal Year, I will send Congress a comprehensive proposal for the future of the poverty program, including recommendations for revising and extending the Act itself beyond its scheduled 1970 expiration.

How the work begun by OEO can best be carried forward is a subject on which many views deserve to be heard—both from within Congress, and among those many others who are interested or affected, including especially the poor themselves. By sending my proposals well before the Act's 1970 expiration, I intend to provide time for full debate and discussion.

In the maze of anti-poverty efforts, precedents are weak and knowledge uncertain. These past years of increasing Federal involvement have begun to make clear how vast is the range of what we do not yet know, and how fragile are projections based on partial understanding. But we have learned some lessons about what works and what does not. The changes I propose will be based on those lessons and those discoveries, and rooted in a determination to press ahead with anti-poverty efforts even though individual experiments have ended in disappointment.

From the experience of OEO, we have learned the value of having in the Federal Government an agency whose special concern is the poor. We have learned the need for flexibility, responsiveness, and continuing innovation. We have learned the need for management effectiveness. Even those most thoroughly committed to the goals of the anti-poverty effort recognize now that much that has been tried has not worked.

The OEO has been a valuable fount of ideas and enthusiasm, but it has suffered from a confusion of roles.

OEO's greatest value is as an initiating agency—devising new programs to help the poor, and serving as an "incubator" for these programs during their initial, experimental phases. One of my aims is to free OEO itself to perform these functions more effectively, by providing for a greater concentration of its energies on its innovative role.

Last year, Congress directed that special studies be made by the Executive Branch of whether Head Start and the Job Corps should continue to be administered directly by OEO, or whether responsibility should be otherwise assigned.

Section 309 of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 provides:

The President shall make a special study of whether the responsibility for administering the Head Start program established under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 should continue to be vested in the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, should be transferred to another agency of the Government, or should be delegated to another

such agency pursuant to the provisions of section 602(d) of the aforementioned Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and shall submit the findings of this study to the Congress not later than March 1, 1969.

I have today submitted this study to the Congress. Meanwhile, under the Executive authority provided by the Economic Opportunity Act, I have directed that preparations be made for the delegation of Head Start to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Whether it should be actually transferred is a question I will take up in my later, comprehensive message, along with my proposals for a permanent status and organizational structure for OEO. Pending a final decision by the Secretary of HEW on where within the department responsibility for Head Start would be lodged, it will be located directly within the Office of the Secretary.

In order to provide for orderly preparation, and to ensure that there is no interruption of programs, I have directed that this delegation be made effective July 1, 1969. By then the summer programs for 1969 will all have been funded, and a new cycle will be beginning.

I see this delegation as an important element in a new national commitment to the crucial early years of life.

Head Start is still experimental. Its effects are simply not known—save of course where medical care and similar services are involved. The results of a major national evaluation of the program will be available this Spring. It must be said, however, that preliminary reports on this study confirm what many have feared: the long term effect of Head Start appears to be extremely weak. This must not discourage us. To the contrary it only demonstrates the immense contribution the Head Start program has made simply by having raised to prominence on the national agenda the fact—known for some time, but never widely recognized—that the children of the poor mostly arrive at school age seriously deficient in the ability to profit from formal education, and already significantly behind their contemporaries. It also has been made abundantly clear that our schools as they now exist are unable to overcome this deficiency.

In this context, the Head Start Follow-Through Program already delegated to HEW by OEO, assumes an even greater importance.

In recent years, enormous advances have been made in the understanding of human development. We have learned that intelligence is not fixed at birth, but is largely formed by the environmental influences of the early formative years. It develops rapidly at first, and then more slowly; as much of that development takes place in the first four years as in the next thirteen. We have learned further that environment has its greatest impact on the development of intelligence when that development is proceeding most rapidly—that is, in those earliest years.

This means that many of the problems of poverty are traceable directly to

early childhood experience—and that if we are to make genuine, long-range progress, we must focus our efforts much more than heretofore on those few years which may determine how far, throughout his later life, the child can reach.

Recent scientific developments have shown that this process of early childhood development poses more difficult problems than had earlier been recognized—but they also promise a real possibility of major breakthroughs soon in our understanding of this process. By placing Headstart in the Department of HEW, it will be possible to strengthen it by association with a wide range of other early development programs within the department, and also with the research programs of the National Institutes of Health, the National Institute of Mental Health, and the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

Much of our knowledge is new. But we are not on that ground absolved from the responsibility to respond to it. So crucial is the matter of early growth that we must make a national commitment to providing all American children an opportunity for healthful and stimulating development during the first five years of life. In delegating Headstart to the Department of HEW, I pledge myself to that commitment.

The Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 directed the Commissioner of Education to study the Job Corps in relation to state vocational education programs. I have directed the Secretaries of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Manpower, to work with the Acting Commissioner of Education in preparing such a report for submission to Congress at the earliest opportunity.

One of the priority aims of the new Administration is the development by the Department of Labor of a comprehensive manpower program, designed to make centrally available to the unemployed and the underemployed a full range of Federal job training and placement services. Toward this end, it is essential that the many Federal manpower programs be integrated and coordinated.

Therefore, as a first step toward better program management, the Job Corps will be delegated to the Department of Labor.

For the Department, this will add another important manpower service component. For the Job Corpsmen, it will make available additional training and service opportunities. From the standpoint of program management, it makes it possible to coordinate the Job Corps with other manpower services, especially vocational education, at the point of delivery.

The Department of Labor already is deeply involved in the recruitment, counseling and placement of Job Corpsmen. It refers 80 percent of all male and 45 percent of all female enrollees; it provides job market information, and helps locate Job Corpsmen in the areas of greatest opportunity.

This delegation will also be made effective on July 1, 1969; and the Departments of Interior and Agriculture will continue to have operating responsibility for the Job Corps centers concerned primarily with conservation.

I have directed that preparations be made for the transfer of two other programs from OEO to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Comprehensive Health Centers, which provide health service to the residents of poor neighborhoods, and Foster Grandparents program. In my judgment, these can be better administered at present, or in the near future, within the structure of the Department.

In making these changes, I recognize that innovation costs money—and that if OEO is to continue its effectiveness as an innovating agency, adequate funds must be made available on a continuing basis. Moreover, it is my intent that Community Action Agencies can continue to be involved in the operation of programs such as Head Start at the local level, even though an agency other than OEO has received such programs, by delegation, at the national level. It also is my intent that the vital Community Action Programs will be pressed forward, and that in the area of economic development OEO will have an important role to play, in cooperation with other agencies, in fostering community-based business development.

One of the principal aims of the Administration's continuing study of the anti-poverty effort will be to improve its management effectiveness. When poverty-fund monies are stolen, those hurt most are the poor—whom the monies were meant to help. When programs are inefficiently administered, those hurt most again are the poor. The public generally, and the poor especially, have a right to demand effective and efficient management. I intend to provide it.

I expect that important economies will result from the delegation of the Job Corps to the Department of Labor, and we shall continue to strive for greater efficiency, and especially for greater effectiveness in Headstart.

A Concentrated Management Improvement Program initiated in OEO will be intensified. Under this program, selected Community Action Agencies will be required to take steps to devise improvements in such areas as organizational structure, financial and accounting systems, personnel training and work scheduling. Standards will be applied under the "management improvement program" to evaluate the operations of Community Action Agencies. We intend to monitor these programs actively in order to insure that they are achieving high-level effectiveness and that they are being administered on an orderly basis.

In the past, problems have often arisen over the relationship of State, county and local governments to programs administered by OEO. This has particularly been the case where the State and local officials have wanted to assume greater responsibility for the implementation of the programs but for various reasons have been prevented from doing so. I have assigned special responsibility for working out these problems to the newly-created Office of Intergovernmental Relations, under the supervision of the Vice President.

I have directed the Urban Affairs Council to keep the anti-poverty effort under constant review and evaluation,

seeking new ways in which the various departments can help and better ways in which their efforts can be coordinated.

My comprehensive recommendations for the future of the poverty program will be made after the Urban Affairs Council's own initial study is completed, and after I have reviewed the Comptroller General's study of OEO ordered by Congress in 1967 and due for submission next month.

Meanwhile, I would stress this final thought: If we are to make the most of experimental programs, we must frankly recognize their experimental nature and frankly acknowledge whatever shortcomings they develop. To do so is not to belittle the experiment, but to advance its essential purpose: that of finding new ways, better ways, of making progress in areas still inadequately understood.

We often can learn more from a program that fails to achieve its purpose than from one that succeeds. If we apply those lessons, then even the "failure" will have made a significant contribution to our larger purposes.

I urge all those involved in these experimental programs to bear this in mind—and to remember that one of the primary goals of this administration is to expand our knowledge of how best to make real progress against those social ills that have so stubbornly defied solution. We do not pretend to have all the answers. We are determined to find as many as we can.

The men and women who will be valued most in this administration will be those who understand that not every experiment succeeds, who do not cover up failures but rather lay open problems, frankly and constructively, so that next time we will know how to do better.

In this spirit, I am confident that we can place our anti-poverty efforts on a secure footing—and that as we continue to gain in understanding of how to master the difficulties, we can move forward at an accelerating pace.

RICHARD NIXON.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 19, 1969.

#### LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

#### MRS. GANDHI SEES MODERATE SIGNS IN CHINA

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in the February 14 issue of the Washington Post appeared an account by Selig S. Harrison of an interview with India's Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi.

I was particularly interested in Prime Minister Gandhi's comments concerning American intervention in Vietnam and about China.

Mrs. Gandhi, when asked if American intervention in Vietnam had helped India in long-term security problems with China, said:

It hasn't made any difference at all in strengthening our position with respect to China as far as we are concerned. As for Vietnam, had there not been a war, both of them would have been in a stronger position to resist China if China ever did wish to menace them. North Vietnam has shown independence of China in not consulting them about the Paris talks.

On the China problem, Mrs. Gandhi said:

For them to be isolated the way they are is dangerous. They believe the whole world is as they're imagining it. I'm sure it would help for them to get their people out and to be more involved.

She continued:

China's basic anger has always been a feeling that "why should two or three powers be the only great powers and China should be left out?" Viewing it from their perspective, your recognition of China as a world power might be helpful in creating a new environment in Asia. But that would still leave the question of what to do with their power.

I believe that my colleagues will be interested in this article, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

MRS. GANDHI: MODERATE SIGNS IN CHINA  
(By Sellg S. Harrison)

NEW DELHI, February 13.—Prime Minister Indira Gandhi said today that she sees "some signs" of a possible moderate trend in Communist China's foreign policy and suggested that American recognition of China as a world power might be helpful in creating a new environment in Asia.

"They seem to be making certain friendly gestures to Burma in quiet ways," she declared in an hour-long interview, "but we don't know yet whether its beginning to change with regard to us. They are beginning to attend diplomatic receptions here and that sort of thing. We would certainly not be adverse to having talks with them if the atmosphere improves."

#### TERMS SOFTENED

The Prime Minister recently softened India's stand on the terms for a border settlement with Peking for the first time since the Himalayan conflict six years ago. She told a news conference that New Delhi should be ready for "a flexible way out" even if this meant modifying the 1963 Colombo proposals backed by India but rejected by China.

This has stirred an undercurrent of debate here between hard-liners in the governing Congress Party and leading Foreign Ministry officials who point to the forthcoming Sino-U.S. talks in Warsaw and view the threat of accommodation with Peking as a checkrein on Soviet arms aid to Pakistan.

Relaxed and full of banter despite election setbacks for the Congress Party yesterday in West Bengal and two other North Indian states, Mrs. Gandhi, wrapped in a gray Kashmir shawl thrown over a bright purple sari, observed that "the Chinese are continuing their propaganda against us, of course, and we cannot ignore that. But this is all part of a larger picture.

"For them to be isolated the way they are is dangerous. They believe the whole world is as they're imagining it. I'm sure it would help for them to get their people out and to be more involved."

#### CHINA VIEW

China's "basic anger," she continued, has "always been a feeling that 'why should two or three powers be the only great powers and China should be left out?' Viewing it from their perspective, your recognition of

China as a world power might be helpful in creating a new environment in Asia. But that would still leave the question of what to do with their power."

Describing proposals for American-Soviet collaboration to contain China as "unfortunate," Mrs. Gandhi said that "any combination against another person provokes that person and must inevitably lead you to some kind of complication." Then she interjected that "a strange situation has been developing" in relations between Washington and Moscow. "While there is a certain amount of Cold War, they do sometimes get together also."

#### REJECTS INTERPRETATION

Asked whether she had Czechoslovakia in mind and had discussed recent events in Prague with the visiting chairman of the Supreme Soviet, I. V. Spiridinov, who conferred with her immediately before my arrival at her residence, she smiled and said only, "I was thinking of Europe rather than Asia."

Mrs. Gandhi shook her head vigorously in responding to a question concerning the contention of former White House adviser Walt Rostow that American intervention in Vietnam had buttressed India's long-term security against China.

"It hasn't made any difference at all in strengthening our position with respect to China as far as we are concerned," she stated. "As for Vietnam, had there not been a war, both of them would have been in a stronger position to resist China if China ever did wish to menace them. North Vietnam has shown independence of China in not consulting them about the Paris talks."

Alluding to the view often expressed by Rostow and others that the war had provided a protective shield for the economic development effort of Southeast Asian countries, she said that "the whole of Southeast Asia is in rather an explosive state just now. None of those countries can be strengthened under present circumstances. It's so much based on the troops and that cannot be solid or lasting. Even though the countries are small they should be strengthening their economic base and working out regional arrangements of their own that will have some lasting value."

#### JOHNSON'S IMPATIENT

Former President Johnson was "very impatient of criticism," Mrs. Gandhi said, "and we were a favorite whipping boy for some time, whether it was Vietnam or the Middle East. In fairness, that impatience is perhaps not just his characteristic. It's an American characteristic. But in any case, the public attitude toward the government's Vietnam policy changed gradually in the United States, and fortunately the differences between us have narrowed."

Urging a continuation of American assistance to India under the Nixon Administration, the Prime Minister expressed gratitude for past aid and added that "It has been well used and very effective despite what some people say. We carry the major burden of development ourselves but what we get from outside gives us a margin we need to go ahead.

"I know there is a feeling in the United States that India is too big to tackle, that the poverty is too vast. But we are making steady progress, and we need and desire your help and friendship."

#### ELECTION DEFEAT

The only moments of tension and reserve in an otherwise free and easy exchange followed persistent questions concerning the implications of the Congress election defeats.

Referring to the Communist sweep in West Bengal, she said that "this has been a surprise to everybody. We had a lot of difficulties with them before, and the situation may be quite difficult. There will be uncertainty in people's minds, in the minds of businessmen. But it's difficult to prophesy."

A series of questions on the current political turmoil in Pakistan brought a cautious response at first that "we are trying very hard to say as little as possible on this subject. It is not our business to pass judgments on them, and we want to keep a good atmosphere in case they should want to make a gesture toward better relations."

After a pause, she added that "obviously, the relations between our two countries are not unrelated to events in both of them. Some people have said that one of the reasons they were not anxious for friendship with India was that Ayub needed tension to justify the denial of democratic rights. I never thought that a military-backed regime was the answer even at the height of Ayub's success. Every system has its good and bad points. There is no easy path to development. We thought democracy as the better path because it educates the people and strengthens them. They gain in experience. The other way they are cut off."

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to Public Law 89-81, the Chair appoints the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY) to the Joint Commission on the Coinage in lieu of Senator Kuchel, retired.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

#### REPORT ON GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES PARTICIPATING IN TRAINING IN NON-GOVERNMENT FACILITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 1308(b) of title 5, United States Code, I am transmitting forms supplying information on those employees who, during Fiscal Year 1968, participated in training in non-Government facilities in courses that were over one hundred and twenty days in duration and those employees who received awards or contributions incident to training in non-Government facilities.

RICHARD NIXON.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 19, 1969.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,  
The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of

the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 684) to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to make certain technical corrections therein, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 684) to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to make certain technical corrections therein, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

##### REPORT OF SECRETARY OF COMMERCE ON EXPORT CONTROL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 86th Quarterly Report on Export Control covering the fourth quarter of 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

##### REPORT OF FEDERAL COMMISSION PURSUANT TO FAIR PACKAGING AND LABELING ACT

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report pursuant to the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

##### STEAM-ELECTRIC PLANT CONSTRUCTION COST AND ANNUAL PRODUCTION EXPENSES, 1967

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting for the information of the Senate a document entitled "Steam-Electric Plant Construction Cost and Annual Production Expenses, 1967" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Commerce.

##### REPORT OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Federal Housing Administration's decision not to require builder's cost certification for Rossmore Leisure World Developments, Department of Housing and Urban Development (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

##### REPORT OF LEGION OF VALOR OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, INC.

A letter from the National Corporation Agent, Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Inc., transmitting, pursuant to law, the financial report of the Legion of Valor for the period August 1, 1967, to July 31, 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

##### REPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE COVERING DONATION OF PERSONAL PROPERTY

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering personal property donated to public health and educational

institutions and civil defense organizations, for the period July 1 through December 31, 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

##### By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Lithuanian Council of Miami, Miami, Fla., remonstrating the continued colonization and oppression of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the U.S.S.R.; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of Carpinteria, Calif., County Water District, praying for favorable and prompt action on the watershed work plan for the Carpinteria Valley Watershed; to the Committee on Public Works.

#### REPORT ENTITLED "ORGANIZATION AND COORDINATION OF FEDERAL DRUG RESEARCH AND REGULATORY PROGRAMS: LSD"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 91-82)

Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. President, pursuant to Senate Resolution 186 of the 89th Congress and Senate Resolutions 59 and 214 of the 90th Congress, I submit a report entitled "Organization and Coordination of Federal Drug Research and Regulatory Programs: LSD," and ask that it be printed. The report was approved by the Committee on Government Operations on January 17, 1969.

The report is based on hearings and investigation conducted by the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization under the chairmanship of Senator Robert Kennedy. Due to Senator Kennedy's death, I am filing this report. The views expressed herein are solely those of the members of the subcommittee who have signed the report.

Robert Kennedy was a vital member of the subcommittee for 3 years. His keen mind, fervent idealism and quick wit made a major contribution to the subcommittee work. He had a deep sensitivity to the issues involved in the urban crisis, drug control and traffic safety. This was complemented by a practical understanding of the steps that must be taken to deal with these problems. Senator Kennedy's death was a grave loss to the Senate and the Nation, for he was a man of great character dedicated to the betterment of his country.

The report summarized the testimony of 17 witnesses from the Government and the private sector concerning LSD. After considering all the evidence the subcommittee concluded that in organization, coordination, and basic research Federal efforts were unequal to the challenge posed by this drug.

The subcommittee made three specific findings: First, the Government did not act promptly to halt the illegal spread of LSD. Although information on how to manufacture the drug became generally available in 1963, according to testimony by Dr. James Goddard, Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, Dr. Stanley Yolles, Director of the National Institute of Mental Health, told the subcommittee that the

Government did not anticipate extensive misuse of the drug because, "it was the feeling of the people concerned that it was such an esoteric drug that it would never be in widespread use in colleges." Thus, 3 years passed before the Government moved to control the abuse of LSD.

Second, the subcommittee found that when the Government did act it moved in a precipitous manner, thereby impairing research and adding to the notoriety of the drug. In April 1966, when Sandoz, the only legal manufacturer ceased production and withdrew its research plan, the Food and Drug Administration abruptly terminated all but nine of the 70 research projects then in progress. This caused the abandonment of other research projects two witnesses told the subcommittee.

Third, the quality of some of the research done was poor and the research program did not recognize the potential for abuse of the drug. Dr. Goddard acknowledged that—

There has been a great deal of bad research carried out on this drug.

And it was not until 1965 that the first survey on the extent and pattern of abuse was planned. This demonstrates again that Government response to LSD was tardy.

Control of these substances will become even more difficult in the years ahead. Dr. Yolles told the subcommittee that in the next 10 years there will be a "hundredfold increase in the number and types of drugs capable of affecting the mind."

These developments will confront us with complex scientific and moral questions. The tragic experience which many of our young people have had with LSD, points up the need for sound and reliable information about any new hallucinogenic or other dangerous drug. We must know more than the pharmacology of such drugs and how they are used in the laboratory. We must learn the causes and effects of drug abuse and how to combat them.

Accordingly, the report recommends a review of our drug regulation and research control measures to assure that these programs are properly organized to deal with the foreseeable problems and that the responsible agencies have adequate authority to carry out their tasks.

With specific regard to LSD, the report makes three recommendations.

First, that the new Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs and the National Institute of Mental Health undertake a comprehensive nationwide study to determine the causes of LSD use, the adverse physical and psychological effects, the extent of its use, and the best method of prevention and treatment.

Second, that NIH expand its research program on LSD and similar drugs to increase our knowledge of the risks and potential benefits of LSD and the relation between them.

And third, that the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs establish an early warning system so that as the pattern of drug use shifts, Federal research, enforcement and education programs will change also.

In carrying out these recommendations

special concern must be given to our young people. In the past 3 years a significant number of them have experimented with LSD and similar drugs. Their use of these drugs manifests more than youthful curiosity. It denotes at least a temporary withdrawal from the responsibilities of organized society. Preventive and punitive measures must be taken to halt the illicit drug traffic. But these actions alone are not a long-term answer to drug abuse. Society must channel the tensions, pressures, and anxieties which young people feel, into constructive alternatives. Drugs are no answer to today's problems, especially for the Nation's youth. As the report says:

Young people must be shown that the challenges and rewards of involvement in the real world are more satisfying for the individual and society than the isolation of the world of drugs.

Finally, Mr. President, we must recognize that the problems represented by LSD are not new. They are as old as the relation of government and science. Each new discovery tests the ingenuity of government to guide the results of invention into paths which benefit society. This is a test of men as well as institutions. If we are to master the sometimes menacing product of our increasing scientific knowledge we will need flexible institutions responsive to change and men who can weave the delicate thread that links freedom of inquiry for the individual scientist with enlightened regulation in the public interest.

This will require that government and science realize their reciprocal responsibilities to each other. It is the duty of government to encourage sound experimentation, evaluate critically the results and act appropriately on them. Correspondingly, it is the obligation of the scientist to conduct his work in an objective manner with due regard for its effect upon the public.

This is the foundation for mutual respect and harmony between government and science. Such an attitude and approach can help contain the social poison carried by LSD and similar drugs.

#### REPORT ENTITLED "THE MIGRATORY FARM LABOR PROBLEM IN THE UNITED STATES"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 91-83)

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the filing of the annual report of the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, together with the individual views of the senior Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY). Approved for filing by the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on January 29, 1969, the report is filed pursuant to Senate Resolution 222, agreed to March 15, 1968.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from New Jersey.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time and, by unani-

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1077. A bill to amend title 18 and title 28 of the United States Code with respect to the trial and review of criminal actions involving obscenity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 1078. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to cause the vessel *Moby Dick II*, owned by Richard B. Campbell, of Hollywood, Fla., to be documented as a vessel of the United States with coastwise privileges; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. SCHWEIKER, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. GOODELL, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. MATHIAS):

S. 1079. A bill consenting to the Susquehanna River Basin Compact, enacting the same into law thereby making the United States a signatory party, making certain reservations on behalf of the United States, and for related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. SCOTT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 1080. A bill for the relief of Coe A. Boardman and his wife, Martha E. Boardman, and the estate of Frank J. Smith and his widow, Therese E. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EAGLETON (for himself and Mr. SYMINGTON):

S. 1081. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in honor of the dedication of the Winston Churchill Memorial and Library; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. EAGLETON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 1082. A bill for the relief of Arlene W. Chang; and

S. 1083. A bill for the relief of Howard Staub; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

S. 1084. A bill for the relief of Lu Jan Tan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 1085. A bill to be cited as the "Environmental Quality Preservation Act of 1969"; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. NELSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1086. A bill for the relief of John Lee Adams and the estates of his wife, Althela J. Adams, and of his sons, David John Adams and Mark Edward Adams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 1087. A bill for the relief of Vernon Louis Hoberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. SCHWEIKER, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. NELSON, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 1088. A bill to be cited as the "Veterans' Employment and Relocation Assistance Act of 1969"; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EAGLETON:

S. 1089. A bill for the relief of Peter Pock; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUSKIE (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. DODD, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HART, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. INOUE, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. THURMOND, Mr.

YARBOROUGH, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio):

S. 1090. A bill to authorize funds to carry out the purposes of title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. MUSKIE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HART (for himself, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. INOUE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. METCALF, Mr. STEVENS, and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 1091. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to provide technical and financial assistance to the commercial fishing industry in meeting the requirements of the Wholesome Fish and Fishery Products Act of 1969; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. HART when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HART (for himself, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. FONG, Mr. GOODELL, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. INOUE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MONTROYA, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PERCY, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio):

S. 1092. A bill to regulate interstate commerce by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for the inspection of facilities used in the harvesting and processing of fish and fishery products for commercial purposes, for the inspection of fish and fishery products, and for cooperation with the States in the regulation of intrastate commerce with respect to State fish inspection programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. HART when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 1093. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act in order to provide for the regulation of the amount of project reservoir storage capacity that may be allotted for water quality control; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. ERVIN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 1094. A bill to improve the health and safety conditions of persons working in the coal mining industry of the United States; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TOWER:

S.J. Res. 50. Joint resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to study and investigate matters pertaining to national security; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. TOWER when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ERVIN (for himself and Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina):

S.J. Res. 51. Joint resolution to designate the month of May as "National Arthritis Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. ERVIN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

#### S. 1079—INTRODUCTION OF SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMPACT BILL

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to grant

official congressional consent to the formation of the Susquehanna River Basin compact, and to make the U.S. Government a party to that compact. I am pleased to have joining me as cosponsors in this effort all of the distinguished Senators from the three States primarily involved—Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER), New York (Mr. JAVITS and Mr. GOODELL), and Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS and Mr. MATHIAS).

The Susquehanna is the last major relatively undeveloped river basin in the Northeast-Middle Atlantic region. The river's West Branch rises in central Pennsylvania; its North Branch issues from Otsego Lake at Cooperstown, N.Y. It flows southward eventually, emptying into the head of the Chesapeake Bay at Havre de Grace, Md. Its length of 448 miles makes it the 24th longest river in the United States. More than 3 million people live in the basin.

Most of the basin lies in Pennsylvania, about 76 percent of it, in an area which comprises approximately 46 percent of the entire Commonwealth. Eighty percent of the basin's total population lives in Pennsylvania, about one-sixth of the State's total.

The area is an extremely valuable asset to the millions of people who reside in it and to the tens of millions who live within a few hundred miles of it. It is an area where many local governments, three States and the Federal Government have major interests and responsibilities. It is an area in need of a comprehensive, coordinated governmental management system which will preserve and enhance its value to its people and their neighbors. This is what the Susquehanna River Basin compact is designed to achieve.

The compact would create the Susquehanna River Basin Commission. Its members would be the Governors of the three basin States—Pennsylvania, Maryland, and New York—or their immediate representatives, and a direct representative of the President. The compact would require the Commission to develop and effectuate plans, policies, and projects relating to water resources of the basin; to adopt and promote uniform and coordinated policies for water resources conservation and management, and to encourage and direct the planning, development, operation, and, subject to the applicable laws, the financing of water resources projects according to such plans and policies.

The core of the compact would be a comprehensive plan "for the immediate and long range development and use of the water resources of the basin" and "a water resources program, based upon the comprehensive plan." This plan is to take into consideration the quantity and quality of the area's water resources needs, existing and proposed public and private projects to meet these needs, and a separate statement of projects which the compact would propose that the Commission undertake. To this end, the Commission would be directed to prepare annual current expense and capital budgets consistent with its program, policies, and projects.

The comprehensive plan and program would deal with such matters as water supply, water quality management and

control, flood protection, watershed management, recreation, fish and wildlife habitat, the preservation and enhancement of scenic, cultural, and historical sites, hydroelectric power, and water withdrawals and diversions in protected areas during emergencies.

Although the Commission would be empowered to act as a construction and operation agency, it would be enjoined by the provisions of this bill to "engage in the construction, operation, and maintenance of a project only when the project is necessary to the execution of the comprehensive plan and no other competent agency is in a position to act, or such agency fails to act." The signatory parties would specifically declare it to be their policy "to preserve and utilize the functions, powers, and duties of the existing offices and agencies of government to the extent consistent with this compact," and the Commission would further be "directed to utilize those offices and agencies for the purposes of the compact."

Throughout this bill, the Commission is required to "cooperate" with others and to "encourage" them in activities that will further the purposes of the compact. Moreover, the compact does not preempt the field; whenever appropriate, the powers of the signatory parties are preserved. Article 5, for instance, states:

Nothing in this Compact shall be construed to repeal, modify, or qualify the authority of any signatory party to enact any legislation or enforce any additional conditions or restrictions to lessen or prevent the pollution of waters within its jurisdiction.

The model for the Susquehanna compact is the Delaware River Basin compact. In 1961, Congress enacted that compact to draw together the efforts of the United States and the States of Delaware, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania in the planning, conservation, development, utilization, management, and control of that basin's water resources. Two of the member States of the Delaware compact—Pennsylvania and New York—are already members of the Susquehanna. That they are again willing to join together with the Federal Government in a venture of this kind is eloquent testimony to their satisfaction with the Delaware compact, and an expression of their confidence in a similar arrangement for the Susquehanna River Basin.

In the middle years of the current decade, the Delaware River Basin experienced a severe water shortage. The Delaware River Basin Commission managed that shortage in such a way that it was not necessary to deny essential water supplies to any public or private entity dependent on basin water, including the tremendous metropolitan complexes of Philadelphia and New York.

The Delaware Commission was successful, too, in formulating and coordinating a set of basinwide water quality standards for submission to the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with the Water Quality Act of 1965. This is the only instance in the entire Nation of such a multistate accomplishment, and it was done in the context of varied and complex water problems.

Today, the Delaware Commission is

taking the lead in the necessary studies to protect the environment in the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area. This involves the close meshing of the planning, developmental, and conservation activities of three States—Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York—and the Federal Government. It is doubtful that this could be undertaken at all in the absence of the Delaware River Basin compact.

Finally, the Delaware commission has acted as the local sponsor of several Federal reservoir projects. Since the benefits of each of these projects will be substantially interstate in character, no one State, and certainly no combination of local governments within a State, could have been in a position to give the necessary local assurances.

I submit, Mr. President, that these several accomplishments illustrate what could be done on the Susquehanna if a similar compact and Federal enabling statute were enacted, as is the purpose of this bill. I think it is worth noting that in all essential respects the Delaware compact, and the proposed compact for the Susquehanna River Basin, are substantially similar. Most of the language of the proposed Susquehanna compact is, in fact, taken from the Delaware. Only in two significant respects do the two differ.

First, the Susquehanna compact would be more explicit in empowering its commission to promote proper flood plain zoning and management. This is a meritorious provision in its own right but, in addition, it is intended to further the policies laid down by Congress in the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, enacted as title XIII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968. The new Federal law requires, as a condition of eligibility for flood insurance in an area, that it be covered by effective State and local land use management laws or ordinances.

The second difference lies in the greater attention that would be given in the Susquehanna plan to the preservation and enhancement of scenic values and cultural and historic sites. This is particularly significant in the Susquehanna Basin because this is the last remaining relatively undeveloped major basin in the most densely populated part of the entire Nation.

In the compact itself, and in the reservations and conditions of the enabling statute, are to be found the several safeguards that Congress enacted in approving the Delaware compact. Some changes, however, have been made. One of these has to do with making more explicit the position of the U.S. member of the Commission. Unlike the Delaware compact, which left this point to implication, the Susquehanna compact would state specifically that the U.S. member is to be the direct representative of the President. Obviously, this is necessary. The State members are to be the Governors or their immediate representatives. To match their authority for coordination with respect to State agencies, the Federal member must be directly responsible to the head of the Federal executive branch.

Also, the language of the Susquehanna

enabling statute would be more exact in assuring that the responsibilities of other Federal agencies are not affected by this compact, except as specifically required by the compact or by reservations in the enabling act.

Several provisions of the Delaware statute declare that commission to be a Federal agency for some purposes, but not for others. This is necessary because the commission is a hybrid, a concept that has worked well on the whole. In certain respects, however, it seemed appropriate to try to improve on the Delaware model in making this point also in the Susquehanna compact. Therefore, this bill makes it clear, for example, that the proposed Susquehanna River Basin Commission is not to be considered a Federal agency for purposes of the Federal Water Power Act. This reservation continues by providing that no license would be required from the Federal Power Commission to develop a project for hydroelectric generation if the project were authorized by Congress, and if that authorization included electric power.

In the Delaware statute, the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration's jurisdiction over water quality is continued in unmodified form. This, it has been argued, appears to be paradoxical since the Delaware River Basin Commission has regulatory authority over water quality, and one of its members is the President's representative; in fact, the Secretary of the Interior. To avoid the possibility of having two Federal agencies proceeding independently, the Susquehanna compact would provide for a limitation of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in those instances in which the U.S. member concurs in commission action regarding water quality.

Mr. President, as I stated at the outset, the Susquehanna River Basin is relatively undeveloped. Time is on our side in this instance, but we do not have much time left. Already population pressures are being felt directly, and they are bound to increase. To avert fragmented, duplicated and unplanned development, we need in the Susquehanna River Basin an arrangement that will provide for the legal and administrative coordination of Federal and State activities. The Federal Government and each of the States has major responsibilities—responsibilities that are not to be avoided. This is recognized in this bill's declaration that "the water resources of the Susquehanna River Basin are regional assets vested with local, State, and National interest" for which each of the parties to this compact has "a joint responsibility."

The compact that is embodied in this legislation is one that has been the object of many years of study and negotiation. In May 1962, the Interstate Advisory Committee on the Susquehanna River Basin met for the first time. Comprised of elected and appointed officials of each of the three States of the basin, the advisory committee, after some preliminary studies, appointed a drafting subcommittee in May 1964. The latter group met almost monthly for 22 months preparing successive drafts for review by the par-

ent committee. In April 1966, it approved a version for publication and distribution. Copies were sent to Federal, State, and local agencies and to interested private persons. Many comments and suggestions were received, and many of these were incorporated in the draft document that was presented to the legislatures of the three States. The compact, in its present form, was adopted by Maryland and New York in 1967, and by Pennsylvania in 1968.

All that remains to be written of this story to transform an idea into reality is to secure the consent of Congress for the Susquehanna River Basin compact, and to make the United States a signatory to this compact. For this purpose, I urge the speedy enactment of this bill so that we can begin to bring the greatest benefits to, and to produce the most efficient service in the public interest for, the people of the basin and the Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an explanatory memorandum prepared by the Interstate Advisory Committee on the Susquehanna River Basin.

**THE VICE PRESIDENT.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1079) consenting to the Susquehanna River Basin Compact, enacting the same into law thereby making the United States a signatory party, making certain reservations on behalf of the United States, and for related purposes, introduced by Mr. SCOTT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The memorandum, presented by Mr. SCOTT, is as follows:

**MEMORANDUM TO ACCOMPANY SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMPACT BILL**

The Susquehanna is the last major relatively undeveloped river basin in the North-east-Middle Atlantic Region. Accordingly, it is particularly in need of a Federal-Interstate coordinating mechanism to guide the conservation, development and administration of its resources in a manner which will most efficiently serve the needs of its population, and which will preserve and enhance its value as a scenic and recreational asset for the tens of millions who live within several hundred miles of the basin. Fine as the individual programs of many Federal agencies may be, and valuable as the efforts of the three separate States and each of their agencies may be, a comprehensive and coordinated governmental management instrument is by far the best hope of safeguarding and maximizing the usefulness of the Susquehanna in a way that will accord proper recognition and give effect to the State, regional and national interests involved. Because the extreme population pressure already ringing the basin are bound to accelerate the trend toward fragmented, duplicative and unplanned development, an overall, combined instrument for the legal and administrative coordination of Federal and State activity is urgent. The dangers of fragmentation arise, on the one hand, from the separatism of Federal agencies and, on the other, from the individuality of State programs.

The Susquehanna River Basin Compact can provide the means of overcoming these difficulties. All three basin States (Pennsylvania, New York and Maryland) have already

enacted the Compact. If Congress also enacts it, the document will be both Federal and State law. Consequently, all of the governments and agencies working in any part of the basin will be brought within a single framework. The Susquehanna River Basin Commission composed of the very topmost level of State representation (the Governors or their immediate representatives), and a direct representative of the President, will come into operation. While the Commission will be an administrative body in its own right, the Compact contains specific safeguards against its displacing existing agencies—Federal, State or local. Coordination will be achieved, while permitting all existing talents and facilities to be employed.

The Susquehanna Compact would not be the first of its type. In 1961 the Congress enacted the Delaware River Basin Compact. While it was made clear at the time that the Federal-Interstate compact was an experiment, and some Federal agencies took the position that it should not be regarded as a precedent, the record of achievement under the Delaware Compact demonstrates that a similar instrument would be most advantageous for the Susquehanna Basin. The Delaware River Basin Commission successfully managed the acute water shortage of the mid-1960's without denying essential supplies to any of the public and private entities dependent on Delaware Basin water, including the tremendous metropolitan complexes of New York City and Philadelphia. It also succeeded in formulating and harmonizing a set of basinwide water quality standards for submission to the Secretary of the Interior under the Water Quality Act of 1965. This is the only instance of such an accomplishment in the entire nation, and it was done in an area of varied and complex water problems embracing parts of four States. Thirdly, the Delaware Commission is spearheading the studies necessary to protect the environment in the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area. Since this involves the close meshing of the planning, developmental and conservation activities of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York and the Federal Government, it is doubtful that it could be properly undertaken at all in the absence of the Delaware Compact. Finally, the compact has established the intergovernmental operating agency which was able to act as the local sponsor of several Federal reservoir projects. Since the benefits of each of these projects will be substantially interstate in character, no one State, and certainly no combination of local governments within a State, was in a position to give the necessary local assurances. It is submitted that these four major accomplishments illustrate what could be done on the Susquehanna, if a similar compact and Federal enabling statute were enacted by Congress for that basin.

In all essential respects the Susquehanna and Delaware Compacts are substantially similar. Indeed, most of the language in the Susquehanna Compact is copied from Delaware. Consequently, it cannot be said that the instrument is untried and that the effects of the provisions are unknown. Furthermore, the fact that two of the States in the Delaware Compact—Pennsylvania and New York—have thought well enough of that Federal-Interstate compact to enact virtually the same arrangement for the Susquehanna is practical testimony to the efficacy of the Susquehanna River Basin Compact.

Only in two significant substantive respects do the two compacts differ. The Susquehanna Compact is more explicit in empowering the Federal-Interstate Commission to promote proper flood plain zoning and management. Not only is this an important advance, but it is directly in line with the policies of the Congress which enacted the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 as Title XIII of the Omnibus Housing Act. This new

Federal statute requires effective state and local land use management in flood plains as a prerequisite to the availability of insurance under the Federal program.

The second difference is in the greater attention to concern with amenities such as scenic values and historical and cultural sites. This is particularly significant for the Susquehanna because as pointed out earlier, this basin is the last remaining relatively undeveloped major basin in the most densely populated part of the entire nation.

The Susquehanna Compact must be part of a Federal statute which will do two things: 1) enact it into Federal law, thereby making the United States a full participant, and 2) contain such auxiliary provisions as are desirable to fit the Compact into the general pattern of Federal law. Section 1 of the bill accomplishes the first task. Section 2 covers the second requirement in much the same fashion as similar provisions of the Federal enabling statute for the Delaware River Basin Compact. However, there are several differences between the Susquehanna bill and the "reservations" included as part of the Delaware statute. These are indicated below, together with the reasons for the changes.

Section 2(q) of the Susquehanna bill is identical with Section 15.1(r) of the Delaware statute, except for the addition of language making it clear that the United States member of the Susquehanna River Basin Commission is to be the direct representative of the President. This is the intent of the Delaware Compact and of the Federal enabling statute. It was recognized that to match the coordinative authority of the governors with respect to the activities of state agencies, it was necessary that the Federal member of the Commission be directly responsible to the head of the Federal Executive Branch. However, a draft Executive Order recently sent to the Bureau of the Budget by the Water Resources Council would have subjected the Federal members of compact commissions to check by both field level interdepartmental committees and the Water Resources Council. Fortunately, the President has not issued the Order, but the auspices under which it was proposed appears to make it desirable that Congress reinforce its original intent. Impeding and downgrading the President's representative on a Federal-Interstate body would give individual Federal agencies powers of delay and ultimate vetoes properly exercised only by Congress and the President, and would materially impair the coordinating capability of the Compact.

In this same connection, it should be noted that a draft of enabling legislation for the Susquehanna Compact presented to the States by the Water Resources Council would give the United States member a veto over Commission action. The Delaware statute confines such power to Congress and the President and carefully details the procedures and circumstances for its exercise, in order to make clear that any such action is intended to be extraordinary, and only for truly compelling reasons.

Section 2(r) of the Susquehanna bill is equivalent to Section 15.1(s) of the Delaware statute in purpose and meaning. Both provide assurance that, except as specifically required by the compact, or reservations in the enabling statute, the responsibilities of other Federal agencies are unaffected. If it were not for the recent suggestions that individual Executive agencies should be unilaterally free to offer their own interpretations of any other Act of Congress as a basis for disregarding the Compact and the Federal-Interstate Commission, alteration of the Delaware statute's language on this point probably would not have occurred to anyone. However, it now seems desirable to make it even clearer that in enacting the Susquehanna Compact, the Congress reserves its

full authority to legislate, and that it is not conferring a like authority on individual segments of the Executive Branch.

Several provisions of the Delaware statute are designed to make the Federal-Interstate commission a Federal agency for some purposes but not for others. On the whole, there is no difficulty with this concept. In fact, the basic value of the Susquehanna River Basin Commission is that it will be a hybrid, able to accomplish tasks that neither Federal nor State Governments could do separately. However, it would be well to improve on the Delaware statute in several particulars.

(a) It has been suggested that in Section 2(1)—the comparable provision to Section 15.1(m) of the Delaware statute—it would be appropriate to make it clear that the Susquehanna River Basin Commission is not a Federal agency for purposes of the Federal Water Power Act. A consequence would be to require the Commission to obtain a license from the FPC if it should decide to develop a project for hydroelectric power generation. The Susquehanna bill incorporates this suggestion, but it also provides that no such license would be required, if the project is one authorized by the Congress, and if the authorization includes hydroelectric power.

(b) The Delaware statute continues the jurisdiction in unmodified form of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration over water quality in the Delaware River. This seems rather anomalous, because the Federal-Interstate Commission has regulatory authority over water quality and one of the members of the Commission is the President's representative. In fact, on the Delaware River Basin Commission, the Secretary of the Interior is himself the U.S. member. In order to remove this anomaly, the Susquehanna bill provides for a limitation on the applicability of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in those instances in which the United States member of the Susquehanna commission concurs in commission action regarding water quality control. It seems destructive to authorize the Federal Executive Branch to proceed in two independent and possibly conflicting ways to abate pollution.

(c) The general effect of the Delaware statute and its interpretation by the Civil Service Commission has been to exclude employees of the Federal-Interstate Commission from coverage by the Federal Employees Retirement System and other Federal employee fringe benefits. Since such a commission is not entirely a Federal agency, there is justice in the position. However, it would be desirable to authorize the Federal agencies administering employee benefit plans to make coverage agreements with the Federal-Interstate Commission. If the Commission were willing to pay the full employer's share, and the Commission's employees were required to pay the remainder of the premiums, there would be no cost to the Federal Government. States make such arrangements with interstate agencies in which they participate. Accordingly, Section 2(m) of the Susquehanna bill authorizes the making of coverage agreements. Otherwise, it is identical with the Delaware statute provision.

Finally, two provisions of the Delaware statute have been omitted from the Susquehanna bill, because their purposes are accomplished by provisions of the Susquehanna Compact itself. These provisions of the Delaware statute are: Sections 15.1 (d) and (h).

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, I am extremely pleased to join in the introduction of legislation to grant the consent of Congress to the Susquehanna River Basin compact and to make the United States a party to the compact.

The compact is of great importance for

the conservation and development of major New York water and related enterprises. Many New Yorkers will share in the benefits of this arrangement. More than one in every 20 people in New York live in the Susquehanna River Basin. The major portion of the basin is in Pennsylvania, but its approximately 6,300 square miles that lie in New York represent nearly one-seventh of the total area of the State.

In addition, the millions of people who reside in the metropolitan areas of New York City, Philadelphia, and Baltimore have an interest in what happens in the basin.

The Susquehanna is the last major relatively underdeveloped river basin in the Northeast-Middle Atlantic region. As such, it will greatly benefit from a coordinated development of its resources through a Federal-interstate arrangement. The Susquehanna compact is closely patterned on the Delaware River Basin compact enacted in 1961. Two of the member States of the Delaware—New York and Pennsylvania—are also members of the Susquehanna.

The record of achievement under the Delaware compact demonstrates that a similar arrangement would be most advantageous for the Susquehanna Basin. We are all aware of the Delaware River Basin Commission's successful management of the severe water shortage of several years ago. The pollution control, environmental planning, and Federal project guarantee activities under the Delaware compact are proving to be of great value and are likely to be even more significant in the immediate future.

The success of the Delaware compact indicates the kinds of achievements which could become a reality in the Susquehanna if Congress enacts the appropriate enabling statute. A thoroughgoing Federal-interstate partnership is the essence of the arrangement. The other signatory parties, the States of New York and Maryland and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, have already enacted the compact. Now it is up to the United States to act.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I am pleased to join the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT) in introducing legislation to give congressional consent to the Susquehanna River Basin compact.

This interstate compact has great importance to Maryland. Although only 300 square miles of the Susquehanna Basin are in Maryland, the Free State is the recipient of all the waters of the river, an average daily flow totaling 25 billion gallons at Conowingo. The Susquehanna provides fresh water for individual, industrial, and municipal use in the vast Baltimore metropolitan area. It contributes well over half of the fresh water flowing into Chesapeake Bay. It provides numerous recreational opportunities for Marylanders and visitors to the State.

Of course, the Susquehanna also contributes pollution, sediment, and floating debris to the Chesapeake Bay. Its seasonal variations produce flood problems at some times, while at other times a low Susquehanna flow into the bay permits saline water to move farther up the bay,

altering its natural balance in ways which can be very destructive to marine life.

Thus maintaining a proper flow of high quality water from the Susquehanna is literally a matter of life or death for the renowned oysters, crabs, and clams of Chesapeake Bay. It is a matter of economic health and growth for the Baltimore region. It is also a knotty problem for water management experts and the governments involved.

The river basin compact, developed through over 6 years of painstaking work by representatives of the States involved, provides a framework for sound regional management of the Susquehanna now and in the years ahead. I trust that the appropriate committee will consider this legislation without delay.

**S. 1081—INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE STRIKING OF MEDALS IN HONOR OF THE DEDICATION OF THE WINSTON CHURCHILL MEMORIAL AND LIBRARY**

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senator SYMINGTON, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would cause the Secretary of the Treasury to strike a medal in honor of the dedication of the Winston Churchill Memorial and Library at Westminster College in Fulton, Mo., in May 1969.

Mr. President, Winston Churchill delivered his world-renowned Iron Curtain speech at Westminster College on March 5, 1946.

As a high school student, I was privileged to be in attendance at the time of his great address and shall always treasure it as one of the truly unforgettable experiences of my life.

A medal commemorating the dedication of this memorial and library is not only a proper tribute to the occasion at hand, but also a fitting tribute to a world statesman, a tangible recollection of one of the great public addresses of modern times, and a worthy recognition of a fine midwestern academic institution, Westminster College.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1081) to provide for the striking of medals in honor of the dedication of the Winston Churchill Memorial and Library, introduced by Mr. EAGLETON (for himself and Mr. SYMINGTON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

**S. 1085—INTRODUCTION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY PRESERVATION ACT**

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the most urgent current business of our Nation is to reverse the accelerating deterioration of our environment. We are now moving rapidly on a course that can threaten to destroy man's habitat and that of most other living creatures. Irreparable damage has been done already and great energies must be directed to reversing this alarming trend.

The menace to our environment posed by a vast tide of air and water pollution, by our increasing urban sprawl, and by the products and byproducts of our rapidly burgeoning technology is staggering indeed. The indiscriminate use of poisonous pesticides are contaminating our environment. Pollution has all but destroyed our lakes and it is threatening our supply of fresh water. Many of our Nation's finest forests have been ravaged and destroyed. Stripminers and bulldozers have forever marred the beauty of our natural landscape. Automobiles powered by the internal combustion engine are filling the air we breathe with noxious gases. Industrial plants pour ever increasing amounts of harmful residue into the atmosphere at a terrifying rate. These grim facts are shocking.

In order to help our governments, Federal, State, and local, to meet the environmental crisis, I am introducing today a bill—the Environmental Quality Preservation Act of 1969.

Title I of the bill would create a Council on Environmental Quality in the Executive Office of the President to oversee the programs of the Federal, State, and local governments to determine to what extent these activities are contributing to the achievement of environmental quality and to gather, analyze, and interpret conditions and trends in environmental quality.

The principal task of the Council will be to develop within a 5-year period comprehensive national policies and programs to improve and maintain the quality of our environment. This is a job of enormous import not only to us today but also to many generations to come.

Under title II of the bill, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to conduct studies of natural environmental systems in the United States to document and define changes in these systems, and to develop and maintain an inventory of natural resource development projects and other related projects which may make significant modifications in the natural environment.

Further, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to establish a clearinghouse for information on ecological problems and studies and to disseminate information about progress in the field and to establish a program in which representative natural environments on Federal lands can be set aside for scientific study and for preservation. Also, the Secretary of the Interior will assist and encourage the establishment of similar natural preserves on State and private lands.

Title III of the bill would establish, under the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, a comprehensive waste management research program, coordinating all such research now being done under a number of different Federal programs. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is also directed to compile a national inventory of waste management needs and problems and of waste management technology.

In addition, the bill would establish a clearinghouse for information on all aspects of air, water, and soil pollution and waste disposal. This information

would be made available to business, industry, municipalities, and the general public.

Our natural resources are a precious commodity and we must begin to more prudently marshal our efforts to stop this senseless destruction of our environment.

The effort that we must make has to be thorough and comprehensive. We need the support of every citizen and of every public official at all levels of government, from city and county government right up to the White House.

The time is long overdue for constructive action and the promulgation of a national directive in this regard.

The Environmental Quality Preservation Act of 1969 can meet this challenging objective.

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

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

The bill (S. 1085) to be cited as the "Environmental Quality Preservation Act of 1969," introduced by Mr. NELSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**S. 1085**

*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 "Environmental Quality Preservation Act of 1969".*

SEC. 2 The Congress finds and declares—  
(a) that the quality of the environment of the Nation—its air, water, and soil—has substantially deteriorated and is continuing to do so at an increasing rate;

(b) that this decline in environmental quality is threatening the health and survival of plant and animal life, and indeed of man himself; is depriving man of esthetic and recreational values increasingly important to his physical and mental health; and is obstructing, and indeed may eventually prevent, the economic, social, and material development necessary to meet the grave problems of an expanding population, and continuing urbanization and industrialization;

(c) that present pollution control programs, directed as they are to specific problems of pollution of water, air, or soil, do not together constitute a comprehensive environmental quality program and cannot maintain overall environmental quality at a level sufficient for the emerging needs of the Nation; and

(d) that the purposes of this Act therefore are to provide for the formulation and recommendation to the Congress of a comprehensive national environmental quality program; to foster interest in and attention to the problems of environmental quality by the Congress and throughout the executive branch; and to recognize and redirect existing research programs, and establish new programs, in order to expand rapidly knowledge of all kinds in the areas of environmental quality, pollution control, and waste management.

**TITLE I—COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY**

SEC. 101. The President shall transmit to the Congress annually beginning not later than June 30, 1969, an Environmental Quality Report (hereinafter referred to as the "Report") which set forth (1) the status

and condition of the major natural, man-made, or altered environmental system of the Nation, including, but not limited to the air, the aquatic, including marine, estuarine, and fresh water, and the terrestrial environment, including, but not limited to, the forest, dryland, wetland, range, urban, suburban, and rural environment; and (2) current and foreseeable trends in management and utilization of such environments and the effects of those trends on the social, economic, and other requirements of the Nation.

Sec. 102. (a) There is hereby created in the Executive Office of the President a Council on Environmental Quality (hereinafter referred to as the "Council"). The Council shall be composed of five members who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, each of whom shall be a person who, as a result of his training, experience, and attainments, is exceptionally qualified to analyze and interpret environmental information of all kinds, to appraise the environmental quality programs of Federal, State, and local governments, and to formulate and recommend national policy to promote the improvement of the quality of the environment.

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

(c) It shall be the principal duty of the Council to develop comprehensive national policies and programs to improve and maintain the quality of the environment needed to meet the emerging social, economic, material, and other requirements of the Nation. The recommendations of the Council shall be transmitted by the President to the Congress by January 1, 1973.

(d) In addition to those in subsection (c), it shall be the duty and function of the Council—

(1) to assist and advise the President in the preparation of the Environmental Quality Report;

(2) to gather timely and authoritative information concerning the conditions and trends in environmental qualities both current and prospective, to analyze and interpret such information and to compile and submit to the President studies relating to such conditions and trends;

(3) to appraise the various programs and activities of Federal, State, and local government for the purpose of determining the extent to which such programs and activities are contributing to the achievement of environmental quality, and to make recommendations to the President with respect thereto;

(4) to make and furnish such studies, reports, and recommendations with respect to matters of policy and legislation as the President may request; and

(5) to foster study and research in the social, technical, administrative, economic, political, and other aspects of environmental quality at institutions of higher learning throughout the Nation.

(e) In exercising its powers, functions, and duties under this title—

(1) the Council shall consult with such representatives of science, industry, agriculture, labor, conservation, State and local governments, and other organizations and groups, as it deems advisable; and

(2) the Council shall, to the fullest extent possible, utilize the services, facilities, and information (including statistical information) of public and private agencies, organizations, and individuals, in order that duplication of effort and expense may be avoided.

## TITLE II—ECOLOGICAL RESEARCH

Sec. 201. The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary"), in order to carry out the purposes of this title, is authorized—

(1) to conduct investigations, studies, surveys, research, and analyses;

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

(3) to develop and maintain an inventory of natural resource development projects, engineering works, and other major projects such as, but not limited to, eradication projects contemplated or planned by public or private agencies or organizations which may make significant modifications in the natural environment;

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

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

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

(7) to encourage other public or private agencies planning development projects to consult with the Secretary on the impact of the proposed projects on the natural environment;

(8) to encourage and assist public (non-Federal) or private agencies or organizations, including educational institutions, museums, and botanical and zoological gardens, and other scientific or conservation organizations, or individuals, to acquire, designate, and maintain representative samples of important natural environmental systems, including natural areas for observation and for manipulation, and to encourage such agencies, organizations, and individuals to utilize existing areas under their control or jurisdiction for such purposes;

(9) to establish through interagency coordination, on federally owned lands, a Federal system of natural areas for scientific purposes and develop the means and methods for withdrawal of such areas from nonconforming uses, and provide for their management and protection to serve the natural research needs of all agencies, both public and private; except that in developing standards governing any such withdrawals, the Secretary shall give due consideration to future alternative uses of such areas subject to withdrawal; and

(10) to assist and advise the Council on Environmental Quality established under title I of this Act.

Sec. 202. The Secretary is further authorized for the purposes of this title (1) to make grants and enter into contracts or cooperative agreements with public or private agencies or organizations, or individuals, (2) to accept and use donations of funds, property, personal services, or facilities, (3) to acquire selected areas of lands or interests in lands by donation, acquisition with donated funds, devise, or exchange for acquired lands or public lands under his jurisdiction which he finds suitable for disposition, (4) to administer such lands or interests for experimental purposes, including the observation and manipulation of natural areas, and (5) to issue such regulations as he deems necessary with respect to the administration of such lands.

Sec. 203. Activities authorized under this title may be carried out on lands under the

jurisdiction or control of other departments or agencies of the Government only with the approval of the head of the department or agency concerned.

Sec. 204. The Secretary shall consult with and provide technical assistance to departments and agencies of the Government, and he is authorized to obtain from such departments and agencies such information, data, reports, advice, and assistance as he deems necessary or appropriate, and which can reasonably be furnished by such departments and agencies in carrying out the purposes of this title. Any Federal agency furnishing advice or assistance hereunder may expend its own funds for such purposes, with or without reimbursement by the Secretary.

Sec. 205. Nothing in this title is intended to give, or shall be construed as giving, the Secretary any authority over any of the authorized programs of any other department or agency of the Government, or as repealing, modifying, restricting, or amending existing authorities or responsibilities that any department or agency may have with respect to the natural environment. The Secretary shall consult with the heads of such departments and agencies for the purpose of identifying and eliminating duplication of effort.

Sec. 206. (a) The Secretary is authorized to establish such advisory committees as he deems desirable for the purpose of rendering advice and submitting recommendations to him relating to the carrying out of the purposes of this title. Such advisory committees shall render advice and submit recommendations to the Secretary upon his request and may submit recommendations to the Secretary at any time on their own initiative. The Secretary may designate employees of the Department of the Interior to serve as secretaries to the committee.

(b) Members of advisory committees appointed by the Secretary may receive not to exceed \$100 per day when engaged in the actual performance of their duties, in addition to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties.

Sec. 207. The Secretary is authorized to participate in environmental research in surrounding oceans and in other countries in cooperation with appropriate departments or agencies of such countries or with coordinating international organizations if he determines that such activities will contribute to the objectives and purposes of this Act.

## TITLE III—WASTE MANAGEMENT RESEARCH

Sec. 301. (a) (1) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall organize the research and related activities authorized by the Clean Air Act, as amended, and the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended, into a comprehensive program for research in waste management. The Secretary shall insure that the program is organized, planned, and conducted with singleness of purpose and maximum effectiveness, and for this purpose the most advanced management and research methods and techniques, including systems analysis and systems engineering, shall be employed.

(2) The Secretary is authorized to consult with the Secretary of the Interior for the purpose of including research and related activities authorized by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, in the program authorized in this title, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to cooperate to the extent practicable with the Secretary for such purpose.

(b) As a foundation for the work of the waste management research program established by subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall have compiled a national inventory of waste management needs and problems, and of present waste management

methods, including the costs of these methods.

(c) The Secretary shall also establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the "Department") an office to collect from appropriate sources and to disseminate actively to the general public, to agricultural, industrial, and commercial groups and their representatives, and to Federal, State, and local government agencies and their representatives, such information as is available regarding all aspects of air, water, and soil pollution, including in particular the extent and dangers of such pollution, and the financial and technical assistance available from the Federal Government for research on, and prevention and abatement of, such pollution.

(d) The Secretary shall assist and advise the Council on Environmental Quality established under title I of this Act.

Sec. 302. (a) The Secretary shall encourage and arrange for full and complete cooperation between the waste management research programs established under section 301(a), and those programs of other departments and agencies of the Federal Government engaged in research and development work on any aspect of waste management.

(b) The Secretary is hereby authorized to request, and the departments and agencies of the Government are directed to grant, the use of the waste disposal installations and facilities of any such department or agency for the purpose of testing and evaluating new methods, procedures, and equipment for waste management: *Provided*, That in the judgment of the department or agency concerned, such test and evaluation work will not disrupt, disorganize, or in any way interfere with the normal activity, operations, and functioning of such agency or department: *Provided further*, That any expense incurred in such test and evaluation work above and beyond the normal and usual expense of operating the waste disposal installations and facilities of the agency or department concerned shall be borne by the department.

Sec. 303. When used in this title—

(a) the term "waste" means the unwanted solid, liquid, and gaseous materials from agricultural, industrial, commercial, domestic, and community production and consumption activities, discarded or discharged into or onto the atmosphere, water courses, or the ground;

(b) the term "waste management" means the planned, organized, and efficient collection, treatment, reclamation, and disposal of waste to minimize or prevent air, water, and soil pollution; and

(c) the term "research" means (1) studies, investigations, and experiments for the development of basic and applied knowledge bearing on waste management in the physical, biological, social, and earth sciences; and (2) the design, development, and testing of equipment, methods, and processes for waste management.

#### TITLE IV—APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 401. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1968, and for each of five succeeding fiscal years, such amounts as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act.

#### S. 1088—INTRODUCTION OF BILL RELATING TO VETERANS EMPLOYMENT AND RELOCATION ACT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Mr. SCHWEIKER, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. HUGHES, I introduce the "Veterans Employment and Relocation Assistance Act of 1969," a measure designed to help Vietnam veterans find

job opportunities to match their skills and provide financial assistance where relocation is necessary. This legislation is aimed at assisting veterans returning to areas in which there is no market for the skills they have acquired while in military service. It would direct such veterans away from areas of high unemployment, whether in inner city slums or depressed rural areas.

Approximately 900,000 men will be discharged from the armed services this year and it is estimated that about 450,000 of these men will seek postdischarge employment assistance. This bill would assist our returning veterans in finding employment opportunities which are commensurate with their military training and experience, no matter where such opportunities exist.

Many veterans have had such difficulty obtaining jobs that they have had to rely on unemployment compensation. Throughout the Nation, 168,841 recent discharges—men who had served in the armed services during 1968—filed for unemployment compensation and drew those benefits for an average total of 9 weeks.

The key feature of the bill I introduce today is job mobility. It is its objective to assist those veterans who would be returning to areas of high unemployment by directing them to other sections of the country where the skills and training they received while in military service are in need and would be utilized. Military service interrupts the life experience of many young men. We should take advantage of this fact and seek to turn such circumstance into an opportunity for significant social and economic breakthrough. Those men who have left depressed urban ghettos to serve in the armed services should have the opportunity, if they wish, of going where employment opportunity exists after their military service has been completed. Not only could such a program benefit the men involved, but it could contribute to the national economy by promoting labor mobility and overcoming manpower skill shortages on a national basis.

Many of our returning veterans acquire skills in the military which have counterparts in the civilian economy. Each servicemen generally learns from one to three "military occupational specialties"—MOS. Many, although not all, of the MOS's have immediate civilian relevance. For those men who are to leave the armed services unequipped to make the transition to civilian life and who need assistance in preparing for a job, in addition to postdischarge training benefits offered under the cold war GI bill, the military is beginning to offer other sources of relevant skill training.

In particular, I refer to Project Transition of the Department of Defense. This program seeks to train men about to be discharged for jobs which will exist, for skills which are needed, in the civilian labor market. This is done by offering specific MDTA courses at each of the armed services separation points in the United States and, in addition, by utilizing direct support from business in the form of company-sponsored courses taught on the bases.

The American Legion magazine of Feb-

ruary 1969 reports that the Department of Defense now has in operation VEEVER, Vietnam era veterans' employment referral, an automated system whereby a Vietnam veteran who meets certain eligibility requirements may make a single application for civilian employment with Federal Defense or any other agency's installations anywhere in the United States and have it referred to the agencies at the geographic location of his choice. This is a step forward in matching a suitable vacancy in an area selected with skills and employment desires.

The Veteran's Employment and Relocation Assistance Act represents an effort to build upon and to supplement military training and programs such as the Vietnam era veterans' employment referral program and Project Transition. One of the greatest limitations to Project Transition is lack of mobility. In an article in the Reporter entitled "A Belated Job Program for Vietnam Veterans," John I. Brooks noted that—

Much of Project Transition's success depends on a man's willingness to go where the job is . . . the returning veteran is at "a point of high mobility" in his life because of his recent separation from home and his travels in the service.

This bill would take advantage of that potential mobility. It would seek to stimulate those veterans whose homes are in areas of high unemployment to relocate in those sections of the country where they could more easily acquire useful and relevant employment. This will be done through a process of compilation and matching of relevant data and a program of financial relocation assistance.

Some of the data relevant to this program of veterans' assistance is already available. The U.S. Employment Service of the Bureau of Employment Security in the Department of Labor is presently charged with maintaining a system of employment offices throughout the Nation which collects and furnishes information on employment opportunities in each area. Moreover, these local USES offices are to offer specific job counseling assistance to veterans.

First, this act would require USES to collect and compile information about employment and training opportunities on a national basis through the establishment of a so-called Veterans' employment and relocation assistance center. It would also require the Secretary of Defense to compile, each month, a list of persons who are to be discharged, together with their homes of record and any special education, training, or skill such person may possess, including his MOS, both primary and secondary. This information, which could be crucial to placing a veteran in a civilian job which builds upon his most relevant and most recently acquired skill, is not now generally available nor is it utilized by USES in counseling and placing veterans in jobs.

Second, the act would seek to match the skills the veterans have acquired in the armed services with employment and training opportunities available on a national basis. Each local USES office would continue its present practice of seeking out veterans returning to its area, counseling them, and assisting them to find

employment in that area. However, if no employment is available in the veteran's home area, the local USES office would then be required to direct those veterans who so desire to employment or training opportunities, commensurate with their qualifications and training, available in other parts of the Nation. This would be done by using the information compiled by the national relocation center. In this manner, the employment opportunities of each eligible veteran would be extended to a national basis.

Finally, the act would stimulate the potential mobility of these returning veterans through a system of financial assistance for relocation. The Veterans' Administration would pay the reasonable travel expenses of each veteran for whom USES has arranged a job interview at a place other than his home area. In addition, a veteran who accepted an employment or training opportunity in an area other than his home area, would receive, as a veterans' benefit, a moving allowance, to include reasonable travel expenses for his family and himself, reasonable expenses for moving his personal effects and household goods, and the cost of lodging for a transitional period while he sought housing in his new location.

It is my estimate that an expenditure of about \$35 million would be adequate to cover the first-year costs of this program, until such time as it has been in operation for a period of time and it would be possible to compute more exactly the number of veterans who would take advantage of its benefits. Presently, about 70,000 men are being discharged each month. If one assumes that about 10,000 of them take advantage of the interview expenses, and 5,000, of the moving expenses each month, these benefits would run to a monthly expenditure of approximately \$2.5 million—based on \$100 per interview and \$300 per actual relocation. Adding an amount for administrative overhead, the potential cost of this program remains but a tiny fraction of the total amount spent on veterans' benefits.

Mr. President, the measure could have social and economic benefits far out of proportion of its costs. The Veterans' Employment and Relocation Assistance Act builds upon and seeks to utilize the skills which a young veteran has acquired while in military service, and takes advantage of the fact that these men are more mobile than most of the unemployed and more mobile than they probably ever have been or ever will be again in their lives. This program should promote labor mobility and thereby ease skill shortages wherever they exist.

Finally, for those veterans who were drafted or enlisted out of our urban ghettos, whose ghetto living experience has been interrupted by military service, this program would seek to reach them before they have returned to areas of high unemployment and would give them the opportunity, if they wished, of utilizing their recently acquired skills and training in areas in which those skills and training will be relevant. Certainly, meaningful employment for our veterans should be a high objective of the society for which they have fought.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD. The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1088) to be cited as the "Veterans' Employment and Relocation Assistance Act of 1969," introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and other Senators), 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. 1088

*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 by the "Veterans' Employment and Relocation Assistance Act of 1969."*

SEC. 2. (a) Part III of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new chapter as follows:

**"CHAPTER 42.—VETERANS' EMPLOYMENT AND RELOCATION ASSISTANCE**

**"Sec.**

**"2101. Purpose.**

**"2102. Definitions.**

**"2103. Entitlement.**

**"2104. Compilation of necessary data.**

**"2105. Counseling.**

**"2106. Administration.**

**"2107. Relocation benefits.**

**"§ 2101. Purpose**

"It is the purpose of this chapter to accord appropriate recognition to the sacrifices made by eligible veterans in serving their country and to help meet the Nation's economic needs by assisting such veterans who desire meaningful employment to obtain jobs which require skills learned by them while serving in the Armed Forces, and to provide the financial assistance necessary to relocate such veterans in areas where such jobs are available.

**"§ 2102. Definitions**

"For the purposes of this chapter—

"(1) The term 'eligible veteran' means any veteran who is eligible for education and training benefits under chapter 34 of this title and who is discharged on or after the effective date of the Veterans' Employment and Relocation Assistance Act of 1968.

"(2) The term 'home' means the home of record of the veteran, as indicated in his military record, at the time of his discharge.

**"§ 2103. Entitlement**

"Any eligible veteran who seeks meaningful employment, on-the-job training, or apprenticeship training commensurate with the skills and training he has acquired during his period of military, naval, or air service and who is unable to obtain such employment, on-the-job training, or apprenticeship training near his home shall be entitled to the employment and relocation assistance provided for under this chapter.

**"§ 2104. Compilation of necessary data**

"(a) The Secretary of Labor shall establish within the United States Employment Service of the Bureau of Employment Security of the Department of Labor a Veterans' Employment and Relocation Assistance Center (hereinafter in this chapter referred to as the 'Relocation Center'). It shall be the function of the Relocation Center to compile and maintain comprehensive lists of available job opportunities and on-the-job and apprenticeship training opportunities available throughout the Nation and the education, training, and skills required for such opportunities. Each local United States Employment Service office shall periodically compile such a list with regard to the job opportunities and on-the-job and apprenticeship training opportunities available in

the particular area served by such office and shall transmit such list to the Relocation Center. Such lists shall be maintained on an up-to-date basis.

"(b)(1) The Secretary of Labor, using every appropriate facility, shall collect and compile information regarding education, training, and skill requirements, occupational outlook, job opportunities, labor supply in various skills, and employment trends on a National, State, area, or other appropriate basis which shall be used in the placement activities carried out under this chapter. The Secretary of Labor shall also place high priority on maintaining in current status the Dictionary of Occupational Titles. The Secretary shall give the highest priority to performing the duties prescribed by this section and shall place particular emphasis on identifying and publishing information relating to those occupations, skills, industries, and geographic areas in which the supply of qualified workers is insufficient to meet existing and foreseeable future needs.

"(2) As soon as practicable after he has collected and compiled the information described in paragraph (1) of this subsection, the Secretary of Labor shall transmit such information to the Relocation Center and the Relocation Center shall utilize such information in carrying out the provisions of subsection (a) of this section.

"(c) The Secretary of Defense shall cause to be compiled at least once each calendar month a list of persons discharged or released from active duty (and who will be eligible veterans), the home of record of each such person, and any special education, training, or skill such person may possess, including his military occupational specialty (both primary and secondary). Such lists shall be transmitted to the Relocation Center for use in carrying out the provisions of this chapter.

**"§ 2105. Counseling**

"(a) Each member of the Armed Forces shall be advised immediately prior to his discharge or release from active duty of the services available to him under this chapter.

"(b) Each local office of the United States Employment Service shall contact each eligible veteran returning to the area served by such office within a period of sixty days after his discharge or release from active duty and inform such veteran of the employment, training, and relocation assistance available to him under this chapter. Special attention shall be directed by the local offices of the United States Employment Service to eligible veterans who are underskilled or who reside in areas of high unemployment.

"(c) Whenever an eligible veteran does not possess any special training or skill to qualify him for appropriate employment in civilian life, he shall be advised of training opportunities available to him, including, but not limited to, on-the-job training and apprenticeship training.

**"§ 2106. Administration**

"(a) An eligible veteran may make application for assistance from the Relocation Center at any time within 90 days following the date of his discharge or release from active duty.

"(b) The appropriate local office of the United States Employment Service shall undertake to match the particular qualifications of an eligible veteran with an available job, on-the-job training opportunity, or apprenticeship opportunity which is commensurate with such qualifications of the veteran. If no such opportunity is available in the home area of the veteran, the local United States Employment Service office shall obtain from the Relocation Center a listing of jobs, on-the-job training, and apprenticeship opportunities available in other parts of the Nation which are commensurate with the veteran's qualifications or vocational objective and shall direct the veteran to such opportuni-

ties. Every effort shall be made to place the veteran as close to his home area as practicable.

"(c) Whenever the local office of the United States Employment Service has matched an eligible veteran with an available job or on-the-job training or apprenticeship opportunity, such office shall, at the request of either party, arrange for an interview between such veteran and the prospective employer or the training or apprenticeship program director, as the case may be. In each case the local office concerned shall ascertain whether or not (1) the interview was conducted, (2) a job, training, or apprenticeship offer was made to the veteran, and (3) the offer was accepted by the veteran.

"(d) An eligible veteran shall not be obligated to accept any offer of a job, training, or apprenticeship made to him, and a refusal of any such offer for a satisfactory reason, as determined in regulations prescribed by the Administrator, shall not disqualify such veteran for additional assistance under this chapter. If a veteran refuses a job, training, or apprenticeship offered to him through assistance under this chapter without a satisfactory reason therefor, such veteran shall be ineligible for further assistance under this chapter. No veteran shall be eligible for assistance in obtaining a job, training, or apprenticeship if he has refused offers of such jobs, training, or apprenticeship made available to him under this chapter on three occasions.

"(e) Unless otherwise provided in this chapter, the provisions of this chapter shall be carried out through the local United States Employment offices in the several States. The Secretary of Labor and the Administrator shall consult and cooperate in the administration of this chapter.

"§ 2107. Relocation benefits

"(a) The Administrator is authorized to pay the reasonable travel expenses, including per diem for food and necessary lodging, of any eligible veteran in connection with any interview of such veteran with an employer or training or apprenticeship director arranged by a United States Employment Service office. Such expenses may be paid in advance when necessary to avoid hardship to veterans and their families.

"(b) The Administrator is authorized to pay a reasonable moving allowance to any eligible veteran who accepts a job or training opportunity in an area outside his home area. Such allowance may include (1) reasonable travel expenses for the veteran and his immediate family; (2) reasonable expenses for moving his personal effects and household goods; and (3) reasonable expenses for lodging for not more than a two-week period while seeking housing in the new location."

"(b) The table of contents at the beginning of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately below

"41. Job Counseling and Employment Placement Service for Veterans ----- 2101".

the following:

"42. Veterans' Employment and Relocation Assistance ----- 2101".

"(c) The table of chapters at the beginning of Part III of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new item as follows:

"42. Veterans' Employment and Relocation Assistance ----- 2101".

SEC. 3. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall become effective ninety days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

S. 1090—INTRODUCTION OF REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1969

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize funds to carry out the purposes of title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, and for other purposes.

In title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, the Congress authorized the establishment of Regional Economic Development Commissions to initiate and coordinate economic development programs for multi-state regions whose economies lagged behind that of the Nation as a whole. In 1966 and 1967 five such commissions were established, serving the six New England States, the Upper Great Lakes region, the Ozarks region, the Coastal Plains region in the Southeast, and the Four Corners region. These Commissions are provided Federal assistance by the Secretary of Commerce for their administrative expenses and necessary research and planning activities.

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

The primary purpose of the bill I am introducing today is to enable the Commissions to implement the programs and projects developed under their comprehensive long-range economic plans. It would—

First, extend for 1 year, through fiscal year 1971, the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to provide technical assistance to the regional Commissions; existing authority expires at the end of fiscal year 1970;

Second, extend for 2 years, through fiscal year 1971, the authority of the Commissions to carry on supplemental grant programs; existing authority expires at the end of fiscal year 1969; and

Third, provide additional authority and funds to enable the Commissions to carry out activities developed under the long-range comprehensive economic plans approved by the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. President, in title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act the Congress laid the foundation for a new form of cooperation between the Federal Government and the States through which their combined resources could be brought to bear on problems which are regional in nature, but relate directly to national goals and objectives. The regional Commissions—consisting in

each instance of the Governors of the States involved and a Federal cochairman—have the responsibility for administering and implementing this cooperative venture.

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

Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee, has introduced a bill which would extend the supplemental grant authority of the regional Commissions for 1 year. I have joined with others in cosponsoring that bill. However, in my judgment, renewed supplemental grant authority alone does not provide adequately for the implementation of the comprehensive long-range plans of the regional Commissions. Since we have directed the Commissions to develop projects particularly suited to the needs of their regions, we have the responsibility to enable them to act on the same basis. This bill provides the necessary authority and funds for the regional Commissions to move forward to implement their plans. I hope that this bill will be given early and favorable consideration by the Senate, and that it will receive final approval by the Congress, in order that the Commissions can move forward with constructive development programs.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and a summary of its provisions be printed in the RECORD at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1090) to authorize funds to carry out the purposes of title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MUSKIE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1090

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

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Regional Development Act of 1969".

SEC. 2. Section 505 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended by—

(a) in subsection (b), striking out the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Thereafter, such expenses shall be paid 50 per centum by the Federal Government and 50 per centum by the States in the region, except that the expenses of the Federal Cochairman, his alternate, and his staff shall be paid solely by the Federal Government. The share to be paid by each State shall be determined by the Commission. The Federal Cochairman shall not participate or vote in such determination.", and

(b) in subsection (c), striking out "June 30, 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1971".

Sec. 3. Section 509 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended by—

(a) in subsection (c), striking out "In existence on or before December 31, 1967," and

(b) striking out in subsection (d) "the sum of \$5,000,000 for the period ending June 30, 1968, and the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969", and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "the sum of \$10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1970, and June 30, 1971".

Sec. 4. Section 510 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended by redesignating such section as section 511 and inserting after section 509 the following new section 510:

**"FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR CARRYING OUT COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC PLANS**

"Sec. 510. (a) The Secretary shall provide funds to each of the Federal Cochairmen of the regional commissions to enable the commissions to carry out activities included within comprehensive long-range economic plans approved pursuant to section 503(a)(2). Activities assisted under this section shall include programs and projects in the fields of natural resources, agriculture, education, training, health and welfare, transportation, and other fields related to the purposes of this Act (including research, planning, and demonstration activities and the acquisition of land or the construction or equipment of facilities). No such program or project shall be implemented until (1) the regional commission involved has approved such program or project and determined that it meets the applicable criteria under section 504 and will contribute to the carrying out of the plan, which determination shall be controlling, and (2) the program or project has been approved by the State member of the Commission in whose State the program or project will be carried out.

"(b) In order to promote maximum efficiency and to avoid duplication of facilities and personnel, Federal departments and agencies having an interest in the subject matter of activities assisted under this section are hereby authorized, to the extent not otherwise prohibited by law or incompatible with the objectives of similar categories of programs or projects, to carry out such programs or projects at the request and on behalf of the regional commissions. The commissions are directed, to the maximum extent practicable, to enter into such cooperative agreements or arrangements as may be necessary to enable such Federal departments and agencies, or agencies of State or local government, to carry out programs and projects assisted under this section.

"(c) The Federal portion of the cost of the acquisition of land or the construction or equipment of facilities in connection with any project assisted under this section shall not exceed the percentage established by each commission for such costs, and shall in no event exceed 80 per centum thereof.

"(d) Financial assistance under this section shall be provided solely out of funds specifically appropriated for the purpose of carrying out this section, and shall not be taken into account in the computation of allocations among the States made pursuant to any other provision of the law.

"(e) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, to be available until expended, for each of the regional commissions for the purposes of this section \$20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and \$30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971."

The analysis presented by Mr. MUSKIE is as follows:

**SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1969**

Section 1 provides that the Act may be cited as the Regional Development Act of 1969.

Section 2 amends section 505 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to—

(a) make clear that the administrative expenses of regional commissions shall be shared 50-50 by the Federal Government and the States, and that the Federal Government will bear the full cost of the administrative expenses of the Federal Cochairman and his staff, and

(b) authorize the appropriation of \$15,000,000 for fiscal year 1971 for technical assistance (including administrative expenses and research and planning funds) to the regional commissions.

Section 3 amends section 509 of the Act to—

(a) make all Federal grant-in-aid programs assisting in the acquisition of land or the construction or equipment of facilities, whenever enacted, eligible for supplementation under section 509, and

(b) authorize the appropriation of \$10,000,000 for each regional commission for supplemental grants for each of the fiscal years 1970 and 1971.

Section 4 adds a new section 510 to the Act authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to provide funds to the Federal Cochairmen to carry out activities included within comprehensive long-range economic plans approved by him pursuant to section 503(a)(2). Activities assisted would include programs and projects in specified fields related to the purposes of the Act, including research, planning, and demonstration activities, and the acquisition of land or the construction or equipment of facilities. No program or project could be implemented until (1) the regional commission had approved the project and determined that it met applicable criteria under section 504 and would contribute to the carrying out of the plan, and (2) the project had been approved by the State Member of the Commission in whose State it would be carried out.

In order to avoid duplication of facilities and personnel, Federal agencies having an interest in the subject matter of activities assisted under the section would be authorized to carry out programs or projects at the request of the regional commissions. The commissions would be directed, to the maximum extent practicable, to enter into such cooperative agreements as may be necessary to enable Federal agencies, and agencies of State or local government, to carry out their programs and projects.

There would be authorized to be appropriated for each regional commission \$20,000,000 in fiscal year 1970 and \$30,000,000 in fiscal year 1971 to carry out activities included within approved comprehensive economic plans.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I am pleased to join in cosponsoring the Regional Development Act of 1969, introduced today by Senator MUSKIE. The bill offers vital and urgently needed amendments to the title V regional Commission program under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, and I welcome the opportunity to help sponsor it.

The original title V program was an important beginning—but only a beginning—toward solving one of the most crucial problems confronting many areas of the country, the problem of finding new ways to coordinate growth and development in various regions having significant economic, social, and cultural ties that transcend State and local boundaries.

I have insisted many times that we must eliminate the excessive fragmentation and decentralization that have so long destroyed any effective effort at coordinated development in the New England area and other parts of the Nation.

As long ago as 1953, President Kennedy, in his first year as a Senator, recognized that the problem cannot be solved without the coordinated efforts of governmental and private organizations. And he stated:

No Federal programs can solve the problems of the New England economy without action on the State and local level. Indeed, no governmental program can do the job without assistance from private agencies, organizations, and industries. . . . As the New England Council has often pointed out, and as experience has shown, community leadership and community spirit are of the utmost importance in maintaining the economic prosperity of an area.

A decade later, in 1965, I emphasized to the Massachusetts Legislature that the two most important problems facing the State were the need for greater revenues and the need for coordinated regional development of the entire New England area.

The States of New England have the oldest continuous system of democratic government in the world. But the era of isolated actions and programs by individual States in the area is past. I urged the legislators of Massachusetts to sound a call in Boston that would be heard throughout New England—not only in Boston, but also in Portland and Providence, in Concord, Montpelier, and Hartford. At that time, we first began to plan a major cooperative program to coordinate the development of the region. Subsequently, when I spoke to President Johnson of our program, he assured us of his support for the regional approach.

We then began to lay the early foundation of our regional development program. We documented our common problems: Persistent economic and social ills, especially in the areas of poverty, housing, employment, and education; the departure of dominant industries, leaving in their wake people too specialized in their labor skills to find new employment; the severe pollution of our streams and rivers, as well as other pervasive blights that have marred our beautiful open spaces and forests, our lakes and coastal areas; and power and transportation networks that have served prior generations well, but that we have failed to bring into the mid-20th century.

In response to the need to promote areawide programs, Congress enacted the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 and the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. In those statutes, Congress shifted the emphasis it had traditionally placed on Federal aid programs.

Before, essentially exclusive reliance had been placed on programs designed to rescue single localities. Now, emphasis was placed on coordinated programs to develop entire regions. At last, the Congress began to grasp the reality that particular localities cannot go it alone, that they can effectively upgrade themselves only by participating in programs

to upgrade others with overlapping interests and problems.

Late in 1965, we, the New England Senators, strongly urged the Secretary of Commerce to designate our six States as an economic development region under the title V program of the Public Works and Economic Development Act. In March 1966, Secretary of Commerce Connor approved the designation of the six New England States as a title V region. Subsequently, in early 1967, the New England Regional Commission was formally established and began to function.

Our Commission acted immediately to provide research and studies of the broad range of problems facing the New England region. By the end of fiscal year 1968—after 15 full months of operation—the Commission had carried out eight major studies, ranging from a comprehensive economic analysis of key industries in the region, to specific studies of such problem areas as regional transportation, pollution, human resources, and urban development. Continuing into fiscal year 1969, the Commission has authorized further studies in important additional areas, such as health, government services, and rural development. In addition, the Commission has financed significant demonstration projects in the areas of health, manpower, and housing.

In spite of its auspicious start, however, I believe that the regional Commission program has not yet fulfilled the promise with which it was launched. In part, the fault lay in the original enabling legislation, which was too narrow in scope to allow the regional Commissions to operate effectively.

In October 1967, the Public Works and Economic Development Act was amended in two significant respects:

First, the act was amended to authorize the regional Commissions to carry out supplemental grant programs, under which the Commissions can help State and local governments that are unable, because of economic circumstances, to supply the full matching shares required for assistance under certain other Federal grant programs. Although some of the regional Commissions have used the supplemental grant provision to promote essential projects that could not otherwise have been funded in their areas, it appears that the provision in its present form has frequently been of only marginal utility. In many cases as it has turned out, the various Federal aid programs have already been too tightly budgeted to accommodate applications under the supplemental grant provision. As a result the program has not yet had an adequate opportunity to realize its potential.

Nevertheless, it is important to retain the supplemental grant provision in at least its present scope. One of the significant provisions of Senator MUSKIE's bill is that it will accomplish this result. I hope that in future hearings on the bill, we shall be able to detect the flaws in the present form of the supplemental grant program and eliminate them in our legislation.

In the second, and by far the more important of the 1967 amendments to the

Public Works and Economic Development Act, the regional Commissions were required to prepare a comprehensive long-range economic plan for their areas. I welcomed that amendment because it offered the opportunity for the regional Commission program to move beyond the study and demonstration project stage, into the area of comprehensive regional planning that has proved so effective in other Federal aid programs.

The 1967 amendment, however, was not adequate to fully reap the promise of the title V program. No one can deny the need for planning, research and study of regional problems, but the time is long past when funding should have become available for action programs. I believe that the regional Commissions must be given new authority to carry out the plans they have prepared, and to expand their demonstration projects into region-wide programs for the benefit of all citizens in the area.

Senator MUSKIE's bill makes a significant contribution toward meeting this need, because it amends the 1965 act by adding a new substantive provision authorizing regional Commissions to make action grants for innovative programs in their respective areas.

It is not clear, however, that even this new authority will be enough. For too long, we have taken too shortsighted an approach to the problem of regional development. Our approach has been piecemeal. One step at a time, we have sought to amend the 1965 act to avoid its most glaring deficiencies.

I believe the time has come for a comprehensive reexamination of the entire title V program. For more than 3 years, we have gained extensive experience under that program. It is clear, however, that we are ready to do more. We are now in a position to make a fundamental reappraisal of the title V program. We should treat the 1965 act as a pilot program, on which we can build new and more enduring legislation that will enable the concept of regional development to bear full fruit.

There is an obvious precedent for such action, a precedent that closely parallels the chronology of the present case. In September 1965, we passed the Law Enforcement Assistance Act, a modest program of Federal aid to State and local law enforcement. Last year, profiting by 3 years of experience under the 1965 act, we enacted title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, which provides a comprehensive program of Federal planning grants, action grants, and research grants to assist State and local law enforcement. As we have all recognized, the new safe streets program has immense potential for combating crime throughout the Nation. It also offers us a guidepost by which the experience of the title V economic development program can be transformed into more effective legislation.

There are many goals that we can seek to accomplish through expanded regional development programs. Many of the proposals that I have most strongly urged in the New England area in recent years can be carried out once the title V pro-

gram is appropriately enlarged. For example:

We can implement an effective region-wide transportation policy, especially in the case of high-speed rail transportation and improved intraregional airports and air transportation.

We can implement effective programs for comprehensive control of the environment, including control of air and water pollution, open space and beautification programs, and new approaches to problems of urban and rural development.

We can implement a comprehensive plan for regional health centers and for the delivery of health and medical services to all parts of the New England region, especially in its sparsely populated areas.

We can improve the training and flow of skilled manpower, especially for disadvantaged individuals and minority groups in the area.

We can undertake a broad program to develop new towns in the area.

We can establish substantial new programs to train officials of State and local governments, with special emphasis on the use of modern techniques and information for planning and providing basic governmental services.

Programs such as these, of course, are not peculiar to the New England area alone. Regional development is a concept that can produce fertile programs in all parts of the country, and it is time for the Senate to take broad action to encourage such programs.

I therefore welcome Senator MUSKIE's bill to upgrade the regional Commission program, not only because it removes a major deficiency in the underlying legislation, but also because it offers us the opportunity to take a fresh new look at the entire problem of regional coordination and development. I am happy to lend my support to these efforts, and I look forward to the day when we can achieve the goal of the cause I have advocated for so long.

#### S. 1091—INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO AMEND THE FISH AND WILDLIFE ACT OF 1956

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the proposed fish inspection legislation may be costly to certain processors. This expense will not result from hiring inspectors, a cost that the Federal Government will bear, but from complying with the processing standards promulgated by the Government. If there were no sanitation problem, there would be no legislation. But since there are problems, it is going to be expensive for some persons to upgrade their facilities so that they will be able to meet the minimum Federal standards.

It is extremely difficult to estimate what the costs to industry actually may be. Obviously they will vary from plant to plant depending upon individual conditions. In some cases, the costs of improving facilities, vessels, and equipment may be such that companies will elect to close their doors rather than meet the expense. In other cases, mergers may take place. But in either case the result may be an unfortunate trend toward economic concentration, with the accom-

panying threat of a reduction in competition within the fishing industry.

Such an eventuality would play a cruel hoax upon the consumer we are seeking to help, and it is a result which we must seek to avoid. Both technical and financial assistance to the industry from the Federal Government may help ease this transition to more rigorous processing procedures. As a result I am introducing on behalf of myself, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. INOUE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. METCALF, Mr. STEVENS, and Mr. YARBOROUGH, a bill which would amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to provide technical and financial assistance to the commercial fishing industry in meeting the requirements of the Wholesome Fish and Fishery Products Act of 1969. The proposal would give the Department of the Interior specific authority to provide technical assistance and to make loans to the commercial fishing industry in meeting the requirements of the new legislation. It would increase the fisheries loan fund by \$15 million for that purpose.

To my way of thinking, the health of the marketplace is nearly as important as the health of the consumer who shops there. I earnestly hope that this technical and financial assistance program will enable us to pass meaningful inspection legislation without producing any adverse effect on competition within the fishing industry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this bill appear at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 1091) to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to provide technical and financial assistance to the commercial fishing industry in meeting the requirements of the Wholesome Fish and Fishery Products Act of 1969, introduced by Mr. HART (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1091

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 4 of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 1121; 16 U.S.C. 742c) is amended—

(1) by inserting before the period at the end of subsection (a) the following: "or new or operating establishments processing fish and fishery products subject to regulations issued under the Wholesome Fish and Fishery Products Act of 1969 and subject to the enactment of such Act";

(2) by inserting immediately after the word "gear" in the first sentence of subsection (b) (4) the words "and establishments processing fish and fishery products", and by inserting before the period at the end of such sentence the phrase "and commercial fish processors";

(3) by inserting immediately after the word "applicant" in subsection (b) (5) the words "for a loan relating to vessels or gear", and by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The applicant for a loan relating to an establishment processing fish and fishery products shall have the ability, experience, resources, and other qualifications necessary to operate and maintain the

establishment in a sound business-like manner."; and

(4) by amending the last sentence of subsection (c) of such section to read as follows: "There is authorized to be appropriated to the fisheries loan fund the sum of \$35,000,000 to provide initial capital."

Sec. 2. Section 7(a) of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 1122; 16 U.S.C. 742f(a)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (5) and (6); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) a new paragraph to read as follows:

"(4) provide technical assistance to the commercial fishing industry in developing economically feasible technical improvements to meet any standards of sanitation and quality control for the processing of fish and fishery products promulgated under the Wholesome Fish and Fishery Products Act of 1969 and any other provisions of such Act, upon the enactment of such Act, and to assure that the processing of all fish and fishery products fully complies with such standards;"

#### S. 1092—INTRODUCTION OF THE WHOLESOME FISH AND FISHERY PRODUCTS ACT OF 1969

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I rise to introduce on behalf of myself, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. FONG, Mr. GOODELL, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. INOUE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PERCY, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, the Wholesome Fish and Fishery Products Act of 1969. This bill is the third of three recent major proposals designed to safeguard the wholesomeness and quality of our Nation's food supply. The first, the Wholesome Meat Act, was signed into law by President Johnson on December 15, 1967. It extends to intrastate processors of meat the same sanitation and quality control requirements that have existed for interstate processors since the early years of this century. The second bill, the Wholesome Poultry Products Act, was signed into law by President Johnson on August 18, 1968. It also requires continuous inspection of both interstate and intrastate processing activities in order to guarantee that the consumer who buys poultry products can be confident in their wholesomeness and quality. For a good many years, however, our third high-protein food—fish—has had the weakest inspection and quality control program of the three. And the result of this oversight has been a product which occasionally can endanger a person's health and which always varies widely in quality.

Over the past decade meat and poultry consumption has increased substantially in the United States, so that in 1967 each person consumed an average of 178 pounds of red meat and nearly 46 pounds of poultry. At the same time, however, consumption of fish and fishery products has remained relatively stable at about 11 pounds per person each year. This wide disparity in the consumption of the different varieties of high-protein food products need not exist. Unquestionably consumer doubt about the quality of fishery products accounts for much of their poor market acceptance.

In the 90th Congress I sponsored two bills which would provide for the inspection of fish and fishery products. The Commerce Committee, to which these bills were referred, held 5 days of hearings on fish inspection—two in July of 1967, and three in April of 1968. Testimony at these hearings disclosed many serious deficiencies in fish handling and in sanitary practices employed by the fish processing industry.

A speech by Deputy Commissioner Rankin of the Food and Drug Administration, for example, which is included in the July 1967 hearings, described conditions in the smoked fish industry. He stated that an examination of 15 plants engaged in smoked fish processing disclosed that 13 were operated under conditions which were judged to be potentially dangerous and six of these were judged to be imminently hazardous to consumers of the finished product. To illustrate these findings, he quoted from a report on one of these processors:

The fish were hung on wooden sticks for the processing operation. The sticks and nails were encrusted with rotten fish scales and particles from previous batches. The top of the table, on which the raw fish were scraped and gutted, was pitted. Debris from previous batches of fish were trapped in the knicked table top since no attempt was made to clean and sanitize the table between operations. These residues served to contaminate all batches of fish that passed over the table. No attempt was made to clean the rusty wire dip nets that were used to remove the fish from the thawing and brining casks. The nets had buildups of bits of rotten fish flesh and entrails.

Since that time, the smoked fish industry has worked closely with FDA in developing vastly improved processing procedures. But FDA inspection reports contained in the April 1968 hearings indicate that unsanitary processing conditions can still be found in nearly every segment of the fishing industry.

The 1967 hearings quite clearly established that as a result of these poor conditions, the consumer of fishery products is frequently shortchanged in the quality of the product he buys. Articles from Consumer Reports magazine which are reprinted in the hearings reveal that 50 percent of the frozen breaded fish portions which were tested by the Consumer's Union were judged substandard and 17 out of 18 salmon steaks sampled were rancid. Tests conducted by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries which also appear in the hearings confirm that a startling percentage of a wide variety of fishery products should be classified as "substandard" or "grade not certified": 55.5 percent of frozen fish portions; 26.2 percent of frozen halibut steaks; 43.2 percent of haddock filets; 37.7 percent of breaded shrimp; 32.4 percent of flounder or sole filets; 52.4 percent of cod filets; and 69 percent of ocean perch filets. In short, these figures may well reveal why the annual consumption of fish in this country has remained at that surprisingly low level of 11 pounds per capita.

Similarly, testimony at our 1968 hearings emphasized that the unsanitary processing conditions in segments of the industry might even raise serious questions about the wholesomeness of the

marketed product. Assistant Secretary Philip Lee of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, testified for example:

In 1963, inadequate safeguards in processing smoked lake fish resulted in a major outbreak of botulism; nine persons died. During one weekend in 1966, about 400 cases of Salmonella poisoning were reported; the illness was directly attributable to smoked fish. Investigations found unsatisfactory sanitary controls and many sources of contamination in the processing plants.

In 1966, more than 250 cases of food poisoning were reported in one city; imported shrimp was identified as the cause.

Infectious hepatitis has been linked to shellfish in four different incidents since 1964. A total of 309 confirmed cases of hepatitis has been traced to shellfish from four eastern coastal areas. These are some of the reported cases. No one knows how many cases of illness attributable to fish go unreported every year. Clearly, unless consumer protection methods are strengthened, further cases of disease or death may be anticipated.

It is difficult for me to believe that in the midst of the space age, large numbers of Americans are becoming seriously ill each year because certain fish processors are still observing quality and sanitation standards which are reminiscent of conditions prevailing in the 19th century. Yet the statistics clearly indicate a startling annual cost in disfigurement, severe illness, or even death from the consumption of fishery products. There is no justification for forcing consumers to play this dangerous game of roulette every time they shop for fish in their local market.

And the severe economic consequences of such health scares to all processors in any indicated segment of the industry are readily imaginable. The 1967 hearings support the worst estimates with hard figures: In 1962 Chicago received 3,700,000 pounds of chubs. In October 1963 the botulism incident referred to earlier broke out, was traced to smoked chubs, and received wide publicity. That year chub receipts in Chicago fell off to 2,700,000 pounds and declined further in 1964 to 1,600,000 pounds—less than half the 1962 figure. Not until 1965, when receipts were back to 3½ million pounds, had the industry recovered from the adverse effects of the health scare.

Unfortunately, the fishing industry is not well adapted to make the improvements which these figures indicate are so essential. The consumer, who purchases a fish product and wants to make sure that the product he is buying is not contaminated, is forced to rely nearly entirely upon the processor. And the well-intentioned processor may nevertheless be forced to cut corners because of the economic pressure exerted by those competitors who process poor quality fish, whenever they think they can sell them, because their costs will be reduced and profits widened. In such a competitive situation, the best available method to upgrade standards is to impose, through law, minimum standards of sanitation and quality control which are to be observed in all fish processing operations. The physical welfare of numerous consumers demands that we do so.

The bill which I introduce today is designed both to protect consumers of

fish products and to improve the economic position of the fishing industry. It authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make a survey of the fishing industry and, within 1 year after the effective date of the act, to issue such minimum standards of sanitation and quality control for the processing of fish and fishery products. These standards would become effective 1 year after they are promulgated and would apply to fish processing establishments, fishing vessels, and transportation and storage facilities. The Secretary would have the authority to amend or revise these standards from time to time.

To insure that the quality control and sanitation standards are properly observed, the bill would require continuous inspection of all fish processing plants and periodic inspection of fishing vessels and transportation and storage facilities. For interstate plants, the inspection would be conducted by Federal inspectors. For intrastate processors, however, inspection would be conducted by State officials in those States which establish inspection programs which are "at least equal" to the Federal program. Where a State does not have such a program, inspection would be conducted by Federal inspectors. Federal funds would be available to help States establish their own programs, however.

Under the bill, all fish products would be required to bear an official mark or official inspection legend before they can be sold at retail. No product could bear such a mark or legend unless it had been processed under continuous inspection. Nor could it bear the official mark or legend unless all labels or packages had first been approved by the Secretary who would determine that the article was not misbranded. This requirement is similar to provisions contained in both the meat and poultry laws.

To guarantee that the consumer will be adequately protected in purchasing any fish product, and to make sure that domestic processors are not placed at any competitive disadvantage, the bill also provides that no edible fish or fishery product can be imported into the United States unless it was processed in a country which had an inspection program "at least equal to" our own. In other words, any foreign country desiring to export fish to the U.S. market would be required to institute a continuous inspection program to enforce sanitation and quality control standards which are equal to or superior to those required for U.S. vessels and processing plants.

Thus, the bill I am introducing today would create a comprehensive fish inspection program comparable to those which presently exist for meat and poultry. The basic provisions of this bill are identical to those contained in S. 2958 in the 90th Congress—a proposal sent to Congress by the Johnson administration. It contains certain changes, however, which reflect criticisms of that bill. To simplify any analysis of this new proposal, I shall briefly itemize the 10 most significant changes:

First. The new bill specifically provides for the sanitation of shellfish growing waters, as well as for continuous inspec-

tion of shellfish processing plants. Although officials from HEW testified last year that they would interpret S. 2958 as authorizing them to set standards for the sanitation of shellfish growing waters as well as for plants and vessels, this new version makes absolutely clear that shellfish are to be included in the whole-some fish program.

Second. The new bill restricts the Secretary's authority to suspend a processor's certificate. Under this new proposal, the Secretary would no longer be empowered to suspend a certificate for "failure to comply with a lawful order for condemnation or detention." And where the certificate is to be suspended because processing activities may pose "imminent harm to consumers," this new version provides that such a determination cannot be delegated to a nonsupervisory official or employee of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Third. The new bill broadens a processor's rights in a condemnation proceeding. Last year's bill contained a provision stating that if any fish or fishery products were found to be adulterated, they should be immediately condemned, and it provided that failure to comply with an order for condemnation would be grounds for suspension of a processor's certificate. The new bill provides that fish or fishery products are to be immediately destroyed only if no appeal is taken from the order of condemnation. In other words, it insures that the evidence can be preserved when the condemnation order is contested without jeopardizing a processor's right to continue his operations.

Fourth. The new bill clarifies the manufacturer's obligation to pay for overtime inspection. Last year's bill would have required that a processor pay the full cost of any overtime or holiday inspection. Because of the vagaries of the fish processing business—where the time of harvesting and landing fresh fish is normally beyond the processor's control, and the necessity is great for processing them as quickly as possible—the new bill provides that overtime pay is to be borne by the processor only when the processing is conducted at odd hours solely because it is convenient for the manufacturer and not when it is due to the unpredictability of fish harvesting.

Fifth. The bill confers authority on the Secretary to exempt fish houses from the requirement of continuous inspection. At last year's hearing we heard testimony that the fishing industry includes many fish houses where fresh fish are stored prior to shipment to retail markets or to processing plants. Although, these fish houses would normally come under the bill's definition of a processing establishment, there is little sense in requiring continuous inspection of a building where fish are merely iced or refrigerated and stored, but are not actually cut up. This new provision, therefore, would permit the Secretary to set standards for fish houses and to waive the requirement of continuous inspection.

Sixth. The new bill makes clear that continuous inspection will not exempt a manufacturer from product liability under common law. Although, undoubtedly,

the original bill would not have been construed to restrict the rights of an individual who had consumed an unwholesome product to proceed against the manufacturer, the new bill specifically states that he will retain this right.

Seventh. The new bill clarifies the Secretary's right to amend sanitation or quality control standards from time to time after the initial standards have been issued.

Eighth. The new bill eliminates the Secretary's discretion to order less than continuous inspection when plants are located geographically near one another. At last year's hearings several processors complained that such a provision was inequitable, since it might subject some processors to less rigorous observation than others. As a result this provision has been eliminated.

Ninth. The new bill makes clear that the official inspection mark or legend need not appear on bulk containers used to ship fish or fishery products between processors prior to their packaging for final sale.

Tenth. The new bill provides an exemption for fish imported into the United States by sports fishermen who catch these fish outside the United States and desire to bring them home for personal consumption.

Briefly then, these are the major changes which we have made in last year's fish inspection bill. I hope they will eliminate some of the objectionable features of that bill. Hopefully, these changes will narrow differences over the bill to one or two major areas.

Assuring the wholesomeness and high quality of our Nation's food supply should be one of the primary objectives of the Federal Government in the consumer field. To do so, however, it is imperative that we raise the standards presently observed in the processing of fish. Since this is the major gap presently existing in our food inspection laws, I anticipate that this proposal will be one of the major consumer bills in the 91st Congress. I hope that we can work constructively with the fishing industry to pass, as quickly as possible, an effective bill which will benefit both processors and consumers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this bill appear at this point in my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 1092) to regulate interstate commerce by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for the inspection of facilities used in the harvesting and processing of fish and fishery products for commercial purposes, for the inspection of fish and fishery products, and for cooperation with the States in the regulation of intrastate commerce with respect to State fish inspection programs, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HART (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## S. 1092

*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 "Wholesome Fish and Fishery Products Act of 1969."*

## CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS

SEC. 2. Fish and fishery products are an important source of the Nation's total supply of food. These foods are consumed throughout the Nation and the major portion of the supply moves in interstate commerce, some from foreign sources. It is essential that the health and welfare of consumers be protected by assuring that fish and fishery products distributed to them are of good quality, wholesome, not adulterated, and are properly marked, labeled, and packaged. Fish or fishery products which do not meet these standards depress markets for wholesome, not adulterated, and properly labeled and packaged fish and fishery products. Those articles that are unwholesome, adulterated, of poor quality, mislabeled, or deceptively packaged compete unfairly with articles that are of good quality, wholesome, not adulterated, and properly labeled and packaged, to the detriment of commercial fishermen, processors, and consumers of fish and fishery products. It is hereby found that all fish and fishery products regulated under this Act are either in interstate or foreign commerce or substantially affect such commerce, and that Federal regulation and cooperation by the States and other jurisdictions as contemplated by this Act (including cooperation through federally approved state programs for control of shellfish growing areas and shellfish harvesting), are appropriate to prevent and eliminate burdens upon such commerce, to effectively regulate such commerce, and to protect the health and welfare of the consumer.

## WHOLESALE FISH AND FISHERY PRODUCTS AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

## DEFINITIONS

SEC. 101. Section 201, as amended, of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is further amended by adding at the end of such section the following new paragraphs:

"(y) (1) The term 'fish' means any aquatic animal, including amphibians, or part thereof capable of use as human food.

"(2) The term 'shellfish', as used in sections 402(f), 421, and 423, means any species of oyster, clam, or mussel, either shucked or in the shell, and either fresh, or frozen or otherwise processed, or any part thereof.

"(z) The term 'fishery products' means any product capable of use as human food which is made wholly or in part from any fish or portion thereof, except products which contain fish only in small proportions or historically have not been, in the judgment of the Secretary, considered by consumers as products of the commercial fishing industry, and which are exempted from definition as a fishery product by the Secretary under such conditions as he may prescribe to assure that the fish or portions thereof contained therein are not adulterated and that such products are not represented as fishery products.

"(aa) The term 'capable of use as human food' applies to any fish or part or product thereof, unless it is denatured or otherwise identified as required by regulations prescribed by the Secretary to deter its use as human food, or unless it is naturally inedible by humans.

"(bb) The terms 'process', 'processed', and 'processing', with respect to fish or fishery products, mean to harvest, handle, store, prepare, produce, manufacture, process, pack, transport, or hold such products.

"(cc) The term 'official mark' means the official inspection legend or any other symbol prescribed by regulations of the Secre-

tary to identify the status of any fish or fishery product under this Act.

"(dd) The term 'official inspection legend' means any symbol prescribed by regulations of the Secretary showing that an article is in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

"(ee) The term 'official inspection certificate' means any certificate prescribed by regulations of the Secretary for issuance by an inspector or other person performing official functions under this Act.

"(ff) The term 'official device' means any device prescribed or authorized by the Secretary for use in applying any official mark.

"(gg) The term 'vessel' means any watercraft of any description which is engaged in the processing of fish for landing and human consumption in any State.

"(hh) The term 'continuous inspection' means the application of inspection by a full-time inspector.

"(ii) The term 'inspector' means an individual appointed or commissioned as an officer or employee of the Department and authorized by the Secretary to inspect articles under the authority of this Act."

## PROHIBITED ACTS

SEC. 102. Section 301, as amended, of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act is further amended by adding at the end of such section the following new paragraph:

"(r) Without authorization from the Secretary or contrary to regulations prescribed by him, casting, printing, lithographing, or otherwise making, simulating, using, or failing to use, altering, defacing, detaching, or destroying any form of official mark, official inspection legend, official inspection certificate, or official device; possessing, without promptly notifying the Secretary thereof, any forged, counterfeited, simulated, or improperly altered form of official mark, official inspection legend, official inspection certificate or official device; forging, counterfeiting, simulating, improperly altering any form of official mark, official inspection legend, official inspection certificate, or official device; making any false statement in any shipper's or other certificate provided for in regulations; or falsely or misleadingly representing that any fish or fishery product has been inspected and passed or exempted from such inspection.

"(s) The processing of any fish or fishery products in any establishment or vessel preparing any such article in violation of the requirements of part B of chapter IV and regulations prescribed pursuant thereto.

"(t) The importation of fish and fishery products in violation of section 410(i).

"(u) The failure to maintain, or to afford access to, records as required by section 411 (b)."

## ADULTERATION

SEC. 103. Section 402, as amended, of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is further amended by adding at the end of such section the following new paragraph:

"(f) (1) If it is, or it bears or contains, any fish or fishery product, and it has been processed, stored, or handled in violation of section 410 or 411 or any regulations issued by the Secretary under such sections.

"(2) If it is, or is a product made or derived in whole or in part from, shellfish and such shellfish (A) was harvested in a State or foreign country that did not at the time of harvesting have in effect (1) an annual State plan for classification and control of shellfish growing areas and for regulation and control of shellfish harvesting practices, approved by the Secretary on the basis of standards promulgated by him by regulation, or (ii) in the case of a foreign country, a shellfish control program at least equal to such standards; or (b) was not harvested, or was not purified after harvesting, in conformity with such State plan or foreign program; or (c) was harvested in a growing area that has been declared closed for such pur-

poses by regulation of the Secretary on the basis of a finding of necessity for the protection of the public health."

**INSPECTION OF FISH AND FISHERY PRODUCTS, ESTABLISHMENTS, AND VESSELS**

SEC. 104. Chapter IV of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is further amended (1) by inserting "PART A—GENERAL" immediately below the chapter heading, and (2) by adding at the end of such chapter the following:

**"PART B—FISH AND FISHERY PRODUCTS**

**"Subpart 1—Inspection and Regulation of Products, Establishments, and Vessels**

"SEC. 410. (a) **GOOD MANUFACTURING PRACTICES.**—The Secretary shall, either directly or by contract, make, by experts in sanitation or other competent persons, such survey of as many establishments in the United States and vessels which process fish and fishery products for interstate commerce as he deems appropriate to inform himself concerning the operations and sanitary conditions thereof for the purpose of developing adequate standards of good manufacturing practices, including but not limited to sanitation and quality control, under which such establishments and vessels shall be maintained and operated. The Secretary shall thereafter by regulation prescribe standards of sanitation and quality control for the processing of fish and fishery products which shall be applicable to persons covered by this part, and he may from time to time amend such regulations. The initial regulations pursuant to this subsection shall be issued within one year after funds are first appropriated to carry out the provisions of this part. Regulations (including amendments to regulations) prescribed pursuant to this subsection shall become effective upon the date specified in the order prescribing them, but the initial regulations shall become effective one year after the date on which such regulations have been issued, unless the Secretary finds that additional time, not in excess of one year, is necessary to place all or any part of such regulations into effect. On and after the effective date of such regulations no person shall process for interstate commerce fish or fishery products in any establishment under his control without complying with such regulations.

"(b) **CERTIFICATION OF ESTABLISHMENTS AND VESSELS.**—Thirty-sixty days after the effective date of such regulations, no person shall process for interstate commerce fish or fishery products in any establishment or vessel under his control unless there is in effect for such establishment or vessel a certificate of registration issued by the Secretary. The Secretary shall issue such a certificate upon application accompanied by such assurance as may be required by regulations that such establishment or vessel is and will be maintained in compliance with applicable standards. The Secretary may deny the certificate of registration if an adequate assurance of compliance is not presented, and the denial shall be subject to the opportunity for hearing and judicial review provided by section 412.

"(c) **SUSPENSION AND REINSTATEMENT OF CERTIFICATES.**—The certificate of registration of any establishment or vessel may be suspended, after opportunity for hearing, for failure to comply with the requirements of this subpart. The certificate may be immediately suspended by the Secretary (1) for failure to permit access for inspection, or (2) where an inspection or investigation discloses violation of any provision of this chapter or any regulation issued thereunder which the Secretary determines would involve an undue risk of imminent harm to consumers if processing were to continue prior to the correction of such violation: *Provided*, That the authority conferred by this sentence may not be delegated to a nonsupervisory officer or

employee of the Department. The holder of such suspended certificate may at any time apply for reinstatement, and the Secretary shall immediately grant such reinstatement if he finds that adequate measures have been taken to comply with the provisions of this chapter and the regulations. Suspension of a certificate and the denial of reinstatement shall be subject to the procedures provided by section 412, but a summary suspension shall remain in effect during the pendency of the administrative proceeding under that section. In the event of any judicial proceeding relating to such summary suspension before the proceeding under section 412 the only issue to be judicially determined shall be whether the Secretary had reasonable cause under the circumstances of the case to take summary action.

"(d) **INSPECTION.**—For the purpose of preventing the use in interstate commerce of fish or fishery products which are adulterated or misbranded, the Secretary shall cause to be made, by inspectors appointed by him for that purpose, a continuous inspection of each establishment where fish or fishery products are processed for interstate commerce. For the same purposes, the Secretary, at his discretion, may require that adequate inspections be made, by inspectors appointed for that purpose, of vessels processing fish or fishery products for interstate commerce. Any inspector appointed for the purposes of this title shall at any time have access to any establishment or vessel where fish or fishery products are processed for interstate commerce. Denial of access to such inspector shall be ground for suspension of the certificate of registration. The Secretary, whenever processing operations are being conducted, may, at his discretion, provide for the sampling, detention, and reinspection of fish or fishery products at each such establishment or vessel. Any fish or fishery products found to be adulterated shall be immediately condemned and segregated and shall, if no appeal is taken from the inspector's determination of condemnation or if upon completion of an appeal inspection such condemnation is sustained, be destroyed for human food purposes under the supervision of an inspector: *Provided*, That any fish or fishery products which may be reprocessing be made not adulterated shall not be so condemned and destroyed if reprocessed under the supervision of an inspector and thereafter found not to be adulterated. Failure to comply with the requirements of the preceding sentence shall be ground for suspension of the certificate of registration. An appeal under this subsection from the determination of condemnation shall be at the cost of the appellant if the Secretary determines that the appeal was frivolous. The cost of inspection (other than any cost of appeal determined to be payable by the appellant pursuant to the preceding sentence) shall be borne by the United States, except that the cost of overtime and holiday pay for inspection service performed, in an establishment subject to inspection, at the convenience of the establishment and not owing to conditions of harvesting or processing beyond the control of the establishment, shall, at such rates as the Secretary may determine in accordance with regulations, be borne by such establishment. Sums received by the Secretary in reimbursement for sums paid out by him for such premium pay work shall be available without fiscal year limitation to carry out the purposes of this section.

"(e) **USE OF THE OFFICIAL MARK AND OFFICIAL INSPECTION LEGEND.**—When fish or fishery products are processed for interstate commerce in an establishment holding an unsuspended certificate of registration and are placed or packed in any container or wrapper, the person processing such products shall, at the time they leave the establishment, cause a label to be attached thereon which shall bear or contain the official mark

or official inspection legend except as may be otherwise authorized by regulation pursuant to clause (2) of section 405.

"(f) **LABELING AND PACKAGING.**—If the Secretary has reason to believe that any labeling or packaging in use or proposed for use with respect to any article subject to this subpart renders or would render such article misbranded, he may direct that such use be withheld, and the official mark or the official inspection legend not used, unless the labeling and packaging is modified in such manner as he may prescribe to comply fully with this Act. If the person using or proposing to use such labeling or packaging does not accept the determination of the Secretary, such person may request a hearing, but the use of such labeling or packaging shall, if the Secretary so directs, be withheld pending hearing and final determination by the Secretary. Any such determination by the Secretary shall be subject to the opportunity for hearing and judicial review provided by section 412.

"(g) **TRADE NAMES AND ESTABLISHED PACKAGES.**—Established trade names or other labeling and packaging which are not false or misleading in any particular and which are approved by the Secretary are permitted.

"(h) **STORAGE OR HANDLING REGULATIONS.**—The Secretary may by regulation prescribe conditions under which fish or fishery products capable of use as human food shall be stored or otherwise handled by any person engaged in the business of buying, selling, freezing, storing, or transporting, in or for interstate commerce, or importing such articles, whenever the Secretary deems such action necessary to assure that such articles will not be adulterated, misbranded, or otherwise in violation of this Act when delivered to the consumer. Violation of any such regulation is prohibited, and fish and fishery products stored or handled in violation of such regulation shall be deemed adulterated under section 402(f) of the Act. Such regulations shall not apply to the storage or handling of such articles at any retail store or other establishment any State that would be subject to this section only because of purchases in interstate commerce, if the storage and handling of such articles at such establishment are regulated, under the laws of the State in which such establishment is located, in a manner which the Secretary, after consultation with the appropriate advisory committee provided for in section 421(a) of this Act, determines is adequate to effectuate the purposes of this subsection.

"(i) **IMPORTATION OF FISH AND FISHERY PRODUCTS.**—After the effective date of regulations issued under this subpart—

"(1) no fish or fishery products shall be imported into the United States if such articles are adulterated or misbranded or otherwise fail to comply with all the inspection, good manufacturing practice, and other provisions of this Act and regulations issued thereunder applicable to such articles in commerce within the United States: *Provided*, That whenever it shall be determined by the Secretary, in the case of any foreign country, that the system of plant and vessel inspection of fish and fishery products is at least equal to all the inspection, good manufacturing practice, and other provisions of this Act and regulations issued thereunder, and that reliance can be placed on certificates required by regulation of the Secretary as to compliance with the country's inspection, good manufacturing practice, and other requirements, the Secretary may accept such certificates as compliance with the comparable requirements of this subpart: *Provided further*, That any fish or fishery products covered by such certificates shall be marked and labeled as required by regulations for such imported articles: *And provided further*, That (A) nothing in this section shall apply to a person who purchases fish outside the United States for consumption by himself

or members of his household except that the total amount of such fish shall not exceed fifty pounds; and (B) the Secretary may further, by or pursuant to regulation, exempt from all or any part of this section, on such terms and conditions as he may deem appropriate, fish that are caught by an individual in the bona fide pursuit of sport and not for commercial purposes in waters outside the United States and that are brought into the United States by such individual by himself or members of his household.

"(2) The Secretary may prescribe, under section 801 of this Act, the terms and conditions of the destruction of all such articles which are imported contrary to this section, unless (1) they are exported by the consignee within the time fixed therefor by the Secretary, or (2) in the case of articles which are not in compliance with this Act solely because of misbranding, such articles are brought into compliance with the Act under supervision of authorized representatives of the Secretary.

"(3) For the purpose of facilitating enforcement of this section and reducing the costs thereof, the importation of fish or fishery products into any port in the United States, except such as may be designated by the Secretary with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury is prohibited.

#### "ADMINISTRATIVE AND AUXILIARY PROVISIONS

"SEC. 411. (a) WITHHOLDING, WITHDRAWING, AND REINSTATING CERTIFICATES.—The Secretary (for such period, or indefinitely, as he deems necessary to effectuate the purposes of this Act) may withdraw withhold a certificate of registration under section 410 or may suspend or withdraw such a certificate issued under that section, with respect to any establishment if he determines that the applicant or holder of such certificate is unfit to engage in any business requiring a certificate under that section because such person, or anyone responsibly connected with him, has been convicted, in any Federal or State court, within the previous ten years of (1) any felony, or more than one misdemeanor, based upon the acquiring, handling, or distributing of adulterated, mislabeled, or deceptively packaged food or fraud in connection with transactions in food; or (2) any felony involving fraud, bribery, extortion, or any other act or circumstance indicating a lack of the integrity needed for the conduct of operations affecting the public health. This section shall not affect in any way other provisions of this Act for suspension of a certificate under section 410. For the purpose of this section, a person shall be deemed to be responsibly connected with the business if he was a partner, officer, director, holder or owner of 10 per centum or more of its voting stock, or employee in a managerial or executive capacity. Withholding, withdrawal, and refusal to reinstate a certificate under this section shall be subject to the opportunity for hearing and judicial review provided by section 412.

"(b) MAINTENANCE AND RETENTION OF RECORDS.—For the purpose of enforcing the provisions of this Act, persons engaged in the business of processing fish or fishery products for human consumption in interstate commerce or holding such products after transportation in interstate commerce shall maintain accurate records showing to the extent that they are concerned therewith, the receipt, delivery, sale, movement, or disposition of fish or fishery products and shall, upon the request of the Secretary, permit him at reasonable times to have access to and to copy all such records. Any record required to be maintained by this section shall be maintained for two years after the transaction which is the subject of such record has taken place.

"(c) ADMINISTRATIVE DETENTION OF FISH OR FISHERY PRODUCTS.—Whenever any fish or fishery product is found by any authorized representative of the Secretary upon any

premises where it is held for purposes of, or during or after distribution in, interstate commerce or otherwise subject to this Act, and there is reason to believe that any such article is adulterated, or misbranded or otherwise in violation of the provisions of this Act or of any other Federal law, or that such article has been or is intended to be distributed in violation of any such provisions, such fish or fishery products, if not otherwise subject to condemnation under section 410(d), may be detained by such representative for a period not to exceed twenty days pending action under section 304 of this Act or notification of any Federal, State, or other governmental authorities having jurisdiction over such article, and shall not be moved by any person from the place at which it is located when so detained until released by such representative. Such fish or fishery product shall be detained in a suitable manner to prevent decomposition and the costs thereof shall be borne by the owner thereof. All official marks may be required by such representative to be removed from such article before it is released unless it appears to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the article is eligible to retain such marks.

"(d) INSPECTION EXEMPTIONS.—(1) The provisions of this subpart shall not apply to the processing by any person of fish of his own raising or harvesting, and the preparation by him and transportation in commerce of the fish or fishery products exclusively for use by him and members of his household and his nonpaying guests and employees, if such person does not engage in the business of buying or selling any fish or fishery products capable of use as human food.

"(2) The Secretary may, by regulation and under such conditions as to sanitary standards, practices, and procedures as he may prescribe, exempt from specific provisions of this subpart retail dealers with respect to fishery products sold directly to consumers in individual retail stores, if the only processing operations performed by such retail dealers are conducted on the premises where such sales to consumers are made. The Secretary may suspend or terminate any such exemption at any time with respect to any person, upon a finding that the conditions of exemption, prescribed by regulations, are not being met.

"(3) The Secretary may by regulation, under such conditions as to sanitary standards, practices, and procedures as he may prescribe, exempt from the requirement of continuous inspection imposed by the first sentence of section 410(d) any establishment, known in the trade as a 'fish house', in which no processing of fish or fishery products is performed except (A) the unloading of fresh whole fish from vessels into appropriate bulk containers, (B) icing or other refrigeration of such fish, and (C) prompt shipment thereof either (i) to an establishment subject to continuous inspection or (ii) to a retail dealer described in paragraph (2) of this subsection.

"(e) PROCESSORS OF INDUSTRIAL FISHERY PRODUCTS AND RELATED INDUSTRIES.—Inspection shall not be provided under this subpart of any establishment or vessel processing fish and fishery products which are not intended for use as human food, but such articles shall, prior to their offer for sale or transportation in interstate commerce, unless naturally inedible by humans, be denatured or otherwise identified as prescribed by regulations of the Secretary to deter their use for human food. No person shall buy, sell, transport, or offer for sale or transportation or receive for transportation, in commerce, or import, any fish or fishery products which are not intended for use as human food unless they are denatured or otherwise identified as required by the regulations of the Secretary or are naturally inedible by humans.

"OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING AND JUDICIAL REVIEW OF DENIAL, WITHHOLDING, SUSPENSION OR WITHDRAWAL OF CERTIFICATES AND WITHHOLDING OF APPROVAL OF LABELING OR PACKAGING

"SEC. 412. (a) OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING.—(1) Any person denied a certificate under section 410(b) or 411(a), or whose certificate has been suspended or who has been denied reinstatement under section 410(c), or who has been refused the official mark for proposed labeling or packaging under section 410(f), or from whom it is proposed to withdraw a certificate under section 411(a), may file objections thereto with the Secretary, specifying with particularity reasonable grounds for his objection, and request a hearing upon such objection. The Secretary shall afford an opportunity for a hearing on such objections, and shall expedite such hearing upon request. As soon as possible after the hearing, the Secretary shall act upon the objections.

"(2) Such order shall be based upon a fair evaluation of the entire record at such hearing, and shall contain findings of fact and conclusions on which the Secretary's action was based.

"(3) The Secretary shall grant such interim relief from any order suspending or withdrawing a certificate as he finds justified upon considering the interests of the person holding the certificate and the necessity for protection of the public health and the interest of consumers.

"(b) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—(1) Any person adversely affected by the Secretary's action on his objections may obtain judicial review by filing in the United States Court of Appeals for the circuit in which he resides or has his principal place of business, within sixty days after the entry of the Secretary's order, a petition for judicial review.

"(2) A copy of the petition shall be transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Secretary, and the Secretary shall file in the court the record of the proceeding. The findings of the Secretary with respect to questions of fact shall be sustained if based upon a fair evaluation of the entire record.

"(3) The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any order under this section shall be final subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code.

#### "Subpart 2—Federal and State Cooperation

"SEC. 421. (a) It is policy of the Congress to protect the consuming public from fish and fishery products that are adulterated, misbranded or otherwise in violation of this Act, and to assist in efforts by State or other Government agencies to accomplish this objective. In furtherance of this policy:

"(1) The Secretary is authorized, whenever he determines that it would effectuate the purposes of this Act, (A) to cooperate with the appropriate State agency in developing and administering a State fish and fishery products inspection program in any State which has enacted a State fish and fishery products inspection law that imposes mandatory inspection, reinspection, and sanitation requirements that are at least equal to those under subpart 1 of this part, and provisions of this Act related to such subpart, with respect to all or certain classes of persons engaged in the State in processing fish and fishery products for use as human food solely for distribution within such State; and (B) to cooperate with the appropriate State agency in the development of an effective State program (described in a State plan approved on an annual basis by the Secretary as meeting standards established by him) for the classification and control of shellfish growing areas and for regulation and control of shellfish harvesting practices, including shellfish intended for introduction into interstate commerce.

"(2) Cooperation with State agencies under this section may include furnishing to the appropriate State agency (A) advisory assistance in planning and otherwise developing an adequate State program under the State law, and (B) technical and laboratory assistance and training, including necessary curricular and instructional materials and equipment, and financial and other aid for administration of such program. Grants to any State under this section from Federal funds for any fiscal year shall not exceed 50 per centum of the estimated total cost of the cooperative program in such State. Such cooperation and payment shall be contingent at all times upon the administration of the State program in a manner which the Secretary, in consultation with the appropriate advisory committee appointed under paragraph (3), deems adequate to effectuate the purpose of this section.

"(3) The Secretary may appoint advisory committees consisting of such representatives of appropriate State agencies and representatives of consumers and industry as the Secretary and the State agencies may designate to consult with him concerning State and Federal programs with respect to fish inspection and other matters within the scope of this part, including evaluating State programs for purposes of this part, and obtaining better coordination and more uniformity among the State programs and between the Federal and State programs and adequate protection of consumers.

"(b) The appropriate State agency with which the Secretary may cooperate under this subpart shall be a single agency in the State which is primarily responsible for the coordination of the State programs having objectives similar to those under this Act: *Provided*, That with respect to the shellfish control program referred to in clause (B) of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) such State agency may, in the case of a State in which different functions of its shellfish control program are vested in different State agencies, be an interdepartmental agency if found by the Secretary to be consistent with the purposes of this Act, including this part. When the State program includes performance of certain functions by a municipality or other subordinate governmental unit, such unit shall be deemed to be a part of the State agency for purposes of this section.

"Sec. 422. (a) (1) If the Secretary believes, by thirty days prior to the expiration of two years after the effective date of regulations promulgated under this Act, that a State has failed to develop or is not enforcing, with respect to all establishments within its jurisdiction at which fish or fishery products are processed for use as human food for distribution solely within the State, inspection, reinspection, and sanitation requirements at least equal to those imposed under subpart 1 of this part and other provisions of this Act related to such subpart, he shall promptly notify the Governor of the State of this fact. If the Secretary determines, after consultation with the Governor of the State, or representative selected by him, that such requirements have not been developed and activated, he shall promptly after the expiration of such two-year period designate such State as one in which the provisions of such subpart 1 and related provisions of this Act shall apply to operations and transactions wholly within such State: *Provided*, That if the Secretary determines that there is reason to believe that the State will activate such requirements within one additional year, he may delay such designation for that period, and he shall in that event not designate the State if he further determines at the end of that period that the State then has such requirements in effective operation.

"(2) The Secretary shall publish any such designation in the Federal Register and, upon

the expiration of thirty days after such publication, the provisions of subpart 1 and other provisions of this Act related thereto shall apply to operations and transactions and to persons engaged therein in the State to the same extent and in the same manner as if such operations and transactions were conducted in or for interstate commerce.

"(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of this subpart, if the Secretary determines, at any time prior to designation of a State under this section, that any establishment within a State is producing adulterated fish or fishery products for distribution within such State which would clearly endanger the public health, he shall, with a view to achievement of effective action under State or local law, notify the Governor of the State and the appropriate advisory committee provided under this subpart of such fact. If the State does not take action to prevent such endangering of the public health within a reasonable time after such notice, as determined by the Secretary in the light of the risk to public health, the Secretary may forthwith designate any such establishment as subject to the provisions of subpart 1 and related provisions of this Act, and thereupon the establishment and operator thereof shall be subject to such provisions as though engaged in interstate commerce until such time as the Secretary determines that such State has developed and will enforce requirements at least equal to those imposed under such provisions.

"(b) Whenever the Secretary determines that any State designated under this section has developed and will enforce State fish inspection requirements at least equal to those imposed under subpart 1 and related provisions of this Act with respect to the operations and transactions within such State which are regulated under this subsection, he shall terminate the designation of such State under this section, but this shall not preclude the subsequent redesignation of the State at any time upon thirty days' notice to the Governor and publication of such notice in the Federal Register, and any State may be designated upon such notice and publication at any time after the period specified in this subsection, whether or not the State has theretofore been designated upon the Secretary determining that it is not effectively enforcing requirements at least equal to those imposed under such subpart and related provisions.

"(c) The Secretary shall promptly upon enactment of this subpart; and periodically thereafter but at least annually, review the requirements, including the enforcement thereof, of the States not designated under this section, with respect to the processing of fish or fishery production and inspection of such operations.

#### "STATE JURISDICTION

"Sec. 423. Requirements within the scope of subpart 1 of part B of this chapter with respect to any establishment or vessel at which a certificate of registration is required under subpart 1 of this part, which are in addition to or different from those made under such subpart may not be imposed by any State, except that any such jurisdiction may impose recordkeeping and other requirements within the scope of section 411(b) with respect to any such establishment. Marking, labeling, packaging, or ingredient requirements in addition to, or different from, those made under this Act may not be imposed by any State with respect to articles processed at any establishment or vessel in accordance with the requirements under such subpart, but any State may, consistent with the requirements under this Act, exercise concurrent jurisdiction with the Secretary over articles inspected under such subpart, for the purpose of preventing the distribution for human food purposes of any such articles which

are adulterated or misbranded and are outside of such an establishment, or, in the case of imported articles which are not at such an establishment, after their entry into the United States. Nothing in this section shall be construed to preclude the establishment and operation and enforcement of a State shellfish program (meeting Federal standards and administered under an annual plan approved by the Secretary) for classification and control of growing areas and for regulation and control of harvesting practices for shellfish, including shellfish intended for introduction in interstate commerce. This Act shall not preclude any State from making requirements or taking other action, consistent with such subpart, with respect to any other matters not regulated thereunder.

#### INTERDEPARTMENTAL COOPERATION

"Sec. 424. (a) There shall be consultation between the Secretary and the Secretary of the Interior prior to the issuance of standards under this Act applicable to fish or fishery products. There shall also be consultation between the Secretary and an appropriate advisory committee provided for in this Act, prior to the issuance of such standards under this Act, to avoid, insofar as feasible, inconsistency between Federal and State standards.

"(b) For the purpose of facilitating enforcement and reducing the costs thereof, the Secretary may utilize by agreement, with or without reimbursement, law enforcement officers or other personnel and facilities of other Federal agencies to carry out the provisions of this Act. The Secretary is also encouraged to enter into agreements or other arrangements, with or without reimbursement, with any State in carrying out the provisions of this Act, including enforcement."

#### OTHER LAWS

Sec. 105. (a) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the amendments made by this Act shall not derogate from any authority conferred upon any Federal officer, employee, or agency by the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act prior to enactment of this Act, by the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act, by the Public Health Service Act, or by any other Act.

(b) Continuous inspection under, and compliance with the requirements prescribed by or pursuant to, the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (including the amendments made thereto by the Wholesome Fish and Fishery Products Act) with respect to fish and fishery products shall not exempt any person from any liability under common or State law.

#### WHOLESOME FISH ACT

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have today cosponsored the bill introduced by the senior Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) which he designates the Wholesome Fish and Fishery Products Act of 1969. I have also cosponsored his bill which would provide both the technical and financial assistance to the commercial fishing industry which might be needed to assist them in meeting the requirements of the Wholesome Fish Act.

I have cosponsored these two measures with serious reservations, but I have cosponsored them. I attach my name to these two measures because I believe America's commercial fishing industries must produce a product of high quality and unquestioned wholesomeness. The consumer, when he buys fish in the market, must be certain beyond doubt that the product he buys is all that he has every right to expect it to be.

The fishing industry has failed to

grow. While our citizens eat more meat and poultry than they used to, our consumption of fish has remained at a constant level. Fish is a rich source of protein. It is appetizing and economical to serve. There is no reason whatever why it cannot compete on equal ground with meat and poultry. I believe that passage of the Wholesome Fish Act would serve to remove whatever lingering doubts may exist in the consumer's mind over the quality of fish products. I believe that Federal inspection standards would improve the level of fish sales and that the commercial fishing industry would benefit substantially.

I have three reservations:

First. Some fish processing facilities may have to be upgraded as a result of passage of the Wholesome Fish Act. Sanitary conditions, equipment, and facilities vary from plant to plant. Often enough for the smaller processor, it is not easy to obtain funds to buy new equipment or to upgrade the old. If the Federal Government is to impose certain standards, I believe it has a responsibility to assist processors in meeting these standards. This is why I have cosponsored the Senator's bill to provide such assistance. This bill would increase the fisheries loan fund by \$15,000,000. It would make available the funds from this long-term, low-interest federally operated loan fund to shore processing facilities as well as fishing vessels. In good conscience, I have great doubt over the wisdom or the fairness of passing the Wholesome Fish Act without at the same time authorizing this Federal assistance to the fish processors, too.

Second. This bill as introduced today provides for continuous inspection. The cost of this inspection would be borne by the Federal Government. It would not be a burden to the processors. I am not worried about the cost of continuous inspection. I am worried about its practicality. Unlike the poultry industry or the meat industry, fish processing plants do not operate on a day-to-day basis. They run when the fish come. During a salmon run, the canneries operate on a 24-hour basis for so long or for so short a time as the fish are available. In my part of the world, there are canneries and freezing plants dotted along the coast of Alaska and down the Aleutian chain. Many of these communities have foggy, unpredictable weather. It might well be that the salmon run could begin at a time when an inspector was not present and weather conditions would make it impossible for him to be on the scene in time to do his job. I doubt, therefore, that continuous inspection would be entirely practical. I also doubt its necessity. I believe that responsible and thorough inspection on a spot check basis would serve the same purpose as continuous inspection. These spot checks should be unannounced and frequent. As such, I believe they would guarantee the maintenance of sanitary standards and quality of the fish product.

Third. The bill as introduced provides that the inspection should be carried out by the Food and Drug Administration. I am not convinced that this is the agency best equipped to do the job. It is not thoroughly familiar with the operation

of the fishing industry, its particular problems and needs. It may well be—and I am not certain of this—that the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries would be better equipped to handle these inspection responsibilities. I remember last spring the Food and Drug Administration inspectors placed an embargo on crab products of eight floating processors which had been operating off the island of Kodiak. They did so because of a report that the product was contaminated. Upon the arrival of the processors in Seattle, the Food and Drug Administration inspectors went aboard to inspect the crab. They found no violations. It was decided that the evidence of contamination they had received was insufficient and, as a result, the matter was dropped. Such occurrences as this do no good to anyone—the industry, the consumer, or the Federal Government. For this reason, I am not convinced that inspection responsibilities should be lodged with the Food and Drug Administration.

In spite of these reservations, I have cosponsored the bills. I believe in their basic intent. As a cosponsor, I hope to testify when hearings are held on these bills, to present my views, and to participate in the writing of the measure in its final form.

#### S. 1093—INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO REGULATE STORAGE AREA FOR RESERVOIR UNDER FEDERAL POWER ACT

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I introduce a bill designed to correct a very serious defect in the Federal Power Act which has been brought to my attention concerning the licensing of multipurpose hydroelectric projects.

In some of the multipurpose hydro-projects, it becomes necessary for the Federal Power Commission to require the storage of water for water quality control and other purposes. If the project involves storage on an interstate river, it raises serious questions for the Power Commission as to the amount of storage for each section of the drainage basin, or, in some cases, more than one river basin. This is a matter of tremendous importance to the sections of the basin above the water quality control project.

Under the present law, there is no standard by which the responsibility of the different sections of the watershed or river basin can be determined. It is my opinion that the amount of storage that can be required of any section of a river basin should be controlled by some standard set by Congress.

I have, therefore, drawn an amendment to the Federal Power Act, setting up such a standard, which I think is fair and just to all parties concerned. The amendment provides that the storage required of the hydroelectric project shall have the same proportion to the total storage required for the water quality control project that the drainage area of the hydro project has to the total area of the river basin or basins involved in the water quality control project.

This problem was brought to my attention by the petition of the American Electric Light & Power Co., through its subsidiary, the Appalachian Power Co.,

before the Federal Power Commission, project 2317, to construct two high dams on New River, in Grayson County in southwest Virginia, which would flood some 16,000 acres of land in Alleghany and Ashe Counties, N.C., and some 25,000 to 26,000 acres of land in Grayson County, Va.

The petition filed in this matter before the Federal Power Commission has asked that 650,000 acre-feet of storage be provided by this drainage area for pollution control on the Kanawha River in West Virginia, 300 miles below the hydro project. This is half of the total estimated storage required for the quality control project. The drainage area of the hydroelectric development is 1,111 square miles. The drainage area of the Kanawha and New River Basins is 12,260 square miles. Thus, less than 10 percent of the drainage area would be furnishing storage for 50 percent of the water needed in the water quality control project. This is totally unjust and inequitable, as far as the people of upper New River Valley are concerned. It will completely destroy for recreational purposes some 30 miles of one of the most beautiful valleys in the Eastern United States, and will greatly impair the recreational value of the remainder of the proposed development.

During the past 50 years, the people of the upper New River Valley in southwest Virginia and in northwestern North Carolina have made a tremendous effort to lift themselves by their own bootstraps, and have made phenomenal progress. The section of the Kanawha River at Charleston, W. Va., the beneficiary of the pollution control project, is perhaps the greatest industrial chemical complex in the United States, with a payroll in excess of \$160 million a year, with giant industry that is expanding every year. To shift 50 percent of the burden of taking care of the waste of this great industrial center to the backs of the people of this more or less isolated section of the Appalachians is, to me, completely at variance with all principles of equity and justice and fair dealing.

The amount of the burden of taking care of this pollution problem shifted to the backs of the people of upper New River Valley should be controlled by law, and should be fair and equitable. This will be accomplished by the amendment to the Federal Power Act which I have introduced.

I ask unanimous consent that my proposed bill be appropriately referred and that a copy of it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1093) to amend the Federal Power Act in order to provide for the regulation of the amount of project reservoir storage capacity that may be allotted for water quality control, introduced by Mr. ERVIN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1093

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of Amer-

ica in Congress assembled, That section 10 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 803) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"(j) Any reservoir storage capacity for water quality control purposes which is a part of any overall plan for water quality control proposed by the applicant or required by the Commission shall not exceed such proportion of the total storage required for the water quality control plan as the drainage area of such reservoir bears to the drainage area of the river basin or basins involved in such water quality control plan.

**S. 1094—INTRODUCTION OF BILL RELATING TO PERSONS WORKING IN THE COAL MINING INDUSTRY—ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON COAL MINE SAFETY BILLS**

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Labor, I announce the opening of hearings on coal mine health and safety legislation on February 27.

The hearings will begin at 10 a.m. in room 4232, New Senate Office Building. The hearing order for that day will be as follows: The senior Senator from West Virginia, Mr. RANDOLPH, will present his two bills for the hearing record, S. 355, to improve the health and safety conditions of persons working in the coal mining industry of the United States, and S. 467, for the elimination of health dangers to coal miners resulting from the inhalation of coal dust.

Other Senators interested in appearing in the opening part of these hearings should give notice of their interest no later than Tuesday, February 25. Telephone communications in this regard may be made directly to the subcommittee staff, extension 3674.

Following the presentations by interested Senators, the subcommittee will hear the opening statements of a representative of coal management and a representative of coal labor.

Additional hearings to receive the views and testimony of all appropriate agencies, groups, and individuals will be scheduled as early as possible in March.

I am introducing at this time a companion Senate bill to H.R. 6540, introduced in the House by Congressman HECHLER, of West Virginia. I am not familiar with the provisions and details of this House bill; however, I am introducing it and making it a part of the hearing record in the interest of having all legislative approaches to the grave questions of coal mine safety examined and analyzed in the hearing process, and made available for consideration by the subcommittee and the full committee.

I would also note that any other bills on this subject submitted by Senators before the February 27 hearings will be welcomed by me and will likewise be made a part of the subcommittee's hearings.

**SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 50—INTRODUCTION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS**

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I introduce today a joint resolution calling for

the establishment of a Joint Committee on National Security Affairs. This committee would be composed of 16 members, eight from each House of Congress, drawn from the Senate Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, the House Committees on Foreign Affairs and Armed Services as well as the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The purpose of this committee is in no way legislative and is not designed to infringe on the responsibilities of any other standing committee of either House. What is proposed is the establishment of a committee of knowledgeable Members of Congress to provide for a comprehensive and inclusive analysis of the national security policy similar to the functions of the Joint Economic Committee in the field of economics and government.

I ask for this joint committee only after a long and thorough investigation of the need of such machinery in the Congress. I believe that it is imperative that we have an organization including Members of both Houses of Congress and both political parties to review national security policies and make recommendations to the appropriate legislative committees.

In an era of increasing international responsibility it is necessary that we coordinate better efforts to provide for national defense and security posture. Too often before, these decisions have been made by an administration that has not even bothered to consult the proper authorities in the Congress. The National Security Council, which is responsible to the President, has in the past been the only body in the country with the diversified expertise to research and comment upon the many areas of concern to the national security. The time is now for the Congress to establish its own apparatus and have its separate judgment on which new systems will be needed, which ones are obsolete, which ones we cannot afford, and which ones we cannot afford to be without.

With the great controversy that has recently arisen in many areas of national policy, I am hopeful that members of both parties and of all political persuasions will agree with the need for such a joint undertaking. With the institution of this committee, we will have an instrument which can marshal the diverse expertise and information necessary to form accurate opinions. Our lack of adequate response in the past has too many times proved the need for this.

In closing, Mr. President, I would like to again stress that the Joint Committee on National Security would not usurp any authority from any present committee or joint committee; its powers will be consultative only. However, it will give expert members from these committees the chance to meet from time to time to exchange information, to consult with each other, and to form opinions and give advice based on diverse information. It is a reasonable approach to a complex problem. I hope that it will be favorably considered.

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

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 50) to establish a joint congressional committee to study and investigate matters pertaining to national security, introduced by Mr. TOWER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

**SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 51—INTRODUCTION OF JOINT RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH MAY AS "NATIONAL ARTHRITIS MONTH"**

Mr. ERVIN, Mr. President, today on behalf of myself and Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, I introduce a Senate joint resolution asking the President of the United States to designate the month of May as "National Arthritis Month." By this action, I believe the Congress will accomplish three independent and useful public purposes.

First, we will increase our own and the public's awareness of the toll of arthritis, its magnitude, and cost, so that we can make wise decisions as to the amount of public effort we assign to combat it and research for its causes.

Second, we will give recognition and impetus to our biomedical research efforts to unlock the secrets of this disease—to alleviate its disabling symptoms and, hopefully, to discover and counteract its causes.

Third, we will give recognition and support to those national institutions that meet the needs of victims and potential victims of arthritis for access to reliable, up-to-date, and relevant information on what medical science and the victim himself can do to reduce the disabling consequences of the disease.

The importance of the problems presented by arthritis is impressive. Mankind has suffered from it ever since Java man, half a million years ago, left us his bones with the unmistakable evidences of this affliction. Tombs and sarcophagi all over the world reveal that no race has been spared its ravages. The U.S. Public Health Service calls it the No. 1 chronic disease.

Arthritis afflicts more than 16 million of our citizens. It causes an estimated 200 million days of restricted activity, 57 million days in bed, 12,200,000 days of work absenteeism, 30 million visits to the doctor, and 1½ million days of hospitalization every year. Its annual cost is \$3,645,000,000, including: expenses for drugs, \$435 million; lost wages, \$1.5 billion; hospital and medical costs, more than \$200 million, and large amounts for lost homemaker services and premature death.

In the light of these figures, I think we ought to ask ourselves: How much effort is it worth—how much ought we to spend—in the endeavor to conquer this disease? The army of sufferers exceeds the peak of our Armed Forces in World War II. The ailment costs the Nation each year more than the total we spent to develop the atomic bomb. How large an effort should be mount to wipe it out?

In an age when novelties capture the headlines—when space science and surgical spectaculars command our admiring attention—it is hard to preserve a

sense of proportion. There is little that is spectacular about arthritis. It often wounds but seldom kills. Yet, it is the most common, perhaps the most costly, and certainly one of the most nagging and frustrating of life's painful experiences.

Our Nation has set for itself the goal of preserving and expanding human freedom. But there is little freedom for those 16 million who are tied to their beds, to restricted physical activity, to strict regimens of medical attention, medication, and behavior. Nor to those deluded unfortunates who are deceived by vicious quack nostrums that promise "long-lasting relief" or "an end to suffering within hours." Annually, the blind alley of fraudulent remedies captures \$350 million from the foolish, the uninformed, the impatient, and the frantic. Worst of all, these deceptive products waste not only the victims' dollars but the valuable time that could be invested in a program of medical salvage—for quick diagnosis and prompt treatment by a knowledgeable physician can mean the difference between a nearly normal life and a lifetime in a wheelchair.

How much are we spending to seek out the causes and the cure? The answer is that our current research budget in this fiscal year is \$15 million for research, plus a small amount for additional work in applied fields.

Then, what is the prospect of success from research into this difficult problem? What further efforts might we make that would be worthwhile—could we usefully sponsor a broader effort?

It would be too optimistic to say that biomedical research stands at the threshold of success. The fact is that the cause of arthritis is still a mystery. Theories are beginning to take form; we are learning where to look for an explanation. But we still do not know. Even so, three significant accomplishments of research deserve our grateful recognition.

First, we have developed an array of medical treatments, specific to the particular forms and stages of arthritis. For arthritis is not one disease but a hundred. Much medical research still needs to be done to sort out the facts about these different, but related ailments. What drugs and what treatments work best with each? In most cases, with early diagnosis and proper medical care, severe crippling can be avoided. In virtually all cases, medical attention can alleviate the symptoms. It can restore many sufferers to active participation in life and work. No case is hopeless.

Early work is in progress to investigate the clinical value of a preparation extracted from bone marrow and cartilage for the treatment of osteoarthritis. Another drug that shows promise is cyclophosphamide. Recently a new drug was added to the arsenal of pharmaceuticals to bring gout under control. These are only illustrative of the many lines of investigation into biochemical treatment of this disease in all its many forms.

Second, biomedical researchers have achieved real progress toward understanding the organism that undergoes degradation—the first step toward total defeat of this tireless plague. In the

exploration of the biological molecule, in the elucidation of the chain of metabolic processes, the United States has achieved world scientific leadership. We have contributed signally to world understanding of molecular biology, which is believed to hold many of the keys to unlock the secrets of metabolic disorders—not only arthritis, but also diabetes, obesity, and kidney and blood ailments.

Third, there is progress in research into the causes of arthritis itself. Two competing theories are being painstakingly tested. There is experimental evidence in support of each. One theory holds that rheumatoid arthritis is caused by an infectious micro-organism intermediate between bacteria and viruses. Another theory being tested has to do with the failure of the body's immunological processes, and suggests a possible avenue to general treatment. There is hope here, but no certainty. We must keep plugging away with steadfast determination until we find the answer. Mankind has already suffered from it for half a million years; we can have patience for a little longer.

I spoke critically, a moment ago, about the fraudulent nostrums and pretended cures of arthritis. But fortunately, there are two national organizations on the scene that balance the ledger on the credit side. I should like to give special mention to these organizations that spearhead the campaign to rid our world of arthritis for once and for all.

One is the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases in the National Institutes of Health. It sponsors and conducts much fundamental research in this field. In May 1965, the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service convened 100 of the top authorities in all fields of health. This convocation recognized that while research should be pursued, we should also make better use of what we already know. Above all, as new techniques are devised they must be quickly put to good use everywhere. This is a tall order.

The other national institution aims to do just that. It is the Arthritis Foundation, a private and voluntary organization with local chapters of medical people, health officers, and others associated with the field. It works closely with and its high usefulness is recognized by the Public Health Service. Appropriately enough the Arthritis Foundation is ending its 20th anniversary in May 1969. Accordingly, it is appropriate that its contributions to health be recognized in connection with the joint resolution here proposed.

The goal of the Arthritis Foundation is a total answer to the arthritis problem—both prevention and cure. It sponsors research, supports professional education, and coordinates work of local clinics, community health services, and home care programs. One of its most important functions is the distribution of the latest authoritative information about arthritis. Local chapters tailor the information to the particular problems and needs of the individual victim.

In requesting the Chief Executive to designate May as Arthritis Month, the Congress will help to focus public attention and professional skills on the defeat

of this incubus. Scientific understanding is the way to scientific achievement. Public understanding leads to public responsibility. Awareness on the part of the victims of arthritis as to the risks of shortcuts and the valued capabilities of medicine today can obviate pain and disability. All of these are proper goals and proper business to command our rigorous prosecution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the joint resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 51) to designate the month of May as "National Arthritis Month," introduced by Mr. ERVIN (for himself and Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 51

Whereas arthritis is the nation's No. 1 crippling disease affecting over sixteen million citizens; and

Whereas two hundred and fifty thousand additional Americans are stricken with this dread disease every year; and

Whereas arthritis strikes people of all ages; and

Whereas twelve million days of work and two hundred and five million days of restricted activity are lost each year because of arthritis; and

Whereas the annual cost of arthritis to Americans is estimated to approach \$3,500,000,000 annually; and

Whereas the use of medicine can prevent severe crippling in seven out of ten cases of arthritis through early diagnosis and prompt and appropriate treatment; and

Whereas back-to-work programs sponsored by local Arthritis Foundation chapters have shown that many arthritics may be returned to gainful employment; and

Whereas homebound sufferers of arthritis are receiving treatment in many areas from mobile therapy units provided by local Arthritis Foundation chapters; and

Whereas the Arthritis Foundation will complete its twentieth anniversary in May 1969 marking twenty years of progress in research and patient care; and

Whereas there is a great need for trained physicians, therapists, and nurses to provide assistance to arthritics and to carry out research to discover the cause and cure of arthritis; and

Whereas only \$15,000,000 was spent in 1968 for arthritis patients and research: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation (1) designating May as "National Arthritis Month", (2) inviting the Governors of the several States to issue proclamations for like purposes, and (3) urging the people of the United States, and educational, philanthropic, scientific, medical, and health care professions and organizations to provide the necessary assistance and resources to discover the cause and cure of arthritis and to alleviate the suffering of persons struck by this disease.*

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Massachusetts

(Mr. BROOKE), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 1070) to establish a commission to be known as the Commission on Air Traffic Control.

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

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 740) to establish the Interagency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs.

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

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I ask also unanimous consent that, at its next printing the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 421) to provide increased annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act; and the bill (S. 422) to provide that the first \$5,000 received as civil service retirement annuity be excluded from gross income for tax purposes; and the bill (S. 423) to provide minimum annuities for civil service retirees.

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

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1063) to temporarily suspend the recent increases in fees for grazing of livestock on public lands.

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

#### INTERSTATE TAXATION ACT— AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 91-4

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I submit two amendments intended to be proposed by me to S. 916, the Interstate Taxation Act which I introduced on February 4, 1969. These amendments will serve to clarify title III of the bill. When I introduced S. 916 I intended to make two minor changes in title III of the Interstate Taxation Act as passed by the House of Representatives last year. In my introductory remarks I described the purposes and effects of these amendments. Unfortunately, the bill, through an error, did not contain the language to effect these changes and did not conform to the description I made in my remarks. These amendments correct that error.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendments were referred to the Committee on Finance.

#### NOTICE OF SMALL BUSINESS SUB- COMMITTEE HEARING

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Small Business Subcommittee of the Committee on

Banking and Currency will resume hearings on the handling of the foreign trade zone application of the State of Maine by the Department of Commerce.

The hearing will begin at 10 a.m. on February 24, 1969, in room 5302 New Senate Office Building. Anyone wishing to testify should contact Mr. Reginald W. Barnes, assistant counsel, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300 New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510, telephone 225-7391, as soon as possible.

#### COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH PLANNING

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, one of my distinguished constituents, Dr. Maurice Kamp, who is a past president of the national association of county health officers and at present the director of health for Mecklenburg County, N.C., has authored an excellent article on comprehensive health planning, which appears in the January issue of American County Government.

Because of the great interest in the intergovernmental aspects of this new legislation, 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:

##### COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH PLANNING

(By Maurice Kamp, M.D.)

The lack of information about comprehensive health planning has created apprehension and even fear in some sectors of the health profession. The laws establishing the concept of comprehensive health planning are: P.L. 89-749, Comprehensive Health Planning and Public Health Service Amendments of 1966, and P.L. 90-174, Partnership for Health Amendments of 1967.

Basically, the law and its amendments consist of two parts:

First, there is an alteration in determining how grant and project funds will be allocated by the Public Health Service (PHS) to the states and through them to the local communities for general public health services, mental health, and some training support. The new laws will permit wider public health services on a more flexible basis than formerly prevailed. The focus of these grants is now redirected from specific or defined categories of disease to the health problems of individuals and families in the community.

The second is comprehensive health planning. The law authorizes the governor of each state to designate or establish a state planning office under the direction of an advisory council. The planning office may be an already established agency, a new agency, or an inter-agency planning unit. The advisory council must consist of a majority of consumer members, that is, non-providers of health care services.

The need for more effective and comprehensive delivery of medical care was highlighted in President Johnson's special message on education and health dated March 1, 1966, when he stated: "Good health for every citizen to the limits of our country's

<sup>1</sup> Maurice Kamp, M.D., is the president of the National Association of County Health Officers. He is the director of health for the Mecklenburg County, N.C., Health Department. The following article is an excerpt from a speech given by Dr. Kamp at NACO's Town and Country Conference, July, 1968, in Washington, D.C.

capacity to provide it must be our national goal. The focus of our efforts is the individual and his family, living in his own community. To meet their health needs requires the cooperation of many agencies, institutions, and experts—of state and local government, of doctors, nurses, and paramedical personnel.

"These are the front line fighters in our battle against disease, disability, and death. As in military battle, a winning strategy demands wise and well planned use of manpower. It demands coordinated use of all the resources available.

##### GREATER FLEXIBILITY

"At present, the federal government offers the states formula grants for categorical programs dealing with specific diseases. This leads to an unnecessarily rigid and compartmentalized approach to health problems. Our purpose must be to help redirect and reform fragmented programs which encourage inefficiency and confusion and fail to meet the total health needs of our citizens. Resources to serve health needs are not evenly distributed throughout the nation. Special problems arise in remote rural areas and the city slums. We need greater flexibility to pinpoint our attack."

Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) Wilbur J. Cohen testified before Congress prior to passage of these laws: "Our national health goals are but an expression of the justifiable expectations of the American people—that this country can and will provide the best in health care to all its citizens; that it can and will, under the legislation already enacted, remove financial barriers to health care for our older citizens, and reduce the toll of major killer diseases; that it can and will reduce infant mortality and provide every child with the health care he needs to develop his capacities to the fullest."

The Congress expressed its thinking by stating in the P.L. 89-749's declaration of purpose: "The Congress declares that fulfillment of our national purpose depends on promoting and assuring the highest level of health attainable for every person, in an environment which contributes positively to healthful individual and family living:

"That attainment of this goal depends on effective partnership, involving close intergovernmental collaboration, official and voluntary efforts, and participation of individuals and organizations;

"That federal financial assistance must be directed to support the marshalling of all health resources—national, state, and local—to assure comprehensive health services of high quality for every person, but without interference with the existing patterns of private professional practice of medicine, dentistry, and related healing arts."

These statements and actions taken at face value mean that health is now a human right. If this proposition is accepted, then every person should have access to high quality personal health services and every person should live in an environment safe from preventable hazard and conducive to healthful and productive living. All of us know that these conditions do not prevail today for many millions of our people.

The project and formula grants covered in the law and its amendments, which relate to section 314 of the Public Health Service Act, may not seem important since they only cover certain restricted areas involving generalized public health and mental health services. Funds for air pollution control, Medicare, Medicaid, research, Hill-Burton, and the Children's Brueau are not included. For about two years, funds for tuberculosis and venereal disease control will not be included. Despite this seemingly narrow area of health programming, the funds involved are relatively sizeable. The 1967 amendments authorize an expenditure of \$589 million for

the next three fiscal years for all types of 314 grants, training, and planning purposes.

Despite budget cuts this year, the House Appropriations Committee approved an appropriation for Comprehensive Health Planning and Services, section 314 a-e, for a total of \$165,604,000 or approximately \$25 million more than was appropriated in the last fiscal year. This fiscal confidence implies that Congress' interest continues, even in a time of national stress and financial stringency.

In 1967, the Health and Education Committee of NACO recommended a statutory stipulation that at least 70 per cent of the project and formula grants allocated to the states by PHS be made available for services at the local level. This was incorporated in House Bill 6418 (Partnership for Health Amendments of 1967, P.L. 90-174) and then passed by Congress in November, 1967. It went into effect July 1, 1968.

In carrying out the partnership concept for comprehensive health planning, the states have been given considerable authority for this program. While the law and its amendments are very specific in outlining the authority and the scope of operations of the state, it is not so detailed in the activities of the local or areawide components of the program. It is hoped that each state will develop a comprehensive health program for the entire state, and in doing so will take into account the recommendations and needs of the local communities. A state health plan will not be the sum of the many local plans, but will be one that recognizes individual community needs and problems in formulating a workable state plan.

To date, 54 states and territories have designated the state agency responsible for comprehensive health planning: 35 are vested in the state health departments, 14 are offices of the governors, and five are interdepartmental commissions.

#### CONSUMER MAJORITY

The fact that the majority of an advisory planning council's membership must consist of consumers has caused considerable concern among physicians and other providers of health services. The professional groups seem reluctant to give up the influence of their specialized knowledge and skills in the important matter of total community health.

In North Carolina, the Office of Comprehensive Health Planning has been established in the governor's Department of Administration. Of the 48 members of the advisory council, 27 are consumers and 21 are health or medically oriented. Of the 21 health members, only seven are physicians, and of these, only two are practicing physicians. Despite this, the state and local medical societies are making sincere efforts to cooperate with the program. It is hoped that this cooperative attitude will prevail in the rest of the country.

Dr. Milford O. Rouse, a past president of the American Medical Association (AMA), may have been thinking of this in one of his editorials in the "Journal of the American Medical Association," where he said that the "... responsibility of the physician is to provide the highest quality of health care at a reasonable price to an ever-increasing population. These factors require that the medical profession assume an important role in planning for health care on a community-wide, statewide, and nationwide basis. Indeed, the concept of planning is neither new nor alien to our profession. They have planned and participated in community health, especially in controlling infectious diseases. Through local, voluntary planning bodies, physicians have participated in the planning of hospital services and facilities. More recently, the profession is planning continuing education programs in improved methods of diagnosis and treatment of cancer, stroke, and heart disease.

"By its very nature, planning for health is primarily a local, community affair. Because

each community has a unique mixture of health problems, the people involved are better able to identify and to evaluate their needs, to decide on acceptable alternatives, and to provide the capability for solution. Voluntary planning under local control will assure all of the concerned groups a voice in the planning and in the ultimate action.

"Involvement in comprehensive planning does not mean capitulation to the direction of others. Rather, it means active participation, cooperative leadership, and mutual exchange of ideas. It is clear that one of the best ways to preserve the rights of the physician is to meet the overall health needs of the public. Continuing, sincere, and cooperative leadership in health planning is the responsibility and privilege of every physician and every organization."

The AMA House of Delegates at its last clinical convention adopted a report that stated, "The planning, organization, and distribution of health facilities and services are a prime responsibility of organized medicine—a responsibility that should be given higher priority among the various activities of medical societies at the state and local levels." Both attitudes argue well for professional participation in comprehensive health planning.

It does not seem too unreasonable to have a preponderance of consumers in a policy-making and supervisory capacity for total health planning. There are many thoughtful non-professional people everywhere very much concerned about personal and community health. More and more they are called upon to make decisions affecting the health of their neighbors—through bond referendums or hospital construction and tax increases, through support of blood donor programs and of voluntary health agencies. Also, the people must elect their representatives to local, state, and national government who pass laws and set policy for the spending of billions of dollars for health care, health protection, and research. These bodies pass laws setting standards in health areas ranging from drugs to air and water pollution and health care facilities.

The laws do not specify the composition of the local or areawide advisory councils, but HEW has ruled that they parallel the structure of the state-wide groups, and that consumers dominate in representation. State agency approval is required for all areawide projects since July 1, 1968. The areawide councils must receive approval of the locally elected officials. With that approval and an advisory council at the local level having a consumer majority, local fiscal support should be assured.

That areawide planning groups have been established and are functioning is shown that by July 15, 1968, 55 grants totaling over \$3 million had been funded for comprehensive areawide health planning under section 314(b) of the Comprehensive Health Planning Law.

A review of the system of federal grants-in-aid for health care points up the need for planning and coordination. Since World War II, federal grants-in-aid have grown in a disjointed fashion, reflecting the relative ability of pressure groups to push their separate categorical or disease oriented interests on the Congress. By 1965, there were some 15 different categories of grants-in-aid to the states administered by PHS. Now, there are over 100 different federal funded programs flowing into the states from various agencies. Planning is done separately under each program.

#### INTENT OF PUBLIC LAW 89-749

It is the intent of P.L. 89-749 and its amendments to provide a centralized mechanism for planning. It must be realized that if this is successful, the council, even though advisory, may have a profound influence on the governor, the state legislature, and the various state commissions to include other

than PHS funds for health care uses in a state.

The net effect of the multiplicity of grants resulted in rigidly circumscribed plans that frequently reflected national, rather than state or local priority. As long ago as 1953, there was a significant swell of uneasiness about the categorization of federal aid for state and local health programs. One can quickly recognize the confusion that results when we think of the multiplicity of grants and of planning devices by merely enumerating some of the agencies and programs involved: the OEO, Medical Society, Model Cities Program, Regional Planning, and various social planning agencies, as well as other public and voluntary health agencies. To develop some coherence and prevent overlapping and duplication, a central planning mechanism is strongly indicated. Even an affluent country like ours cannot afford to meet all the health needs with the present uncoordinated type of programming.

One aspect of this partnership mechanism to be guarded against is that the states and local areas do not become junior partners in the whole enterprise as too often existed in the past. Already, there is a feeling among many officials that the administration is setting its own priorities in the health field. There must be care that grants-in-aid for health purposes should not be controlled by specialists working in the federal government. We must insist that the law means what it states, that the federal partner does not dominate the entire operation. This is part of our concern and so long as we recognize it, much can be done to maintain a harmonious working relationship at all government levels.

The legal propriety of the law and its amendments is open to question. The law changes categorical funding to block grants for federal support of state health program, enabling the states to determine for themselves how they will spend this money. The additional authorization in providing for comprehensive health planning of all health services, public and private, by the states and local communities places the federal lawmakers on thin legal ground. The Constitution does not provide for such wide interest on the part of the federal government. It appears the legal means for enforcing this interest is quite limited, and will be fiscal in nature. Comprehensive planning in the states and localities is a condition of receiving additional federal monies for this activity.

#### NO LOCAL POWER

The legislation gives the local or areawide planning agencies no power or authority. It remains for the states and local communities to vest them with any degree of status, authority, or legal recognition they may achieve. The federal legislation does not give the areawide planning groups representation on the state planning agencies or a direct voice in the development of the state-wide comprehensive health plan. In addition, the local level planning agencies are not given a review responsibility of federal health dollars coming into their own communities. The state-level comprehensive health planning agencies are in a much better position when it comes to legal authority. Although the legislation contains greater requirements and conditions for the state planning agencies, there are many indications that attention is being given administratively at the federal level to interrelate health planning functions among the many agencies.

Two important problems must be overcome. One is the constantly rising cost of delivering comprehensive, high-quality health care both through public agencies and through private practice. The other is the fragmentation of health activities among national, regional, state, local agencies, and between official and voluntary bodies.

We in public health have not been as effective as we would like and must share a

part of the blame for this dereliction. Our attack against both has been more verbal than active. We hope we now have the skills, the knowledge, and the experience to deal with them successfully in order to raise the quality of our public and private practice to its highest level to bring the benefits more economically to every citizen. One of our most serious faults is failure to follow through effectively on the ideas and recommendations which have come out of most of our planning in the past. We now recognize that if our planning efforts are to have any meaning they must be continuous in nature and must be equipped with built-in mechanisms for coordinating all the elements for effectively implementing any recommendations and proposals which the planners make.

#### HOW NOT TO PLAN

Certainly, we have learned how planning should not be done. It should not be limited to crisis situations which have characterized it in the past; it should not be restricted to limited segments of health problems. It should not be attempted by groups composed entirely of persons representing categorical approaches rather than the wide-angled view of health; and it should not result in reports which only gather dust on obscure shelves.

Professor Herman E. Hilleboe, of the Columbia School of Public Health, places many of these thoughts in proper context. He recognizes that the federal agencies have been most aggressive and could dominate the health picture because of the relative power of the federal revenues available to them. However, he believes the health planning legislation goes a long way to provide the states and local areas with motivation and fiscal resources to revitalize leadership roles at the state and local levels in meeting the needs of the American people. He recognizes that the needs of the various states have varied greatly over the years and that at the present time, there is no evidence that any state has achieved a high level of statewide health planning, or, for that matter, a high degree of coordination of health services as implied in the legislation under discussion.

No state or municipality has developed a rationalized system of health services that can serve as a model for what P.L. 89-749 envisages. There is an enormous diffusion of sponsorship and organization of health services, maldistribution of resources, and increasing imbalance between expectations and the availabilities of health services. In addition, great differences exist among federal, state, and local governments in their relationship to the voluntary and private sectors of the health industry. Without denying the substantial contributions by a variety of governmental and non-governmental agencies to the health of the American people, a better coordination of these and related efforts is urgent if we hope to make progress toward obtainable goals of quality, efficiency, and equality of health services.

#### CRITICAL QUESTIONS

Another matter that is taking place in many areas is a mighty health battle between hospital administrators and health agency administrators on the leadership role in planning for health care. Should the hospital be the focal point with neighborhood health centers the satellites? Or should the comprehensive health centers, located where the people live and work, be the headquarters and the hospitals serve as ancillary units? Where do the private health agencies and their community services fit into the picture? These are some of the critical questions facing the health planners in many communities in our country.

The health planner recognizes that beyond certain minimal requirements of organization and submission of plans, the act displays few sharp teeth. On the other

hand, the law's strong invitation to the varied elements of the health industry to find ways and means to seek out mutual advantages, while serving the common good, distinctively keeps within the realities of the American political and social system.

#### SUMMARY

The Comprehensive Health Planning Law and its amendments appear to be a definite expression of past inadequacies and present and future health needs. Although the planning council has no operational powers and no authority except its influence and the authority to allocate within the state the PHS formula grants for public health programs, this constitutes a powerful beginning and stimulus for more effective coordination and cooperation of all the segments of the health care industry. It now seems fairly well established that good health is not the exclusive property of those who can afford to purchase it, but is an inherent basic right of all of our citizens. Past experience shows that if the providers of medical care fail to accept the responsibility of providing such care, the public through its government is quite likely to seek other means of solving the health care problems. This is the challenge that is offered to us, and the hope that if we accept our responsibilities and act in a manner to fulfill our responsibilities, total quality comprehensive health care can be made available to all our citizens.

#### SENATOR HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., SCORES LACK OF RELEVANCE IN EDUCATION AND OFFERS A COMMUNITY COLLEGE PROPOSAL

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS) recently spoke before the New Jersey State Federation of District Boards of Education. Citing the "lethargy of traditionalism and the security of the status quo," he said that this country must provide a new level of educational experience for all. He was talking about the need for comprehensive community colleges to meet the new educational requirements of this country. Since his speech, he has acted by introducing legislation which is designed to meet this need: The Comprehensive Community College Act of 1969, which he introduced this past Monday. If enacted, it would be a significant milestone in the effort to provide full educational opportunities to all Americans. I was pleased to join him in sponsoring this important proposed legislation, and I hope that it will be acted upon soon.

The need for this legislation is obvious. The level of expertise required by employers has risen so rapidly the last few years that secondary school training is no longer adequate to prepare its graduates for the work force.

As Senator WILLIAMS put it:

The three "Rs" must give way to a new "R"—relevancy. The lethargy of traditionalism and the security of the status quo have produced failures in our education experience. It shows up in the eyes of a neglected infant in a slum house. It is apparent in the aimless course of a man's life wasting away in the wrong job. It sits heavy in the heart of an elderly woman with only loneliness in her remaining years. And it is evident in the vacant gaze of a runaway youth in a hippie haven. We must find a better way to seek out and develop our best resource. . . . Then we must provide the opportunity for that talent to develop and express itself. Simply doing something for

tradition's sake has no place in this picture. . . . Too many teachers, principals, superintendents, and boards of education members have not recognized that the pace of knowledge has accelerated so quickly in the past few years that a high school education carries its own dead-end guarantee. They still insist on the three "Rs"; they are still teaching kids what to think and not *how* to think.

Mr. President, this important speech sets the framework for the Comprehensive Community College Act of 1969. We should take this opportunity to join in Senator WILLIAMS' education sensitivities.

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

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

#### THE OUTLOOK FOR FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION IN 1969

(Address by Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., before the New Jersey State Federation of District Boards of Education, Rider College, Feb. 8, 1969)

Last Sunday on "Meet the Press", Robert Finch, Secretary of H.E.W. was asked to name his Department's most urgent problem. He responded by citing the needs of elementary and secondary education—"particularly in terms of bringing the disadvantaged into the mainstream."

It is unlikely that Secretary Finch's remarks were intended as a slur on his predecessors. Nor were they meant to downgrade the enormous progress (55% of the more than 75 programs administered by the Office of Education were enacted in the 88th and 89th Congress—a period from 1963 to 1966) made in the past few years toward an intelligent Federal involvement in all levels of education. I believe he meant to indicate what our first priority should be.

The civil rights, poverty and education legislation of the Kennedy-Johnson years, taken together with a heightened interest on the part of Washington in the condition of the schools, has transformed the Office of Education from a tired and marginal office to a center of action and controversy. It is this office—which is at the disposal of President Nixon—and the education subcommittees in Congress that hold the key to the direction that education will take in the next four years.

What can we expect from this new administration? Certainly more than we heard last fall.

I was interested in the conclusions of Mr. Nixon's own task force on education which is reported to have said that he is not regarded as a particularly "education-minded president." The report criticized him for coming "perilously close" to reopening the church-state issue by supporting general versus categorical aid to education; and creating the impression during the campaign that he would go slow on school desegregation.

These are all issues we have settled, and I for one will have no part in going over these matters again. The crisis in education today demands that we move ahead and move ahead swiftly—each of us doing this thing.

The problems that you *must* tackle—and I will support you at the federal level—are bureaucratic inflexibility, outdated curriculums, and the rigidity of poorly trained teachers.

The three "R's" must give way to a new "R"—relevancy. The lethargy of traditionalism and the security of the status quo have produced failures in our education experience. It shows up in the eyes of a neglected infant in a slum house. It is apparent in the aimless course of a man's life wasting away

in the wrong job. It sits heavy in the heart of an elderly woman with only loneliness in her remaining years. And it is evident in the vacant gaze of a runaway youth in a hippie haven.

We must find a better way to seek out and develop our best resource, whether it be in Newark or Ridgewood, in Short Hills or Bridgeton. Then we must provide the opportunity for that talent to develop and express itself. Simply doing something for tradition's sake has no place in this picture.

Elementary and secondary schools have failed for two reasons. First, there is no room for relevancy. Too many teachers, principals, superintendents, and board of education members have not recognized that the pace of knowledge has accelerated so quickly in the past few years that a high school education carries its own dead-end guarantee. They still insist on the three "R's"; they are still teaching kids *what* to think and not *how* to think.

Not only is relevancy missing in the curriculum, but also in your responsibilities as board members to the community. When was the last time your public meetings were not "cut and dry"; when was the last time you sold your school budget to a community in terms of effect on children rather than dollars and cents; when was the last time teachers and students were part of your decision-making process; when was the last time a teacher could come to you as an individual without fear of reprisals; when was the last time you stopped to listen to a student; and when was the last time you communicated your education problems to your local, State and national representatives?

My mail is heavier on humane treatment of animals than it is on education of our children.

The 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act is up for extension this year. This bill directly affects your school program, yet how many of you know what title I is? (Curriculum and program development for economically and socially deprived). Has title II met your needs? (Support for library materials, books, film strips, records, etc.). If you have applied for title III (innovation grants for supplemental education centers), how does it relate to your total school program—or do you really care?

Education is *one* of my responsibilities. Education is *your* only responsibility. When am I going to hear from you?

We will fail to improve education programs for two reasons: Political and budgetary realities, and failure of groups like yours to participate in improving them. Starting in a couple of weeks, you will be receiving a special education report from me on a regular basis to help you do just that. These reports will contain budget items, new program descriptions and education philosophy. I hope you will react to them and let me hear from you.

The second reason elementary and secondary schools have failed is the excessive demands society is making on the education process. 100 years ago we assigned the responsibility to secondary schools to produce a finished product. Today, 12 years of learning is at best only a stepping stone for many. But too often a millstone for those who have been neglected in high school and left behind in the arbitrary college admissions procedure.

Fortunately, there is a new level of education emerging in the country. It is a level quite different from secondary education and higher education. It is a level of education which is developing an environment to meet those demands through occupational, adult, technical, community service and remedial programs. It is the comprehensive community colleges.

Last week the fourth "R" we've been talking about took the shape of an informal workshop in my office to discuss the philos-

ophy, movement, programs and Federal role in the comprehensive community college. Ten experts in post-secondary education helped crystallize my thinking in this area. What emerged from this meeting is not completely clear, but two themes clearly developed—and each of you is part of these developments. First, whether as presidents of universities, volunteers in headstart, members of boards of education, or legislators, our first responsibility is to the total network of education in our country. We are educators first, then university presidents, teachers, principals, headstart volunteers. Anyone who doesn't believe that doesn't belong in education—as a policy-maker, as a teacher, as a critic, or as a community representative on an education board.

The second development is that the Federal Government is not now addressing itself in an official capacity to this new level of education. The office of education has a bureau of elementary and secondary education, a bureau of adult vocational and library programs, a bureau of higher education, a bureau of research, and a bureau of education for the handicapped—but there isn't even a single office or individual to handle the specific needs of community colleges.

The need for a new look at the role of higher education at this new stage of educational growth in our country is imperative, from the conclusions of the recent Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. No less than 500 new two-year community colleges are recommended within the next five years to meet the growing demand for this continuing form of education. Thirteen major cities in our country do not have a public community college within the city limits. Twenty-five major cities only have one community college, and the evidence is overwhelming that a major segment of our population is being denied the benefits of a quality education.

As I plan to work for the improvement in elementary and secondary schools when legislation comes before our subcommittee, I plan to do something for community colleges. At the next opportunity I have in Washington, I plan to introduce a comprehensive community college bill which will address itself to the Federal responsibility in this area of education. My bill will isolate this level of education from the responsibilities of the secondary schools and higher education. We will then be able to serve more equitably the needs of all aspects of our society.

#### DANGER OF COMMUNIST SUBVERSION AT HOME

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, recently I received a particularly poignant and moving letter from Mr. and Mrs. Harold Cole of Oakland, Ore. The Coles, who lost their only child fighting in Vietnam, ask a question posed by so many Americans today: What can an individual citizen do to fight constructively against Communist subversion here at home?

They write that the tragic death of their son, Jerry, "brought the terrible realization that, while he was dying thousands of miles away from us, the same enemy he was fighting is right here in the United States."

The Coles say they want to help in the fight against communism. They ask only where they can start, what they can do.

Mr. President, I have received many letters asking these same questions. I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD my answer to Mr. and Mrs. Cole

in the hope that it will be of value to other similarly concerned Americans.

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

U.S. SENATE,  
Washington, D.C., February 19, 1969.  
Mr. and Mrs. HAROLD COLE,  
Oakland, Ore.

DEAR MR. and MRS. COLE: Thank you for your recent letter. Permit me first to express my deep sympathy to you in your bereavement. The loss of a son is a great tragedy, but the loss of an only child is especially difficult to bear.

I believe that our first duty is to preserve our own country and its institutions. Thomas Jefferson once stated, "The laws of necessity, of self-preservation, of saving our country when in danger are a higher obligation (than strict observance of the written law)." The war in Vietnam is justified as an action that is necessary for the security or self-preservation of the United States. I agree with this judgment, and I believe that your son and all the other brave young men who have given their lives there have done so in a noble cause.

However, I can appreciate your wondering how seriously our government takes the struggle for which it asked your son to give his life. You are by no means alone in calling attention to the paradox of our sending boys thousands of miles to fight communism in Vietnam while we seemingly do very little to combat the subversion of the communists here at home.

The government is not, of course, completely indifferent to the subversive activities of the communists and their allies here at home. The Federal Bureau of Investigation remains under the leadership of J. Edgar Hoover, who is second to none in his understanding of the danger that subversion poses for our country. Please rest assured that the FBI keeps the subversives under close surveillance. Mr. Hoover is very active in writing, speaking and testifying to alert Congress and the public to the need to keep our guard up.

Congress is very much interested in combatting communist subversive activities. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee under Senator James Eastland and the House Committee on Un-American Activities have carried out extensive investigations and published excellent reports and studies which expose the activities of subversives here at home. They have also published studies on the structure and operations of the international communist conspiracy. Some of the more important publications are on sale to the general public at nominal prices at the Government Printing Office. The most recent of these are *The New Left*, a memorandum by Allan C. Brownfeld, and *Aspects of Intellectual Ferment and Dissent in the Soviet Union*, both published in recent months by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, and *Subversive Influence in Riotings, Lootings and Burnings*, published in four parts by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. I would recommend study of these publications to every American who wishes to combat communism. To be effective, we must be well-informed.

Congress has also demonstrated its interest in safeguarding our internal security by passing appropriate legislation. However, it must be admitted that for the past several years the Supreme Court has been steadily pulling the teeth from our internal security legislation. The Court has ruled that it is unconstitutional to require teachers to sign loyalty oaths, that it is unconstitutional to prohibit Communist Party members from working in designated defense plants, that it is unconstitutional to require party members to be registered with the Subversive Activities Control Board, etc. These and other

decisions have frequently been passed by the Court majority over the strongly dissenting opinions. They have emasculated much of our internal security legislation, and unless there is a radical change in the attitude of the Court, it is safe to predict that it will be increasingly difficult in the years ahead to defend this country against subversion from within. Incredibly enough, the next major test will probably center around the issue of whether the government itself has the right to require its employees to certify their loyalty to the United States as a condition of federal employment.

I should also point out that in recent years, the Department of Justice was not at all vigorous in enforcing the anti-subversive legislation. The Subversive Activities Control Board was allowed to remain dormant for years. It was narrowly saved from extinction by the vigorous efforts of Senator Dirksen, who finally succeeded in getting the Justice Department to give the Board a small assignment. We have also seen increasing laxity develop in the administration of the government's own security program, which guards against subversive penetration of the government.

I am sure that any velvet-glove approach toward the communists will be discarded by the Nixon administration. President Nixon harbors no illusions about communist intentions either within or outside the United States. I know that he will do all in his power to combat subversion at home, as well as resisting communist aggression abroad.

Nevertheless, he needs the support of citizens such as you to do this job effectively. The communists and their allies can be relied upon to resist bitterly every step that is taken to frustrate their designs on America. Their chief weapons will be criticism and ridicule. This will be heaped upon every member of Congress, every public official and every judge who ventures to support any measures designed to strengthen our internal security. It will be difficult for our public officials to stand up to the abuse of the loudly vocal minority if the great majority who want these measures remain generally silent.

This suggests the answer to your question: what can the private citizen do as an individual?

Every individual who feels as you do can make an important contribution in this great battle. First of all, make your own wishes known to as many people as you can. Make them known to your senators, your congressman, to the chairmen and members of the Judiciary Committee in the Senate and the House, to the editors of newspapers and magazines, and to members of the judicial branch of our government. Be specific in your requests. Ask these people to support measures that will enable the government to take effective legal action against individuals who teach and advocate the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence. Point out that we must find ways to bar these people from serving as teachers in our public schools and colleges where they can poison the minds of our youth. Urge that the legislation barring them from employment in vital defense plants be reinstated. Insist that appointments to the Federal courts, including the Supreme Court, be made from the ranks of those who agree with Thomas Jefferson that the preservation of the nation must be given precedence over the rights of individuals to work for the destruction of the nation.

Secondly, do whatever you can to encourage your relatives, friends and neighbors to speak up also. Your example alone will do much, but a little persuasion will help also. Too many people take the attitude that their opinions do not matter. They do. This is what our democracy is based on.

I believe that many of our citizens would be aroused to demand action if they were better informed of the extent of subversive

activity in this country and of the rapid increase in the strength of subversive groups in the past eight years. The mass media are not doing as an effective job of conveying this information to the public as they could. You should urge that the newspapers, magazines and radio and TV stations improve their service in this respect. This can best be done by calling to the attention of the editors and managers sins of omission and commission. For example, the public did an excellent job of rebuking our great television networks for their one-sided coverage of the riots in Chicago at the time of the Democratic National Convention. At least one of the networks has admitted that it should have done a better job of informing the public of the subversive background of some of the individuals who planned and organized the Chicago demonstrations.

In order to criticize the mass media constructively, you should read regularly some of the specialized publications that provide information about subversive activities not normally covered in the mass media. I would suggest you write to the FBI for recommendations on these. Also, the publications of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and the House Committee on Internal Security which may be ordered from the Government Printing Office, will supply you with a list of publications available on request. I might note that a tremendous amount of useful information can be found in the Congressional Record which appears daily when Congress is in session. Your Congressman or Senators may be able to obtain a free subscription for you. If not, you may subscribe through the Government Printing Office.

I thank you for your interest in this matter. I hope that these comments will be of some value to you, and I urge you to continue your dedication to the great cause for which you have already given so much, the life of your only child. You are representative of the spirit that has made this country great, and I have no doubt that we will triumph and that your sacrifices will not have been in vain.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MURPHY.

#### THE 91ST BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF FORMER REPRESENTATIVE ALLGOOD, OF ALABAMA

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, Alabama has been fortunate over the years in her Representatives in the National Congress. There were such outstanding men as Senator John T. Morgan, three generations of Bankheads who gave distinguished service in both Houses, and Senator Lister Hill, whose great contributions to medicine and health have meant so much to this country and the world. There are many others who could be cited, too numerous to name.

I am reminded of these great predecessors of ours by the fact that a former Alabama Representative, Miles C. Allgood, will be 91 on February 22. Miles still is active and alert. His service in Congress was during the exciting first years of the New Deal, when President Roosevelt was leading the Nation out of the wilderness of depression, and Allgood's contributions were numerous.

Last year on the occasion of Representative Allgood's 90th birthday, Representative TOM BEVILL, who represents the same congressional district once served by Representative Allgood, spoke to the House on the fine accomplishments of this distinguished man. His remarks are to be found in the CONGRES-

SIONAL RECORD, volume 114, part 4, pages 4029-4030.

Today as Miles Allgood nears his 91st birthday, I should like to pay tribute to him and express my appreciation for his friendship through the years.

Let me say, Mr. President, that my colleague from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN), whose home is not very far from where Miles Allgood now lives and who knows Mr. Allgood well, has stated his wish to join me in these remarks regarding our good friend, Miles C. Allgood.

#### SIGNS OF VINTAGE RUSSIAN IMPERIALISM

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, in the aftermath of the Soviet-led five-nation invasion of Czechoslovakia in August 1968, Moscow repudiated its oft-repeated principle of "full respect for the sovereign rights" of each Socialist country replacing that principle with the new doctrine of a "Socialist commonwealth" run from Moscow.

Now commonly known as the Brezhnev doctrine, since its elaboration by Soviet Party Secretary Leonid Brezhnev in Warsaw, November 12, 1968, this doctrine constitutes an ominous change in Soviet international legal doctrine. I believe the American people should be further informed on this matter.

In this connection, I wish to place in the RECORD the analysis which I made on this general subject in a speech to the North Atlantic Assembly in Brussels, Belgium, on November 12, 1968. The speech is entitled "Does the Leopard Change His Spots?"

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### DOES THE LEOPARD CHANGE HIS SPOTS?

(By Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, before the Military Committee, North Atlantic Assembly, Brussels, Belgium, November 12, 1968)

I

Many people during recent years have believed that the Soviet Union was on a fixed course toward more moderate policies, and that détente had come to stay.

As you may know, I have not shared this optimistic outlook.

But however sanguine any of us may have been about Soviet policy, the brutal invasion of Czechoslovakia has been a sobering experience. It calls to mind a comparable act in Stalin's time—the Kremlin takeover of Czechoslovakia in 1948.

II

In military terms, the Soviet thrust into Czechoslovakia proved what they can do. It was a vivid demonstration of Soviet capability for rapid, selective mobilization, for efficient movement of large combat and support forces over extensive distances, and for the establishment and testing of effective lines of communication in support of military operations far from the Russian homeland. The Soviet capability that was exercised so impressively in Czechoslovakia is available for employment on other tasks.

The invasion of Czechoslovakia certainly made clear that early "political warning" of a Soviet conventional move in Europe cannot any longer be taken for granted. In the Czech assault, until the moment of attack, the political signals of Soviet intentions were

at best ambiguous. The lightning-like drive into Czechoslovakia took almost everybody by surprise. And it reminds us once again of the vital role of forces-in-being. NATO combat units, on the line, ready to make a determined stand, have far more deterrent value than mobilizable and deployable forces that might be moved to the scene after the action begins.

### III

Also of special significance is the ominous revision of Soviet international legal doctrine in the aftermath of the Czech invasion—a textbook case on the “heads I win, tails you lose” attitude of the Kremlin.

You may recall that in the mid-1930's, the USSR joined the League of Nations and entered alliances with France and Czechoslovakia. At that time, Moscow acknowledged the concepts of national sovereignty and non-interference with the rights of independent states, in part to improve its credentials as a collaborator in international undertakings. Maxim Litvinov, then Soviet Foreign Minister, declared that the USSR would join agreements with other states under conditions that recognized “the extension to every state belonging to such an association of the liberty to preserve . . . its state personality and the economic and social system chosen by it—in other words, reciprocal non-interference in the domestic affairs of the states therein associated . . .”

Ironically, just a few weeks ago Litvinov's grandson, Pavel, was sentenced to exile in Siberia for defending Czechoslovakia's right to “the economic and social system chosen by it.”

Since the mid-30's the principle of “reciprocal non-intervention in the internal affairs of other states” had been a recurring concept in Soviet doctrine. As the number of countries calling themselves communist increased and divisions among them became more apparent, Soviet writings had more and more tended to emphasize the “complete equality” of all socialist states and the strict observance among them of respect for independence and national sovereignty. The communiqué from the 1960 meeting of communist party leaders stated: “Every country in the socialist camp is insured genuinely equal rights and independence.” As late as last April, during the height of Alexander Dubcek's efforts at liberalization and reform, Kosygin declared that:

“The Soviet state . . . made its invariable principle in international policy the strict observance of equality, national independence, and non-interference in the internal affairs of other states and peoples.”

Soon after, on August 20, the Soviets spearheaded the five-nation intervention in Czechoslovakia. For some weeks there was a flurry of inconsistent Soviet explanations and rationalizations. Then *Pravda* struck. In a September 25 article, by Mr. Kovalev, *Pravda* stated that Czechoslovakia's implementation of “self-determination” would have “caused harm to other socialist countries”, and that socialist states cannot act independently when such action is contrary to the interests of the “socialist community of nations.” Said *Pravda*:

“The sovereignty of each socialist country cannot be opposed to the interests of the world of socialism, of the world revolutionary movement.”

Little doubt is left that Moscow intends to determine what constitutes action contrary to the interests of the “socialist community.”

Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko confirmed the new doctrine in a speech to the United Nations on October 3, 1968:

“The Soviet Union and other socialist countries have on many occasions warned those who are tempted to try and roll back the socialist commonwealth, to snatch at least one link from it, that we will neither tolerate nor allow this to happen.”

Moscow is saying, in essence: A nation with leanings toward socialism thinks it has the right to independence and self-determination. Well think again! Because you haven't; and we will make international law confirm it. You can have independence and self-determination if we consider it proper for you; you cannot have it if we consider it improper, because we have a doctrine of law that says what is yours is mine and what is mine is mine.

The leopard does not change his spots. The *Pravda*-Gromyko thesis is vintage Russian imperialism.

It should surprise no one that the East German Communist Party promptly praised the idea of a “socialist commonwealth” run from Moscow. For the most part, however, other communist parties have greeted the new doctrine with silence—or with dismay and defiance. No wonder!

It seems to follow logically from the new doctrine, that any country which in the future adopts a communist government, either by revolution or election, automatically becomes a part of the “socialist commonwealth” as defined by the Soviet Union, and as such is subject to the Soviet concept of intervention—military or otherwise—even against the will of the communist party in power.

Some people have seen the point. The British Communist Party voiced strong condemnation of the new thesis in its house organ *Morning Star* on September 27, 1968: “It is to be hoped that Mr. Kovalev's thesis will be speedily and officially repudiated . . . It would do irreparable damage to the unity of the international Communist movement and relations between socialist states if it gained any further currency.”

Austrian Communist Party Central Committee member Heno Kostmann, writing in *Volksstimme* of October 9 disavowed the new doctrine as a danger to the survival of the world communist movement: “. . . no norm exists or has existed anywhere giving a socialist country or a group of such countries the right to intervene in a fraternal socialist country. Incidentally, such a right of intervention is in conflict with all existing norms of relations among fraternal socialist countries and among Communist parties. . . . On any basis other than . . . the basis of autonomy, a world Communist movement is not possible.”

The Yugoslavs have gotten the message too. President Tito, who for twenty years has fought Soviet attempts to control his party and country, spoke to his countrymen on October 20 and warned the Soviet bloc not to interfere in the affairs of Yugoslavia:

“Comrades, as far as attempts are concerned to justify to a certain extent the case of Czechoslovakia . . . a theory was raised that sovereignty was not vital for small nations. Well, it did not say small nations but that is what was meant . . . the small nations are in danger. The small nations should act unitedly. They should agree . . . that nobody has the right to interfere in their internal affairs. These countries have the right to defend their sovereignty.”

The significant point, I believe, is not so much that the Soviets have tried to provide ideological rationalization for what they did in Czechoslovakia, but that they have consciously and deliberately laid the basis for political pressures, blackmail and possible adventures elsewhere.

### IV

What can we now say of Soviet intentions? Moscow's sharp admonition to other socialist parties and states to stay in line—or else—suggests a deep Soviet concern over the kind of urge toward freedom that appeared in Czechoslovakia and that could spread to adjacent regions, including the USSR itself. It suggests a concern in the Kremlin that the whole so-called “socialist commonwealth” might come unglued.

Surely we cannot discount the danger that

the course of repression and counteraction in East Europe will produce new crises and disturbances spilling over the frontiers of NATO. There is always the possibility that Moscow may try to restore some unity to the Warsaw Pact nations by creating a major crisis centered on Berlin and West Germany.

So we must see to the readiness of our immediate defenses along NATO's central front. We need to assure ourselves that we have enough high quality, ready forces in position, and prepared for sustained combat, to convince our adversaries that military action against NATO territory would be too hazardous for them.

And we must think hard about the implications of Soviet actions, not only for the central region, but also for NATO's vital flanks.

Looking ahead, what are Soviet intentions toward Austria?

Consider also the problem of Yugoslavia. It is evident that Yugoslavia's territory occupies a key position in relation to NATO's southeast flank. Under hostile control Yugoslavia would constitute a corridor running from Central Europe to the Mediterranean, separating Greece and Turkey from the remainder of the Alliance. What should be our response if the Kremlin seeks at any time to enforce its new doctrine against Belgrade? The understandable uneasiness in Yugoslavia today can hardly be a matter of indifference to NATO.

And what is the meaning of the far-ranging expansion of Soviet naval activity in recent times? The facts are disturbing:

Soviet naval deployments in the Indian Ocean continue. Do they intend a permanent Soviet military presence there? I doubt that all those ships are engaged in operations connected with the Soviet space program.

During the invasion of Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Mediterranean squadron was built up to some 50 ships, about half of which were major combatant vessels, including submarines. There is every indication that the Soviet Navy is in the Mediterranean to stay.

There have been Soviet naval exercises on both sides of the Straits of Gibraltar.

There has been significant Soviet naval activity, on a sustained basis, in the Norwegian Sea. Do they plan a permanent naval presence in that area also?

The USSR is a dangerous and unpredictable opponent, with a military capability whose reach is expanding. We cannot be confident that a Soviet Union that invades Czechoslovakia will not use military force to achieve its purposes on other fronts, when it thinks this can be done without running unacceptable risks.

The uncertainties we confront are compounded by the possibility of further shifts within the Kremlin's power structure, where there is already evidence of a move toward the hard-liners.

### V

So we meet today in an atmosphere of turbulence and uncertainty; but we also meet in a spirit of renewed solidarity and confidence. The governments and peoples of our Alliance are facing with a new seriousness the problems posed by Soviet actions.

There is little disagreement in America about the value of the Atlantic Alliance or the importance and firmness of the U.S. commitment to the defense of the North Atlantic area. But I and others in our Congress have had a severe problem in trying to maintain an effective American combat force in Western Europe. That problem resulted in large part from a widespread feeling in my country that so many Europeans were less concerned with the security of their homelands than we were. To many Americans it has seemed that a prosperous Western Europe was not making a reasonably proportionate contribution to the common defense effort.

Clearly, the tasks ahead call for a new

determination, on both sides of the Atlantic, that will not only see us through this period of crisis but that will serve the Alliance well for the long, hard pull. The burdens of our common security will make substantial demands on us all—for many years to come.

You can understand that I am heartened by the evidence that more of you here in Europe are recognizing that there is a direct relationship between your willingness to draw on your own resources for your own defense, and the willingness of the American people and the American Congress to provide substantial resources and forces for mutual security in NATO.

So I am encouraged by the current initiatives of some European members of the Alliance to reinvigorate NATO. For I am convinced that the future vitality of the Alliance depends in very large measure on the degree and quality of European efforts to keep NATO strong.

#### THE SPESSARD L. HOLLAND LAW CENTER OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, one of our distinguished colleagues has received a great and justly deserved honor for his lifetime of devotion to the field of law in active practice, both in the courts at all levels and in the legislative field.

On February 1, 1969, the \$3 million new law center of the University of Florida at Gainesville was dedicated in honor of SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, the senior Senator from Florida, whom I have had the honor and pleasure to know for many years.

SPESSARD L. HOLLAND obtained his law degree from the University of Florida in 1916. He was president of the student body, a scholar, and an athlete, having earned membership in Phi Beta Kappa and the position of first-string pitcher on the baseball team.

SPESSARD HOLLAND pursued a course in the active practice of law as prosecuting attorney, county judge, member of the Florida Senate from 1932-40, Governor of Florida from 1941-45, and as a Member of the U.S. Senate from 1946 to date. He is an inactive partner in the law firm of Holland & Knight, one of the largest law firms in Polk and Hillsborough Counties, having offices in Bartow, Lakeland, and Tampa.

The dedication of the new law center provides the University of Florida with one of the finest law school complexes in the country. With the completion of the new structure, the Florida Law School is placed in a position, so far as physical plant is concerned, to attain pre-eminence.

The dedication of the Spessard L. Holland Law Center was attended by numerous dignitaries. The Chief Justice of the United States made the principal address. The former junior Senator from Florida, George A. Smathers, dedicated the new center in honor of his former colleague, SPESSARD L. HOLLAND. Also in attendance were Florida Gov. Claude Kirk; the attorney general of Florida, Earl Faircloth; the chief justice of the Supreme Court of Florida, Richard W. Ervin; U.S. Court of Appeals Judge Warren Burger; Representatives CLAUDE PEPPER, DON FUQUA, and BILL CHAPPELL; University President Stephen O'Connell; dean of the College of Law, Frank Ma-

loney; former president of the university, Wayne Reitz; the president of the Florida Bar Association, Marshall M. Criser; William Reese Smith, Jr., secretary of the American Bar Association; and members of the board of regents.

In all, more than 700 attorneys, State and Federal judges, and representatives of many of the country's major law schools participated in the dedication of the law center and joined in bestowing honor on the senior Senator from Florida, who, throughout his service in the Senate, has fought for the principles of the Constitution and successfully brought about its 24th amendment after a fight of 14 years to abolish the poll tax. That may be regarded as his greatest achievement here.

However, Senator HOLLAND has been in the forefront of many of the legislative battles on constitutional principles, among which are two that I readily recall: the Submerged Lands Act of 1953, better known to many as the Tidelands Act, as to which he participated in the arguments before the U.S. Supreme Court at the request of the attorneys general of the five Gulf States; and more recently, on the Senate floor, the discussion regarding a proposed change in Senate rule XXII. These are only a few of the many legislative marks that have been made by the senior Senator from Florida, marks which will be preserved in history.

I wish to congratulate those responsible for the foresight in naming the new law center at the University of Florida in honor of SPESSARD L. HOLLAND. They could not have chosen a person more dedicated to justice, one more dedicated to the State of Florida, than our distinguished colleague, SPESSARD L. HOLLAND. This could not be attested to more greatly than was done by Governor Kirk, of Florida, when he said:

This teaching center carries the name of a great student and a great teacher. Pray there will be more like him.

#### NATIONAL FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA WEEK

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, this week, February 15 to 22, more than 450,000 young men across the Nation are participating in the observance of National Future Farmers of America Week.

The theme selected for this year's observance, "FFA: An Opportunity for Youth," very fittingly describes the character of the organization throughout its history. Since its founding in 1928, the Future Farmers of America has offered training in technical agriculture, leadership, and character development to millions of young men.

Built on the foundation of leadership, cooperation, thrift, character, patriotism, improved agriculture, and service, the FFA has produced leaders for all phases of American life.

In my own State of North Dakota, FFA members have left an indelible imprint on their communities. The leadership they have exerted while active in FFA and later has led to improvements in their communities and in our State.

As an integral link in the program of

vocational agricultural training in our high schools, FFA has done much to help make American agriculture the envy of the world. Through it, these young men have become aware of the great technological changes taking place in agriculture and how these developments can best be applied to their own situation.

This program has always placed great emphasis on the development of good citizenship and on participation in community, State, and National affairs. It is essential, in these critical times, that we have an aware and active citizenry. FFA is doing an outstanding job of meeting this need for the Nation.

Mr. President, I join people all across the Nation in saluting the Future Farmers of America. This organization has made great contributions to our society in the past, and I look forward to even greater developments in the State.

#### LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, February marks the anniversary of two important events in the national life of Lithuania. For it was in February 1261, more than seven centuries ago, that this small nation was established as an independent state. It was on February 16, 1918, after many centuries of independence, that she shook off the bonds of more recent Russian domination and German occupation, and declared herself an independent state.

During the years that followed, the nation moved forward in many areas, and her citizenry prospered.

Then, in violation of a treaty signed with Lithuania in 1920, Soviet Russia occupied the Baltic States. Ever since that day in June 1940, the Soviet Union has refused to allow Lithuania to take her deserved place among independent states. The curtailment of the freedoms of the people of Lithuania has been deplorable.

Mr. President, at this time when we celebrate the freedom that was once known by this brave nation, let us declare once again our hope for a future of liberty and self-government for all the peoples of the world.

#### BIG SPRING, TEX., HERALD CALLS FOR CREATION OF BIG THICKET NATIONAL PARK

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the legendary Big Thicket in southeast Texas is one of the few remaining wilderness areas in our country. The beautiful and majestic land, which once covered some 3.5 million acres of forest and woodlands, stands as a living monument to the biological and historical development of this Nation. The ancient groves of beech and magnolia, the stately loblolly pine, the sleepy river bottoms of crystal waters, the silent cypress swamps—abound with the tales of the frontier and the stories of Texas history.

Once the forests of the Big Thicket were literally filled with wildlife—with black bear, panther, whitetail deer, otter, muskrat, raccoon, opossum, timber wolf, red wolf, red fox, and many other species. The woods rang with the song of count-

less birds—including the rare ivory bill woodpecker.

Some species still make their home in the Big Thicket, even though its land area has shrunk to barely 300,000 acres—land that has been disappearing at the rate of 50 acres per day. New sounds in the thicket—the persistent hack and grind of ax and saw—give notice that this remaining portion is doomed, unless immediate action is taken to preserve this last remnant of a once magnificent wilderness.

I have introduced a bill, S. 4, which seeks to prevent further exploitation of the area by establishing a Big Thicket National Park of not less than 100,000 acres. This is less than 3 percent of the original acreage, but I feel that a significant representative portion of the Big Thicket can be preserved by such action.

Support for the preservation of the Big Thicket has grown considerably over the last few years. Not only are many local Texas organizations concerned with the project, but numerous nationally known conservationist groups are working for the preservation of the Big Thicket. Due to such widespread enthusiasm and support, I am hopeful that my bill, S. 4, will receive early consideration by the Senate.

Mr. President, the Big Spring, Tex., Herald of February 3, 1969, published an editorial, written by Mr. R. W. Whipkey, editor, endorsing the establishment of a 100,000-acre Big Thicket National Park. This is one of the best editorials that I have seen on the subject. 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 BIG THICKET

Sen. Ralph Yarborough, dissatisfied with some proposals that would create a "monument" or a "playground" in the area, has introduced a bill calling for the creation of a Big Thicket National Park in East Texas of not less than 100,000 acres. This bill expresses in concrete terms a general and un-specific measure he introduced first in 1966.

Most Texans by now probably are aware that there is an area known as the Big Thicket in East Texas. But all too few have actually penetrated that wilderness of great trees and dense undergrowth, of scattered lakes and boggy sloughs, abounding with animal and exotic plant life. The noise and the stress of civilization seem far away indeed around a campfire while the wind sighs among the leaves of the lofty trees.

When the first white man found this wilderness it encompassed an area of approximately 3.5 million acres. But lumbering and agriculture have reduced the Thicket to an area of only about 300,000 acres in Hardin, Liberty, San Jacinto, Polk and Tyler counties. The encroachment proceeds at the rate of about 50 acres a day. It will be gone if prompt steps are not taken to set aside a portion of it for the enjoyment of this and future generations of Americans.

Congress should take action this year to create the Big Thicket National Park. This probably is the last natural area in need of being set aside.

#### ARAB ATTACK ON ISRAEL EL AL AIRLINER

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, all decent people must deplore the cowardly attack

by Arab commandos on an Israel El Al airliner in Zurich, Switzerland, yesterday.

In the words of Gideon Rafael, director general of the Israel Foreign Office who was on the plane:

The terrorists would not observe the neutrality of Switzerland, which even Adolph Hitler did.

It is indeed sad that these hit-and-run killers seem to concentrate on unarmed people. When the Arab terrorists attack, it is seldom ever against a military installation. They seem rather to prefer unarmed travelers, crowded theaters, or schoolrooms.

But the free world must do more than deplore. Now is the time for action and I call upon the United Nations to act promptly and effectively. The U.N., in concert with other nations of the world, must condemn this terror and take specific actions to prevent it from happening again. In the past the United Nations has waited until the Israelis were forced to retaliate and then condemned—not both sides—but Israel alone.

Now we are waiting to see whether the United Nations will act in time to prevent another such terrorist attack against unarmed people.

#### BENJAMIN BANNEKER AND THE DEPARTMENT OF PEACE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on February 7, together with the senior Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) and 13 other Senators, I introduced a bill (S. 953) to establish a Cabinet-level Department of Peace. As I noted at the time, the idea of such a department is nearly as old as the Nation, dating back to an essay of the 1790's which appears in the collected writings of Dr. Benjamin Rush, pioneer medical scientist and a signer of the Declaration of Independence. The date ascribed to it is 1799.

However, the bulk of this four-page article may also be found in nearly identical form, word for word, in the "Almanack and Ephemeris for the Year of Our Lord 1793," published at Philadelphia by Benjamin Banneker, sometimes known as the "black Ben Franklin." Although it appears there without signature, the historian John Hope Franklin considers it a contribution by the Philadelphia doctor to his friend's publication.

However that may be, it is an interesting document. As a result of the introduction of the new bill, which was also introduced in the House by Representative SEYMOUR HALPERN, of New York, and 59 other Members of the House, the full text of Dr. Rush's essay was reprinted in the February 15 issue of Engage, a publication of the Board of Christian Social Concerns of the United Methodist Church. On February 14, Mr. William Raspberry in his regular Washington Post column, cited portions of this material and commented on the Hartke-Halpern bill.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Raspberry's article and the full text of the essay as reprinted in Engage be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items

were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 14, 1969]  
PEACE DEPARTMENT PROPOSAL, WHILE BOLD,  
IS 175 YEARS OLD

(By William Raspberry)

Q. Mr. President, as you are aware, I am sure, there has been discussion on the Hill about trying to set up a Department of Peace to include the Peace Corps and the Disarmament Agency and other organizations. I wondered about your reaction to that idea.

A. In fact, one of my task forces recommended a Department of Peace. I think, however, that derogates, and improperly downgrades, the role of the Department of State and the Department of Defense . . . I think putting one department over here as a Department of Peace would tend to indicate that the other departments were engaged in other activities that were not interested in peace.

From a recent Presidential news conference.

Thus did President Nixon shoot down Sen. Vance Hartke's (D-Ind.) bold, new idea.

Well, bold, anyway. It wasn't exactly new, considering that a very similar proposal was made some 175 years ago by Benjamin Banneker, the black astronomer-mathematician who helped L'Enfant lay out the District of Columbia.

"Among the many defects which have been pointed out in the Federal constitution by its antifederal enemies," Banneker wrote in his *Almanack and Ephemeris for the Year of Our Lord 1793*, "it is much to be lamented that no person has taken notice of its total silence upon the subject of an office of the utmost importance to the welfare of the United States, that is, an office for promoting and preserving perpetual peace in our country."

"It is to be hoped that no objection will be made to the establishment of such an office, while we are engaged in a war with the Indians, for as the War-Office of the United States was established in time of peace, it is equally reasonable that a Peace-Office should be established in time of war."

He then proceeded to outline his plan for the office, to be headed by a "Secretary of Peace" who would "establish and maintain free schools in every city, village and township," and "be responsible for the talents, principles and morals of all his school-masters."

Banneker's draft called for careful instruction in the 3Rs "and in the doctrines of a religion of some kind; the Christian religion should be preferred to all others; for it belongs to this religion exclusively to teach us not only to cultivate peace with all men, but to forgive, nay more—to love our very enemies."

Further: "Let every family in the United States be furnished at the public expense, by the Secretary of this office, with a copy of an American edition of the Bible. This measure has become the more necessary in our country, since the banishment of the Bible, as a school-book, from most of the schools in the United States."

Banneker's proposal also included repeals of all laws "which authorize juries, judges, sheriffs, or hangmen . . . to commit murder in cold blood in any case whatever," since otherwise "it will be in vain to attempt to introduce universal and perpetual peace in our country."

Hartke's bill begins to look pale in comparison. How would Mr. Nixon have reacted, for example, if the Hoosier had called, as Banneker did, for an end to military shows and even repeal of militia laws?

"Military dresses and military titles should be laid aside," said Banneker. "Reviews tend to lessen the horrors of battle by connecting them with the charms of order . . . military dresses fascinate the minds of young men, and lead them from serious and useful pro-

fessions; were there no uniforms, there would probably be no armies."

If he had thought of it, I suppose he would have wanted to ban toy weapons for the kids and get rid of the violence on television.

How about it, Sen. Hartke?

[From Engage, Feb. 15, 1969]

A PLAN OF A PEACE-OFFICE FOR THE UNITED STATES

(By Benjamin Rush, signer of the Declaration of Independence)

Among the defects which have been pointed out in the Federal Constitution by its anti-federal enemies, it is much to be lamented that no person has taken notice of its total silence upon the subject of an office of the utmost importance to the welfare of the United States, that is, an office for promoting and preserving perpetual peace in our country.

It is to be hoped that no objection will be made to the establishment of such an office, while we are engaged in a war with the Indians, for as the War-Office of the United States was established in the time of peace, it is equally reasonable that a Peace-Office should be established in the time of war.

The plan of this office is as follows:

I. Let a Secretary of the Peace be appointed to preside in this office, who shall be perfectly free from all the present absurd and vulgar European prejudices upon the subject of government; let him be a genuine republican and a sincere Christian, for the principles of republicanism and Christianity are no less friendly to universal and perpetual peace, than they are to universal and equal liberty.

II. Let a power be given to this Secretary to establish and maintain free-schools in every city, village and township of the United States; and let him be made responsible for the talents, principles, and morals of all his schoolmasters. Let the youth of our country be carefully instructed in reading, writing, arithmetic, and in the doctrines of a religion of some kind: the Christian religion should be preferred to all others; for it belongs to this religion exclusively to teach us not only to cultivate peace with men, but to forgive, nay more—to love our very enemies. It belongs to it further to teach us that the Supreme Being alone possesses a power to take away human life, and that we rebel against his laws, when ever we undertake to execute death in any way whatever upon any of his creatures.

III. Let every family in the United States be furnished at the public expense, by the Secretary of this office, with a copy of an American edition of the Bible. This measure has become the more necessary in our country, since the banishment of the bible, as a school-book, from most of the schools in the United States. Unless the price of this book be paid for by the public, there is reason to fear that in a few years it will be met with only in courts of justice or in magistrates' offices; and should the absurd mode of establishing truth by kissing this sacred book fall into disuse, it may probably, in the course of the next generation, be seen only as a curiosity on a shelf in a public museum.

IV. Let the following sentence be inscribed in letters of gold over the doors of every State and Court house in the United States: The son of man came into the world, not to destroy men's lives, but to save them.

V. To inspire a veneration for human life, and an horror at the shedding of human blood, let all those laws be repealed which authorize juries, judges, sheriffs, or hangmen to assume the resentments of individuals and to commit murder in cold blood in any case whatever. Until this reformation in our code of penal jurisprudence takes place, it will be in vain to attempt to introduce universal and perpetual peace in our country.

VI. To subdue that passion for war, which education, added to human depravity, have made universal, a familiarity with the in-

struments of death, as well as all military shows, should be carefully avoided. For which reason, militia laws should every where be repealed, and military dresses and military titles should be laid aside: reviews tend to lessen the horrors of a battle by connecting them with the charms of order; militia laws generate idleness and vice, and thereby produce the wars they are said to prevent; military dresses fascinate the minds of young men, and lead them from serious and useful professions; were there no uniforms, there would probably be no armies; lastly, military titles feed vanity, and keep up ideas in the mind which lessen a sense of the folly and miseries of war.

VII. In the last place, let a large room, adjoining the federal hall, be appropriated for transacting the business and preserving all the records of this office. Over the door of this room let there be a sign, on which the figures of a lamb, a dove and an olive branch should be painted, together with the following inscriptions in letters of gold: Peace on earth—good-will to man. Ah! Why will men forget that they are brethren?

Within this apartment let there be a collection of plough-shares and pruning-hooks made out of swords and spears; and on each of the walls of the apartment, the following pictures as large as life:

1. A lion eating straw with an ox, and an adder playing upon the lips of a child.
2. An Indian boiling his venison in the same pot with a citizen of Kentucky.
3. Lord Cornwallis and Tipoo Saib, under the shade of a sycamore-tree in the East Indies, drinking Madeira wine together out of the same decanter.
4. A group of French and Austrian soldiers dancing arm and arm, under a bower erected in the neighbourhood of Mons.
5. A St. Domingo planter, a man of color, and a native of Africa, legislating together in the same colonial assembly.

To complete the entertainment of this delightful apartment, let a group of young ladies, clad in white robes, assemble every day at a certain hour, in a gallery to be erected for the purpose, and sing odes, and hymns, and anthems in praise of the blessings of peace.

One of these songs should consist of the following lines.

Peace o'er the world her olive wand extends,  
And white-rob'd innocence from heaven descends;

All crimes shall cease, and ancient frauds shall fail,  
Returning justice lifts aloft her scale.

In order more deeply to affect the minds of the citizens of the United States with the blessings of peace, by contrasting them with the evils of war, let the following inscriptions be painted upon the sign, which is placed over the door of the War-Office.

1. An office for butchering the human species.
2. A Widow and Orphan making office.
3. A broken bone making office.
4. A Wooden leg making office.
5. An office for creating public and private vices.
6. An office for creating a public debt.
7. An office for creating speculators, stock jobbers, and bankrupts.
8. An office for creating famine.
9. An office for creating pestilential diseases.
10. An office for creating poverty, and the destruction of liberty, and national happiness.

In the lobby of this office, let there be painted representations of all the common military instruments of death, also human skulls, broken bones, unburied and putrefying dead bodies, hospitals crowded with sick and wounded soldiers, villages on fire, mothers in besieged towns eating the flesh of their children, ships sinking in the ocean, rivers dyed with blood, and extensive plains with-

out a tree or fence, or any other object, but the ruins of deserted farm houses.

Above this group of woeful figures—let the following words be inserted, in red characters to represent the human blood: "National Glory."

JOHN F. O'LEARY, DIRECTOR,  
BUREAU OF MINES

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the Senate is familiar with the controversy over reported plans to replace John F. O'Leary, Director of the Bureau of Mines in the Department of the Interior.

Mr. O'Leary has held this position only 4 months. But during that time, he has compiled a most unusual and impressive record of public service. This record was reported by New York Times writer Ben A. Franklin on February 17, 1969. Mr. Franklin wrote:

In his four months on the job, Mr. O'Leary startled the old-line staff at the Bureau of Mines—an agency that the former Secretary of the Interior, Stewart L. Udall, called "timorous and almost apologetic" in its regulation of the mining industry—by insisting that the bureau "represent the public interest rather than the industry alone."

Mr. O'Leary has been reminding his top aides that, despite the bureau's new safety campaign, 42 miners have died in accidents in the 63 working days since the Farmington disaster.

The immediate cause of anti-O'Leary pressure from the industry was the director's order last December to the bureau's 300 mine inspectors to make unannounced spot checks of coal-mine compliance with Federal safety rules. This step involved an element of surprise that the bureau had rarely tried before, although it is directed to do so by legislation. Mr. O'Leary's order was one of several issued after the West Virginia mine explosion.

More than 600 spot checks were made in December alone, compared with 137 in all of 1967. With the power to close mines only with evidence of "imminent disaster" or "unwarrantable disregard" of previously reported safety violations, the inspection staff under Mr. O'Leary's directives since November has ordered workers temporarily out of more than 200 coal mines considered unsafe. During the entire previous 10 months of 1968, only 129 such closure orders were issued.

He has also said the industry's argument that it could not bear the cost of health and safety standards ordered by the bureau and included in new legislation now pending in Congress ceased to be valid in the early 1960's, "when profits began to rise after a period of depression in coal."

Clearly, we need more men like John F. O'Leary in the public service, not less.

Without in any way passing judgment on a possible successor, it is obvious that we must encourage men like John F. O'Leary to stay on the job to continue their dedicated efforts to protect the citizens of this country.

Recruiting men of high caliber for the Federal service is difficult enough. When we have a good man, we cannot afford to let him go, particularly if he is as conscientious as Mr. O'Leary.

Indeed, how ironic that the Government should consider replacing Mr. O'Leary at a time when Americans feel disenchanting and distant from the Government. Perhaps if we had more public officials like John O'Leary, this gap between the people and the Government might not be so great.

It is unwise public policy to replace a man who is dedicated to carrying out the duties of his office and who is fully implementing the laws that he is charged with upholding.

#### U.S. FAILURE TO RATIFY FORCED LABOR CONVENTION: THE COMPANY WE KEEP—XX

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, of all the human rights conventions which I have daily urged the Senate to ratify, the Convention on Forced Labor has been ratified by the largest number of nations.

Seventy-five nations have ratified the Convention on Forced Labor since its adoption by the International Labor Organization at Geneva in 1957.

As I have mentioned earlier, this convention which had its initial push from the free American labor movement, has not been ratified by the United States.

But perhaps even more interesting, Mr. President, than our own failure to ratify the Convention on Forced Labor is a look at some of the other nations which have failed to ratify this same treaty: Albania, Byelorussian S.S.R., Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Ukrainian S.S.R., U.S.S.R., and Yugoslavia.

Why have not any of these countries ratified the Convention on Forced Labor?

The answer is completely obvious to every American old enough to read a newspaper or understand a newscast: These nations dominated as they are by the threat or the presence of the Red Army and by leaders who, with some notable exceptions, are not free of Russian domination, are unwilling to have their forced labor practices viewed or reviewed.

But why has the United States refused to ratify this same Convention on Forced Labor?

Our failure to ratify this convention has put us in some very peculiar company relative to the practice of forced labor. Certainly we have nothing to be ashamed of, nothing to hide from probing eyes.

Let the Senate dispel any doubts on the question of forced labor. Let the Senate allow no one to point an accusing finger at the United States. We can do both of these very, very simply by ratifying the Convention on Forced Labor.

#### FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA WEEK

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, during November of 1928, a small group of high school vocational agriculture students met in Kansas City and decided to form a national organization of boys studying vocational agriculture under the provision of the Federal Smith-Hughes Act. North Dakota was represented at that meeting by two delegates. The group decided on the name Future Farmers of America.

On May 11, 1929, a small delegation of vocational agriculture students from 29 North Dakota schools met at the North Dakota Agricultural College, now

the North Dakota State University, and decided to organize a State FFA association and ask for a State charter. The charter was granted October 7, 1929. The association was the 30th State association to receive a charter from the national organization.

This June, 750 FFA members and advisers representing approximately 3,500 members of the 65 North Dakota chapters, will gather at NDSU for their 40th State FFA Convention.

This week North Dakota FFA members join some 450,000 FFA members in the 9,000 chapters throughout the Nation to celebrate National FFA Week. The theme this year is "FFA—an Opportunity for Youth."

The FFA provides opportunity for youth to participate in activities and to gain experience which leads them to excel, to grow, and to become outstanding young leaders for agriculture in America. FFA members pursue vocational and educational objectives as students of vocational agriculture.

Through the FFA, a member can develop skills and prepare himself for his vital role as an adult leader in American agriculture. Many young people have grasped these opportunities and progressed. Many more in the future will find opportunities in FFA to learn, to do, to earn, to serve.

North Dakota Gov. William Guy honors the FFA members in North Dakota by proclaiming this week as "Future Farmers of America Week" in North Dakota. I ask unanimous consent that the proclamation be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### PROCLAMATION

Whereas, Agriculture provides job opportunities for over 23,000,000 men and women in our nation, and

Whereas, Agriculture is the largest employer, the biggest producer and the prime consumer in North Dakota, and

Whereas, Production agriculture—farming and ranching—is America's largest industry, employing 7,000,000 people, and

Whereas, Other opportunities in agriculture account for approximately 40% of the nation's private jobs, and

Whereas, The need for technical and professional agriculturists far exceeds the supply, and

Whereas, It is estimated that by the year 2000, America will have 330 million people and food production must be increased 83% on fewer acres, and

Whereas, Vocational and technical education in agriculture educates the student in the science and principles of food production and in other occupations in the spectrum of agriculture, and

Whereas, The Future Farmers of America organization is the leadership training arm of the vocational agriculture program numbering many outstanding leaders among its alumni

Now, therefore, I, William L. Guy, Governor of the State of North Dakota, do hereby proclaim the week of February 15–22, 1969, as "Future Farmers of America Week" and urge all citizens to become better acquainted with and give support to the program of vocational agriculture and the FFA.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the

State of North Dakota to be affixed this 28th day of January, 1969.

WILLIAM L. GUY,  
Governor.

Attest:

BEN MEIER,  
Secretary of State.

"I AM AN AMERICAN"—POEM RECITED BY WENDY STOUT, SAXAPAHAW, N.C.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, a few days ago I had the pleasure of visiting an elementary school in my home community of Saxapahaw, N.C.

While I was there, one of the students, an attractive fourth-grade girl named Wendy Stout, recited a poem entitled "I Am an American."

She did it beautifully and with a sincerity which impressed me deeply, as did the poem itself.

I do not recall the author's name. The message conveyed, however, was one which I think is important to all of us, young and old, in this time of unrest and uncertainty in our national life as a reminder of some of the truths and values which too many seem to have forgotten or laid aside.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the poem be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### I AM AN AMERICAN

I am an American.

If you ask me what that means  
I'll answer:

I love my country and my God;

I love my parents and they love me.

I respect my neighbors and deal with them fairly.

I am strong; I am happy; I am free.

I can speak without fear and act without shame.

And walk tall among the children of earth.

All the rights that I have I am willing to share.

I am proud of my nation—my birth.

I can work as I wish and play as I wish,

And think what I wish and say what I wish,

And do as I wish and pray as I wish,

So long as I'm decent and true.

My school is free and my church is free,

My country's laws are made for me,

And all in all it is good to be

An American.

I am glad that I am an American.

I am proud of my birthright, but humble, too.

And being an American

These things I must do:

I must speak the truth as I see the truth;

I must play by rules that are fair.

I must not laugh at another's ways,

Or take more than is my share.

I must do nothing that will cause me shame.

I must walk tall and brave and free,

And I must help others to have,

The rights that mean so much to me.

#### THE RETIREMENT OF CHARLES A. RICHEY, SUPERINTENDENT OF LAKE MEAD NATIONAL RECREATIONAL AREA

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on January 24 of this year, Mr. Charles A. Richey

retired as superintendent of the Lake Mead National Recreation Area after 15 years of vigorous and imaginative leadership. I think it appropriate to pay tribute to a man who exemplifies the National Park Service's high standard of excellence.

Chuck Richey was an able administrator and an outstanding organizer, but he will be remembered principally for a creative spirit that fostered a variety of major additions and improvements to the Lake Mead NRA. Under his stewardship, camping and boating facilities were greatly expanded. Water systems were installed. An airstrip was constructed, new roads were added, and parking facilities were increased. A new visitors' center was built, and numerous improvements were implemented in concession operations.

The product of Mr. Richey's tireless efforts is reflected in visitor statistics. From a modest beginning, the Lake Mead National Recreation Area has become the fastest-growing outdoor complex of its kind in America. Last year it attracted 5 million visitors—more, by far, than any other western park or recreation facility, including Yellowstone and Yosemite.

Recognized as an authority in management techniques for water-oriented recreation areas, Mr. Richey's career with the National Park Service spanned 37 years. The capstone of that career came last year when he was invited to Washington to receive the Department of the Interior's Distinguished Service Award. Secretary Udall, in making the presentation, said he knew of no person more deserving of the Department's highest honor—and Chuck Richey's hundreds of admirers agreed.

A graduate of Iowa State University with a degree in landscape architecture, Mr. Richey first became associated with the National Park Service in 1931 when he was employed as a junior landscape architect in San Francisco.

In that position, he was a member of the first team selected to prepare master plans for the development of national parks and monuments in the West and Southwest.

In 1935, he was transferred to Santa Fe, N. Mex., as an associate architect in the Branch of Plans and Design.

Then, in 1940, he was promoted to the position of assistant superintendent—and later to superintendent—of Southwestern National Monuments, administering 28 areas in four States. Three years later he was named assistant director of the service's regional office in Santa Fe, and in that capacity was instrumental in working out the details of a merger of Southwestern National Monuments into the regional organization.

Mr. Richey accepted a promotion to the Branch of Lands in the headquarters office of the National Park Service in Chicago in 1945, and a year later was promoted to assistant chief of Lands and Recreation Planning.

In 1947, he was selected to serve as an advisor to the Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers and the Japanese Gov-

ernment on the reorganization and replanning of the Japanese national parks.

Before leaving Washington in 1954 to assume the Lake Mead superintendency, he prepared a report on land acquisition which has evolved into a statement of policy on this phase of national park administration.

Mr. Richey has been a member of the Boulder City, Nev., Planning Commission and, since 1955, of the executive board of the Boulder Dam Area Council, Boy Scouts of America, which he now serves as a commissioner.

In addition, he is a member of the American Society of Landscape Architects, Rotary Club, the Arizona Park and Recreation Association, in which he has served on the executive board since 1965, the Nevada Park and Recreation Society, and the Alpha Phi Chapter of the Pi Kappa Alpha fraternity. He is a charter member of and helped organize the Southern Nevada Unit of the Coast Guard Auxiliary.

Mr. President, Charles A. Richey has served his Nation with distinction and honor. We are fortunate to have had the benefit of his wisdom and judgment during a critical period in the development of the Lake Mead National Recreation Area. His career represents a chapter of excellence in the history of the National Park Service.

#### THE VALUE OF FARM PROGRAMS

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, largely because of incorrect and adverse articles about agriculture appearing in almost every magazine and other news media, farm programs have become increasingly unpopular. I do not know of any program of the Federal Government that is less understood and more misrepresented than farm programs, particularly the price-support program. Farm price-support programs could and should be improved, but with all their deficiencies they are of tremendous help to farmers.

Land-grant colleges which have made a study of the present programs invariably come up with the answer that if they were abolished farm income would drop as much as another 50 percent. Not only farmers but this whole Nation could be in serious trouble if Congress, through lack of accurate information and understanding, abolishes these programs.

Mr. Alf T. Olsen, farm editor of the Forum, North Dakota's largest daily newspaper, wrote an article published in the February 14 issue relating to this subject. It is an excellent article. It would be of tremendous help if the farm equipment industry, the automobile industry, the fertilizer industry, the chemical industry, the rubber industry, and all others who do a huge business with farmers had a better understanding of the problems of their best customers. There should be, as Mr. Olsen points out in his article, a better relationship between agriculture and industry and, for that matter, all of the people of the Nation.

Mr. President, I believe Mr. Olsen's

article is one that would be of great interest to people everywhere. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### SIDEWALK FARMING

(By Alf T. Olsen, Farm Editor)

Farm state politicians, farm organization officials, farmers and agribusinessmen have and are bemoaning the fact that the so-called "farm bloc" in Congress has faded away to ineffectiveness.

It seems that there isn't a day that goes by that someone doesn't point an accusing finger at the lack of an effective farm bloc as the main reason for farmers not getting a fair shake from the nation's legislators.

Well, there still is a farm bloc in existence. An extremely efficient one if an effort is made by farmers and their farm organizations to use it.

The farm bloc I'm talking about is the one made up of the millions and millions of Americans who depend upon the farmers for their daily food, and those of this group whose salaries are dependent upon the economic well-being of the farmer.

Wouldn't it be something if when farm legislation designed to give farmers a fair share of the nation's economy was being considered to see representatives of industry testifying favorably, such as the farm equipment industry, the oil industry, the automobile industry, the chemical industry, the fertilizer industry, the food processing industry, or any other industry for that matter!

The list in the paragraph above is only a partial one. There are few segments of industrial America not dependent upon farmers for their profits.

Has anyone ever invited representatives of industry to come out in favor of giving farmers an equitable share of the nation's productivity? If they have, it's been a deep dark secret.

Sure, there have been some attempts at getting labor union support by some groups. Both the attempts and the resulting action have been half-hearted.

What is needed is nationwide farm pressure on agribusiness, stressing the importance of their support of farmers in their battle to maintain farming as a way of life.

#### GEORGE J. BURGER: 60 YEARS IN "AUTOMOBILE ROW"

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the Automobile Old Timers News has published its January-March 1969 issue on its 30th anniversary. In this issue is an article entitled "60 Years Hence." It is a description of the activities of a man whom we in the Capitol all know, and he is well known by all who have worked in the field of small business. He is George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business. We all know of the long years of faithful and effective service George Burger has given the cause of small business.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

#### SIXTY YEARS HENCE

George J. Burger, our AOT Active member, can give you a tour through more than sixty years of experiences in the automotive indus-

try, association work, and still not show you everything.

In 1909, he entered the auto industry in "Automobile Row" in the area between 50th to 59th Streets on Broadway in New York City. Working in an automobile supply house, stocking tires and accessories, he came in contact with the many dealers representing Oldsmobile, Cadillac, Peerless, Lozier, Buick, Packard, Pierce-Arrow, and others. The tire industry had a good representation through Goodrich, Goodyear, Firestone, and a few others who were in the race.

For a portion of 1910, he worked for the United States Motor Company, which was made up of Stoddard-Dayton, Maxwell Briscoe, Brush, and Columbia—traveling as a bill collector for them.

A business of his very own was established in 1911 on the fourth floor of the Buick Building and known as the H & B Auto Supply Company. In the years that followed, the automobile industry advanced and so did the business grow for George Burger. Buick needed all of their space and this necessitated the move of H & B Auto Supply to another location while increase of business required a second move after that to a larger building. During those years, he served the metropolitan area of New York; particularly, Buick and Cadillac agents who in turn were happy to recommend tires and accessories as supplied by the H & B Company. These years of service were done on the basis of "personal service with good quality merchandise with no exceptions or omissions."

From the Brooklyn Eagle, February 1911, we share with you a clipping that will show the duties of a representative of a product during a show:

#### "GOODYEAR TIRES AT SHOW

"George J. Burger, the Brooklyn representative of the Goodyear Tire Company, reports that most of the cars shown at the armory are equipped with Goodyear tires. It is evident that Mr. Burger takes great pride in that part for he is constantly on the watch to keep the shoes of the cars looking clean and white. If a tire shows the slightest sign of dirt or grease, one of Mr. Burger's assistants immediately is dispatched to remove it.

"Announcement was made at the Armory yesterday that the Peerless Garage and Sales Company had concluded arrangements to become the representatives of the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company for Brooklyn and Long Island. The salesrooms will be located at 1525 Bedford avenue. George J. Burger will have charge of this department. Mr. Burger has been in the accessory business for several years. He was formerly connected with the United States Motor Company."

With a keen interest in the protection and growth of independent businesses, George has spent many years of devotion and service on their behalf. Not only has he served with the independent tire dealer association but he was also a founding member of the Greater New York City Tire and Battery Association in 1920; and was President and a founding member of the United Tire Stores of America in 1929.

Early 1935 found him as Secretary and General Manager of the National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, where he remained until 1941.

In 1941, Mr. Burger founded his own Consultant Service for independent tire dealers, the Burger Tire Consultant Service and commenced publishing his own tire trade journal, the *National Independent*. His work was limited generally to tire-dealer problems, until 1947, when he became Vice-President and Board Member of the National Federation of Independent Business, and where he has represented small businessmen at Washington, D.C., for more than 30 years.

His interest has been generally in all things directly or indirectly affecting independent

business fair opportunities. His chief concern has been in adequate enforcement of all antitrust laws, at the national, state, and local levels, among businessmen, farmers, labor, and government itself to keep trade channels free of arbitrary restraints. He believes that adequate antitrust enforcement strengthens free enterprises and thereby helps stave off otherwise inevitable trends toward state socialism or greater government interference with business.

Since 1947, Mr. Burger's legislative efforts have helped gain small businessmen the strongest, most effective representation ever in our nation's history in governmental affairs . . . through creation of the permanent Senate Small Business Committee (1950), creation of the Executive Branch Small Business Administration (established in 1953, made permanent in 1958), and creation of the continuing President's Special Cabinet Committee on Small Business. He has also directed efforts which resulted, in 1958, in Congressional enactment of \$260 million in special tax revisions for smaller firms, in the Small Business Tax Adjustment Act.

More than this, he has coordinated legislative activities which have helped lead to, among other things, (1) Federal Trade Commission pioneering efforts to establish tire maximum discount ceilings as protections for independent dealers (1947), (2) the successful small business counterdrive against "basing point" proposals which could have wrecked antitrust protections against pricing unfairnesses (1949), (3) enactment of the Celler-O'Mahoney strengthener to Clayton Act prohibitions against monopoly procuring mergers (1950), (4) enactment of the McGuire Fair Trade Enabling Act, and creation of the Smaller War Plants Corporation to integrate small business productive potential into the Korean War programs (1951), (5) successful cooperation with the Independent Bankers Association in securing enactment of the Bank Holding Company Bill (1955), (6) in the period 1958-1964 a number of Congressional enactments helpful to independent enterprise, including measures for speedier enforcement of antitrust orders, the closure of legal loopholes which helped giant chains escape effective antitrust supervision over unfair pricing activities, bills to protect small interstate sellers from multi-state taxation of their incomes, the 1962 and 1964 tax reduction and revision bills, and (7) enactment (1966) of H.R. 318, a bill which requires tire manufacturers to pay Federal Excise Taxes on tires delivered to their factory stores for sale to ultimate consumers on the same basis as competing independent tire dealers are required to pay these taxes (this bill corrects a defect in the original tire excise tax procedure which gave tire factory-owned stores a measurable financial advantage over competing independent dealers).

Additionally, he has directed Federation legislative activities in cooperation with the Hoover Commission which have helped promote a claimed \$7.5 billion in savings on government operations, and he has helped set the wheels in motion for elimination of burdensome Federal excise taxes on independents' telephone and telegraph bills, and has provided Capitol follow-up on Federation member wishes to reduce the size and number of Government establishments competing with independent businessmen. Presently, he is working closely with a number of Congressmen on new legislative proposals aimed to require manufacturers who sell through both their own factory store chains and independent dealers, to treat both equally price-wise.

In his years at Washington, D.C., Mr. Burger has been a member of the Small Business Task Force of the National Security Resources Board, a member of the Business Ad-

visory Committee to the President's Council of Economic Advisors, and a member of the Small Business Advisory Committee to the House Small Business Committee. Further than this, he has acted as consultant to both major political parties in drawing up the Small Business planks of their Presidential Year Platforms, testifying before their conventions in 1948, 1952, 1956, 1960, and 1964. Many of his recommendations were incorporated into these platforms, and subsequently voted into law. The Senate Commerce Committee appointed him, in 1961 and again in 1962, as its consultant to investigate small business opportunities for exports to Common Market countries during his trips to Europe.

All during his life he has been interested in organization and prior to 1947, he represented the nation's independent tire dealers at Washington, D.C. In that capacity he shared in leadership of the drives that led to enactment of the Robinson-Patman Law, which put teeth into Clayton Act prohibitions against unfair price discrimination, and that led to enactment of the Miller-Tydings Fair Trade Enabling Act. He worked closely with Congressmen in establishing the temporary House and Senate Small Business Committees in 1940 and 1941, and cooperated closely with these Committees in their studies of tire-dealer problems. These studies have become the "bible" for Government officials working on small business problems to this day. By surveys of national conditions, he helped put the wheels in motion with Justice Department and Federal Trade Commission on projects that have freed independent service-station operators to buy their tire-battery-accessory goods when and from whom they want. By espousal of the Tire Bill, a measure to bar tire manufacturers from selling at retail in competition with their independent outlets, he helped head off disastrous price wars in the rubber industry. In cooperation with the Small Business Committees, he helped lay the groundwork for the Smaller War Plants Corporation, which helped integrate small business into the World War II effort, and for the Government rubber program which integrated tire independents into the war effort.

These past sixty years have been filled with challenges and experiences for George Burger, our devoted member and industry leader. His final message to us is: "With my 60 years in the automobile industry, I will still continue to work for the future success of the independents in that major industry."

#### GUN CONTROL REGISTRATION

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, it has been brought to my attention that since the Gun Control Act of 1968 went into effect the Internal Revenue Service, by regulation, has been requiring that purchasers of ammunition must furnish information which is tantamount to registration. As the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD) pointed out recently, this is a circumvention of the intent of Congress in adopting the 1968 act. At that time, Congress clearly did not expect the IRS to do by regulation what it had tried to prohibit by law.

The Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT) on February 4, introduced S. 845 which would eliminate the registration requirement of the IRS regulation for individuals purchasing rifle, shotgun and .22-caliber rimfire ammunition. However, under this bill buyers purchasing ammunition for most pistols and revolvers would still be subject to the regulation

and, therefore, have to provide the required information. I am sure the Senator from Utah chose not to eliminate the regulation, as it applies to ammunition for such hand guns, because statistics have shown overwhelmingly that the vast majority of crimes are committed with the use of these kinds of weapons and not the guns which the sportsman uses.

I believe the regulation requiring the purchaser to, in effect, register before obtaining rifle ammunition will make no meaningful contribution to the war on crime but will only unnecessarily inconvenience the law-abiding sportsman.

#### NATIONAL ENGINEERS WEEK

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, under the sponsorship of the National Society of Professional Engineers, the week of February 16 through February 22, 1969 is observed by the Professional Engineers of America as National Engineers Week. This particular week is traditionally chosen each year as it includes the observance of Washington's birth date, our first President himself having been a trained surveyor and builder.

Since the time of Washington's active engineering accomplishments, engineers have continually played a major role in shaping and reshaping our country's face and its fortune, and now paves our way into the vast reaches of outer space.

National Engineers Week is a particularly good time to call the attention of our young people to the opportunities which exist for a career in engineering—opportunity for participation in a vital professional activity with unlimited applications for talent, ingenuity, imagination and personal satisfaction. Active American leadership in tomorrow's world will in part come from the engineering community. A partnership share in this leadership is open to today's young people.

A special article on the role which engineers play in the shaping of urban environment and solution of human needs has been prepared by Prof. John G. Duba, director for urban environmental studies of the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn. It will appear in newspapers and magazines across the country during National Engineers Week. It has been brought to my attention by Robert H. Doyle, legislative counsel for the National Society of Professional Engineers. I ask unanimous consent that the announcement be printed in the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL ENGINEERS WEEK: ENGINEERS PLAY KEY ROLE IN SHAPING URBAN ENVIRONMENT AND SOLVING HUMAN NEEDS

(By Prof. John G. Duba, P.E., director, Center for Urban Environmental Studies, Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn)

Engineers have been major contributors to the growth and development of cities through the centuries. Some early engineering works such as the roads and aqueducts of Rome still stand today. In our present day society based on science, technology and in-

dustrialization, the contributions of engineers to improvement of our urban environment are much greater than in the past and serve an ever increasing population.

Our country's population now totals approximately 202 million and continues to grow. It would take a city the size of Detroit to house just last year's increase in population. In less than two years the nation's population increase will be greater than that of Chicago.

#### POPULATION FACTORS

Two out of every three persons live in our big central cities or their adjacent suburbs. If we consider the number of persons who live in small cities and towns, almost 75 percent of our total population can be considered urban. It is therefore not surprising that so much attention is being given to the needs of urban areas.

We read and hear much of urban problems—social, economic and physical. Newspaper headlines regularly point out problems of slum and blight; the inadequacy of schools and parks; pollution of the air, water and land; noise; ugliness; traffic congestion and a score of other conditions which affect the urban environment.

Man's environment may be considered as all of the conditions, circumstances and influences surrounding him. Included are the place he lives, the schools attended by his children, the recreation facilities available to him and his family, his place of employment, the transportation facility he uses, public and private utilities and a host of other facilities and services.

In reviewing this list of facilities and services, it becomes immediately apparent that the engineer plays a key role in shaping the urban environment. He may be planner, designer or builder. Or he may maintain and operate the all important urban transit systems, airports, port facilities, roads and bridges, waterworks, sewage treatment plants, incinerators, power plants, communications networks, distribution systems and buildings. The engineer also administers programs of air pollution control, building code enforcement, water pollution control, collection and disposal of solid wastes, traffic control and safety, and other municipal services.

#### MAJOR CONTRIBUTOR

During the Twentieth Century the engineer has been a major contributor to the growth and development of urban areas. The highways and bridges, transit facilities, jet airports, water supply and sewerage systems and skyscrapers are among his more notable achievements.

We have paid a price for many technological advances made by man. Disposal of untreated industrial wastes has polluted many of our valuable waterways. No longer can the by-products of industrial operations be allowed to foul our natural resources. Highways have sometimes had a detrimental effect on the countryside or caused disruption of urban neighborhoods. The location of such facilities must be guided not only by considerations of design and economics, but must include social and esthetic values. The use of plastic containers has been a boon to both the housewife and the manufacturer, but constitutes a serious problem of disposal. These are but a few examples which illustrate the complexity and diversity of urban problems being faced by the engineer. As our population and cities continue to grow, the problems will also expand.

It is easy for us to comment on current day problems and mistakes of the past as we look backward. But forecasting the effect of today's technological advances and patterns of growth is another matter. Solutions or answers to many of the problems are as yet unknown but will be developed from a planned interdisciplinary approach.

#### INTERRELATED SYSTEMS

A city may be considered as being composed of a series of inter-related systems or elements which taken as a whole make up the urban environment. Residential, commercial, and industrial areas; education, recreation and health facilities; the transportation system; and utilities may each be considered as an urban system. A change in any one of these systems affects another. It is therefore essential that changes introduced or actions taken to control or improve the urban environment be part of a master or comprehensive plan. This immediately implies the involvement of the citizenry, the elected and appointed officials and a wide range of specialists.

Engineers, architects, planners, political scientists, sociologists, landscape architects, and economists are among the many talented professionals who may be involved as members of interdisciplinary teams working on the development of programs to provide facilities for the growth of our urban population and the creation or renewal of an attractive and satisfying urban environment.

The engineer will continue to play a key role and often will head these interdisciplinary groups because of his involvement, experience, and proven competence in coping with urban problems and shaping the environment for our expanding population. And he will have at his disposal some of our latest technology such as high altitude photo mapping and the computer-oriented approach to design of the various city systems.

#### CAREER OPPORTUNITIES

Because of the enormity of the challenge, the opportunity to be creative in solving urban problems, and the sense of satisfaction and accomplishment realized when a problem is solved, many young engineers are being attracted to organizations—public and private—working in this area. It is a stimulating and satisfying experience to be a member of the team responsible for improving the quality of life in our urban areas. Today's high school students should consider pursuing a career which will enable them to play a key role in this growing and extremely important field of improving the urban environment.

Interested young people or their parents may obtain a free booklet which gives the basic facts about engineering. The booklet, "Engineering . . . A Career of Opportunity," is available from the National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.

#### PRESIDENT NIXON CONGRATULATED ON HIS PLEDGE FOR WORLD PEACE

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I invite attention to the joint statement by 50 Senators and Representatives on February 8, in which they congratulated the President of the United States on his pledge for world peace and assured their support for four specific measures designed to realize this goal. This timely statement which was endorsed by other distinguished Members of Congress demonstrates the willingness and desire of members of both parties to work toward world peace. The four specific measures for which we pledged our support are:

First. Prompt ratification of the Non-proliferation Treaty;

Second. Meaningful steps to begin talks with the Soviet Government for the purpose of achieving agreements to curb the arms race;

Third. Immediate reconsideration of the ABM system;

Fourth. A thorough analysis of defense spending to locate responsible cuts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the joint statement and the list of Senators and Representatives who signed it.

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

#### THE JOINT STATEMENT

As Members of Congress who share a commitment to the development of international cooperation, a strengthened United Nations, and the realization of the United States foreign policy of 'general and complete disarmament under enforceable world law,' we congratulate President Nixon on his pledge to consecrate his administration to the cause of world peace.

We add our own pledge to his. As immediate steps in this direction, we assure our own support for the following:

1. Prompt ratification of the Non Proliferation Treaty, which represents an important safeguard against the spread of nuclear weapons.

2. Meaningful steps to begin talks with the Soviet Government for the purpose of achieving agreements to curb the arms race and reduce nuclear missile stockpiling.

3. Immediate reconsideration of the Anti Ballistic Missile system, the effectiveness of which is questionable and the deployment of which may lead to further intensification of the arms race.

4. Thorough analysis of Defense Spending to locate responsible cuts, and to bring the important contribution of our military into reasonable perspective.

The anxieties of the Nuclear Age have caused an emphasis on military spending which is out of proportion to our security requirements and has inhibited our efforts to meet human needs, both at home and abroad. As Members of Congress, we will seek to bring leadership to these vital issues, and urge all Americans to share in the quest.

#### ENDORSEMENT MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Senators Edward Brooke (R., Mass.), Philip A. Hart (D., Mich.), Vance Hartke (D., Ind.), Mark Hatfield (R., Oreg.), Harold E. Hughes (D., Iowa), Jacob K. Javits (R., N.Y.), Eugene J. McCarthy (D., Minn.), George McGovern (D., S. Dak.), Walter F. Mondale (D., Minn.), Frank E. Moss (D., Utah), Edmund S. Muskie (D., Maine), and Gaylord Nelson (D., Wis.); and Representatives Brock Adams (D., Wash.), Thomas L. Ashley (D., Ohio), Jonathan B. Bingham (D., N.Y.), Edward P. Boland (D., Mass.), John Brademas (D., Ind.), George E. Brown, Jr. (D., Calif.), Phillip Burton (D., Calif.), Jeffery Cohelan (D., Calif.), John R. Dellenback (R., Oreg.), Don Edwards (D., Calif.), Donald M. Fraser (D., Minn.), James G. Fulton (R., Pa.), Jacob H. Gilbert (D., N.Y.), William J. Green (D., Pa.), Gilbert Gude (R., Md.), Seymour Halpern (R., N.Y.), Augustus F. Hawkins (D., Calif.), Henry Helstoski (D., N.J.), Robert W. Kastenmeier (D., Wis.), Edward I. Koch (D., N.Y.), Allard K. Lowenstein (D., N.Y.), Richard D. McCarthy (D., N.Y.), Paul N. McCloskey, Jr. (R., Calif.), Abner J. Mikva (D., Ill.), F. Bradford Morse (R., Mass.), Richard L. Ottinger (D., N.Y.), Thomas M. Rees (D., Calif.), Ogden Reid (R., N.Y.), Henry S. Reuss (D., Wis.), Benjamin S. Rosenthal (D., N.Y.), Edward R. Roybal (D., Calif.), William F. Ryan (D., N.Y.), James H. Scheuer (D., N.Y.), Fred Schwengel (R., Iowa), Frank Thompson, Jr. (D., N.J.), Morris K. Udall (D., Ariz.), James W. Symington (D., Mo.), and Charles R. Whalen, Jr., (R., Ohio).

#### TELEVISION PROGRAM ON CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, several days ago the NBC television network presented a 1-hour documentary program on chemical and biological warfare—CBW. The program graphically detailed the physiological effects of these dreaded weapons, and discussed the nature and extent of U.S. activity in connection with CBW.

The instruments of chemical and biological warfare can kill in minutes, paralyze and maim with permanent effects, temporarily blind, or otherwise incapacitate persons in order to make them easy targets for conventional weapons, and help destroy in a variety of other ways. They can be the most ghastly weapons ever devised by man.

The sight on our television screens of rats, rabbits, and sheep twitching in uncontrollable convulsions and then dying of asphyxiation—unable to control their breathing muscles—is a shocking reminder of the inhumane brutality of most of these weapons.

The NBC program summarized some of the dread diseases which can be used in biological warfare:

The Army has catalogued all the diseases which could be used as weapons, either by us or against us. For example, it knows that brucellosis or undulant fever is very disabling, with long lasting severe fever and general aching. It knows that plague produces rapid pulse, rapid breathing, high fever and death. That anthrax causes fever, sores, lesions of the lung and death.

It went on to mention tularemia, plague, Q-fever, Rocky Mountain spotted fever, and viruses such as encephalitis, all transmissible from animals to man, all potential weapons.

There is even a combination of several of these described as sort of a germ cocktail, guaranteed to kill.

Most terrifying of the chemical weapons perhaps is a concentrated liquid nerve gas identified by the code letters G-B. It was described as follows:

Pure G-B is colorless and odorless in liquid or vapor form. A few drops on the skin or a few deep breaths of concentrated G-B would kill in minutes. Like other nerve gases, G-B is chemically similar to a good bug killer. It attacks the human nervous system . . . just as an insecticide kills bugs.

The documentary covered in general terms and with specific examples the nature of U.S. participation in the development of chemical and biological weapons and in discovering ways to counteract them. It noted some of the universities and military bases where research and testing are carried on. And it pointed out some of the hazards.

In particular, I am sure we all recall the accident in Utah which is now known as the "Skull Valley sheep episode." A herd of about 5,000 sheep were killed after unexpected weather conditions upset spray testing of chemical weapons at the nearby Dugway Proving Ground. The Army buried the sheep and made compensation payments of close to \$400,000 to the owners. It has, however, consistently denied any connection be-

tween Dugway Proving Ground and the dead sheep.

The program also described the great cloak of secrecy which the Defense Department has drawn over U.S. activities in the area of chemical and biological warfare. I am opposed to this secrecy and feel that the American public has a right to be better informed about what this country is doing.

The NBC program did not discuss the international efforts, both past and present, to bring CBW under control, but I would like to note two present developments which are of particular importance for limiting CBW weapons. As the result of a recommendation adopted unanimously last year, the United Nations is conducting a comprehensive study of the effects of chemical and biological warfare. I am hopeful and confident that this study will serve as a focal point for new proposals at the 18-Nation Disarmament Committee—ENDC—in Geneva and at the United Nations General Assembly this year.

In addition, the British representative to the ENDC last year submitted a working paper which would impose a complete ban on biological warfare, with nations agreeing not to employ it either in first use or in retaliation against another party. It is constructive at least to explore the feasibility of such an idea, and it is expected that the British delegation will push for consideration of their working paper when meetings resume on March 6.

The mysterious area of CBW, as presented in the NBC program, is perhaps best summarized by the following excerpt:

Some military men believe that biological weapons would determine the balance of world power in the event of effective nuclear disarmament. Some believe that Russia is ahead of us in the development of both chemical and biological weaponry. No one knows for sure, but it is believed that the United States spends a million dollars a day on CBW. Ironically, this is about the same amount Russia spends every day to subsidize Cuba. But we do not know how much Russia spends on CBW. Everyone prefers to think of CBW as a combination of mystery and myth, even if it's history.

Mr. President, CBW need not be either mystery or myth, and I hope that future efforts can remove the shroud of secrecy and lead to constructive limitations on chemical and biological warfare.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the NBC program of February 4, 1969, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

NBC NEWS' PRESENTS FIRST TUESDAY, CHEMICAL-BIOLOGICAL WARFARE, FEBRUARY 4, 1969  
CBW: THE SECRETS OF SECRECY

VANOCUR. Tonight, you will see an industrial film about a product called Death. The product is being tested by an agency of the United States government. It is produced by the United States government which is developing a full line of the product under the brand name CBW. As in all good industrial films, the product is demonstrated . . . with emotion or without exaggeration.

**NARRATOR.** This laboratory animal is about to be exposed to a nerve gas. An Army Chemical Corps technician draws up a very small amount of the nerve gas, which is in a liquid state. Through an opening in the top of the enclosure, a droplet is released. Exposure to nerve gas now begins. A current of fresh air continuously maintained inside the enclosure draws the nerve gas vapors over the rabbit. Though the amount of nerve gas is minute, and the time of exposure to it probably no more than a few seconds, the animal is already beginning to feel the effects. It becomes increasingly difficult for the animal to stay on his feet. General weakness and lack of muscle control become more apparent. Twitching, convulsions, and gasping now set in and become progressively stronger. After approximately two and one-half minutes, the animal is in the last stages . . . generalized convulsions and unconsciousness. The rabbit stops breathing and finally, death occurs.

**PETTIT.** The United States also has nerve gas for people. These artillery shells are filled with the nerve gas, code designation V-X. V-X is a major weapon in America's arsenal for chemical, biological warfare . . . CBW. My name is Tom Pettit. I have been studying CBW for six months. The report you are about to see was prepared without the cooperation or approval of the Department of Defense. For years, the entire subject of CBW has been shrouded in official mystery, a cult of secrecy.

The U.S. Army arsenal at Pine Bluff, Arkansas, 35 miles southeast of Little Rock is one of the places the Army would not let us enter. The Army has spent more than a hundred million dollars here on biological warfare facilities. Somewhere on these fifteen thousand acres of Arkansas countryside there is a germ factory, a pilot plant to produce microbes for war. The Army does not like unauthorized reports about CBW. It prohibits all photographs beyond the gates of secret bases like Pine Bluff.

The British are much more open at their biological warfare research center. Last fall, we were allowed to photograph some of the laboratories at Porton, 80 miles southwest of London. Even laboratory work can take on the appearance of a medieval executioner's ritual. The British emphasize that the work here is purely defensive . . . designed to develop masks and vaccines. But to do this requires detailed information on how germs can be used as weapons. The knowledge of biological weaponry developed at Porton is given to the United States military for its own use. For one thing, British scientists have learned how to mass produce germs. The first step of the process is called seeding. It is very delicate work, requiring the skill of a master chef, preparing a favorite recipe.

Disease organisms are planted in a gelatin-like substance. This is where they will take root, grow, and reproduce. The British even turn out high-quality germs for export to scientists in other countries. At Porton, as in the United States, scientists have studied anthrax, brucellosis, the plague, and more diseases: Q-fever, encephalitis, rabbit fever. They even combine them in a sort of germ cocktail, guaranteed to kill.

The scientists at Porton have earned an international reputation for their expertise. They also have done major work on immunization using chicken embryos to provide the raw material needed to produce living virus cells. This is how Porton developed new vaccines for undulant fever, anthrax, and the plague . . . all potential weapons. In 1957, they produced a rush order of three-quarters of a million doses of vaccine against the Asian flu. One English commentator interpreted this to mean they could produce three-quarters of a million doses of a disease just as easily. In this sealed air chamber, scientists at Porton have demonstrated that airborne mi-

crobes can remain alive and virulent for as long as 24 hours. This laboratory finding proved the military feasibility of biological warfare. Germs sprayed from enemy airplanes would still cause infection when they reached the ground. Any country with a good-sized brewery could manufacture the germs with essentially the same technology used to make beer. Britain actually tested biological weapons in 1941, when there was fear that the Axis powers might use germ warfare. In one test, the remote island of Gruinard, off the northwest coast of Scotland, was sprayed with anthrax bacteria. The targets were sheep. They died. But the anthrax bacteria were so durable that the island still is unsafe for people, 28 years later. It is expected to remain that way for at least another one hundred years.

**VANOCUR.** Some military men believe that biological weapons would determine the balance of world power in the event of effective nuclear disarmament. Some believe that Russia is ahead of us in the development of both chemical and biological weaponry. No one knows for sure, but it is believed that the United States spends a million dollars a day on CBW. Ironically, this is about the same amount Russia spends every day to subsidize Cuba. But we do not know how much Russia spends on CBW. Everyone prefers to think of CBW as a combination of mystery and myth, even its history.

The conventional or accepted history of chemical warfare blames Germany for first using poison gas . . . a chlorine attack against the British and French in April, 1915. But eight months earlier, the French had used tear gas against the Germans. Most people have forgotten that after the first German chlorine attack, both sides used poison gases until the end of the War in 1918. Chlorine, phosgene, and mustard gas. The United States Army organized a unit and called it The First Gas Regiment and it saw action on nearly every section of the western front. It participated in the campaigns of Chateau-Thierry, Saint Mihiel, and Meuse Argonne. The United States spent on the order of seventy million dollars, just to manufacture poison gases for combat, in World War I. In mobilizing for World War II, the United States expanded its poison gas production facilities at Edgewood Army Arsenal, Maryland, and elsewhere. President Roosevelt pledged in 1943 that we would not use such weapons unless they were first used by Germany or Japan. They were not. But by 1945, we had nearly twice the gas supplies of the enemy, though nothing as deadly as Germany's secret nerve gas.

**ANNOUNCER.** Uncovered in the American zone in Germany, 75,000 tons of Nazi poison gas are loaded aboard ships for destruction. One type, deadliest of all, attacks the skin, lungs, and bloodstream and can kill a man in two minutes. The obsolete S.S. Alcobanner heads out on her last journey, for the only practical way to dispose of this deadly gas cargo is to send it to the bottom of the sea.

**VANOCUR.** Germany had not used the nerve gas, presumably from fear of retaliation, even though in fact we did not possess nerve gas. The allies destroyed much of the captured gas, but on the Eastern front, the Russians had captured an entire nerve gas factory, giving them a headstart in chemical weaponry for the Cold War.

**PETTIT.** After the war, and in great secrecy, the United States also went into the nerve gas business. We built at least two full-scale factories to produce nerve gas. One is on the isolated plains of Western Indiana, not far from the small farming community of Newport. It cost more than thirteen million dollars to put up this plant, and for nine years it turned out a high quality nerve gas called V-X. Then last fall, it was quietly decided that American stockpiles of nerve gas are adequate, at least for now. There

have been no Pentagon press releases about Newport because the Defense Department seldom publicizes chemical weapons. One rare exception was a film about military Psycho-Chemicals. It was released in the late 1950's and widely shown on national television news programs.

The so called cat and mouse experiment demonstrated a chemical, which would put an enemy soldier out of action but not kill him. In the first part of the experiment, the cat's behavior was normal. Then the chemical, an experimental drug, was administered to the cat. At the time, the name of the drug was withheld, but its effect was self-evident. A complete reversal of normal emotions. The cat became afraid of the mouse. It is now known that this was a demonstration of LSD and the cat was merely on a bad trip. LSD turned out to be impractical but we did develop a number of other chemicals designed to incapacitate. At the same time, production of chemicals that kill went on. Just after the Korean war started, a forty million dollar nerve gas factory was built at the Rocky Mountain arsenal, near Denver. The Army rules on secrecy have been inconsistent, to say the least.

In 1954, the Hearst Metrotone Newsreel company was permitted to take these films. But in 1963, NBC was denied permission to enter the plant, even after the Denver Post had been allowed to document the loading of shells, bombs, and rocket warheads with nerve gas in liquid form. One ton tanks of liquid nerve gas were stockpiled in quantity on the grounds of the Rocky Mountain Arsenal. But with air traffic increasing at the adjacent Denver airport, and the city itself expanding, the Army became sensitive about publicizing the storage of nerve gas at the arsenal. The supposedly-secret stockpiles were clearly visible, however, to passengers flying in and out of Denver, even though photographs on the ground were prohibited. The factory itself is no longer producing nerve gas; and then late last summer, the Army started to remove the nerve gas supplies.

**TUTTLE.** This is Lt. Terry Tuttle at the Rocky Mountain Arsenal. This information was released by the Department of the Army on August 22, 1968 concerning the movement of toxic agents at the Rocky Mountain Arsenal. Most of the toxic materials now at the Rocky Mountain Arsenal will be moved. This includes toxic materials of all types. Details are classified.

**PETTIT.** About half the nerve gas at Denver was shipped by rail to a remote Army depot, 35 miles southwest of Salt Lake City. This is the principal nerve gas storage point within the continental United States. The amount stored here is secret. In every other respect, there is more secrecy surrounding CBW in the United States than about hydrogen bombs. Canada also has a CBW establishment. The Canadian base was set up on the bleak prairie of Alberta, early in 1941, when wartime secrecy concealed its existence. Even today, a traveler on the highway southeast of Calgary is not likely to stop for a sight-seeing tour. But there is far less official mystery than in the United States. We were allowed inside on the basis of a single telephone call to the Canadian Defense Research Board. By national policy, the station at Suffield works only on defensive measures.

But the findings are shared with Britain, Australia, and the United States. Samples for some of the experiments are supplied by the United States. This technician is working with a concentrate liquid nerve gas, code letters G-B, the material which was produced at the Rocky Mountain Arsenal. He is diluting it for use in an experiment. Pure G-B is colorless and odorless in liquid or vapor form. A few drops on the skin or a few deep breaths of concentrated G-B

would kill in minutes. Like other nerve gases, G-B is chemically similar to a good bug killer. It attacks the human nervous system . . . just as an insecticide kills bugs. Canada does extensive animal studies with G-B. Once the liquid nerve gas is diluted, men can work without masks and usually do. It remains a liquid at room temperature. One carefully measured microgram . . . a few billionths of an ounce . . . of G-B will be dropped into one eye of the rabbit as part of an experiment to study the non-lethal effects of nerve gas. Canada has done exactly the same experiment on human volunteers. Within seconds, the pupil of the eye contracts sharply. This condition, known as miosis, reduces night vision. In combat, this could happen to a soldier before he knew what was happening. Full recovery from miosis takes up to three weeks. This test shows that a nerve gas attack could reduce the fighting effectiveness of unprotected troops, even if they were not killed outright. The Suffield laboratories also are testing new antidotes for victims of nerve gas. So far, they have found nothing better than the standard antidote, a chemical called atrophine. Ironically, nobody knows why atrophine works, but it does. You are looking at a living mouse heart, sustained by oxygen and a nutrient solution. Injection of a nerve agent causes paralysis of the nerve endings; the heart slows down and stops. The electrocardiograph falls to zero. Injection of atrophine, if done quickly enough reverses the nerve paralysis and the heart resumes beating. The Canadian laboratory has been doing animal experiments for many years. For the technician, killing with nerve gas is just part of the day's work. Many people working in CBW today have been in the business for twenty or twenty-five years. They have a vested interest in CBW. Most are convinced that these are the weapons of future wars.

This vial contains the nerve gas G-D in dilute solution for injection into the laboratory mouse. CBW researchers are always trying to improve the product through testing. G-D is one of hundreds of nerve gases, each a slight variation of the same basic formula. G-D is more resistant to atrophine. All of them kill as G-D kills very quickly. Exercise Vacuum was conducted last Fall at Suffield by Canadian, British, and United States troops. While Exercise Vacuum was never announced in America, it was openly reported on Canadian television.

WARREN. Military and scientific authorities emphasize that the exercise was strictly a defensive one. It was a test of man, equipment and procedures against the hypothetical enemy equipped with chemical and biological weapons. That means germs and nerve gas, but they don't use the term very often around here. It was the first time Canadian troops have been tested in a full scale CW, that's Chemical Warfare exercise. The men were forced to wear respirators and protective gear for as long as fourteen straight hours while performing their military jobs. The men had simulated nerve gases shot at them, sprayed at them from aircraft and blown up around them in mines in precontaminated areas. The stimulant used was such that a badly equipped or careless soldier suffered irritating symptoms similar to those of a mild shot of tear gas and they discovered that sleeping, eating, and other functions could be difficult in full protective equipment. The scientists say Canada has no weapons for waging chemical and germ warfare . . . only for defense. John Warren, CBC News, at the Defense Research Establishment, Suffield, Alberta.

VANOCUR. In contrast to Canada and England, the United States does have weapons for waging chemical and biological warfare. That report will be next.

VANOCUR. As we said the United States does have weapons for waging chemical and

biological warfare. We test them in Utah at a base which was nicely obscure until an accident last Spring, at the Dugway Proving Grounds, eighty miles Southwest of Salt Lake City. Here is Tom Pettit.

PETTIT. The only advertisements for the U.S. test program are placed where almost nobody sees them, on lonely side roads of the great Salt Lake Desert. Dugway Proving Ground is used by the Army, Navy and Air Force to test both chemical and biological weapons. The base is so remote that very few people knew that it existed until last March and what came to be known as the "Skull Valley Sheep Episode". A valuable herd of about five thousand sheep were suddenly wiped out. Most had been grazing in Skull Valley, twenty miles North of Dugway. Some were forty miles away. All were buried by the United States Army. But the military consistently denied any connection between Dugway Proving Ground and the dead sheep. There were many official inquiries. The governor of Utah named a special investigator, Dr. D. A. Osguthorpe, a veterinarian, who looked first for physical damage to the sheep, or what a veterinarian would call "pathology."

OSGUTHORPE. The main effect is upon the nervous system. There was one thing about . . . I noticed about the sheep, that there was no pathology what so ever with these sheep. The gastro-intestinal tracts, the circulatory systems, musculature were all perfectly normal from a pathological standpoint, but the animals were dead, mainly from suffocation due to the fact that there was no connection between the muscles they used . . . that these animals used to breathe and the respiratory center, and as a result, they were not able to take in sufficient oxygen and they died of suffocation. After several days of, of um, questioning, why the Army finally admitted that they had conducted experiments in the area with nerve gas agents.

General STONE. There are too many confusing aspects. We have been working in this area for twenty-five years, in this particular part of this country. With complete safety and impunity and we have never done anything to damage the surrounding area. If we are the cause of this, we have a problem.

Lieutenant Colonel BLACK. No other form of animal life has evidenced any symptoms whatsoever, although they are located in the same area where the sheep are dying. Horses, cows, dogs, birds, and rabbits.

OSGUTHORPE. This is a rabbit showing the effects of the poisoning. This very typical, you can see the tribulation. Notice the trembling of the hair on the rabbit. See there . . . see the very minute tribulation.

PETTIT. Did this rabbit die, do you know?

OSGUTHORPE. This rabbit died, yes. Here again you . . . you just saw the, the muscular incoordination that this compound produces.

PETTIT. This is the same thing that happened to the sheep then, that is happening in this rabbit?

OSGUTHORPE. Yes.

PETTIT. The U.S. Department of Agriculture studied the surviving Skull Valley sheep and some animals which the Army tested at Dugway. USDA needed Army clearance merely to report on the findings of the Dugway test.

VAN KAMPEN. These animals were given low levels of the nerve agent. And after a short period of time they developed the same droopiness of the head and twisting in the spine as had been seen in the Skull Valley sheep. Symptoms have persisted for as long as three months in some of the animals.

PETTIT. Or longer?

VAN KAMPEN. Or longer. We have several here that have had the symptoms persist for six months.

PETTIT. In your view then, there is abso-

lutely no doubt that the cause of the sheep dying and becoming sick in Skull Valley was a nerve agent.

VAN KAMPEN. Certainly connected with the nerve agent, yes.

PETTIT. We now know that on March 13, at Dugway, a jet fighter released the nerve gas V-X at an abnormally high altitude. Freak winds carried it even higher, and rain dropped it onto the Skull Valley Pasture. Dr. Osguthorpe feels that the V-X might have been carried even farther.

OSGUTHORPE. This could have been, very very easily washed into, into one of our reservoirs, our drinking water. Had it been rained out over one of these areas we might have had some real disastrous results. Um, one, one specifically, the Deer Creek reservoir very easily could have got that far had it not been rained out. I'm, I'm sure that had this got into a water supply why, it would have definitely killed people. You cannot conduct these, this type of experiment without endangering the life around you.

VANOCUR. To this day the United States Army maintains there is no absolute proof that the Skull Valley sheep were killed by the nerve gas test. But it has agreed to a payment of nearly four hundred thousand dollars to the owner of the sheep. And in recent months the Army has announced more stringent safety regulations for field testing at Dugway. If the sheep episode did nothing else, it stripped away a bit more of the official secrecy surrounding CBW in this country. It also turns out that Dugway is not our only test site after all.

PETTIT. The United States headquarters command for testing chemical and biological weapons is designated the Deseret Test Center. Its work is so secret that even its location, Fort Douglas in Salt Lake City was not known until after the sheep episode. The Deseret Test Center plans and conducts America's CBW tests, at Dugway and elsewhere. Military sources have revealed the existence of other test programs directed from here. At Fort Greely, in Alaska. Fort Clayton, in the Panama Canal Zone. And at Fort Huachuca in Arizona. There has even been an ultra-secret test project in the Pacific Ocean, conducted under a cover of bird-banding study. A scientist in California had been asked to develop a bird-counting radar.

COGSWELL. There was some possibility of the Department of Defense seeking a, um, test site of some sort or other, I never knew what, in the general region. And were interested therefore in the bird populations and numbers in the region. I did know, also at this time that the Smithsonian Institution or the U.S. National Museum in Washington, D.C. had a project going on at that time in the area, that the area of interest was in the Central Pacific, Southward from the Hawaiian Islands to near the Equator. The whole, the whole Central Pacific area.

PETTIT. The Pacific Ocean biological survey has cost the Defense Department more than two and a half million dollars. This amount was paid over the past six years to the Smithsonian Institution. Fred Sibley, a biologist, worked on the project for three years.

SIBLEY. Um, this was a program administered by the Smithsonian Institution to study distribution and migration of sea birds in the Central Pacific. My job was mainly that of a trip leader, taking four or five people out on a party, and we would land on the various islands, do biological survey on these islands and part of which was banding, a considerable number of birds.

PETTIT. This story is picked up by Robert Standen, who took these home movies in true amateur fashion, waved at his own camera.

STANDEN. On one very dull day, we spent the whole day doing nothing but bagging birds with that long net, which is not much

fun, since you can go around and pick them up at night with no trouble at all. Fred felt that we should keep busy. We went about finding out how isolated that area was. In a sense that was part of what we were doing, I would say. Not specifically. Nobody ever said that to me, mind you. But that, I felt, was implied. We did a very intensive biological study of a specified area.

PETTIT. Standen later took part in an ultra-secret military CBW project in the Pacific, which he was not allowed to film. He said the military test involved vectors . . . the scientific term for live animals, which can carry disease organisms. Have you ever told anybody what was done at was done?

STANDEN. No I haven't.

PETTIT. Not even the Smithsonian?

STANDEN. No I didn't. I haven't told a soul. I would like to tell somebody, sometime, because it, it would be just fun to tell somebody. I thought it was extremely interesting.

PETTIT. What was the point of holding this test, that far out in the Pacific?

STANDEN. Well, the vector, the carrier, the biological carrier, didn't live in that place normally, okay. The place was well isolated from other areas, okay. And it would be very easy to eliminate the carrier, once it was over. Therefore it wouldn't introduce a new species into the area. Also, of course, I think, this is worthy of note; since the vector that we used had to be kept alive all the way to the location, you see. This was an experiment in itself. This is where the scientific experiment comes in. There were meteorologists there who observed everything about the conditions of the atmosphere at the time and place, okay. Plus we had an extensive biological staff. We had, literally, guinea pigs on the island.

PETTIT. Where was this?

STANDEN. I can't say.

PETTIT. Roughly.

STANDEN. In the Pacific Ocean.

PETTIT. In the Hawaiian chain?

STANDEN. No.

PETTIT. In the Hawaiian Islands?

STANDEN. I can't say.

PETTIT. Can't say yes or no?

STANDEN. I could say yes or no, but I won't.

PETTIT. Why?

STANDEN. Because I was told not to.

PETTIT. Since talking with Standen, we have learned from other sources that the test was conducted in the Spring of 1965, on an island seventeen hundred miles southwest of Honolulu, just north of the equator . . . Baker Island, a U.S. possession. There is an abandoned World War II airstrip on Baker, but the island is uninhabited. The six-week test involved Army, Navy, and Air Force personnel, commanded by the Deseret Test Center. On the one square-mile Baker Island they were testing animal vectors, or carriers, to see how they would behave in a tropical climate. No germs were involved. In effect it was a check-out of an animal delivery system for CBW. The Smithsonian says it knows nothing about a biological warfare testing program related to its bird-study project. But Joseph Clark of Philadelphia, when he was in the U.S. Senate, learned of a direct connection between the Pacific Bird project and the CBW testing.

CLARK. Well as I understand it, under the screen of the Smithsonian Institute in a bird-banding project, they were looking for a relatively safe place to conduct chemical and biological warfare testings. This resulted in their picking one of the islands in the Hawaiian Chain, probably a pretty small one . . . it is my understanding that they are now on their way to do some testing there.

VANOCUR. The Army has catalogued all the diseases which could be used as weapons, either by us or against us. For example, it knows that brucellosis or undulant fever, is very disabling, with long lasting severe fever

and general aching. It knows that plague produces rapid pulse, rapid breathing, high fever and death. That anthrax causes fever, sores, lesions of the lung and death. Much of the research on disease is done in the Army's on secret laboratories or by contract at various universities and private companies. At one time more than fifty different institutions held Army contracts. One of them is the University of Utah. Again, Tom Pettit.

PETTIT. The University of Utah has been doing secret biological research for the Army for sixteen years, but very few people on the campus in Salt Lake City know anything about it. The work is done by an obscure university research organization, housed in these unpretentious quarters. The E and E group, which means Ecology and Epizootological Research has been doing supposedly routine studies of diseases in Utah wildlife. The full nature of the work was not known even to the university president, until last August. At that time a series of false alarms at the main, biology building aroused the curiosity of William Hanly, an associate professor of biology. Hanly already had heard about a secret laboratory in his own building on the main campus.

HANLEY. I knew that something had been going on there which was connected in some way, and I am still not sure, which way with Dugway Proving Grounds here. Um and at the same time connected with the University housed in the same building.

BROWN. The first two runs, we were all restricted from going into the specific area where these alarms were originating from. The University personnel advised us to stay out because of um, disease problems.

HANLEY. I was told by a number of people that in order to enter that area, one had to have immunizations against certain diseases. Diseases such as tularemia, anthrax, plague and various others. One would assume then that these diseases are in that area. The organism which cause those diseases. And in order to get these immunizations, one had to go to the Dugway Proving Ground.

PETTIT. The University, voluntarily showed us its contract with the Army. It reveals a clear-cut relationship with Dugway Proving Ground. Through the Deseret Test Center the E and E group is paid about five-hundred thousand dollars a year. The University insists that it is not involved in weapons testing. But the contract does specify certain diseases: Tularemia, plague, Q-fever, Rocky Mountain Spotted Fever, and viruses such as encephalitis, all transmissible from animals to man, all potential weapons. Until now it has not been generally known that the University of Utah scientists do some of their Army work right at the Dugway Proving Ground. They have done so, since 1952. In 1955 they made this film to document their own activities. Besides their academic study of disease in native animals of the Dugway area, they have performed experiments to induce infections artificially. For these studies, the Utah research group developed laboratory procedures for growing large numbers of ticks. Some ticks are vectors, or carriers of several highly infectious diseases, among them, Rocky Mountain Spotted Fever, Tularemia and encephalitis, ticks are reared by the simple process of letting them feed on living kangaroo rats. As part of its Army work, the Utah research group raises literally thousands of animals. Some have been set out in the field to monitor the spread of biological agents being tested by the Army. The special infection studies are of obvious interest to Army experts on biological warfare. In this case, a deer mouse was prepared for exposure to germs in an aerosol-spray chamber . . . probably to the organism which cause tularemia.

Military men consider aerosol-spray the best system for spreading diseases. They feel

germs distributed this way are more efficient at causing disease than germs carried by bugs or animals. The University researchers have done pioneering scientific work in charting the flow of diseases. In other words, how infection is spread from one animal to another. In this experiment, disease organisms were injected into a laboratory guinea pig. The guinea pig was then fed to a wild coyote. This work adds to the Army's knowledge of how germs can be spread, both by nature and by humans' design. But for years, the military implications of the University research were kept obscure. The secrecy syndrome in the chemical biological warfare business is most pronounced when private industry meets with the military. This is a U.S. Navy installation at Port Hueneme, California, where an unpublicized CBW conference was held. Security precautions were extraordinary. Even generals were thoroughly checked. And every person attending was required to have Defense Department clearance for secret information. The conference amounted to a who's who of CBW. Brigadier General James A. Hebbeler, the Army's ranking officer in the field, is Director of all chemical biological, and nuclear operations. Major General Lloyd E. Fellenz, who used to be head CBW, now works for a large chemical company. Colonel Clyde L. Friar, commanding officer of the arsenal at Pine Bluff, Arkansas.

Dr. Jacob Minarik, civilian scientist at Fort Detrick and the foremost expert on defoliation. Norman I. Shapira, chairman of this meeting, a retired Army colonel, now employed by Litton Industries. Many other large companies were represented: DuPont, Alcoa, Dow Chemical, Lockheed, McDonnell-Douglas, North American Rockwell, Aero-Jet General, the Rand Corporation, Goodyear, Honeywell, Monsanto . . . more than forty companies in all. Some who participated in the closed door meetings were willing to discuss their work. One was Roger Eyer, his consulting firm has received more than a quarter of a million dollars from the Pentagon for CBW research. Particularly an analysis of intelligence information.

EYER. Obviously, the Chinese Communists are behind us. And as a result of their, um um, say, student revolutions, they're getting even further behind, because their technical base is going down. But um, other than that I don't think I can say anything else.

PETTIT. The Soviet Union is not in that same position.

EYER. No, as a matter of fact the Soviet Union is a very sophisticated enemy. Their threat would be at least on a par with ours.

REINAGEL. The hardware does exist. Quantity wise, whether one could do this to mount an engagement or not, that is a question I can't answer. But it can be manufactured.

PETTIT. The Hayes Corporation, which wants to manufacture the hardware, already manufactures defoliation equipment for use in Viet Nam, and is actively developing CBW hardware. At its own expense, Hayes is working on a number of weapons systems all listed right in the company brochure. One of them is called, "The Wet-Dry Agent Biological Bomblet", the biological bomblet is not being mass produced right now. This indicates that the United States has the technology for biological warfare, but not a combat capability. At Fort Detrick, Maryland, the U.S. Army has been accumulating biological warfare know-how for nearly twenty-six years. The work started here in 1943 in secrecy equal to that of the atomic bomb project. Today, Fort Detrick, is even more secret than Oak Ridge. Using laboratory animals, the scientists at Fort Detrick have precisely measured the infectivity of nearly every known disease. Especially in the aerosol-spray form of transmission. Aerosol-

spray forces microbes deep into the most sensitive part of the lungs. Even human volunteers have been infected this way. Seventh-Day Adventists, serving as conscientious objectors in the army medical corps. One of them was Frank Miyashiro.

**MIYASHIRO.** It was somewhat, um, spooky when the light would flash on and you know that um, there are organisms being passed into your body to make you sick. This is the time that you really wonder if you should be there. Um, some of the fellows came down with tularemia, well they started developing symptoms about two days after we received the organisms. I know, um, when, . . . we were all waiting to see who would get hit first. And, um, a friend of mine, um, had violent headaches one night. And his temperature zoomed up to about 103 degrees overnight. We were given . . . our temperatures and our pulse rates were taken every six hours throughout the day and we could see when the temperature started rising that . . . after about two or three days, the fellows, most of the fellows started developing symptoms . . . violent headaches and um, muscular aches and pains, most . . . fellows couldn't even get out of bed. Um, the temperatures, like I said always increased to about 104 degrees. And um, just um a lot of sweating . . . some of the fellows would get up in the middle of the night completely soaked. And it would last for a few days, well a couple of days, and as soon as the doctor knew that you had developed a disease and they were certain that you had developed a disease, they would give you medication.

**PETTIT.** Tularemia is fatal in less than ten percent of the cases. But it is highly disabling and once was routinely suggested for use in Viet Nam. This suggestion was turned down. Instead the military in Viet Nam has turned to chemical warfare: Tear gas on the ground, defoliation of the jungle from the air. C-123 aircraft have dropped tons of chemical weed killers. The spray technique, or a modification of it, could also be used to deliver nerve gas, or even germ weapons, if they were available. In Viet Nam, the military has demonstrated its ability to wage chemical warfare, this is the "C" of CBW. The possibility that chemical or biological weapons might be used against the United States has not gone unnoticed.

**FILM NARRATOR.** A mask filters out dangerous elements in the air, such as gas, germs, or radioactive dusts. Final tests on this mask used volunteers to breathe in a completely harmless test spray. The volunteer children participated with the consent of their parents. The mask will be made in six sizes, to fit all persons from the age of four upward. For children under four, there is a tent like infant shelter.

**PETTIT.** The all-purpose mask was never produced in quantity for civilian defense. No one seriously expects nuclear attack. And nerve gas is primarily a battlefield weapon anyway. But in future wars, biological weapons could be used against civilians.

Despite all the mystery about biological warfare and all the secrecy, there is one simple fact: The United States, today does not have germ weapons ready to go at the push of a button. We know how to build them; we have tested the stuff, but so far at least there has been no order to go into mass production. And until there is an order, the U.S. biological warfare capability will remain only a paper tiger. Of course we don't know about Russia or Red China.

#### ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR JAVITS

**Mr. JAVITS.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the completion of the memorial statements in memory of our late beloved colleague, the

former Senator **BARTLETT** of Alaska, I may have 15 minutes in which to address the Senate.

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

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

#### E. L. "BOB" BARTLETT, LATE A SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF ALASKA

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** Under the order of Monday the Senate will proceed to eulogies for the late Senator **BARTLETT**.

**Mr. KENNEDY.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the **RECORD** a statement by the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana (**Mr. MANSFIELD**), in tribute to the late distinguished Senator from Alaska, Senator **BARTLETT**.

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

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I join my colleagues today in paying respect to our late beloved colleague **BOB BARTLETT** of Alaska. Senator **BARTLETT** was a dedicated and courageous member of this body. He fought tenaciously, if unassumingly, for what he believed in and for the people whom he represented. To him, more than anyone else, goes the credit for the admission of Alaska into the Union.

**BOB BARTLETT** and I served together in the House of Representatives. I watched his dedicated, determined efforts to bring about the change from the territory of Alaska to the State of Alaska. He knew what Alaskans wanted and he worked to persuade Congress to the same point of view.

In the Senate, he showed the same tenaciousness—notably in his work on the Commerce, Small Business, and Appropriations Committees. One of my most pleasant remembrances is of the election and swearing in of this distinguished American as the first Senator from Alaska.

The Senate shares with Alaska a warm memory of **BOB BARTLETT**. Those of us who were his colleagues will remember him for his keen intelligence, his unassuming manner, his innate modesty, and his many legislative achievements for the benefit of the entire Nation.

His graciousness was expressed in many ways, including the frequent presentation of roses grown in his own garden to the distinguished senior Senator from Maine (**MARGARET CHASE SMITH**), who, as the Senate knows, has a deep affection for the flower. I believe **BOB BARTLETT**'s last gesture in the Capitol and in the city of Washington before he left for his final operation was to proffer to Senator **SMITH** a single rose, the last which had bloomed in his garden.

Little things make big men. **BOB BARTLETT**'s continued attention to his duties, his devotion to his state and his country, and his thoughtful actions marked him as a man and as a friend. We will miss him because of what he stood for and what he did and, most of all, for what he was—a gentle man.

**Mr. KENNEDY.** Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in honoring the memory of Senator **BOB BARTLETT** of Alaska. Though Senator **BARTLETT** and I were separated by many years in age, and though our homes were on opposite

sides of the continent, he was, I am proud to say, my close friend.

Our relationship and our friendship began with the recognition that the well-being and future of the people of the State of Massachusetts, was tied in many ways to the well-being and future of the people of Alaska. This is the great binding force of our Nation, despite other ills and problems we may suffer—we are one people, with common problems and common aspirations.

But beyond that **BOB BARTLETT** and I were drawn together by our common interest in the sea, its beauty, power, and the potential of its bounty. Massachusetts, like Alaska, lives with the sea and has drawn its strength from it. And as he and I worked together a friendship and trust grew between us that was larger than our own making.

But it is more than friendship that prompts me to rise today to speak of Senator **BARTLETT**; it is the respect that I have held for him over the years as a legislator, and as a man of quiet achievement. With a steady persistence that grew out of his love for his State and his people he compiled a legislative record that was remarkable. It was once estimated by the Library of Congress that he had more bills passed into law than any other Member in the history of the Congress. **BOB BARTLETT** was responsible for the nine-mile contiguous fishing zone, for the Federal fish protein concentrate program, for the inclusion of fish products in the food-for-peace program, for the Commercial Fisheries Research Act, and for the passage of the Radiation Safety Act. Many of his colleagues were not aware of his successes in these areas, for it was not in his nature to make much of what he had done—he was more concerned with what he was going to do for Alaska, what he was going to do to repay the people of that frontier State for the opportunity they gave him to speak for them.

Today we in the Senate are paying tribute, and we in the Senate are gratified with the knowledge that in the near future his likeness will be placed in Statuary Hall. Our tribute, however can never match in feeling the love and affection that the people of his State had for him. Alaska and **BOB BARTLETT** were one and the same. He ran for Congress 10 times—as delegate or Senator—and never once was seriously challenged. His last election brought him a majority of close to 80 percent—a vote of confidence and a vote of esteem from all Alaskans—the miners, the fishermen, the oil men, Eskimos, newcomers and oldtimers. He was their man and there will not be another.

So it is as a result of his work that today's Alaska, despite earthquakes, despite floods, despite the transgressions of the past by those who thoughtlessly drained her of her minerals and resources, Alaska stands today with a healthy and growing economy and a confident future.

To his lovely wife **Vide** and his daughters I once again offer my sympathy for their loss, but in consolation to them and the people of Alaska there are warm memories of a great man who had the

rare opportunity to lead a proud State into a nation, and by so doing enriched both his people and our country.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, it was my privilege and honor to have served with BOB BARTLETT during the 10 years in which he represented the State of Alaska in the Senate.

History will record that it was for those 10 years that Alaska was first represented in this body, and that BOB BARTLETT served as his State's first senior Senator. He played an important role in representing his State before, during, and after the attainment of statehood.

BOB BARTLETT was held in high esteem in the Senate, and made a strong contribution during his years of service here.

The overwhelming electoral support he received as an indication of the esteem in which he was held by Alaskans.

An editorial in the Anchorage Daily Times shortly after his death was representative of the way the people of his State felt:

On 10 different occasions the stubborn, unmanageable, belligerent and politically erratic populace of Alaska handed him the crown with election returns as much as 81 per cent in his favor.

No one in all the state's history has ever enjoyed such frequent and solid support from Alaskans.

BOB BARTLETT's death marks the end of an era of transition, one of the most significant chapters in Alaska's history, and one that is virtually a summary of his life and public service.

I felt close to BOB BARTLETT. He was a warm and sympathetic person, interested in other people and in the welfare of people. He was deeply appreciated by his own people and everyone who knew him had a deep affection for him.

He will be greatly missed not only by the people of Alaska, but also by the Senate and the Nation as well.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I rise today to perform a sad task and I hope that never again, no matter how long I shall be here, will the reason be so sad-denying or compelling.

Senator E. L. "BOB" BARTLETT was my friend, and nothing else I could say would be more significant than that. Senators who served with him in the Senate remember him: the Senator who would always chair a hearing, who, as a freshman Senator, uncomplainingly presided over the Senate for long hours, and finally, as a Senator who would not surrender principle for expediency or sacrifice the public good for the sake of partisanship. When BOB BARTLETT left the House of Representatives after 14 years as our Territory's delegate, he received the unqualified praise of his colleagues from both parties.

It was not my privilege to serve with him in this body, although nothing would have honored me more. However, if that had ever come to pass, I know one thing: even though we were of different parties, separated by this aisle that at times seems so very wide, BOB BARTLETT would have worked with me and helped me, for the good of Alaska and the Nation.

BOB BARTLETT's legislative achievements are almost too numerous to mention. The results of his tireless efforts within this Chamber have transformed the State of Alaska. When he arrived in Congress as a delegate in 1944, Americans knew Alaska only as an ice-locked wilderness, with names such as Kiska, Attu, and Dutch Harbor more unfamiliar than Guadalcanal or Okinawa. But in 14 years a miracle had occurred: the population had doubled, roads and airports had sprung up and Alaska was on the threshold of statehood. All of this was traceable to BOB BARTLETT's ability and dedication of all his accomplishments and dreams, statehood for Alaska was his greatest triumph. As much as any other man he helped add the 49th star to the American flag. A mark of his pride in this achievement could be seen in the Senate garage: instead of the prestigious No. 1 license plate of a senior Senator, his was Alaska No. 49. But for BOB, statehood was only a beginning. Alaska had become a State, and now her potential had to be developed and our vast resources tapped for the good of the Nation and the world. Permission for Japanese pulp mills in Alaska, increased oil and gas revenues to Alaska from Federal leasing, public works projects without number and the infusion of massive amounts of Federal aid after the earthquake in 1964 and the Fairbanks flood of 1967, are but some of his landmark achievements for the State of Alaska.

But it should not be thought that his only concern was for the citizens of his own State. His legislation reflected a tremendous concern for the welfare of all Americans, with such bills as the radiation safety bill, which set sweeping safety standards for all radiation-emitting equipment from television sets to X-ray machines, and the Bartlett act, which provided that all federally funded buildings be constructed so as to provide easy access and use for the physically handicapped.

Senator BARTLETT led efforts which resulted in the establishment of the 9-mile contiguous fishing zone as well as the law which gave the Coast Guard the authority it needs to see that our fishing zone and territorial waters are protected from foreign incursion. His concern for the welfare and growth of the American fishing industry produced such legislative achievements as the addition of fish to the food-for-peace program and the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act of 1964. As chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee he worked long and he worked hard, firm in his belief that America should have a healthy, modern, and competitive merchant marine fleet. His efforts will provide the foundation on which a new merchant marine policy will be built.

Whatever BOB BARTLETT did, he placed the welfare of the people before any partisan consideration. His was a selfless dedication that is so seldom found in life, whether public or private. His work for Alaska's native population was endless: in Bethel, Alaska, where the native population lives in a squalor unequalled by

any in America, a new housing project is rising with the work and construction being conducted by the natives themselves.

Mr. President, it is my pleasure to announce at this time that Secretary Romney has today approved the first \$1 million for the BOB BARTLETT remote housing program He did so, at my specific request, to take place in conjunction with this memorial to our beloved Senator.

Toward the end of his delegate days in the House of Representatives, he said:

If, during my service in Congress as delegate from Alaska, I accomplished nothing else than to assist in some small measure in making sure that TB would never again take so many lives and cause such heartache and anguish, I should feel that my contribution had been worthwhile.

This concern for the small man and his welfare brought BOB BARTLETT the undying affection of the Alaskan people and the admiration of his Senate and House colleagues.

Further, BOB BARTLETT never sought the spotlight of national publicity for his accomplishments. What he did was for Alaska and not for himself, but the success of his work can be seen in Alaska's growth and prosperity today: few men can claim over a third of a million square miles and a quarter of a million people as a monument to their life's work. BOB would have been the last to claim such a monument; he would immediately begin speaking of all the others over all the years who contributed to leading Alaska into the forefront of the 20th century. It was typical of the man, that at a memorial dinner in 1964 commemorating 20 years of service in the House and Senate, when his turn came to speak, BOB BARTLETT was thanking his friends and the people of Alaska for helping him. And yet, coming from him, it seemed natural and appropriate.

Words are often useless things. We cannot measure a man's life in words, nor can we pay proper tribute with them. If they are any real use at all, it is for us who must now continue the monumental tasks ahead. Perhaps we can draw some little comfort from them, in the painful awareness that we are now less than we were. And if comfort is needed, as it surely is, then BOB BARTLETT's favorite poem, which was written by R. L. Stevenson and which was read at his graveside in Fairbanks, can provide more than anything else:

Under the wide and starry sky,  
Dig the grave and let me lie.  
Glad did I live and gladly die,  
And I laid me down with a will.

This be the verse you grave for me:  
Here he lies where he longed to be;  
Home is the sailor, home from sea,  
And the hunter, home from the hill.

BOB BARTLETT is gone. He was my friend and I will miss him.

Alaskans, to a man, will miss him. More than that, however, Alaskans, to a man, are determined that BOB BARTLETT's faith in them and his confidence in their ability to build a State will be fulfilled.

Alaska will not fail BOB BARTLETT.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have listened with appreciation, sympathy, and complete approval to three fine statements which have been made with reference to our late, beloved friend, Senator BOB BARTLETT; namely the statements made by the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON).

I certainly approve and want to join in every statement that each of those three distinguished Senators has made.

Mr. President, our late friend, Senator BOB BARTLETT, was my good friend. I was sincerely fond of him. Mrs. Holland and I are fond of Mrs. Bartlett.

There are many things I could say with reference to the personal loss which we feel.

It seems to me, however, that perhaps the thing which I should say at this time should relate most to the long, finally successful fight which Senator BARTLETT made, before he came to the Senate, when he was the delegate from the Territory of Alaska, to secure statehood for the area which he loved so well and served so ably.

It happened that I was one of the many Senators who thought that Alaska should have statehood, and that while statehood would bring great opportunities to Alaska, Alaska would also bring great values to our Nation; and I believe that both of those objectives still hold true.

However, may I rather briefly speak about a portion of the contributions which Senator BARTLETT made. Not being a Member of the other body at that time, I cannot relate the long debates that took place there. As I remember, he was successful, in the final instance, in fighting off a couple of determined efforts to recommit his bill, and he had a good, stiff fight there before it passed the House of Representatives. I want to take a little time to talk about the things that happened here in the Senate.

I recall that in January 1957, proceeding under the so-called Tennessee plan, which had been followed later by others of our States which have made such great contributions to our Nation since admission to statehood, there was a group, a delegation, here in the Senate, in the gallery just behind the clock on the south side of the Senate Chamber, representing Alaska and Alaska's hope for statehood. May I make a few remarks about that occasion.

Remarks supporting the proposal for statehood for Alaska appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 14, 1957, in volume 103 at pages 466 to 476 of the permanent CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They show that the people of Alaska had proceeded under the so-called Tennessee plan by holding a constitutional convention and by choosing in an election the Honorable Ernest Gruening and the Honorable William A. Egan to be their first two U.S. Senators and the Honorable Ralph J. Rivers to be their first U.S. Representative.

The delegation from Alaska, consisting of the three gentlemen just named, and our late, distinguished friend, Senator BARTLETT, then the Delegate from the

Territory of Alaska, in the House of Representatives, sat in that Senate Gallery and received the plaudits of the assembled Senate. Among those Senators speaking after I began the discussion for myself and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), who could not be present that day, were the then chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Senator Murray from Montana, together with the Senator from California, Mr. Kuchel, the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. Kefauver, the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. O'Mahoney, the Senator from Indiana, Mr. Capehart, the Senator from Oregon, Mr. Neuberger, the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. Humphrey, the Senator from Maine, Mr. Payne, the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. Thye, the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. Wiley, and the Senator from Oregon, Mr. Morse.

Mr. President, I am sorry that none of those distinguished Senators are here with us now. Of course, we know that some of them have gone to their last reward. I think that my reference to the place where their remarks appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will enable all who are interested to see the kind of interest manifested in statehood for Alaska that was expressed on that occasion.

Repeated references were made to the fact that our late friend, Senator BARTLETT, had been and was at the time the leader in the Congress for Alaskan statehood and that in the interest of harmony he had stepped aside in favor of the distinguished Alaskans who had been named to be the first Senators and the first Congressman from the proposed new State. I quote, for instance, from the statement of the late Senator O'Mahoney, as follows:

I should like to say in associating myself with the . . . Senator from Florida that the prospective Senators and Representatives now seated in the Gallery may hope to see the time speedily arrive when Bob Bartlett's bill shall pass both the House and the Senate and become a law. Mr. President, I cannot take my seat without complimenting Mr. Bartlett for the magnificent work he has done in and out of Congress to make statehood a reality for Alaska.

So spoke the late, distinguished Senator from Wyoming, Mr. O'Mahoney.

In the course of the debate, the late Senator Neuberger stated:

I desire to join in the tribute which the distinguished Senator from Wyoming (Mr. O'Mahoney) paid to Delegate E. L. Bartlett, who has been a leader in the cause of statehood and who unselfishly stepped aside for this delegation of two Senators and one Representative to come to Washington if and when Alaska becomes a State. I believe Delegate Bartlett, when Alaska becomes a State—as I am confident it will—will share a great deal of the credit which is due to all who have worked in this cause. Delegate Bartlett has been a valiant and pioneer advocate of statehood under the dome of our United States Capitol.

Senator Humphrey also stated, relative to former Governor Gruening, of Alaska, and to Delegate BARTLETT, as follows:

I join in paying tribute to him (Governor Gruening) as I do to Delegate Bartlett who has been with us in connection with every one of the efforts for statehood of the great Territory of Alaska.

We all know that BOB BARTLETT's bill, as it was called by the late Senator O'Mahoney, did pass Congress the next year, in 1958, and that Alaska's admission to full statehood was certified on January 3, 1959.

I should remark that Senator Egan, who sat in the gallery on the day I mentioned, had by that time become Governor Egan, the first Governor of the new State, and that Delegate BARTLETT had become the senior Senator from the new State of Alaska.

Great credit and great honor should go to our late friend, Senator BARTLETT, for that statehood achievement in which he played such a leading part.

Mr. President, there are many other things which I could say—true things—with reference to the industry, the effectiveness, the friendliness, the knowledgeable qualities which Senator BARTLETT showed in committee, and on the floor of the Senate. Especially did I note his effective work in the Appropriations Committee, where we both served. I shall leave them to others, because I want my own remarks to be centered around the fact that I think, without his dedicated effort, devoted and continued effort, Alaska probably would not now be a State and enjoying the privileges of statehood.

In my mind, the fond memory which we should have of him, the high honor which he should always hold in the annals of Alaska and the annals of America, has to do with his magnificent performance as the Delegate from Alaska in being the spearhead of the effort to make that great territory our 49th State.

Mr. President, Mrs. Holland and I wish our affectionate sympathy to Mrs. Bartlett and her family to be of record. I want the RECORD to show that I personally shall miss the smiling, busy, and always effective Senator BARTLETT here on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, it is with sadness but a sense of extreme pride that I speak of our beloved BOB BARTLETT as I knew him through years of association and of the deep admiration and fond regard that I had for him.

The late Senator BARTLETT was elected Delegate to the House of Representatives from Alaska in 1944 and served seven consecutive terms. When Alaska was granted Statehood, he was promptly elected Senator and twice reelected. I started my service in the House of Representatives 2 years after Bob's first election and served with him four consecutive terms in that body. During his 10 years in the Senate I was closely associated with him on the Committee on Commerce. Our warm personal friendship started during my first term in the House and continued for 22 years. It is unnecessary to emphasize the high esteem in which he was held in both bodies, for everyone of us who ever served with him is fully aware of it. Not long before Alaskan Statehood I journeyed to Alaska with the late Senator Andrew Schoepel and held rather extended hearings in both Anchorage and Fairbanks on the then controversial question of the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission in the territory. BOB BARTLETT as Delegate accompanied us during

those hearings and I had a firsthand opportunity to witness the love and affection that all the people of Alaska had for him. Their devotion to him is a matter of record because during all his years he was overwhelmingly elected and reelected as both Delegate and Senator. For years no political opponent ever entertained any serious expectations of contending with him successfully.

During all his time in the House and Senate, I never knew a single Member of either body or either party who did not like and respect BOB BARTLETT. Some men do not incur animosities simply because they have negative personalities and have little force or influence—not so in the case of BOB BARTLETT. He fought doggedly and determinedly for the principles in which he believed and instantly gave battle whenever the welfare of Alaska or its people were concerned. But he had the rare and priceless faculty of being always firm but never offensive. He could differ without anger. He could lose without rancor. He could win without exultation. In all the years I was associated with him, I never saw him show the slightest sign of losing his temper. His courtesy was unflinching because it was born of a deep affection not only for his associates here but for all men everywhere. No wonder he exercised a mighty, though unobstructive, influence in the Congress. No wonder he accomplished so much for Alaska. No wonder he contributed in such a large measure to the winning of Alaskan statehood.

It was my privilege to go on that last sad journey to Fairbanks as we laid him at rest among those who knew him and loved him from his boyhood days. Mrs. Bartlett and one of his daughters took the long trip back with us to Washington. I have never seen grief more bravely borne. She and both her daughters have the admiration and deepest sympathy of us all.

BOB BARTLETT had a genius for friendship. We think of him today, not so much as a Senator or an associate, but as a companion whose modesty, good sense, and good humor made every moment with him a memory to be enjoyed.

Over whatever seas he is sailing  
 Whatever strange winds fan his brow,  
 What company rare he's regaling,  
 I know it is well with him now.  
 And when my last voyage I am making  
 May I go, as he went, unafraid,  
 And, the Pilot that guided him taking,  
 May I make the same port he has made.

(At this point Mr. MONTROYA assumed the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I saw our late colleague, BOB BARTLETT, for the last time a day or two before he left for Cleveland to undergo heart surgery.

This was in the Senate subway to the Capitol. I knew nothing about the forthcoming operation, and asked him how he was feeling. In reply, he placed his hand over his heart and said: "I'm going to have some repair work done here."

I am sure he was fully aware of the odds. But there was no outward sign. No panic. No expression of self-pity. Just inordinate courage and an ability to face up to adversity.

I wished him good luck, gave him a pat on the back and said: "Goodby, Bob."

This incident characterized BOB BARTLETT in life. He was not a dramatic person, but very wise and very dedicated and very sound in his approach to the grave problems we face as a nation and as a world.

Almost up until the time of his departure from Washington, he was busy in his office devoting attention to the most pressing problems coming within his purview as a Senator.

BOB BARTLETT and I developed a very close personal relationship when we both served in the House of Representatives; he as a nonvoting Delegate and I as a Member of the House.

Every 2 years the people of Alaska returned him to Washington as the sole representative of that vast territory. Year after year he worked zealously to provide statehood for that vast expanse of land and water.

And it was fitting indeed that after BOB BARTLETT had won his fight for Alaskan statehood, its people elected him in 1958 to be their senior Senator. I was elected to the Senate that same year, and BOB and I served together on the Commerce Committee where his great ability and talent contributed so much to the formulation and passage of major legislation.

He symbolized the greatness of the American dream. He shared the hope and pioneer spirit characteristic of his State's present and tremendously potential future of excellence.

Our largest State will be forever a monument to BOB BARTLETT's memory because, in a very real sense, he was responsible for adding the 49th star to our Nation's flag.

We shall miss BOB BARTLETT and the skills which he gave to his country and his State. Mrs. Prouty joins me in expressing deepest sympathy to Mrs. Bartlett and her two daughters.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I rise to participate as the Senate honors today the memory of one of its ablest and finest Members, the late Honorable E. L. "BOB" BARTLETT, Senator from Alaska. His untimely death on December 11, 1968, was greeted with great sorrow both in this Chamber and in the State he loved so thoroughly and served so well for nearly a quarter of a century.

I came to know Senator BARTLETT well and to respect him deeply during the past 4 years. Stanch in his convictions, wise of counsel, humble of spirit and humanitarian to the core, Senator BARTLETT was exemplary as public servant, statesman and man. Many of us separated from him by long years justly counted him as friend and counselor. His passing is all the more painful to the Senate for his friendship and counsel is now denied us.

BOB BARTLETT's contributions are well known to the Members of this body. One of them for which I am personally grateful is the vote he cast in the Chamber for cloture last year that made the fair housing amendment a reality. We could not have done it without him, and BOB BARTLETT was willing to make the difference when it counted.

The greatest tribute paid to any Senator comes, of course, not from this body but from the State he represents. The measure of BOB BARTLETT was best captured, in my judgment, by this excerpt from the Anchorage Daily Times of December 12:

Senator Bartlett played a key role before, during and after the attainment of statehood. Without his dependable and constant efforts in winning special measures from Congress and the Chief Executive in Washington, the revolutionary changes experienced by Alaskans would have been more difficult.

The loss of our friend is overwhelming. We are so blinded by our sorrow that we tend to overlook the great victory that his life exemplifies and our good fortune in having him so long.

Mr. President, rather than grieving at the loss of one who loved life and served his fellow men so well by the way he lived it, let us join with all the Alaskans who loved him so well in remembering the victories his life exemplified and our own good fortune in having him so long.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, while the Senate was in adjournment, death came to one of our most beloved and respected colleagues, a fine, able, dependable gentleman and friend whom we shall remember with respect and a warm feeling of affection. Indeed, I am sure that as we sit here today, each of us feels keenly and in a deep personal sense, the absence of Senator BOB BARTLETT, of Alaska.

I first met BOB BARTLETT when we served together in the House of Representatives. He was Delegate to the Congress of the United States from Alaska and I was Congressman-at-Large from Ohio. Then later I distinctly recall we were sworn into this body the same day. Over the years we became close friends, and I always held BOB BARTLETT in the highest admiration.

No man deserves greater credit than BOB BARTLETT in the prolonged efforts to achieve statehood for Alaska. For 14 years as Delegate to Congress from Alaska he devoted himself and his energy to that cause. The people of his great State showed their appreciation by electing him to the U.S. Senate in 1958, and reelecting him in 1960 and 1966. I recall distinctly in January 1959 walking down the aisle in this Chamber directly behind BOB BARTLETT and his escort and our taking our solemn oaths at the same time as Senators of the United States.

Few Senators were as effective in producing significant gains for their States as BOB BARTLETT was for Alaska. He also served the needs of the Nation so well that he set an example for all Senators to follow. It can truly be said of our beloved colleague that he lived with an abiding faith in the democratic process which he zealously guarded, and in doing so he provided a ringing affirmation of our way of life in these times of trial and torment.

BOB BARTLETT did not elect to make headlines. He chose to work quietly and in his quiet way he achieved. When BOB spoke we listened. His eloquence showed itself in his writing. I shall always recall his words in speaking of his beloved State:

I love Alaska. My attachment for it, my concern for it, is so deeply imbedded that it is a very part of me. There I have grown, studied, married and worked. I have toiled in her beautiful natural setting as a gold miner. I have learned the life of her towns as a reporter. I have met her people as an appointed administrator and again as Delegate and Senator. As years pile upon years there is a greater personal insistence in drawing upon memory's treasure trove.

When Bob went to Cleveland, Ohio, for heart surgery he was buoyed in the hope that this would restore his health. He knew the odds, but he wanted desperately to be well again so he could continue to serve his State and his Nation.

Bob was buried in Fairbanks, Alaska, where he spent his youth and grew to manhood. The day of his burial, I am told, was overcast but beautiful and quiet; the stillness broken only by the sound of crunching snow as his friends gathered at the graveside. A local newspaper carried a comment which conveyed the spirit of the grieving State:

It's days like today that remind souldoughs they're not too big to cry.

BOB BARTLETT will long be remembered in the hearts of all who knew him, worked with him, and had the privilege of his friendship. The Nation has lost one of its finest public servants. I have lost a close personal friend. No words of mine can really assuage the anguish and bereavement of his family, but Mrs. Young and I express our heartfelt sympathy to his lovely wife and helpmate, Vide, and to his daughters, Doris Ann and Sue, for the great loss that they, together with our Nation, have sustained in his passing.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, today we pay a much deserved tribute to a man who was probably as much beloved by his colleagues in the U.S. Senate as any man who has served here. E. L. BARTLETT, or Bob to his 99 friends in the Senate and his thousands of friends outside these walls, was taken from us after recurrent illness last December 11. His passing deprived his home State of excellent representation, his Nation of valuable services, but most of all it deprived men and women who knew him of a warm and loyal comrade.

To his colleagues on the Commerce Committee, BOB BARTLETT was a man we could count on to labor as hard on another's behalf as on his own. He was fair in his judgment of issues and charitable in his judgment of men. He was a leader in the fight for freedom of the seas, and it is his legislation which could, if enforced, stop the sort of gunboat piracy which so recently occurred off the coast of Peru on the high seas. As chairman of the Maritime and Fisheries Subcommittee, he was leader in a host of other legislative contests, too. But even in contests, neither bitterness nor unfriendly act marred BOB BARTLETT's grace. Indeed, his every move seemed based on boundless affection for his colleagues.

That affection was returned a thousandfold, and the affectionate memory of BOB BARTLETT lives with all of us now, and will for years in the future.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, our former

colleague, BOB BARTLETT, was a friend of mine. He was a very warm-hearted, generous, and intelligent man.

Very few men who have served here have quite the memorial that BOB BARTLETT has. He has his whole State as his memorial. As has been said by our colleagues, Bob's life was synonymous with the development of our largest State with its untold resources which, in my judgment, will be developed one day as we solve the problems even of climate with our advanced technology into one of the great metropolitan areas of our Nation. It will be his memorial. He is one of the men who helped found it and bring it to statehood, though it was so many miles from the continental United States.

Alaska is the first State to mark the break with the tradition that there had to be attachment to the continental United States. Alaska was followed by Hawaii. It may be followed by others.

BOB BARTLETT was one of the main architects of the statehood of Alaska. His cathedral will be the cathedral of great treasure, vast space, the unplumbed depths, and the frozen seas. In many places, Alaska is a temperate and pleasant land, similar to a great deal of the rest of the territory in the United States.

I will remember Bob beyond everything else for his personal kindness, his delicacy of approach. I do not know of a harsh word he ever said to anyone. It was not in him. I will always remember his cooperation and, at the same time, the decisiveness with which he knew his own mind. One never had to worry about Bob. He would say whether he was going to vote yes or no, and he knew precisely how he stood on any given question.

I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to a friend and Senator. I congratulate Alaska for producing so noble a son.

I express for Mrs. Javits and myself the deepest condolences and sympathy to Mrs. Bartlett and the family.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, BOB BARTLETT was a relative youngster when he first came to Congress back in 1944 as the Territory of Alaska's Delegate. He was working for his Alaska then and he was working for it last year when tragedy ended his great career.

During his 24 years in Congress, 10 of them as a Senator, he became one of the best-liked and most-respected Members. I worked with him on the Senate Appropriations Committee and came to know him and respect him as a personal friend.

But now my words of tribute must have a hollow ring. For how can words do justice to BOB BARTLETT the man and BOB BARTLETT the Senator with a fine record of service to his State and Nation? I only know that the people of the young State of Alaska were fortunate indeed to have men like BOB BARTLETT and Ernest Gruening to represent them as they entered the Union.

Alaska has made great strides since BOB BARTLETT first settled there some 65 years ago, and one big reason was BOB BARTLETT. He was the kind of rugged, self-sufficient man Alaska needed to convert a raw frontier territory into an

active, bustling, modern State whose name is synonymous with courage and enterprise.

I submit BOB BARTLETT's name was also synonymous with courage and enterprise—and dedication. He died serving his State in the Senate of the United States. As much as he loved Alaska, I think he would have had it no other way.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, no State or territory has received more dedicated, persuasive representation in this Nation's Capitol than did Alaska receive from Senator E. L. "BOB" BARTLETT.

He was my colleague and my friend of 24 years.

Being from the Northwest United States, my associations with Alaska and BOB BARTLETT have been many. I knew him first when he was sworn in as the Territorial Delegate to the Congress in January of 1945. I was a member of the House Interior Appropriations Subcommittee and Delegate BARTLETT was a non-voting member of the House Interior Committee. While he could not vote in those years before statehood, he had access to the House floor and committee rooms. His voice was strong and clear in support of the development of the resources of Alaska. We worked hand in hand on a myriad of problems involving statehood, the fisheries, mineral development, native claims, and other questions concerning Alaska.

I was chairman of the Senate Territories Subcommittee at the time of Alaskan statehood. BOB BARTLETT was a wise and ready battler in that debate and statehood could not have been achieved without him.

He served as Territorial Delegate from 1945 until he was sworn in as the elected Senator of Alaska in January of 1959. His tenure as Delegate was the longest served by any person representing that Territory.

He was a great U.S. Senator. His interests extended far beyond the extensive boundaries of Alaska. As a member of the Senate Commerce, Armed Services, Small Business, and Appropriations Committees, he helped devise and affect legislation meaningful to the well-being of all Americans. He was a strong friend of the poor and underprivileged. His heart was out to the underprivileged, particularly the native of his home State whose incidence of illness are much too high and their opportunities for education and work far too low.

He was an articulate voice for a strong nation in the face of challenges abroad. And he was compassionate of the down-trodden in other countries as well as our own.

He wanted a better world and until his final day he worked hard to achieve it.

My wife Helen joins me in extending our deepest sympathies to Vide Bartlett, a remarkable woman in her own right, and to their daughters, Mrs. Doris Ann Riley and Miss Sue Bartlett.

We in the Senate miss BOB BARTLETT, as does Alaska and the Nation. He exemplified the best in the pioneering spirit of the State he represented. He was warm, kind, and dedicated. He will long be remembered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I join

my colleagues in paying tribute to BOB BARTLETT.

I knew BOB before he came to the House of Representatives as a Delegate. He was associated with Tony Dimond who for years so ably represented the Territory of Alaska in the House of Representatives. BOB BARTLETT succeeded him when Tony Dimond left the House to become a Federal judge in the Territory of Alaska.

I knew BOB well in the Senate. I was very pleased to be associated with him. He and I served on the Small Business Committee here for several years.

He was always interested in small business matters. At various times he had the Small Business Committee, or some part of it, go to Alaska and check conditions there. He was always alert to the needs and the requirements of the great part of the Nation that he represented in the Senate and in the House, when he was a Member of the latter body.

BOB was one of the most personable fellows I have even known. I was pleased always to be able to count him as my good friend. I shall miss him greatly. We shall all miss him in the Senate as time goes on.

Mrs. Sparkman and I extend to Mrs. Bartlett and all his loved ones our sympathy and our feeling of personal loss.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, those of us who represent the less populated States take great inspiration from the life of BOB BARTLETT.

Senator BARTLETT and his fellow Alaska Senators are the only Senators that represent fewer people in the Senate than do the Senators from Wyoming. BOB BARTLETT never let the big States overwhelm him as he constantly put Alaska's interests forward.

Alaska is a State with vexing problems. It is our largest State and at the same time has the smallest population. Her people are scattered and her industries are few. For many years Alaska was a territory of the United States. During World War II Alaska was a battleground. Not only is Alaska remote, her internal communications, roads, and facilities are sparse.

BOB BARTLETT, a true son of Alaska, never gave up the fight for Statehood for his State. Following his election as Territorial Delegate in 1944, he led the fight here in Congress to get Alaska statehood. The awesomeness of his task did not deter him and when success finally came in 1958, Alaska recognized his efforts by electing BOB BARTLETT to the Senate.

Since statehood, Senator BARTLETT was relentless in his efforts to improve conditions in Alaska through Federal programs. Senator BARTLETT was in the forefront of those who want other criteria used in Federal programs than just a per capita distribution.

Senator BARTLETT kept Alaska's needs before the Senate and the Government.

There is another factor to Senator BARTLETT's passing that, so far as I know, has not previously been noted. The retirement of Senator Hayden, or Arizona, and the defeat of Senator Gruening, of Alaska, along with Senator BARTLETT's death, substantially reduced the Members of Congress who had served in these halls

since the statehood of their respective States. I consider this a distinctive quality of all of these former colleagues.

I envy the opportunity they enjoyed to see their States obtain statehood and then be able to help their States so well through their infancy.

I find it personally most unfortunate that because of his sudden passing, I was not able to serve with Senator BARTLETT longer on the Commerce Committee.

He leaves a void that will be hard to fill.

Senator BARTLETT was the chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee of the Commerce Committee and was a great ally of those of us who are trying to establish a true national maritime policy.

I am sure his efforts regarding the fishing industry will be noted by those Senators from States with a more extensive coastline than land-locked Wyoming.

However, fishing is an important industry to Alaska and Senator BARTLETT was keenly aware of the industry's problems.

I attended Senator BARTLETT's funeral in Fairbanks and I was impressed by the esteem in which he was held by his fellow Alaskans.

He leaves a memory of achievement and dedication. We miss his wise counsel and friendly ways.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, it is always difficult to comment on the passing of a colleague, especially so when that colleague was a close friend with whom I had been privileged to have been associated since our election to the U.S. Senate in 1958, and to have been associated in the class of 1958 since that time.

BOB BARTLETT was such a friend, who, in his quiet way, was an indispensable Member of this body. Beloved by his constituents as their long-time representative in Washington, he maintained his qualities of personal concern and unaffected modesty in spite of the honors and the attention which were his over long years of public service.

Alaska owes much to BOB BARTLETT for the labors he performed in making statehood possible. His colleagues owe him much for his quiet competence, his devotion to making the Senate a more responsive body, and his dependability as an associate and a wise counselor. The Nation owes an enormous debt of gratitude to a man who knew the richness of our largest State, the value of its untapped resources, and, above all, the importance of each individual to the strength and greatness of our Nation.

It was my privilege, together with the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, to attend the funeral of BOB BARTLETT in Alaska. I shall never forget the services, in the evening of a cold winter day, in Fairbanks, Alaska, in the shadows of the mountains which he loved so dearly.

It was my privilege to travel to Alaska and return with another good friend, his widow, Vide Bartlett.

I should like to take this opportunity to extend the deepest sympathy of myself and Mrs. Muskie and to assure Mrs. Bartlett of our friendship through the years that lie ahead.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I should like to join my colleagues this afternoon in paying tribute to a great American.

It was my privilege to serve on a committee with BOB BARTLETT when he began his service in the Senate. I was impressed, as were we all, with his complete dedication to his State and to the Nation.

He was a great public servant. Perhaps his outstanding characteristic was his spotless integrity.

My wife and I extend our deepest sympathy to his gracious lady. We all know that in the loss of BOB BARTLETT the U.S. Senate lost one of its finest Members.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Senator BARTLETT of Alaska.

It was my pleasure and privilege to work closely with Senator BOB BARTLETT on the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the Committee on Commerce. As Senators know, and as all persons in the United States and in the world who are familiar with maritime matters know, Senator BARTLETT rendered distinguished service to our Nation as chairman of that subcommittee and as an expert on maritime affairs.

I had the privilege to be the ranking minority member of his subcommittee. In that capacity—even though my service has been much shorter than that of many others who have spoken today—I had the opportunity to know him well.

His rugged individualism, strength of character, and friendly demeanor were always a source of inspiration to those who knew and worked with him. During the relatively short time I was able to serve with him, he never ceased for a moment being fair, objective, and sincere in the conduct of his senatorial responsibilities. In the work of the subcommittee, he always gave the party opposite him every consideration at all times.

Mr. President, the untimely death of BOB BARTLETT is not just the Senate's loss; it is a loss to an entire Nation and particularly to the great State of Alaska, which finally gained statehood in large measure due to BOB's untiring efforts.

To the members of Senator BARTLETT's family, my wife and I extend our profound sympathy, and we hope that they may be sustained by their pride in his courage, dedication, enthusiasm, devotion to country and the great record he compiled as a U.S. Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, today is a very sad day for me in reminiscing the association I have had for so many years with our distinguished colleague, Senator BARTLETT, of Alaska. I suspect that in terms of years I was one of his oldest friends. I knew him before he came to Congress. I have had much association with him in many mutual projects involving the Pacific Northwest and Alaska when it was a territory, and the development of the entire area.

Mr. President, I could stand here all afternoon and talk about the things that he did for what is now the State of Alaska in its development, and the things that were near and dear to Alaskans and to him.

Mr. President, I suppose you could take a trip to the State of Alaska today and no matter where you would stop you

would find not only his friends but something that he had helped to develop. He touched every part of that vast State. Of course, the people of Alaska acknowledged his services on many occasions by returning him to Washington.

Over the years he had a great deal to do in the fight for statehood for Alaska, as we in Congress know. He served on my Commerce Committee with me for all the years he was in the Senate, and his contribution to the work of that committee was invaluable.

I know of no one who was more expertise in the field of fisheries, the field of the merchant marine, and numerous other areas, than the Senator from Alaska. We on the committee will miss him greatly. As I have said, I could stand here all afternoon and talk about BOB BARTLETT.

In the days when Alaska was a territory they had representation in the House of Representatives but no representation here; and when an Alaskan matter would come to the Senate naturally BOB BARTLETT would confer with me about it and we would work together. As a matter of fact, he introduced me on several occasions in those days as "the Senator from Alaska" because they had no Senator.

I could add many, many contributions with respect to BOB BARTLETT. When I went to the funeral in Fairbanks, Alaska, the Daily News Miner of Fairbanks published a story which I think probably covers the subject of this great Alaskan much better than I can. The headline on the story states "Bartlett's Last Trip Home—Friends Gather for Final Tribute."

It goes on to say:

The small and great, the miner and the hunter, the Eskimo and the senator, the trapper and the governor joined today in paying final tribute to their friend, Sen. E. L. (Bob) Bartlett of Alaska.

In this snow-covered city, on the edge of the northern wilderness which comprises so much of the Alaska he loved, funeral services were held for Alaska's senior senator who represented his state in the nation's capital for 24 years.

The 64-year-old former miner and newspaperman died Wednesday in a Cleveland, Ohio clinic of cardiac arrest following an operation in November to relieve blockage of an artery.

Then it goes on to describe what happened and what was said there. This is an unusual tribute, because all of the churches in Fairbanks; Catholic, Protestant, Presbyterian, joined in the service.

Then it goes on to say:

His body, accompanied by his wife, Vide, his daughters, Doris Ann and Sue, and several close friends, was flown here last night from Washington aboard an Air Force jet. Scores of friends stood in the clear, sub-zero night to await the plane's arrival.

Shortly after sunrise in this northland city where daylight is less than four hours long on this day, the first of the large crowds began filing past the casket lying in state at St. Matthew's Episcopal Church. Heavy hooded parkas and bright mukluks mingled with dark business suits and fur coats to demonstrate the wide variety of friends who came to pay their final respects.

The simplicity of the setting was much like the man being mourned. A green mat covered the casket, placed in front of the

altar. An honor guard of members of Igloo No. 4, stood on both sides of the casket.

Then the Reverend Warren, the Episcopal representative, detailed his long record of service to the State and country. He said:

"Was his greatness in his warmth? Yes. In his simplicity? Yes. In his unawareness of it? Yes.

"But it was chiefly in his faithful response to his Creator, when our Lord said, 'Inasmuch as you have done it unto one of the least of these, my brother,' Bob gracefully heard and did. When Jesus said, 'All men are your neighbors,' Bob gracefully understood and loved.

"When God said, 'Be come, Edward Lewis,' Bob gracefully began to try and we know he continues to try.

Rev. Warren closed the service with the reading of Robert Louis Stevenson's "Requiem," which he said was Bartlett's favorite poem.

And so, Mr. President, to his great and loyal wife, Vide, who is our warm personal friend of many years, Mrs. Magnuson and I extend, again, our deepest sympathy.

To his fine daughters, and to his hordes of friends our condolences.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the complete article printed in the RECORD.

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

#### FRIENDS GATHER FOR FINAL TRIBUTE

The small and great, the miner and the hunter, the Eskimo and the senator, the trapper and the governor joined today in paying final tribute to their friend, Sen. E. L. (Bob) Bartlett of Alaska.

In this snow-covered city, on the edge of the northern wilderness which comprises so much of the Alaska he loved, funeral services were held for Alaska's senior senator who represented his state in the nation's capital for 24 years.

The 64-year-old former miner and newspaperman died Wednesday in a Cleveland, Ohio clinic of cardiac arrest following an operation in November to relieve blockage of an artery.

His body, accompanied by his wife, Vide, his daughters, Doris Ann and Sue, and several close friends was flown here last night from Washington aboard an Air Force jet. Scores of friends stood in the clear, sub-zero night to await the plane's arrival.

Shortly after sunrise in this northland city where daylight is less than four hours long on this day, the first of the large crowds began filing past the casket lying in state at St. Matthew's Episcopal Church. Heavy hooded parkas and bright mukluks mingled with dark business suits and fur coats to demonstrate the wide variety of friends who came to pay their final respects.

The simplicity of the setting was much like the man being mourned. A green mat covered the casket, placed in front of the altar. An honor guard of members of Igloo No. 4, stood on both sides of the casket.

Mrs. Bartlett was seated in a room to the side, talking quietly with those who came to express their sympathy.

The funeral services, originally scheduled for St. Matthew's, was transferred to the Catholic Cathedral to accommodate the large crowd which heard the Rev. William T. Warren ask God "to continue taking good care of Bob."

The Episcopal Eucharist burial service also included a communion service for the members of Bartlett's family, and others who wished to participate.

Assisting the Rev. Mr. Warren in the service

was Bishop William J. Gordon, Episcopal Bishop of Alaska and the Rev. Dean Hickox, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Fairbanks. Seated near the altar were Catholic Archbishops Ryan, Bishop of Alaska, Bishop Robert L. Whelan, SJ, and Bishop Francis Gleason.

The Rev. Mr. Warren, after detailing Bartlett's long record of service to his state and country, said:

"Was his greatness in his warmth? Yes. In his simplicity? Yes. In his unawareness of it? Yes.

"But it was chiefly in his faithful response to his Creator, when our Lord said, 'Inasmuch as you have done it unto one of the least of these, my brother,' Bob gracefully heard and did. When Jesus said, 'All men are your neighbors,' Bob gracefully understood and loved.

"When God said, 'Be come, Edward Lewis,' Bob gracefully began to try and we know he continues to try."

Rev. Warren closed the service with the reading of Robert Louis Stevenson's "Requiem," which he said was Bartlett's favorite poem.

An eight-member committee from the U.S. Senate, with Warren G. Magnuson of Washington as chairman, comprised the honorary pallbearers.

Mr. INOUE, Mr. President, it is sometimes very difficult to say farewell to a Senator, especially a good friend.

The people of Hawaii were deeply saddened by Senator E. L. "BOB" BARTLETT's passing, because they owe a great deal to him for his understanding and cooperation during Hawaii's fight for statehood.

During the darkest moments of our struggle, he remained in the forefront of our cause. For his assistance, the people of the State of Hawaii will always be grateful.

But, most important, we will miss him as a good and compassionate friend. He was truly a most compassionate man who, time and again, demonstrated by deeds his concern for those in need—the poor, the hungry, the sick, and the lame.

Americans across the Nation have felt and benefited from the love Senator BARTLETT gave so generously to his country.

We will miss this good and great American, BOB BARTLETT.

Mr. GORE, Mr. President, my service with the late Senator ROBERT BARTLETT was a source of pleasure and of reward. His compassion, his fellowship, his faith in mankind, his zest for public life, his penetrating understanding of issues, the trust and confidence which he extended to his fellow Senators, made of him not only a beloved but a valuable colleague. His passing was a great loss to his State, to his Nation, and to this body.

Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. President, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to a distinguished American, Senator E. L. "BOB" BARTLETT.

Senator BARTLETT has a long and meritorious record of public service. In 1944, he was elected Delegate to the Congress for the Territory of Alaska. He served very capably in that capacity for seven successive terms. After Congress approved statehood for Alaska in 1958, Senator BARTLETT was overwhelmingly elected U.S. Senator from Alaska. He represented Alaska in the Senate with integrity and dedication until his death on December 11, 1968.

Sometimes, I had occasion to work

very closely with Senator BARTLETT during his tenure in the Senate. We served together on numerous subcommittees of the Senate Appropriations Committee following his appointment to that committee on February 25, 1963. His work exemplified his love and devotion for Alaska and America. I treasured his warm friendship and wise counsel throughout our association.

I count it a great honor and privilege to have known and served with Senator BARTLETT. Mrs. McClellan and I express our heartfelt sympathy to his family.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I join Senators on both sides of the aisle today in paying tribute to the late Senator E. L. BARTLETT, affectionately known as "Bob" by those of us who served with him during his 10 years in the Senate.

BOB BARTLETT'S record of service to his home State of Alaska was well recognized by the voters of the 49th State who elected him by overwhelming majorities to represent them in Washington. He first came to the Nation's Capitol in 1944 when he was elected as a Delegate to Congress from the territory of Alaska. He was reelected six times, and during that period he was Alaska's foremost spokesman for statehood. Certainly no man was more deserving than BOB BARTLETT to move to the Senate on November 25, 1958, as the first senior Senator from Alaska. He was easily reelected to the Senate in 1960 and 1966 although the Republicans carried Alaska for the top of the ticket positions on both occasions.

Only the sting of death could have removed BOB BARTLETT from the Alaska political scene, as it did shortly before Christmas of last year. His loss will be keenly felt by every citizen of his great State as well as by this body. I was honored to have served with him on the Committee on Appropriations, where we admired and respected him as a hard working and fair-minded colleague.

Mrs. Mundt joins me in extending our profound sympathy to his family.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, time is taking its toll of colleagues whose presence in the Senate it was our privilege to share. Their absence makes this Chamber a lonelier place—just as it deprives their State and our Nation of a stalwart son and symbol.

E. L. "BOB" BARTLETT was truly symbolic of Alaska—with great natural endowments—commanding presence—rugged representative of the biggest of our country's possessions.

BOB BARTLETT was brought to Alaska as a babe in arms at the turn of the century. The Alaskan purchase of 1867 was just beginning to lose its name of "Seward's Folly" as the \$7 million price to Russia was swallowed in the billions of wealth derived from that great territory.

With BOB BARTLETT it was a case of love at first sight for this land of glaciers and volcanoes, timbered mountains, and gold in the soil and the seas.

With his very hands he mined for gold. As a newsman, he fashioned the current vibrant history of the Territory and proved his love for the great people of the great country which is the meaning of its name, Alaska.

Twenty-five years ago BOB BARTLETT came to Congress as the Delegate from Alaska, and a decade ago he achieved his dream of statehood.

His was the deserved reward of membership in this Senate, and ours was the reward of winning a colleague whom we revered as a friend and recognized for the statesman BOB BARTLETT was.

It was an inspiration to serve with him particularly on the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Commerce. Ability, affability, integrity were his attributes. We will always remember him for his impeccable appearance—his genial manner—his ready smile—the lovely touch of a flower in his lapel.

I am told the official flower of Alaska is the forget-me-not.

I am sure the official and popular tribute of Alaska to BOB BARTLETT will be "Forget him never."

To the loved ones of our departed colleague goes our heartfelt sympathy; and from all the Nation goes our everlasting appreciation for a dedicated public servant.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I join Senators in paying tribute to the life and service of our distinguished former colleague, Senator E. L. BARTLETT, who passed away on December 11.

In addition to being an able and just legislator, BOB BARTLETT was a warm, friendly man with a great capacity for human understanding and compassion; our body has been diminished by this loss.

Senator BARTLETT made a lasting contribution to his State and his Nation during his years in Congress, with particular regard to the long but successful struggle he conducted on behalf of Alaskan statehood, and he leaves a record of which his family and friends can rightfully be proud.

Mrs. Jordan and I were saddened by his passing and extend our deepest sympathy to his wife and family.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I share with each of you in this Chamber today who served with him a sense of personal loss and sorrow because our colleague, BOB BARTLETT, is no longer with us.

His death during the recess period not only left a void in this body, but in a very real sense closed a chapter in the history of his State and of the country as a whole.

He was perhaps more than any one other man responsible for Alaskan statehood—a cause which he made his primary issue in his first campaign as a territorial Representative to Congress in 1944 and for which he fought continuously until it became a reality 11 years later.

Fittingly, he was its first elected Senator under statehood status, and he battled just as hard in the next decade to make Alaska a full partner in the Nation's activities.

I admired and respected him for those fighting qualities and for the courage which sustained him even in the long months of his illness and enabled him to continue his service to the end of the past session.

He was not only a fighter but a prolific worker who produced what, according to a Library of Congress survey, may well be the most legislation ever approved for a single Member.

It is thus that I will remember and honor BOB BARTLETT, the one-time Alaskan gold miner, who struck pay dirt for the territory he loved and served.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, the Senate was deeply saddened by the death late last year of the incomparable Senator from Alaska, BOB BARTLETT.

Senator BARTLETT was a champion of Alaskan statehood. He had lived in Alaska since the turn of the century, and had learned to love its rich natural resources. He first came to Washington as a delegate from the territory in 1944, and served in the Congress until Alaska was admitted to the Union in 1959. At that time he was elected to the Senate for a 2-year term, and easily won reelection in 1960.

Throughout his years of service in the Congress, BOB BARTLETT spoke clearly and well for the rights of the less populous States. He understood the needs of the farmers, the small businessmen, and the sportsmen. But he was able to understand the conditions of city life as well. He appreciated the changes which are occurring in our society, he comprehended the tensions, and he sought to turn the tides to the advantage of the entire country. Senator BARTLETT was a man who saw the long-range needs of this Nation and put them foremost. His counsel and perspective will be sorely missed.

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, if we measure a man by the service he gives to his fellow men and to the ideas and institutions in which he believes then we must measure BOB BARTLETT, our late colleague from the State of Alaska, as having been quite a man. Indeed, Alaska is a State which demands big men to match its own dimensions, its own promise. In BOB BARTLETT it found such a man, not to mention a sterling advocate who persisted many long years in the fight to have Alaska enter into the Union and takes its place in our Nation's future.

After his own family—his widow, Vide; and his daughters—with whom we share grief and sorrow at his passing, BOB BARTLETT thought first and foremost of the people of Alaska—the natives and the relative newcomers as well—and their well being. Indeed, for many years he and he alone, almost, represented them in the Nation's Capital as the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Alaska.

In fact, it was back in those days when BOB BARTLETT was the Delegate from the Alaska Territory that I first came to know him. From the year 1950 until his death I had many occasions to learn to trust, admire, and enjoy the friendship of the man. He and I arrived in the Senate at approximately the same time and remained the closest of colleagues throughout our mutual Senate careers.

There was a small family footnote to this friendship of nearly 20 years. It hangs on the magic of the date April 20. While historians will associate that day with Hitler's birth, it had a far greater meaning in the Bartlett and McGee

households. It was a birth date shared by BOB BARTLETT and my wife, Loraine.

Appropriately, Senator BARTLETT was elected to the Senate after statehood finally came to his beloved Alaska, and he served his State well and faithfully for the rest of his life. What more, Mr. President, can be said of a public servant?

We can say that we miss his company, his example, his uncommon good sense, and, yes, his rose, as I am sure the people of Alaska do. We share with them this loss. But we also share their pride at having known BOB BARTLETT and having been associated with him through the years. Our devoted, personal friendship will remain a treasured memory.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, high on the list of colleagues whom we have all held in high esteem during recent sessions of the U.S. Senate has been the senior Senator from Alaska.

His premiere position on many Senate lists was accidental. Based upon the process of alphabetical listing, his name was among the first to be called as we voted; and in our congressional directories, which are arranged alphabetically by States, he also was near the front.

But many of us came to think of him as among the first in far more substantive ways. No Senator enjoyed a more widespread popular support among the people of his State. In visits to Alaska I came to know that this affection and respect went far deeper than that required to achieve a steady voting majority in excess of 80 percent. The feeling was almost universal that he represented the interests of his State in the most effective manner possible, and Alaskans loved him for it.

So it became a habit for many of us, especially from developing States like Oklahoma, to seek his guidance. He was a staunch ally in the fight for many important causes. Since both our States have a high percentage of American Indians, I especially recall his efforts on behalf of this most neglected portion of our population. As colleagues on the Select Committee on Small Business I am aware of the fact that the American small businessman has lost a needed and effective friend.

Today I would hope that those of us who were allied with him will not only pay tribute to his memory; we must also pledge our continued and redoubled efforts in those areas where his tasks were unfortunately left unfinished.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, Senator E. L. "BOB" BARTLETT was a great Senator and an effective, dedicated spokesman for his State of Alaska. We will miss this true friend and patriot.

I first met BOB BARTLETT in 1949, when both of us served in the House of Representatives.

Although as a Delegate to Congress he did not have a vote, BOB BARTLETT proved to be a distinguished and able Member of the House.

His seven terms in that body earned him a reputation for hard work and uncommon legislative skill.

It was a reputation BOB BARTLETT deserved and one that followed him to the Senate when he came to this body in 1959.

By then, however, Alaska had achieved statehood—and its representatives had the right to vote. One wonders if this goal—statehood—would have been reached without BOB BARTLETT.

From the moment he arrived in Congress, this staunch advocate fought hard to make Alaska a State.

He labored tirelessly to achieve this goal—and was one of the key leaders who shaped the strategy that led to statehood in 1958.

Many of his colleagues in the House credited Bob with having played the major role in the effort to give Alaska statehood.

Typical of this sentiment was a speech Representative Stewart Udall gave in the House when President Eisenhower was preparing to sign the Alaska statehood bill. Mr. Udall said:

As one member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs who has worked on it in recent years and watched very closely the day-to-day progress of that legislation, it has seemed to me that not enough credit has been given to the man who really led this fight and who over the long years through hard work and through his friendship with Members of this body made this legislation possible. I refer, of course, to the Delegate from Alaska, BOB BARTLETT. To me, BOB BARTLETT has stood out above all the rest and I should like to pay him that tribute here today.

On the same occasion, the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner said in an editorial:

Among the men to whom Alaskans' undying gratitude will flow there is one who stands out above the rest. He has led the statehood fight not just for the last few years but without letup for 14 years, in seven successive Congresses. He has led it not only with faithful determination but with rare skill. This man, of course, is Delegate E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT.

The people of Alaska promptly elected BOB BARTLETT to the Senate. His constituents reelected him in 1960 and in 1966.

BOB BARTLETT once said in his State:

I love Alaska. My attachment for it, my concern for it, is so deeply embedded that it is a very part of me. There I have grown, studied, married, and worked. I have toiled in her beautiful natural setting as a gold miner. I have learned the life of her towns as a reporter. I have met her people as an appointed administrator and again as a Delegate and a Senator. As years pile upon years there is a greater personal insistence in drawing upon memory's trove.

His was a deep love for Alaska. We can thank BOB BARTLETT for his role in making Alaska a State—and we can thank his State for having given us a great Senator and friend. We will miss him very much.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, I join in paying tribute to the memory of our late colleague, BOB BARTLETT, the gentle Alaskan whose passing so saddened us and left the Nation diminished in his loss.

He was called the gentle Alaskan because he was just that. But that gentleness neither weakened his tenacity, nor diverted the persistence with which he pursued his causes.

I knew more of BOB BARTLETT than I knew the man himself. I knew how he had championed statehood for Alaska,

and how well—first as a Delegate and later as a Senator—he served his beloved State.

I knew how well he had learned the agencies and the programs of the Federal Government—few knew them as well—and how effectively he made use of that knowledge to help the people of Alaska.

But mostly I knew the man from hearing and reading his own words.

They tell what kind of man—what kind of American—BOB BARTLETT was.

He was a man of humor, from whom those of us in this august body who take ourselves too seriously could learn a worthwhile lesson.

Here is BOB BARTLETT on a subject dear to all of us:

Every so often there is a day in November when you hold your breath and wait. You never know whether the contract will be renewed.

And then there was BOB BARTLETT, the Senator from Alaska. This is how he conceived Alaska's role to be:

One of the greatest contributions which Alaska can render is to be herself, and to offer still another American alternative to the general pattern of our national life. The Alaska alternative must be unique and treasurable. It must stimulate the searching mind; it must soothe the troubled heart; it must mobilize the restless imagination. As the transportation and cultural links between Alaska and her sister States deepen, as Alaska drinks thirstily from the national cultural cup, we Alaskans must be careful to retain our unique identity.

And then there was BOB BARTLETT, the American, speaking for all Americans:

Americans of today have an especial responsibility to show the world and to show themselves that our Government, our Constitution, our culture know no color or racial barrier. Guarantees of individual equality and liberty written into the basic documents of our government must be fulfilled. They must be fulfilled, not just because the world is watching, which it is, not just because domestic unrest threatens, which it does, but because they are right.

Finally, there was BOB BARTLETT the man, speaking of man's relationship to man, and man's relationship to his government. This is what he said:

There are few men or women in the more than two billion inhabiting this earth who do not care and care deeply for human relationships of all kinds, including association with government, which will allow them to enjoy to the limit their individual capacities and desires. So properly stated, the great struggle of our day is between statism and government responsive to the will of its individual citizens.

Thus BOB BARTLETT left us our challenge. Let us work to meet it—while God rests his great soul.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, one of the greatest tributes that can be paid a man is the recognition that his community, his State, and his Nation are all the better for having had the benefit of his counsel and service. To the memory of our esteemed late friend and colleague, BOB BARTLETT, such recognition is most certainly due.

One of the last of the great frontiersmen of the hardy American stock de-

veloped during the Yukon gold rush days, BOB BARTLETT could always be found in the forefront of efforts to preserve, protect, and develop our national heritage of natural and human resources. His outstanding public career of 35 years encompassed an unusually wide variety of beneficial and self-sacrificing services to the people whom he represented so faithfully and so well.

BOB's associates in the Senate came to know him as an individual not given to spectacular displays of eloquence or temperament, but rather as a person of quiet and unassuming patience, wisdom, and courage. Through uncommonly effective use of these attributes, he was able to make his beliefs and influence felt to the everlasting benefit not only of Alaska but also of the entire United States. To us, BOB BARTLETT was and shall remain in our memories a pillar of strength and a tower of integrity.

The presence in the Senate of this trusted friend and distinguished colleague will be sorely missed. To his family, I extend my deepest sympathies in this time of their sorrow.

Mr. HOLLINGS. As a freshman Senator, it was my privilege to serve as a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee of the Commerce Committee under the chairmanship of my friend, "BOB" BARTLETT, the man we honor today.

Senator BARTLETT impressed me from the start as a man who, probably more than any other, actively reflected the spirit of his State. Like his State, "BOB" BARTLETT was a man whose imagination, compassion, and capacity for work seemed to stretch on and on, and he had the vitality and newness necessary to represent a new State. Just as Alaska is a nature's wonderland, "BOB" BARTLETT was both a man of nature and a natural man. Pomposity, personal privilege and spitefulness were total strangers to "BOB" BARTLETT. In the spirit of his State, he was always willing to help the newcomer and I never took a problem to him that did not receive his personal attention.

As my thoughts turned to "BOB" BARTLETT and his loss to this body, it brought to mind words of Robert Burns, who said:

The voice of Nature loudly cries,  
And many a message from the skies,  
That something in us never dies.

The spirit of statehood that "BOB" BARTLETT brought to Alaska and the spirit of statesmanship that he left this body shall never die.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, Senator E. L. BARTLETT was a warm human being, sensitive to the needs of people. He imposed upon himself a high sense of duty to the great State of Alaska and the country which he served. These qualities governed his actions throughout his long period of public service.

I became more closely acquainted with Senator BARTLETT when I served with him on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee of the Commerce Committee during the 89th Congress. That experience was both educational and personally rewarding. He brought to any task great balance and integrity and

imparted those qualities to all around him.

His efforts and leadership were instrumental in the admission of Alaska as the 49th State of this Union. He brought this leadership to the U.S. Senate and established a tradition of service which shall surely become a standard for all who follow. Senator E. L. BARTLETT was a warm human being.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I rise to make public note of the character and achievements of the late Senator BARTLETT. He deserves high commendation from his Senate colleagues, his Alaskan constituents, and indeed from the American people as a whole. He was a dedicated public servant and a fine gentleman. He courageously and competently dealt with the difficult issues which faced the Senate; he unstintingly directed his energies toward building public policy that would best serve the Nation.

It was my privilege to serve with him, and thus work closely with him on the Commerce Committee where, as chairman of the Merchant Marine Subcommittee, he performed particularly outstanding work. His daily efforts to fulfill his responsibilities enhanced the quality of legislation that emerged both from that committee and the Senate at large.

Even as his health was failing, he pursued with all his vigor the public interest in guiding through the Senate the Radiation Control for Health and Safety Act, a major consumer protection measure which I had the honor to follow to its final passage as chairman of the conference committee.

His character and his accomplishments have been an inspiration to all of us who knew him. His commitment to service and to principle advanced us all by example and deed, for he brought to the Senate the rugged frontier spirit which came from the Alaska that he loved and represented so well.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the many tributes made to our beloved departed colleague, BOB BARTLETT.

He was not only a dedicated public servant and capable Senator. He was a warmhearted and kind human being who deeply cared about his fellow men.

He and I had many things in common. One which I shall always remember was our affinity for the rose. The small rose bud on his lapel was one of his hallmarks.

From the Washington rose garden that he and his lovely wife nurtured, he repeatedly brought me the loveliest of roses.

One of the very last things that he did his last day in the Senate before he entered the hospital for surgery was to bring some roses to me.

That is how I shall always remember BOB BARTLETT.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, it is with a deep sense of personal loss that I pay tribute to Senator E. L. BARTLETT, the late Senator from Alaska. It also is with a sense of pride—pride that BOB BARTLETT was a friend and colleague, pride that I was associated with a man who was so deeply devoted to his own State

and to its people and to all the people of the United States.

Senator BARTLETT and I were first closely associated when we served together on the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the 83d Congress. He was then the Territorial Delegate. After Alaska achieved statehood, and he became one of the original Senators from Alaska, we were together again, this time in the Senate.

BOB never relaxed his efforts for statehood. Due in large measure to his effective efforts, Alaska has one of the most forward looking constitutions of the 50 States.

But there were other accomplishments of which Senator BARTLETT was justly proud and which will do lasting honor to his memory.

Alaska had a serious tuberculosis problem. Senator BARTLETT was in the forefront of efforts to establish programs to control this disease.

As a territory subject to an "organic act" which gave it its territorial status, Alaska and Alaskans labored under major handicaps. The act, for example, made it impossible for Alaska to establish its own mental hospital, and patients had to be sent all the way to Portland, Oreg., for treatment. Senator BARTLETT fought a long and sometimes bitter battle to get authorization for Alaska to establish its own mental hospital facilities, and he finally won. I know that he was proud of this humanitarian accomplishment.

BOB BARTLETT brought his State—then a territory—under the Federal Highway Aid Act. He worked on behalf of fisheries which would be owned and operated by Alaskans instead of outsiders. Conservationists praise him for the leadership which resulted in the first international conference on the preservation of the polar bear.

We are fortunate to have known and worked with BOB BARTLETT, a great Alaskan, a great westerner, a great Senator, a great American.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, it is with deep sorrow that we assemble today to pay tribute to our colleague and our friend, the late Senator E. L. BARTLETT, of Alaska.

Working with BOB BARTLETT in this body, and earlier, serving with him in the House of Representatives, has been an inspiring and rewarding experience. I know this feeling is shared by all of us.

Senator BARTLETT's distinguished career began with his appointment as Secretary of Alaska in 1939. For nearly two decades, this far-sighted and courageous man served his State in Congress, working toward statehood for Alaska. His persistence and devotion were finally rewarded in 1958, when Alaska became our 49th State.

Our late President John F. Kennedy once said:

When at some future date the high court of history sits in judgment on each one of us—recording whether in our brief span of service we fulfilled our responsibilities to the State—our success or failure, in whatever office we may hold, will be measured by the answers to four questions: were we truly

men of courage—were we truly men of judgment—were we truly men of integrity—were we truly men of dedication.

BOB BARTLETT was a man of courage. His voice was never silenced by opposition when the ideals in which he believed were at stake.

BOB BARTLETT was a man of judgment. His opinions were sought and respected by his colleagues and his fellow citizens.

BOB BARTLETT was a man of integrity. His belief in what was right was never subject to compromise.

BOB BARTLETT was a man of dedication. His every word and deed bespoke selfless championship of his State and his country.

He has left behind him a legacy for which his State, his country, and the U.S. Senate will forever be indebted to him.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, BOB BARTLETT and I were both elected to the Senate in the same month, November 1958. We knew each other well and worked together through the intervening years until his death on December 11 last. I knew him, too, as the delegate to Congress from Alaska, when we worked together in the House of Representatives. He was elected in 1944 and served until 1958, when the territory of Alaska became the State of Alaska, and he became its senior Senator. Statehood for Alaska was a crowning achievement for which BOB BARTLETT had labored for years.

To BOB BARTLETT, his people of Alaska were his main lifetime concern. He had been a gold miner; he served as Secretary of the Territory for many years before coming to Washington; he was fully aware of the problems of Alaska and gave special attention to the native population of Eskimos, Indians, and Aleuts. He was a man the people loved and he was known on a first-name basis by thousands of citizens in his State.

In the Senate as in the House he worked quietly and efficiently to further the interests of the great new State of Alaska. He and his colleague, former Senator Ernest Gruening, formed a first-rate team in advancing living conditions and the well-being of the citizens of Alaska.

Bob and his wife, Vide, lived in Washington near where I reside. I recall with pleasure many mornings when we would wave to each other as he drove by in his Volkswagen on his way to the Hill. His wife and Mrs. Randolph were close friends.

In the Senate we knew him as a warm, quiet man, casual in manner and strong in character. There was much of the rugged quality of the Great North in his bearing.

One of his many legislative achievements which I especially admired and which was a measure of his concern for the less fortunate, was the successful effort in the last Congress to enact Public Law 480 which insures that public buildings financed with Federal funds are so designed and constructed as to be accessible to the physically handicapped. This legislation was considered and reported by the Senate Committee on Public Works. I had the responsibility to serve as chairman of the Senate conferees on

that bill. This law is another monument to BOB BARTLETT's humanitarianism.

I enjoyed his friendship and benefited from our service together. Mrs. Randolph joins me in extending to his beloved widow, Vide Bartlett, and his daughters, Sue Bartlett and Mrs. Burke Riley, our sincere sympathy.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I should like to add my thoughts to those of my colleagues who today are paying tribute to the late Senator E. L. "BOB" BARTLETT of Alaska.

Having had the opportunity to serve with Senator BARTLETT the entire time he was in the Senate, and having come to know and respect him, I was deeply saddened when he lost his last great battle.

BOB BARTLETT was a man of conviction who had much to do with Alaska's present status of statehood. He never lost his enthusiasm for working for the interests of his State, the West, and the Nation.

Although we did not agree on all issues, Senator BARTLETT was a man of his word who worked tirelessly for his beliefs. He worked hard throughout his life. He earned eternal rest.

May I take this opportunity to express to his family my deepest sympathy and to say to them that BOB BARTLETT will be fondly remembered in this body and missed by all.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it is difficult to eulogize a man like BOB BARTLETT. To say that we shall miss him is totally inadequate. To express our condolences to his wife, Vide, is even more inadequate. If we could only have more men of his caliber in Congress and in Government, what a great thing it would be.

So, at this time, the most I can say about BOB BARTLETT is: He was a good man; he lived a good life; and he made the world better.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, history, the final judge of public men, will look with favor on BOB BARTLETT, gold miner, newsman, Territorial Delegate, senior Senator from Alaska.

History will record that BOB BARTLETT had a dream—statehood for Alaska—and that when he entered politics in 1943, he campaigned on that dream, despite advice to the contrary.

The people of Alaska shared that dream, and reelected him Territorial Delegate six times to carry the fight in Washington.

It will be up to future students of the Alaska statehood fight to give credit where credit is due, but I am sure they will be guided by the words of the late Sam Rayburn, a staunch foe of statehood for years who was finally won over by Delegate BARTLETT.

When asked how Alaska achieved statehood, Rayburn replied:

I can tell you in two words—BOB BARTLETT.

And then history will list the many Bartlett bills which became law, the many Alaska appropriations secured by this astute student of Washington, and historians will explain that this former gold miner understood that statehood represented a beginning and not the end of the effort to develop the Great Northland.

Perhaps his greatest achievement for the State was winning approval of unprecedented Federal aid given Alaska following the great earthquake of 1964. Alaska recovery programs set a precedent from which many other disaster-struck areas have benefited.

History will also note that as he gained seniority his interests broadened, and he took the lead in such diverse areas as oceanography, fish protein concentrate, merchant marine, radiation safety, and appropriations for health and education programs.

I would like to quote from a letter from Dr. Karl Z. Morgan, director of the Health Physics Division at Oak Ridge Laboratory, written to the Senator's staff the day after BOB BARTLETT died:

I am sending this letter I wrote to Senator Bartlett yesterday although I read the sad news in the morning paper of his death last night. No one in Congress has ever done as much as Senator Bartlett for the protection of man from unnecessary exposure to ionizing radiation. . . . All of us together can hardly take the place of Senator Bartlett, but we must try and we must succeed in developing new legislation that will more specifically reduce unnecessary exposure. . . .

I could cite other accomplishments, but I will leave that to historians, for the written record is there.

But what will history say of the man himself, aside from the printed record? Here it is up to those of us who knew him and worked with him to supply the information for history.

And here I struggle for simple eloquence to express the affection which this body had for this man.

He was a man of courage, as he showed in casting the deciding vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the debate over the Civil Rights Act of 1968. That vote I shall never forget.

He was a man of compassion, as he showed time after time in efforts to help the poor of the Nation.

He was a man of understanding, who was never too busy to listen to and to help a fellow man, whether that man was a U.S. Senator, a constituent, or an elevator operator.

And having said this, I still have not caught the essence of this warm, sincere human being.

To his gracious wife, Vide, and to his daughters, Doris Ann and Sue, I can offer no meaningful consolation, but I want to say that I am a better human being for having known BOB BARTLETT; the U.S. Senate is a better institution for his having served in it, and Alaska is a better place in which to live because, as he said himself:

I love Alaska. My attachment for it, my concern for it, are so deeply imbedded that it is a very part of me.

I know that his family misses him deeply.

We all do, but while we are all poorer because of his untimely death, we are all better for having known and worked with BOB.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, today we, as Members of the U.S. Senate, take a few moments to eulogize a late Member of this body, the Honorable E. L. "BOB" BARTLETT of Alaska.

He was a quiet man, not often given

to rhetoric. But his being a quiet man did not in any way mean he was not a forceful man, for he was.

Senator BARTLETT was forceful by nature of his background, raised in the wilds of the Alaskan territory. As a boy and young man, he learned of the force of nature and the dormant power of the natural resources of that great land. Alaska shaped BOB BARTLETT, just as he was to later help shape Alaska.

His deep interest in the land where he lived and his love for its people brought him to the Nation's Capitol as a Delegate to Congress in 1944. Here he began his important work that would culminate with the admission of Alaska to statehood. He worked long hours and long years representing his native land and showing Congress the importance of bringing Alaska into the United States. And so it was that this quiet man, working with Senator Ernest Gruening and other Alaskans, succeeded in adding another star to the American flag.

His work for Alaska did not cease at that point. He worked tirelessly for his native land as a U.S. Senator. The United States gained much by admitting Alaska. It gained in vast natural resources and a thousand other ways. The Senate also benefited directly, for the admission of Alaska to statehood brought E. L. "BOB" BARTLETT to the Senate. The Senate will miss this quiet, forceful colleague.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with all of those who have expressed their personal sorrow on the passing from the stage of world affairs of our beloved friend and distinguished colleague, Senator E. L. "BOB" BARTLETT. I also wish to extend my deepest sympathy to the members of his family.

It was a high privilege to serve with him in the Congress for many years. I not only served with him in the Senate but for a while he was a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and we worked together on the Senate Appropriations Committee. His presence, his experience, and patriotism will be greatly missed.

It would be a great thing for the future of America if this country could produce more selfless public servants in the mold of BOB BARTLETT. His first dedication was to the development of his beloved State of Alaska and his activities in this area, including his promotion of statehood, will forever enshrine his name and deeds in the memory of his people. As a devoted patriot, he served the entire Nation with zeal, ability, and distinction.

Those of us who were privileged to know him and serve with him will always be grateful for the warmth of his friendship and the pleasant memories of our association will long dwell in these Halls.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, because of his deep love for Alaska, Robert W. Service must have had BOB BARTLETT in mind when he wrote these words about Alaska in the poem "The Spell of the Yukon":

It's the great, big, broad land 'way up yonder,  
It's the forests where silence has lease;  
It's the beauty that thrills me with wonder,  
It's the stillness that fills me with peace.

We shall all deeply miss BOB BARTLETT in the Senate—not only for his kind and gracious personality but also because he represented for us our "great, big, broad land 'way up yonder." In many ways, the public service of Senator BARTLETT reflected the history of Alaska and its fight for statehood. He will certainly be long remembered in the future history of this State he helped to make great. BOB was the Alaskan territory's nonvoting delegate to Congress for 13 years and these years were marked by his tremendous efforts to gain admission to the Union for Alaska. In 1958, after his goal of statehood was obtained, he became Alaska's first Senator.

Mr. President, knowing BOB BARTLETT was a deep pleasure for me which I shall forever cherish. He was one of those rare political individuals who in the words of an Anchorage newspaperman "achieved quiet wonders by gentleness" and his loss will be felt by all of us.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I wish to join in the eulogies by the Members of the Senate today in honor of our departed friend, the senior Senator from Alaska, Mr. E. L. "BOB" BARTLETT.

I find it exceedingly difficult to find the words to express the great sorrow we all feel in the loss of our beloved friend or to even partially tell of his many tremendously fine qualities.

BOB BARTLETT, as we all knew him, had an unusual personality. He was the kind of a person you could not help but greatly admire and respect. He was kindly and considerate and a loyal friend.

BOB BARTLETT established a record in the Senate equaled by few people. He was an able and effective legislator—industrious and intelligent with all of the qualities that make an effective Senator. During his service in the Senate—and long before Alaska became a State when he served as a Delegate—he accomplished much for his beloved State and he did it in such a way as to win the respect and admiration not only of Alaskans but of everyone who knew him.

We will all sorely miss BOB BARTLETT. To his wife and family I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, my friend and beloved colleague, Senator BARTLETT, will long be remembered for his gracious presence in the Halls of Congress and for his outstanding service to his State and to this Nation.

It was my privilege and pleasure to serve with Senator BARTLETT in both the House and Senate. I found him to be a rugged, friendly man, tirelessly devoted to the needs of his people and a rewarding friend to all who came under the spell of his warm personality.

He abounded with energy. He had a profound love for his State, which he served long and faithfully before and after statehood and he attracted a multitude of admirers wherever he went throughout his illustrious career. Those who had the good fortune to be associated with BOB BARTLETT in Alaska, in Washington, and wherever duty called

him, bear an unforgettable picture of this rare and lovable man, who always extended an affectionate greeting to those around him.

I sincerely regret the passing of this statesman and patriotic American. He was a source of strength to Senators and administrators and an inspiration to all Americans. He labored long and effectively. Now I join the people of Alaska, his family and his legions of friends in sadness. I personally held BOB BARTLETT in highest esteem and admiration. We will miss him but the memory of his radiant character and great achievements will always remain fresh in our hearts.

Mr. President, an article appeared in the Anchorage Daily News entitled, "A Good and Decent Man Once Came Their Way." I think this is a fitting tribute to our deceased colleague. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

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

A GOOD AND DECENT MAN ONCE CAME THEIR WAY

(By Joe Josephson)

It ended for Bob Bartlett in a dreary section of Cleveland, far from the places he knew and loved—places like Fairbanks, where he grew to manhood, and Washington, D.C., and the committee rooms up on Capitol Hill, where he did his best work for Alaska.

He had come to Cleveland for surgery, knowing the risks, but wanting to be made whole again so he could resume effective service as a senator. It was medical treatment that would resolve the half-life of disability, one way or another. There would be pain, the doctors had told him, but he decided to trade pain for a new chance to be productive again.

His personality was known to almost all of us, and we will think now about the meetings and conversations and letters that for each of us seem to capture the man as we knew him.

Yet, there were aspects of that personality known only to a few, who worked for him, or with him. We remember how Bob Bartlett never boarded an elevator, or drank from a water fountain, or got on a subway car in the Capitol, ahead of somebody else; how the freshman senator from Alaska spent more hours presiding over the Senate than anyone—something like a soldier volunteering for K.P.—because Bob Bartlett thought the sacrifice would help him get more effective help for Alaska.

They say no man is a hero to his own valet, but it's a lie when the boss is a true and complete gentleman. Someone once wrote that a gentleman is a man who treats everybody alike, and everybody well—regardless of rank or influence. By that definition, Bob Bartlett was a perfect gentleman. He respected everyone as a member of the human family; he labored for everyone—not just friends, or just contributors, or just Democrats.

If you were an Alaskan, you were entitled to help for any worthy problem. Your residence in the territory was your membership card in the Bob Bartlett Benevolent Society. When you worked for him, you counted on him to be as thoughtful and as considerate of you as he was for the high and the mighty. He didn't let your expectations down, either.

Bob Bartlett had a reverence for life, and he showed it by the way he treated other people. If you were a human being, you had enough in common with him to count in his

book. The way you held a cup, or the accent you spoke with, or who your father was, or the size of your bank account, didn't matter.

Some say that his struggle for life in that slate-gray section of Cleveland was all a waste. But it wasn't. Psychiatrists tell us that you can't love others until you like yourself. In the same way, it must be that you can't revere the humanness in other people unless you respect it in yourself. Bob's fight proved again his respect for life, and everything living, and taught us to appreciate our own chance to live and to try to do something worthwhile with it.

His greatness as a person sometimes obscured his grasp of world events and national problems. He didn't wear intellectuality on his sleeve, and he never strove consciously to impress anyone with glibness or smartness. He told Esquire that his favorite movie was a cowboy thing called "Shane," and it was. He wouldn't have mentioned Fellini or Antonini or Bergman. He was a stranger to pretense or pretentiousness. But he was a reader, a thinker, a mind of breadth and depth, and he could master the fine print in a bill or a budget.

If being the complete gentleman made him a little nineteenth century in an unhappily brash and ungracious age, he was on the other hand completely contemporary in the world of ideas, alert to new developments in science and international affairs. He pioneered as a statesman in fields like atomic energy, and his concern about strontium-90, and ecology, especially a quest for a sustaining fishery.

He thought hard about the world's hunger, knew of hunger's pressures on world peace, and found at least partial answers in Fish Protein Concentrate. One day the world will honor him for his leadership—imagination coupled with frontier practicality—in getting the FPC program moving.

He worried about x-ray abuses that endanger life. He convened hearings, brought Ralph Nader up to the committee room to testify, and got the nation listening and aware. He could see decades ahead to technical developments of the communications industry and got COMSAT officials excited about satellite service for rural Alaska. He saw the shacks and hovels of rural Alaska, knew the TB rate they bred, and by friendship and persuasion and by summoning all the patient skills he learned in 14 years as a non-voting Congressman, he pushed his native housing bill through Congress.

But just as he was a contemporary thinker, he was also the last of an era. We will never see his likes again, because nobody will come to the Senate like he did. He came there as the logical choice for the job. The job sought the man. He had mentioned that he might not run for senator, but for governor, and there was an outcry from everybody so pained, so disappointed, that he announced for the Senate on the following day.

His was the politics of lifelong friendships and a career of sensible public service, completely unsoiled by demagoguery or flamboyance or tastelessness of any sort. His career flowered before the arts of modern media became practiced in Alaska politics. You know Bob Bartlett, and his decency; you trusted and voted for him.

You knew he had been getting the job done in Washington, and you were certain there was no mirage. His was the politics of quite, undramatic, faithful service, and personal contacts with the people. His was the politics you think the nation's founders dreamed of. In his politics, he always emerged successful, in a process that left him undiminished and untarnished.

And now it's over—if we let it be. It is true that there will never be another Bartlett. But perhaps—just maybe—there will be a state where some thousands will remember, and stand a little taller, and live a little straighter, because a good and decent man

once came their way, and served them, and believed in them.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Senator E. L. "Bob" BARTLETT personified the frontier spirit which developed Alaska, turning it from a challenging wilderness to a great State. He demonstrated the toughness which is so necessary for survival in a new territory, but he also showed his deep concern for others, his willingness to pitch in and help those who might need assistance. This readiness to work with and for others was as much a part of that frontier spirit, as was his individualism.

Senator BARTLETT's parents were among the early developers of Alaska. His father had a business in Fairbanks when that city was established in 1903. I feel Senator BARTLETT and I had a great rapport, for his pioneer father, Ed Bartlett, born in Victoria, Tex., was from a Texas family. Senator BARTLETT himself was born in the State of Washington.

Senator BARTLETT's family was a frontier family on the move to new frontiers.

The Senator first worked to develop the territory of Alaska, working in that traditional occupation of the area, gold mining. He later turned to newspaper work, chronicling the story of his State.

Senator BARTLETT then turned to public service and for 3 decades worked for the people of Alaska. He first came to Washington in 1932 as an assistant to A. J. "Tony" Dimond, the territory's delegate to Congress.

After 2 years of working with Dimond, Senator BARTLETT returned to Alaska to take over the family business after the death of his father. Senator BARTLETT wanted to continue to serve the people. He stayed active in public affairs through the years, fighting first to gain statehood for Alaska. When Alaska became a State, he was elected to the Senate as one of Alaska's first Senators in this body.

I had the privilege of serving with Senator BARTLETT on a committee from January 3, 1959, the day he first entered the Senate. We worked together on the Committee on Commerce and later on the Committee on Appropriations. It is well known that "you know best those Senators with whom you serve on committees." Since I worked with him on committees during his years in this body, I feel I knew him well. Our positions were very similar on most measures.

Like the people of Alaska, I found Bob BARTLETT to be a true gentleman—courteous, always with great consideration of others.

He compiled a list of solid legislative achievements for the people of his State and this Nation. He constantly worked to improve the habitat, the education, the health, and the welfare of man.

Senator BARTLETT was also interested in the natural resources of this earth. He worked to improve the fishing off the Alaska coast and all around the world.

He worked to preserve all the natural resources in a way to benefit the welfare of the human race. He was a supporter of seaborne commerce and of the exploration of the ocean resources.

No tribute to Senator BARTLETT would be complete without recognizing his devoted wife, the former Vide Gaustad. Mrs. Bartlett was always at the Senator's side, helping him in health, caring for him in sickness.

Senator BARTLETT, in the final analysis, was a Senate man. His drive was toward the work of the Senate, his devotion was to his labors in the U.S. Senate. The Senate is better for his having served in it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, it is with deep sadness I join in these services for a great American, Alaska's most beloved citizen, Senator E. L. "Bob" BARTLETT.

It was my privilege, my honor, to have served with this outstanding gentleman, to have had the opportunity to know him and work with him on the Commerce Committee.

I like to think that although our homes were thousands of miles apart, BOB BARTLETT and I shared many similar concerns for our States. As a Nevadan, I understand well his love of the great open spaces and his concern over the development of his wilderness State, Alaska.

Son of Alaska pioneers, BOB BARTLETT became a living example of the rugged individualism of his Arctic frontier constituency. He shared his fellow Alaskans' resourcefulness and courage, and reflected these qualities in his 25 years of service to his State.

For 14 years he was the lone voice of Alaska as its delegate, fighting for the "Lower 48's" recognition and acceptance of Alaska's needs, problems, and promises.

We came to the Senate at the same time in 1958, and he immediately compiled a record of significant gains for the young State.

He was an outstanding Senator and contributed greatly to our legislative deliberations because he had the vision to embrace whatever policies he thought would be helpful to the Nation.

To BOB BARTLETT's family I extend my sincerest condolences.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President. We in the West have a special understanding and affection for those rare individuals who, even in our modern world, are still frontiersmen, for they are constant reminders that the quest for new horizons which made us great did not stop at the Pacific shoreline.

Such a man—a true frontiersman—was BOB BARTLETT.

Perhaps that is why he represented his great State of Alaska so well, for he not only felt and symbolized the pioneer spirit which is still so strong in that area, but he also conveyed this spirit to those with whom he worked.

But that is only part of the story.

Many of the frontiers which Bob saw so clearly, and which challenged him throughout his entire life, were not just within the boundaries of his own vast State, but rather they were those new and fascinating goals which are sought after by only the most dedicated and visionary of men in the fields of health, knowledge, brotherhood, and natural resources.

BOB BARTLETT accepted the challenge of these broad frontiers and it is to his

credit that as a result of his efforts, they are now a lot closer for all of us.

Such men are all too few.

He will be sorely missed.

A MAN WHO MATCHED ALASKA'S MOUNTAINS

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, BOB BARTLETT faced the voters of his beloved Alaska 10 times and 10 times they gave him their overwhelming support at the ballot box and their hearts as well.

That approbation was not a gift, however, as the Anchorage Daily Times made clear in a moving editorial the day after Senator BARTLETT'S death last December 11. He earned it—every bit of it.

President Johnson, I think, summed up Senator BARTLETT'S legislative career best in a telegram he sent to a testimonial for BOB BARTLETT back in 1965. President Johnson said:

His accomplishments in both houses of Congress match the high mountains and broad plains of Alaska.

I have known few men with the great warmth and sincerity Senator BARTLETT had. He was an extremely attractive human being.

His enthusiasm for and devotion to his State was legendary. He played a pivotal role in the achievement of statehood for Alaska. He was the delegate for the territory of Alaska to the House of Representatives for 14 years prior to the achievement of statehood and he became the new State's first senior Senator.

Senator BARTLETT was indeed Alaska's most revered citizen and it is fitting that there are plans to place his statue in Statuary Hall of this U.S. Capitol where the most honored citizens of other States now stand.

Quoting again from the Anchorage Daily Times:

Senator Bartlett's service to Alaskans went far beyond the normal duties of a public official. He had the unique quality of humility that graced him with an enduring warmth and friendliness for mankind. He was sought after by Alaskans whether or not they needed his help or wanted him to do something. . . . There was no limit to the time and energy that Senator Bartlett was willing to expend in behalf of an Alaskan. It was as though every one of us was a member of his closest family and he was concerned for the total welfare of each. Alaskans mark the death of Bob Bartlett with sorrow but historians will note it as the end of an era. It is the end of an era of transition, one of the most thrilling chapters in Alaska history—one that is virtually a summary of the life and public service of Bob Bartlett.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, today we meet in tribute to a man who served in this body for 10 years. I was privileged to serve with Senator BARTLETT on the Commerce Committee and have known him to be a man of both character and ability. He was diligent in attending to his duties as a Senator and was dedicated to the welfare of the people of Alaska.

Senator BARTLETT became a resident of Alaska shortly after his birth and in him the people of Alaska had a tireless advocate. He worked hard for Alaskan statehood and served as a Delegate to Congress from 1944 until he was elected to the Senate in 1958.

The faith that Alaska had in BOB BARTLETT was amply demonstrated by his seven elections as a Delegate and his three elections to the U.S. Senate.

BOB BARTLETT repaid this faith through his steady, dependable work in this body and his zealous advocacy of the best interests of the people of Alaska. Senator BARTLETT was also dedicated to the people of the Nation and acquitted himself ably in the halls of the Senate. Senator BARTLETT was a man to be admired and a man to be liked. The Senate will miss him.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I knew and served with the late BOB BARTLETT in the House of Representatives. We both came to the Senate together in January 1959. We served on the Appropriations Committee together, and I formed a very deep and sincere feeling of fondness and appreciation for Senator BARTLETT. I have never seen a Senator who was more congenial and amicable, more agreeable and friendly than was our late departed colleague. He was a man who was completely open and frank and honest.

Someone has said that character is that trait which draws a man toward God and other men toward him. BOB BARTLETT possessed that ingredient of character. His big heart and warm disposition, combined with the sterling integrity of the man, drew all toward him.

He was a Christian gentleman. He was a highly respected and very effective Senator. He was a great American.

To his fine wife and family, Mrs. Byrd and I extend our sympathy. We shall never forget our warm friendship with Vide, his wife, and Bob. Not only Alaska has lost a great leader; the Nation has lost a great man.

Beyond these unavailing words of mine, perhaps the thought epitomized by the following lines of simple verse may, for the present, help to sustain his wife and family and make clearer to their vision the broader and more beautiful life which Bob has so lately come to know and will forevermore:

I watched a sail until it dropped from sight  
Over the rounding sea. A gleam of white,  
A last far-flashed farewell, and, like a  
thought

Slipt out of mind, it vanished and was not.

Yet, to the helmsman standing at the wheel,  
Broad seas still stretched beneath the gliding  
keel.

Disaster? Change? He felt no slightest sign,  
Nor dreamed he of that far horizon line.

So may it be, per chance, when down the tide  
Our dear ones vanish. Peacefully they glide  
On level seas, nor mark the unknown bound.  
We call it death—to them 'tis life beyond.

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, BOB BARTLETT was buried on a slate-gray day in Fairbanks. The temperature was 20 degrees below zero. But his friends were there.

Few men have passed through time with as many friends. They all called him BOB. And in that familiarity there was respect.

Respect for a man with a quick mind, a persuasive manner, a keen sense of compassion. A gentle man.

Most of his adult life was spent right here in Washington, superbly representing the people of Alaska. Yet, he managed to remain close to his land and to his people. They knew him and they trusted him. And on that sad gray day last December they grieved him as they had grieved no Alaskan before him.

BOB BARTLETT was tempered in an Alaska where life was hard—a raw frontier of hope and independence. He helped it grow. He helped smooth those rough pioneer edges. He helped reduce the economic hardship and the uncertainty of the hard life.

Above all else, BOB BARTLETT was the architect of Alaska statehood. Many participated in that effort. But the quiet, driving leadership was his. I am certain that many of my colleagues can bear witness to that fact. And from statehood has emerged a new Alaska—rich in the benefits that self-government makes possible.

BOB BARTLETT understood the new Alaska as well as the old. He never seemed dated, or tired, or out of touch with the moment.

He has left his imprint in countless areas. He has influenced us all in many direct and subtle ways. Most important, is the influence of his example.

BOB BARTLETT was a good man. He served the people of Alaska and of our Nation, with all his heart, and with all his energy. And he grew with his success. In fact, he was a living legend in Alaska. Most of us find it difficult to believe he is gone.

A poet once plead in verse for men who were worthy of the frontier. He asked, "Send us men to match our mountains."

BOB BARTLETT was a man who matched our mountains. And such men remain, if not in life, then in our souls.

Mr. President, I now offer a series of written statements made by Senator BARTLETT during the course of his career. Perhaps they best convey the essence of the man. These statements are followed by a representative cross section of the news stories and articles of tribute written in the immediate aftermath of Senator BARTLETT'S death. Some of the articles are beautiful expressions of gratitude and commemoration by fellow Alaskans. I also have a statement by Representative POLLOCK. I ask unanimous consent that these materials be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE LATE HONORABLE E. L. BARTLETT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. POLLOCK).

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, on this the 10th anniversary of our achievement of statehood for Alaska—the 10th birthday for our 49th State—Alaskans look with pride upon our great accomplishments in so short a period of history; and we look with confidence and courage toward the future, notwithstanding the substantial problems yet to be resolved. But our task will indeed be far more difficult, for we have lost an invaluable friend and advocate, Alaska's most beloved citizen, Senator E. L. "BOB" BARTLETT, a man who served in this body with distinction for seven terms

as the delegate for the territory of Alaska, and thereafter for 10 years as the senior Senator for Alaska. Senator BARTLETT died on Wednesday, December 11, 1968.

It was my privilege, my honor, to have served with this outstanding gentleman, to have had the opportunity to know him well and to have become his friend despite our political differences. BOB BARTLETT was Alaska's most revered citizen, and I will urge the Governor and the Legislature of Alaska to authorize a statue to be cast and placed in Statuary Hall of this U.S. Capitol in honor of this man who enjoyed more frequent and more solid support than any public figure in Alaskan history.

No words of mine would be adequate to sufficiently honor BOB BARTLETT on this occasion, nor to assuage the anguish of bereavement which his widow, Vide, and his family and friends have sustained in his loss.

STATEMENT BY E. L. BARTLETT

It is the constitutional responsibility of the Congress to see that the public money is well spent and that the common welfare and defense are well provided for. If it is to fulfill its responsibility, the Congress must determine which research is necessary, which defensible; which is to be done first, which is to be done at all. The products of this research and technology are changing the face of the world, the face of our society. Changes will come at ever greater rate. It is imperative that the Congress be aware of what changes it is buying with its research dollar and so to be prepared for these changes when they come.

Merely because treaties have been broken does not mean we should stop making new ones. Merely because attempts to save the peace have failed in the past does not mean that we should abandon these efforts. The whole dance of history can be recounted in three steps forward and two steps back. We do move forward, however, even though sometimes the pace is not perceptible.

We must view the standard of living concept everywhere, but most particularly in Alaska, with greater sophistication. We may then discover that the family with woods to roam, and a great sky overhead, and a felled moose to eat is enjoying a higher living standard—that is a standard more likely to promote personal fulfillment—than the urban dweller with two channels of color TV shows.

It is surely obvious that the complications of today's world demand clear intelligence. Nor is there today, nor was there ever in the past, any substitute for honesty, true dedication to a high moral order and willingness to put service to such moral precepts ahead of personal gain or wishes. Vision is that combination of thought, diligence and imagination behind all action.

In Alaska freedom from elbow rubbing is easily found. And this does something splendid for the inner man. There is room and time to expand, to contemplate, to enjoy; in such surroundings, with such perfect peace, with the nervous strains of city dwelling far removed, there is somehow a restoration and a reassembling until the whole man is himself again.

I do say that the passion for labels can paralyze the passion for wise government.

I have always believed, and now believe, that it is scarcely less advantageous to the white people than to the native people that progress be recorded among the latter.

Every so often there is a day in November when you hold your breath and wait. You never know whether the contract will be renewed.

Perhaps this is the age of specialization in science and technology, but the art of free government must ever remain the art of all the people. No costs and no sacrifices are too

great if they serve the cause of freedom and are adopted by the informed people, freely and knowingly. But no costs and no sacrifices, however small, can be justified if they compromise, confuse or disregard the meaning of America.

The Alaska star, the star that makes the 49th in our flag, is fixed in place, secure. It has a magnetic, challenging light which you and I, in our own ways, in love of country, in love of God, in love of humanity, must keep shining bright.

There was nothing in the background of Harry Truman to inform us that, meeting up with destiny, he would and could walk in step with destiny, making without a single error the right response for every great decision he was called upon to face.

The President, after all, is human, the information supplied him is fallible, and yet the Constitution requires that he act, that he decide, that he direct and lead the country. As he goes, so the well-being of the country goes.

We have, in the person of our President, one as able as any in recent history in the power of persuasion and art of negotiation. His surpassing talents in understanding men, their motivation, and their feelings will serve us well as the United States undertakes discussions at whatever level.

There are few men or women in the more than two billion inhabiting this earth who do not care and care deeply for human relationships of all kinds, including association with government, which will allow them to enjoy to the limit their individual capacities and desires. So properly stated, the great struggle of our day is between statism and government responsive to the will of its individual citizens.

If democracy and representative government are to prevail in this Nation it is necessary that the Congress understand the importance of decisions concerning programs and funds for science and technology and that it have a role in making them.

Americans of today have an especial responsibility to show the world and to show themselves that our government, our Constitution, our culture know no color or racial barrier. Guarantees of individual equality and liberty written into the basic documents of our government must be fulfilled. They must be fulfilled, not just because the world is watching, which it is, not just because domestic unrest threatens, which it does, but because they are right.

Teaching the young that freedom is a precious heritage may have far-reaching benefits. The mind that regards liberty as a precious legacy from preceding generations will be a mind which will hold in proper reverence the legacy of our arts and letters, our sciences and our philosophy, our religions and our ethics, our language and our sport.

I am one who believes that our children should receive a broad education founded on the cultural heritage of our western civilization. Let us not send each child forth necessarily as a specialist but as a rounded individual with knowledge that will permit him or her to lead a better and more useful life; and prepared to turn then, if he or she so desires, to some special field.

If we embark now on a concerted effort of research and development of our fisheries, we shall be able to continue to enjoy the benefits of this great resource. If we do not, we may lose one of our most valuable resources as well as a substantial national industry. We cannot continue to ignore the dangers of depletion and overutilization, nor can we fail to develop those fisheries which have not heretofore been developed.

I love Alaska. My attachment for it, my concern for it, is so deeply imbedded that it is a very part of me. There I have grown, studied, married and worked. I have toiled in her beautiful natural setting as a gold miner.

I have learned the life of her towns as a reporter. I have met her people as an appointed administrator and again as Delegate and Senator. As years pile upon years there is a greater personal insistence in drawing upon memory's treasure trove.

In about 41 years of flying, most of it within Alaska and starting in the very early days of aviation, I have never had a forced landing. And I attribute this remarkable record less to my own good luck than to the splendid skill of the Alaska aviators who have manned the Alaska skies from then until now.

Democracy, of course, is not primarily a system at all but a set of values. Our ideas of self-government, majority rule, popular sovereignty, all derive from the concept that government is an instrument for service.

Alaska can either be the region furnishing protection for our Nation or it can be the region from which an enemy can reach us. The choice is ours. With respect to Alaska we simply cannot be put in the position of saving a few dollars where that saving would result in peril to this country.

There is an unalterable conflict between our beliefs and those the Communists live by. Necessity may reduce the overt expressions of that conflict and practicalities may compel the Soviet to deviate at times from the rigid Communist creed. The conflict between their creed and ours, however, is as basic and enduring as the conflict between truth and error.

Unless the fisheries are elevated in terms of national policy, disaster may well fall upon this industry, which has been so important in many ways for so long insofar as the United States is concerned but, which, on account of lack of attention, is rapidly going to the bottom of the ocean in every way.

To insure that government has integrity and its devotion turns to the general good; to make sure resources and land are not recklessly surrendered to those who might want to plunder; these, and many others, constitute the high goals for Alaska for which I aim.

The speed of the jet and the perfection of instantaneous communication make leisurely foreign policy a thing of the past. Missiles and H bombs have taken foreign policy from the hands of the few and have made it the business of the many. If we are in danger of being blown up when it goes wrong, it is in our interest to see that it doesn't go wrong. And so it is imperative that we keep straight what is important and true and what is not.

To fulfill our role as a state, Alaska is committed to act with intelligence, honesty and vision. Should any of these be lacking, we shall surely fall even if we possess all other attributes in their highest order.

[From the Anchorage (Alaska) Daily News, Dec. 13, 1968]

A TRIBUTE

State Senator-elect Joe Josephson of Anchorage has written a tribute to Senator E. L. (Bob) Bartlett for publication in the Anchorage Daily News. It is a magnificent piece, an eloquent portrait of this revered Alaskan. We are publishing it on our opinion page today, because Mr. Josephson has said it beautifully—with understanding, with sensitivity.

Mr. Josephson in a very real sense, is a Bob Bartlett protege. He joined his staff in Washington when the late Senator was Alaska's territorial delegate in the House of Representatives. In January of 1959, at the time of statehood, he went with Mr. Bartlett to the Senate where he remained until July 1960. Mr. Josephson then became the Senator's former legislative assistant and moved to Alaska, where he entered the private practice of the law.

A GOOD AND DECENT MAN ONCE CAME THEIR WAY

(By Joe Josephson)

It ended for Bob Bartlett in a dreary section of Cleveland, far from the places he knew and loved—places like Fairbanks, where he grew to manhood, and Washington, D.C., and the committee rooms up on Capitol Hill, where he did his best work for Alaska.

He had come to Cleveland for surgery, knowing the risks, but wanting to be made whole again so he could resume effective service as a senator. It was medical treatment that would resolve the half-life of disability, one way or another. There would be pain, the doctors had told him, but he decided to trade pain for a new chance to be productive again.

His personality was known to almost all of us, and we will think now about the meetings and conversations and letters that for each of us seem to capture the man as we knew him.

Yet, there were aspects of that personality known only to a few, who worked for him, or with him. We remember how Bob Bartlett never boarded an elevator, or drank from a water fountain, or got on a subway car in the Capitol, ahead of somebody else; how the freshman senator from Alaska spent more hours presiding over the Senate than anyone—something like a soldier volunteering for K.P.—because Bob Bartlett thought the sacrifice would help him get more effective help for Alaska.

They say no man is a hero to his own valet, but it's a lie when the boss is a true and complete gentleman. Someone once wrote that a gentleman is a man who treats everybody alike, and everybody well—regardless of rank or influence. By that definition, Bob Bartlett was a perfect gentleman. He respected everyone as a member of the human family; he labored for everyone—not just friends, or just contributors, or just Democrats.

If you were an Alaskan, you were entitled to help for any worthy problem. Your residence in the territory was your membership card in the Bob Bartlett Benevolent Society. When you worked for him, you counted on him to be as thoughtful and as considerate of you as he was for the high and the mighty. He didn't let your expectations down, either.

Bob Bartlett had a reverence for life, and he showed it by the way he treated other people. If you were a human being, you had enough in common with him to count in his book. The way you held a cup, or the accent you spoke with, or who your father was, or the size of your bank account, didn't matter.

Some say that his struggle for life in that slate-gray section of Cleveland was all a waste. But it wasn't. Psychiatrists tell us that you can't love others until you love yourself. In the same way, it must be that you can't revere the humanness in other people unless you respect it in yourself. Bob's fight proved again his respect for life, and everything living, and taught us to appreciate our own chance to live and to try to do something worthwhile with it.

His greatness as a person sometimes obscured his grasp of world events and national problems. He didn't wear intellectuality on his sleeve, and he never strove consciously to impress anyone with glibness or smartness. He told Esquire that his favorite movie was a cowboy thing called "Shane," and it was. He wouldn't have mentioned Fellini or Antonini or Bergman. He was a stranger to pretense or pretentiousness. But he was a reader, a thinker, a mind of breadth and depth, and he could master the fine print in a bill or a budget.

If being the complete gentleman made him a little nineteenth century, in an unhappily brash and ungracious age, he was on the other hand completely contemporary in the world of ideas, alert to the new developments in science and international affairs. He pioneered as a statesman in fields like atomic

energy, and his concern about strontium-90 and ecology, especially a quest for a sustaining fishery.

He thought hard about the the world's hunger, knew of hunger's pressures on world peace, and found at least partial answers in Fish Protein Concentrate. One day the world will honor him for his leadership—imagination coupled with frontier practicality—in getting the FPC program moving.

He worried about x-ray abuses that endanger life. He convened hearings, brought Ralph Nader up to the committee room to testify, and got the nation listening and aware. He could see decades ahead to technical developments of the communications industry and got COMSAT officials excited about satellite service for Alaska. He saw the shacks and hovels of rural Alaska, knew the TB rate they bred, and by friendship and persuasion and by summoning all the patient skills he learned in 14 years as a non-voting Congressman, he pushed his native housing bill through Congress.

But just as he was a contemporary thinker he was also the last of an era. We will never see his likes again because nobody will come to the Senate like he did. He came there as the logical choice for the job. The job sought the man. He had mentioned that he might not run for senator, but for governor, and there was an outcry from everybody so pained, so disappointed, that he announced for the Senate on the following day.

His was the politics of lifelong friendships and a career of sensible public service, completely unsoiled by demagoguery or flamboyance or tastelessness of any sort. His career flowered before the arts of modern media became practiced in Alaska politics. You knew Bob Bartlett, and his decency; you trusted and voted for him.

You knew he had been getting the job done in Washington, and you were certain there was no mirage. His was the politics of quiet, undramatic, faithful service, and personal contacts with the people. His was the politics you think the nation's founders dreamed of. In his politics, he always emerged successful, in a process that left him undiminished and untarnished.

And now it's over—if we let it be. It is true that there will never be another Bartlett. But perhaps—just maybe—there will be a state where some thousands will remember, and stand a little taller, and live a little straighter, because a good and decent man once came their way, and served them, and believed in them.

[From the Anchorage (Alaska) Daily News, Dec. 12, 1968]

BOB BARTLETT: A MAN WHO SYMBOLIZED ALASKA

(NOTE.—This story of Senator E. L. (Bob) Bartlett was written by Daily News staff writer Tom Brown from files and material compiled by Brown and special correspondents John Wiese and Beverly Isenson.)

It was one of those ironic quirks of fate that Sen. E. L. (Bob) Bartlett was born in Seattle instead of Alaska.

For if ever a man came to symbolize Alaska—in action and in the minds of his fellow Alaskans—it was Bartlett, himself the son of Alaska pioneers.

Even after he became a U.S. senator when Alaska gained statehood, Bartlett epitomized the individualism of his Arctic frontier state.

He was informal in dress and manner in a political world often noted for its stiffness. He was friendly and outgoing in a world of political back-biting.

Bartlett was not an eloquent speaker. But his was a voice respected by Alaskans because he seldom wasted words on the unimportant.

He learned much about life throughout his Alaska as a young reporter for the Fairbanks News-Miner.

He worked three years at the classic Alaska occupation—gold mining. He didn't make any money—but he was proud that he paid his debts.

And he devoted more than three decades to public service—first as assistant to A. J. (Tony) Dimond, Alaska's delegate to Congress before statehood; as secretary of Alaska; as delegate, succeeding Dimond; and finally as U.S. senator.

As a result of those years of public life, Bartlett personally knew literally thousands of Alaskans, and he rarely forgot the name or face of anyone he met, in city or remote bush village.

And in Washington, he remembered the things his constituents told him. He introduced and saw passed reams of legislation important to Alaska's development, both as a territory and a state.

Most important, Bartlett thought, he led and won the lengthy battle for statehood.

Bartlett's father, Ed, was a transplanted Texan who, with a brother, made a business of hauling supplies to the placer mines on the creeks of Interior Alaska after moving over from the Klondike country in the Yukon Territory. They worked from Circle and Eagle and then from Fairbanks when it was established in 1903.

In Fairbanks, Ed Bartlett married Ida Doverspike, a gold rush pioneer who had made the trip from Skagway on foot over the Chilkoot trail and down through the Yukon into Alaska.

It was the following year, on April 20, 1904, while the Bartletts were in Seattle on a business trip, that Bob, named Edward Lewis after his father, was born. In 1905 the Bartletts returned to Fairbanks.

The young Bartlett showed himself to be independent-minded from an early age—as became evident when he decided he wanted to be known as Bob.

He disliked being referred to as "Junior"—so much so that as a schoolboy in Fairbanks he began actively seeking a substitute name.

The newspapers and magazines of the day frequently carried stories on the exploits of polar explorers like Vilhjalmur Stefansson. Among those whose deeds were extolled in print was Capt. Robert Bartlett of the Arctic exploration vessel "Karluk."

He was widely known and referred to as Capt. Bob Bartlett. So the Fairbanks schoolboy decided this hero deserved to have his name perpetuated—and adopted it for his own. And he made it stick.

After graduation from high school in 1922, Bartlett attended the University of Fairbanks and the University of Washington at Seattle. But he didn't stick around at either institution long enough to get a degree.

His real education, which left him with a knowledge of Alaska and its people equalled by only a handful of others, began in 1927, when he took a job as reporter for the Fairbanks News-Miner and ended only with his death in a Cleveland hospital.

Bartlett worked for the News-Miner until 1932, serving the paper in all editorial capacities. The work put him in contact with many of Alaska's early-day working newsmen—legendary figures like W. F. (Wrong Font) Thompson, publisher of the News-Miner. From them he learned much about Alaska as it was in the 1890s and through the gold rush era.

He also became well acquainted with other Alaska history makers—men like Dr. Charles Bunnell, who started what is now the University of Alaska; Austin E. Lathrop, who has been dubbed Alaska's first millionaire; and Judge James Wickersham, to name a few.

And he met hundreds of ordinary Alaskans—miners, construction workers, storekeepers; the people who one day would send him back to Washington again and again as their representative.

Paul (IP) Lien, who took over for Bartlett when he left the paper, recalled the future

senator's journalistic career as a productive one.

"Bartlett sparked the paper with column after column of local news," he wrote in a *Jessen's Daily* historical edition. "He gave arrivals and departures on the train, hospital news, the courthouse beat and numerous local happenings he got walking up and down the streets.

"... News coverage for the most part was turned over to Bob.

"Although Bartlett gave excellent coverage to the Wilkins Expeditions and other very exciting aviation stories, I remember him most vividly for his reports on the World Series games, especially the Cardinals and the Yankees in the twenties; the "Black Bear" mall robbery story and the local hanging of an Indian from the lower Yukon River country, which Bob witnessed."

In 1930, while still working for the *News-Miner*, Bartlett married Vide Marie Gaustad, an Alaskan girl he had first met at the University of Alaska.

In 1932 Dimond was elected Alaska's delegate to Congress and he took young Bartlett on as an assistant. During the next two years, Bartlett absorbed a great deal of knowledge about the operations of the federal government. He learned his way around the government maze in Washington, helping Dimond, who had no vote but could introduce legislation in the House, to sell Alaska and its causes to congressmen, senators and officials of Franklin D. Roosevelt's administration.

He was on hand and provided first-hand information about the territory when the decision was made, for instance, to settle dust bowl farmers in Alaska.

The Bartlett's first child, Doris Ann, was born in Washington.

In 1934, Bartlett returned to Alaska as assistant territorial director of the Federal Housing Administration (FHA). It was his first official look at Alaska's housing needs. He developed a life-long concern for the subject—and several pieces of special federal housing legislation for Alaska resulted in later years.

His father died in 1935 and the following year Bartlett took over the small placer gold mine his father had worked near Miller House in the Circle district. He operated the mine for three years and was fond of saying, "I was one of the few people to make a success of mining. I didn't make any money, but I did pay back my loans."

In 1939, President Roosevelt appointed Bartlett Secretary of Alaska. He returned to Juneau, carrying in his pocket a gold nugget from the mine for the rest of his years. He would rub the bright lump when he was nervous.

The territorial post of Secretary of Alaska was roughly equivalent to today's Secretary of State—the number two post after the territorial governor.

The man FDR appointed governor, at the same time he appointed Bartlett, was Ernest Gruening.

For the next five years the Bartletts made their home in Juneau. Bartlett's talents complimented those of Governor Gruening and they formed an efficient and compatible team for administration of the territory's affairs.

Susan, the Bartlett's younger daughter, was born during Bartlett's tenure in Juneau.

In 1943 Bartlett's mentor and special friend, Tony Dimond, decided that six terms as delegate to Congress were enough and that he wanted to go home to Alaska when his term expired.

Bartlett considered the situation and decided that if he were going to make a career of government service he should run for the seat. He had been working in an administrative capacity as Secretary of Alaska, but he was quite familiar with the delegate's job because of his two years as an assistant to Dimond.

Some friends and associates tried to dissuade Bartlett at first—usually because they wanted to keep his talents in Juneau. But when they recognized his determination they yielded and gave their assistance. Two of his staunchest supporters were Gruening and Dimond.

And there were others—"Doc" Bunnell at the Alaska college; the McCutcheon family of Anchorage; his long-time colleague in government service, Hugh J. Wade; and Chris Hennings, who was a leader among organized mine workers in Alaska.

But none of Bartlett's friends could provide the kind of financial backing he desperately needed to run an effective campaign in the sprawling territory, then home to about 100,000 persons, in the face of tremendous opposition.

With a background steeped in the liberal traditions of President Roosevelt's New Deal, Bartlett had many adversaries in high places in Alaska—especially in the conservative financial "establishment."

Salmon cannerymen wanted no more threats to remove their fish traps and no more cutting into their earnings with taxes that were used to provide economic and social advances in the territory.

Steamship operators wanted no more investigations into their frequently exorbitant profits on the Alaska run.

There were unhappy employers who resented the pressures that had been brought to bear on them for the benefit of Alaska's resident work force by the "Roosevelt Democrats" in Juneau.

And there was a disgruntled and vociferous if not large, group that felt too much had been yielded to the natives of Alaska by Dimond, Gruening and Bartlett.

So Bartlett faced a tough campaign—the toughest of his career, it turned out.

He made it clear that his sentiments lay with the ordinary citizens of the territory and that where their interests conflicted with those of the establishment, he was more than willing to join battle.

Bartlett had, for instance, worked for full rights for the state's native population long before the campaign began and made his position on the subject clear throughout the campaign.

After his election he said in an interview in Washington that, "These people saw the first white man land on Alaska's shores. When we discriminate against these people we are guilty of aggression and tyranny."

In 1944, Alaska's transportation facilities were made meager and the demands of war had put an even greater strain on them. Bartlett and his wife took their scant savings and rode buses up and down Alaska's few highways to meet the people (they had no car).

That won him the campaign.

He appeared before the voters in person. He didn't make speeches—he had always hated that—he just talked to them. He listened to their problems. And he understood their problems as only another life-long Alaskan could.

The election was close. But Bartlett won it. It was the last time he ever faced serious opposition in an election.

In his first term Bartlett proved himself to Alaska's voters and they sent him back to Washington for a total of six terms as delegate and two as U.S. senator.

Bartlett took his seat in the U.S. House of Representatives in January of 1945, with the end of World War II in sight. Great problems would be facing Alaska in the immediate future—military installations would be closed, construction payrolls cut and Indian fishing rights were a hot issue.

But Tony Dimond believed the territory's future was in good hands when he introduced his successor to Congress:

"I know that my work here in the House

of Representatives will be in able hands. I commend to you my successor. His name is E. L. Bartlett—but everyone calls him Bob.

"He is a man of honor, of ability and of integrity."

Bartlett's immediate chore was pushing through Congress an appropriation bill to run the territory. He could introduce legislation and speak on the floor of the house. But he could not vote—and Alaska had no representation at all in the Senate.

He soon formed a close and valuable friendship with Sen. Warren Magnuson, D-Wash. Magnuson had been a four-term congressman before being appointed to the Senate in late 1944. He took on the task of introducing most of Bartlett's legislation in the Senate and guiding it through to passage.

Working for Bartlett in those days was Mary Lee Council, a former Cordovan, who had been Dimond's secretary. She served him as secretary, then as administrative assistant until her retirement in 1967. Bartlett's executive secretary, Margery Goding Smith of Skagway, also came to Washington with him.

Mrs. Smith recalls that public speaking was always a terrifying chore for Bartlett. (Once while working for Dimond, the young Bartlett was given the task of delivering a speech in Southeastern Alaska. He wrote it days ahead of time—then edited a little cut of it each night. On the day of the speech he got up, introduced himself, thanked the crowd for coming—and sat down). "Mary Lee and I urged him to take speech lessons and learn golf," Mrs. Smith recounts, "but he never would listen. He was always a one subject man—Alaska politics."

Until he became a senator, with a staff comparable to those of other senators, Bartlett wrote all his own speeches. During the push for statehood, Mrs. Smith recalled, cooperative senators and congressmen agreed to speak on the floor for Alaska statehood.

"George Sundborg did all the writing," she said, "and he managed to make them all sound different."

Statehood was already an issue when Bartlett went to Washington for his first term as delegate. Most Alaskans were for it and those who weren't usually opposed it because they feared their economic interests would be threatened.

In the late 40s and early 50s the statehood fight appeared to be approaching a climax. Bartlett had to overcome the opposition of Southern senators who feared Alaska would send liberals to Congress and Republicans who feared it would send Democrats.

In 1950, approval for statehood was granted by the House, where Bartlett's hard work and close friendships with many representatives paid off. But the statehood bill died in the Senate.

Two years later, the statehood bill finally reached the floor of the Senate, but was sent back to committee by the Southern Democrat-Republican coalition by a vote of 45-44.

Eventually Bartlett made a deal with Lyndon B. Johnson, then at the peak of his power as Senate majority leader, and Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn—an agreement that has remained secret until now. Bartlett apparently pledged allegiance to Johnson in return for his support for statehood.

With Johnson's help, both houses of Congress approved statehood for Alaska in 1958, and Bob Bartlett's greatest battle was won.

After the statehood vote, Bartlett threw himself into the race for U.S. senator and won handsily. He picked up more than 81 per cent of the votes cast for himself and two opponents.

Ernest Gruening was the winner of the state's other Senate seat.

The two men flipped a coin to determine who would become the state's senior senator. Bartlett won and drew a two-year term. Gruening became the junior senator and drew a four-year term.

In 1960, Bartlett went before the voters again and was overwhelmingly returned for a full six-year term and was re-elected again in 1966. In both races he faced Dr. Lee McKinley, a conservative Republican from Anchorage.

As a member of the Senate, Bartlett served on the appropriations committee, the commerce committee and the select committee on small businesses.

Though Bartlett never won an academic degree from the University of Washington or the University of Alaska, he did hold, among others, an honorary doctor of laws degree from Union College at Schenectady, N.Y.

That is the college that graduated William H. Seward, who as Secretary of the Interior negotiated the purchase of Alaska from Russia in 1867, and Dr. Sheldon Jackson, the pioneer Alaska missionary whose name is perpetuated by a high school and junior college at Sitka.

The heart trouble that led to the senator's death began in September of 1966. Bartlett spent nine days in the hospital then after a routine medical examination showed he had suffered an undetected heart attack.

Last December he entered a hospital for treatment of pericarditis, an inflammation of the heart lining. He was released Jan. 10, convalesced at home and returned to work in February.

Then on June 6 he went to the hospital for what was diagnosed as lung congestion. He spent 10 days under intensive care and returned home. But shortly after his return, he again complained of shortness of breath and was re-admitted to the U.S. Naval hospital at Bethesda, Md. Once in the hospital, he suffered another heart attack.

The Senator's third heart attack came just before the Democratic National Convention at Chicago in August. Bartlett was taken from the riverboat Delta Queen after suffering a mild heart attack and was admitted to an East Liverpool, Ohio, hospital.

In November, Bartlett entered Cleveland Clinic for an extensive series of tests. Doctors decided to attempt a double internal arterial implant—an operation in which the patient's two mammary arteries are implanted into the front and back of his heart's left ventricle in order to bypass clogged arteries and deliver a greater supply of blood to the heart.

Doctors at the clinic perfected the technique and have performed several thousand such operations in the last six years. The survival rate following this type of operation has been about 90 per cent.

After the operation, which lasted 3½ hours, doctors reported they had found the arteries near the Senator's heart to be more clogged than expected. But, they said, the mammary arteries they implanted were in good condition—"like those of a young man."

Furthermore, Bartlett's heart appeared to have suffered little damage despite the three attacks.

Doctors predicted "an entirely normal recovery."

And initially it appeared their prediction would be borne out. Only two days after the operation, Bartlett was sitting up in bed, asking for his robe and slippers and exchanging banter with his wife.

He was soon out of the intensive care unit and there was talk of him leaving the hospital about two weeks after the operation.

But then on Nov. 30, nine days after the operation, Bartlett suffered a cardiac arrest.

Doctors managed to restart his heart through a combination of external and open chest heart massage. But there were complications.

External heart massage, to be effective, requires that considerable pressure—at least 80 pounds—be applied. And when it was administered to Bartlett, one of his ribs broke and penetrated his left lung.

As a result, the lung collapsed.

In addition, a serious chest infection developed.

And Bartlett suffered two more cardiac arrests.

Doctors reopened the senator's chest to clean out the infection and repair the lung damage, but his condition continued to deteriorate.

On Dec. 6, he suffered a bout of heart fibrillation—a condition in which the heart loses its normal beating rhythm and contracts rapidly and without co-ordination. It is a relatively common occurrence following heart surgery—and can be fatal.

Doctors managed to control the fibrillation, but Bartlett remained extremely weak and appeared near death. His condition was listed as "very critical."

Then, unexpectedly and almost miraculously, the infection, which doctors had blamed for his deteriorating condition, began to subside. The senator became more alert. Doctors cautiously pronounced themselves encouraged.

On Dec. 8, Bartlett showed a further slight improvement. He fed himself (broth and jello) for the first time in more than a week—a week in which he had been fed intravenously and hovered on the brink of death, leading a close friend to observe sorrowfully that he was being kept alive "by machines, tubes and hook-ups."

He had something else working for him, too.

"This man's tremendous constitution, and indomitable will to live are working to pull him through," doctors said.

But there are times when even the most indomitable of spirits cannot sustain a body wracked by sickness. Mrs. Bartlett was nearby when the senator died.

Bartlett's illness seldom blunted his humor and good spirits—except when they kept him away from his avocation, Alaska politics.

Every hospital stay was too long for the senator. His staff members suspected he would never admit how badly he felt when he finally got back to work. Mrs. Bartlett and the senator's doctor, Adm. Rufus Pearson, also seemed to suspect he pretended to be better than he actually felt.

Bartlett's heart trouble forced him to live on a strict diet and he lost weight. Though a heavy drinker in his younger days, Bartlett also became a teetotaler as a concession to the diabetes he developed in later years.

But almost until the end he remained a chain-smoker—against doctors' orders. He maintained that a man was entitled to one vice.

His illness made travel to Alaska difficult, for each trip, packed with visits with old and new friends that ran from morning until well past midnight, became a physical ordeal. But Bartlett loved it.

One of Bartlett's most attractive characteristics was his humility and genuine interest in others.

He was always easily approachable, no matter what the occasion or how pressed he was for time and he could always spare a moment to listen to the problems of a constituent, no matter how trivial they may have seemed.

A man who operates the freight elevator in the Senate Office Building, recalls that Bartlett was the only member of the Senate he could recall who was willing to ride in that elevator.

"He always remembered to ask about my family," the man said.

[From the Anchorage (Alaska) Daily News, Dec. 12, 1968]

**BARTLETT'S PACT WITH JOHNSON—A STORY NEVER BEFORE TOLD**

WASHINGTON.—In the late 1950s, as the long arduous battle for Alaska statehood neared its climax, Sen. E. L. (Bob) Bartlett assured the outcome by pledging his alle-

giance to Senate Majority Leader Lyndon B. Johnson and Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn in return for their support for statehood.

This intriguing footnote to history was disclosed by sources close to the senator.

Bartlett apparently pledged complete support for Johnson in return for an all-out drive to put the statehood bill over the top, these sources said.

The arrangement was known only to a handful of Bartlett's closest intimates and does not appear in any of the accounts of the fight for statehood.

But Bartlett reportedly kept notes on the agreement in his files and future historians may find the full story there.

Such an agreement could explain why Bartlett confined his legislative efforts mainly to Alaska projects or fields associated closely and unmistakably with the state's needs—fishing, merchant marine, small business loans, public works and the like.

Bartlett supported Johnson in his bid for the Democratic presidential nomination in 1960—as did the Alaska delegation to the Democratic National Convention.

And aside from any deal, Bartlett had always had high regard for Johnson because of his competence as majority leader.

"He always thought LBJ would make a good President because he was such a good majority leader," an aide said.

Earlier this year, after Johnson announced his decision not to run for reelection, Bartlett remarked that the statehood debt had at last been paid.

CITY OF JUNEAU, ALASKA, RESOLUTION No. 347, A RESOLUTION COMMEMORATING THE LATE U.S. SENATOR BOB BARTLETT

Whereas Bob Bartlett was taken from us in death on December 11, 1968; and

Whereas his official residence as a United States Senator was the City of Juneau; and

Whereas he served Alaska longer than any other representative in Congress, having been a delegate for the territory for the final fourteen years before statehood, and having served for the first decade of statehood as one of our Senators; and

Whereas Bob Bartlett, in conjunction with the Alaska-Tennessee Plan delegation and other interested Alaskans achieved for his home country the full sovereignty of statehood and as the 49th State of the Union; and

Whereas both as delegate and as a Senator Bob Bartlett was a tireless, selfless worker for Alaskan causes; and

Whereas during his twenty-four years in Congress he sponsored and guided to passage much of the Federal legislation of special benefit to Alaska; and

Whereas his contributions in the Senate went beyond the borders of his State—to his nation and to international affairs in which his country was involved; and

Whereas over his long years of service Bob Bartlett was responsible for much legislation and administrative action of direct benefit to the greater Juneau area; and

Whereas he was not only a great public servant, but a great human being as well whose friendship was highly valuable in itself, aside from any consideration of power or influence: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the Council of the city of Juneau, Alaska:

The people of the City of Juneau deeply mourn the passing of Bob Bartlett, our friend, protector and guide. And we convey to his widow Vide, and to his daughters Doris Ann and Sue our heartfelt condolences.

Copies of this Resolution shall be sent to members of Senator Bartlett's immediate family and to the Alaska Congressional delegation at Washington.

Passed and approved this 16th day of January, 1969.

CITY OF JUNEAU, ALASKA,  
JOSEPH L. GEORGE,  
Mayor.

Attest:

IONA N. STONE,  
Deputy City Clerk.

[From the Anchorage Daily News, Dec. 12, 1968]

#### BARTLETT IS DEAD

CLEVELAND.—Sen. E. L. (Bob) Bartlett, the son of Gold Rush pioneers and Alaska's senior senator, died Wednesday night of a cardiac arrest. He was 64 years old.

Bartlett died at 8:20 p.m., EST (3:20 p.m. AST) as he chatted cheerfully with a doctor.

Ed Isenson, Bartlett's administrative assistant, said in Washington that Bartlett was talking, with a doctor when he suddenly went pale and collapsed.

Efforts to revive him were unsuccessful.

Bartlett's death opened the way for the appointment, by Gov. Walter J. Hickel, of the state's first Republican senator. During the senator's long illness there was considerable speculation that he might be succeeded by Carl Brady, a close friend of Hickel who lost his bid for re-election to the state Senate in November, or Elmer Rasmuson, who lost to Mike Gravel in the U.S. Senate race.

Bartlett's death makes Senator-elect Gravel, a Democrat, Alaska's senior senator.

His death also ended one of the most fabulously successful political careers in Alaska's history.

Bartlett served 14 years as Alaska's delegate to Congress in territorial days and 10 years, following statehood, as the state's senior senator.

Bartlett's first campaign for delegate, in 1944, was his roughest. After that he was re-elected seven times—five terms as delegate and two as U.S. senator—by landslide proportions.

At one time or another he served on most of the important committees in Congress and he contributed more than perhaps any other single individual to the long battle for statehood.

Bartlett's death followed two years of heart trouble.

He suffered his first heart attack in September of 1966 and was in and out of hospitals until his death.

He died following an operation at Cleveland Clinic three weeks ago today to correct an arterial blockage that had been held responsible for the three heart attacks he had suffered.

But the senator's recovery was plagued by an unexpected series of four cardiac arrests—the final one fatal.

Funeral arrangements for the senator are pending. But it was understood he would be buried in Fairbanks, which he has always considered home.

There probably will be a memorial service in Fairbanks.

[From the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner, Dec. 12, 1968]

#### BARTLETT FUNERAL HERE ON SATURDAY— COLORFUL CAREER ENDS AT 64

WASHINGTON.—Alaska's senior U.S. Senator E. L. "Bob" Bartlett, one time gold miner and newspaperman, considered himself an example of the rugged individualism that marked the tough life in his Arctic frontier state.

Bartlett, who died Wednesday night at the age of 64, prided himself on his informal bearing, his goldmining past and the close contact he tried to maintain with the ordinary citizen.

He died of cardiac arrest in a Cleveland, Ohio, clinic where he had been under treatment since a November operation to relieve blockage of an artery.

CVX—249—Part 3

Funeral service for Sen. Bartlett will be held at 1 p.m. Saturday at St. Matthew's Episcopal Church under tentative plans announced today.

Final arrangements for the service will not be completed until Mrs. Bartlett arrives here tomorrow.

The tentative arrangements call for the Rev. William T. Warren to officiate. Sen. Bartlett's body will lie in state at St. Matthew's at 10 a.m. Saturday. The casket will remain closed. Burial will be in Northern Lights Memorial Park.

Bartlett and Ernest Gruening, also a Democrat, were elected Alaska's first senators in 1960 and Bartlett was deemed senior senator by the toss of a coin.

Gruening was defeated in the primary this year by Mike Gravel who went on to win the Senate seat in the general election.

Bartlett had come to Washington in 1933 as secretary to Anthony J. Dimond, the Alaska Territory's nonvoting delegate to Congress. He returned to Alaska in 1935 to operate for three years the small placer gold mine his father had worked near Miller House, Alaska.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt appointed Bartlett secretary of the Alaska Territory in 1939. In 1944, he succeeded Dimond as Alaska's congressional delegate and was re-elected to six two-year terms before becoming a senator.

Before the government service, he had been a Fairbanks News-Miner reporter for six years.

Bartlett was born in Seattle, Wash., April 20, 1904, and was taken by his parents Ed and Ida Bartlett, to Fairbanks the following year.

[From the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner, Dec. 12, 1968]

#### L. B. J. LOSES A FRIEND IN DEATH OF BARTLETT

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson and Vice President Humphrey expressed regret today at the death of Sen. E. L. Bartlett of Alaska.

"America lost one of its most authentic pioneers, Alaska has lost a founding father, and I have lost a friend," Johnson said in a statement.

The President said Bartlett had a rich and varied career, as a construction worker, a reporter, a gold miner and a public servant, and added:

"More than anything else, he'll be remembered as the man who believed in Alaska's potential and devoted his life to that cause.

"He will be sadly missed, but affectionately remembered by the many men and women whose lives he helped to enrich."

Humphrey said: "I am deeply saddened by the passing of Bob Bartlett. He was both a Senate colleague and a personal friend. Mrs. Humphrey and I express our deepest condolences to his family and to the citizens of Alaska whom he served so well. The 49th state has lost one of its finest sons."

[From the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner, Dec. 13, 1968]

#### FUNERAL FOR BARTLETT AT CATHOLIC CATHEDRAL

Friends from every walk of life, from the nation's capital and from the Arctic bush, began arriving in Fairbanks to pay final respects to Sen. E. L. (Bob) Bartlett, Alaskan miner, newspaperman and statesman who represented Alaska in the nation's capital for 24 years.

Sen. Bartlett died Wednesday in a Cleveland hospital of cardiac arrest. He had been under treatment since a November operation to relieve blockage of an artery.

The anticipated host of mourners was so large that the funeral service at 1 p.m. tomorrow was transferred from St. Matthew's Episcopal Church to the Catholic Cathedral at Peger Road and Airport Road. The cathedral will seat from 500 to 600.

The body of the Senator will lie in state at St. Matthew's Cathedral from 10 a.m. until 12 noon Saturday to permit friends to pay their respects there. The casket will remain closed.

The Rev. William T. Warren of the Episcopal church will officiate at the service at the Cathedral. Burial will be in Northern Lights Memorial Park, but the family has asked that only members of the family and close personal friends attend the service there.

Buses have been arranged to pick up out-of-town people from the Traveler's Inn, Fairbanks Inn, Golden Nugget Motel and Nordale Hotel and take them to the Cathedral.

From 4 to 7 p.m. a reception will be held in the Gold Room at Traveler's Inn for out-of-town guests.

The Senator's body will be returned to his beloved Alaska for the last time tonight aboard an Air Force jet. The plane is scheduled to arrive at International Airport at 7 p.m. Accompanying the body will be Mrs. Bartlett and her two daughters, Mrs. Doris Ann Riley and Sue and five other close friends.

Another plane carrying the representatives from the United States Senate will arrive at the airport at 11 a.m. tomorrow. Representing the Senate will be Senators Edmund S. Muskie, Maine, unsuccessful candidate for vice president of the United States in the November election; Warren G. Magnuson of Washington, Philip A. Hart, Michigan, and Norris Cotton, New Hampshire.

Rumors that President Johnson might attend the service were widespread in Fairbanks but persons close to the Bartletts discounted the reports. President Johnson has attended funeral services for his former colleagues when he was in the Senate, but no one here, including Federal Bureau of Investigation, has been alerted to such a possibility. The President is in El Paso, Tex. meeting with Mexican President Dias Ordaz to celebrate the end of a century-long border dispute.

Gov. Hickel, who was appointed secretary of the interior on the day Bartlett died, is returning to Juneau today and announced he will attend the service. Also attending will be Keith Miller, secretary of state, who will succeed Hickel as Governor of Alaska.

Both had planned to come to Fairbanks today for the annual Governor's Ball, but it was postponed for a week out of respect to Sen. Bartlett.

A number of U.S. Senators will be honorary pall bearers at the funeral.

So far the list of Senators to attend include: Sen. Warren G. Magnuson of Washington, Sen. Norris Cotton of New Hampshire, Sen. Philip Hart of Michigan, Sen. Henry Jackson of Washington, and Sen. Edmund S. Muskie of Maine.

[From the Anchorage Daily News, Dec. 13, 1968]

#### BARTLETT SERVICES SLATED TODAY IN NATION'S CAPITAL

WASHINGTON.—The body of E. L. (Bob) Bartlett was to be flown here today to lie in state at St. Patrick's Episcopal Church in the nation's capital, where he served 10 years as Alaska's senior senator.

The body of the senator, who died in Cleveland Wednesday at the age of 64, will lie in the church from 1-3 p.m. Washington time.

There will be a special Senate memorial service, attended by the friends and colleagues of his 24-year career in Washington.

Accompanying the body will be Bartlett's family—his wife, Vide, and their two daughters, Doris Ann Riley and Susan.

Following the memorial service, Bartlett's body will be flown back to Alaska for burial Saturday in Fairbanks, the town the senator always considered home.

Funeral services will be held at 1 p.m. at the Catholic Cathedral of the Sacred Heart

in Fairbanks. The services had originally been scheduled for St. Matthew's Episcopal Church, but were moved to the much larger cathedral. The Rev. William Warren of St. Matthew's will officiate.

Accompanying Bartlett's family and the body back to Alaska will be Sen.-elect Mike Gravel, who canceled all his appointments for the rest of the week in order to help with arrangements and attend the Washington memorial service and the funeral.

Speaker of the House John McCormack Thursday night appointed Rep. Howard W. Pollock to officially represent the U.S. House at the funeral.

Also attending the funeral will be Gov. Walter J. Hickel, who was appointed Secretary of the Interior in the Nixon administration just after Bartlett's death.

In Anchorage there will be a memorial service at All Saints Episcopal Church at 1 p.m. Saturday—coinciding with the funeral service in Fairbanks. The Rev. Norman Elliott, rector of All Saints, will officiate.

Hickel declared Saturday a day of mourning for Bartlett. The Alaska flag will fly at half-staff.

Bartlett died of a cardiac arrest following two years of heart trouble.

[From the Anchorage Daily Times, Dec. 14, 1968]

#### VIGNETTES AND VIEWS: SATURDAY SUNDAY (By William J. Tobin)

"Someday," Bob Bartlett said a couple of years ago, "I hope somebody will write the true story of Alaska statehood, the real story. But it won't be me who does it." And he died Wednesday, a sad day, with that dramatic episode in Alaska's history still untold the way he felt it should be—by someone who was not as close as he to the years of struggle, by someone who dispassionately might tell of the successes and failures, the jealousies and the friendships, the heartaches and joys which finally gave birth to the 49th Star.

Sen. E. L. Bartlett, God rest his soul, won't write the story of Alaska statehood. But it is a story he lived, and that is more important. An autobiography, neatly catalogued by chapter and footnote and bound in hard covers and packaged in a slick jacket, is not the legacy he left us. He left us, instead a golden memory brighter by far than the metal he sluiced from streams of the Interior as a youth. Our heritage is richer for the life he led, and that's a gift more precious than gold.

Bob Bartlett was many things, sometimes paradoxically so. He was a humble man, but one who was terribly proud—of his state, his friends, of the loyalty he felt to those who had earned his respect. He was non-political, but a master politician. He was sensitive and shy, but practical and bold. He was quiet, yet with a gifted wit. He was no great orator, but a charming public speaker who could enthral an audience.

If he was not a writer of books, he was a delightful correspondent. Perhaps because of his days as a newspaperman, he had the style of a superb columnist, a touch with a phrase that made any letter from him a literary treasure to enjoy as you would a familiar classic. He was a master with words, and with them he spread both good humor and sharp scorn as the occasion might demand. With biting but witty irony he could needle a political foe, and with simple kindness he could fashion paragraphs of good will.

But Bob Bartlett lived by actions, not by words. In a way that not many people understand, in a manner that most men in political life are not capable of handling, in a fashion almost out of mode in a society where the stairway to success is made out of ego and brass, our senator achieved quiet wonders by gentleness.

Some day in Alaska there will be another man like Bob Bartlett, and it is no sacrifice to say so. Bartlett would have wanted that, surely—to know that even in the dramatic years that lie ahead, in the years of tumultuous growth, in the years demanding vigor and activity, there will be a premium and a place for one of modesty and dedication to play a role in the great future of the state he helped to make great.

But there is no one now on the scene to wear the mantle that Bob Bartlett tailored, and it is no criticism of Alaska to say that, either. He simply stands out among the leaders of his time, in both public and private life, who worked for the things for which he worked, who helped achieve the things that Alaska achieved, who shaped by their efforts the Alaska of today.

But the mark of Bob Bartlett's greatness was not so much what he accomplished for Alaska, although that was enormous. The true measure of this man was that every Alaskan—nearly everyone who knew him wherever he traveled—called him friend.

Any number of people earn great honors or wealth. The land is filled with men of distinction in science or industry or government or the military. The world is full of its heroes and its stars. But rare indeed is the man who is called a friend by all who pass his way, whose service is not self-serving, whose dedication seeks no personal glory, whose heart is moved in modest wonder at the things goodness can achieve.

Good men do, indeed, finish first. And Bob Bartlett stood first in the hearts of Alaskans.

[From the Anchorage Daily News, Dec. 14, 1968]

#### BARTLETT SERVICES ARE TODAY

A delegation of U.S. Senators, including Edmund Muskie of Maine and Warren Magnuson of Washington, will join Alaskans today in Fairbanks to pay their last respects to Sen. E. L. (Bob) Bartlett, who died Wednesday in Cleveland after a lingering heart illness.

Services will be held at 1 p.m. at Cathedral of the Sacred Heart in Fairbanks. The services originally were planned for St. Matthew's Episcopal Church but were changed to accommodate a larger crowd.

At the same time, services will be held in Anchorage at All Saints Episcopal Church. The Rev. Norman Elliott, rector of All Saints, will preside.

Bartlett's body arrived in Fairbanks Friday night at 7:10 aboard an Air Force plane.

The widow, Vide Bartlett, and her two daughters, Doris Ann Riley of Anchorage and Susan of Washington, D.C., was aboard the plane. With them were Anchorage attorney Stanley McCutcheon, one of Bartlett's oldest friends, and William Foster, a former aide to the senator.

The body will lie in state from 10 a.m. to noon at St. Matthew's. Burial will be in Northern Lights Cemetery.

A delegation of 7 U.S. Senators is scheduled to arrive in Fairbanks about noon aboard an Air Force plane to attend the funeral. On the flight will be Sen. Warren Magnuson, one of Bartlett's closest associates during his 24 years in Washington; Muskie, this year's Democratic vice presidential nominee; Sen. Henry Jackson of Washington; Sen. Philip Hart of Michigan; Sen. Norris Cotton of New Hampshire; Sen. Daniel Brewster of Maryland; and Sen. Clifford Hansen of Wyoming.

Alaska Republican Congressman Howard Pollock; Senator-elect Mike Gravel; Gov. Walter J. Hickel, named Secretary of Interior in the Nixon cabinet; and Secretary of State and Governor-designate Keith Miller also will attend the Fairbanks services.

U.S. Senate majority secretary Stanley Kimmitt and minority secretary J. Mark Trice will fly to Fairbanks with the Senate delegation.

Aides to Bartlett will attend, too. They are administrative assistant Hugh Gallagher; Mrs. Marge Gooding Smith, Bartlett's secretary for 24 years; Jack Cornman and Ed Isenson; and former aides to the senator, Mary Lee Council and Bill Boesch.

Thursday and Friday, flags flew at half mast in the nation's capital in tribute to Bartlett.

Many of Bartlett's Senate colleagues visited St. Patrick's Episcopal Church Friday, where the Senator's body lay in state. They included Sen. Edward Kennedy, Sen. Eugene McCarthy, Sen. Margaret Chase Smith, Sen. Harry Byrd, Sen. Gale McGee, Sen. Thomas McIntyre, Congressman Edward Garmatz, Congressman Samuel Stratton—New York.

Others who attended were Mrs. J. William Fulbright, wife of the senator from Arkansas; Mrs. Frank Moss, wife of the senator from Utah; Mrs. Edmund Muskie, wife of the senator from Maine; Mrs. Clare Engel, wife of the late senator from California.

Also attending were Donald McKernan, special assistant for Fisheries and Wildlife in the Department of State; George Sundborg, administrative assistant to Sen. Ernest Gruening; Don Greeley, Gruening's executive assistant; Laura Olson, Gruening's legislative assistant.

[From the Anchorage Daily Times, Dec. 14, 1968]

#### ALASKA SAYS GOODBYE TO "BOB"—SKIES ARE GRAY, MERCURY AT -25 FOR HIS FUNERAL

Dreary, slate-gray clouds hung low over Fairbanks today as the Interior city bid a final farewell to its most famous son, the late Sen. E. L. "Bob" Bartlett.

Bartlett's friends, from humble walks of life and from the highest positions of national leadership, gathered in 25-below-zero temperatures to pay tribute to the modest man who dedicated his life to public service to the northland he loved.

Today has been proclaimed a day of mourning by Gov. Walter J. Hickel in memory of Bartlett, 64, Alaska's senior senator, who died Wednesday in Cleveland, Ohio. Flags were to fly at half-staff until after his burial.

His death brought expressions of grief and tribute from across the state and nation. Bartlett had served as Alaska's territorial delegate in Congress from 1945 until statehood in 1959 and as U.S. senator since then. From 1939 until 1944, he was secretary of the Territory of Alaska, a position similar to secretary of state now.

Episcopal funeral services were conducted today at the Sacred Heart Catholic Cathedral in Fairbanks. The Rev. William T. Warren of St. Matthew's Episcopal Church in Fairbanks conducted the simple service following the format of the Book of Common Prayer.

At the same time the Fairbanks services were held, a memorial service was being held at All Saints Episcopal Church in Anchorage.

Before the funeral, Bartlett's body lay in state from 10 a.m. to noon at St. Matthew's. Hundreds of Fairbanks residents filed slowly past the bier.

A nine-member congressional delegation attended the funeral. Sen. Warren Magnuson, D-Wash., was chairman of the delegation.

Other members were Sens. Norris Cotton, R-N.H.; Edmund S. Muskie, D-Me.; Philip A. Hart, D-Mich.; Daniel B. Brewster, D-Md.; Clifford P. Hansen, R-Wyo.; Rep. Howard W. Pollock, R-Alaska; J. Stanley Kimmitt, secretary to the Senate majority, and J. Mark Trice, secretary to the minority.

Alaska's Sen.-elect Mike Gravel also was with the delegation, but Sen. Ernest Gruening, who has been in Puerto Rico the past week, did not attend.

In addition, Adm. Willard J. Smith, Coast Guard commandant, and representatives of the Army, Navy and Air Force were present.

Gov. Hickel and Secretary of State Keith H. Miller were among the mourners.

Pallbearers were Alex Miller and C. R. Snedden, of Fairbanks; Richard McVeigh, Anchorage; state Supreme Court Associate Justice John Dimond, Juneau; Felix Toner, Juneau; Stanley McCutcheon, Anchorage; Hugh J. Wade, Anchorage; James Hurley, Wasilla; James D. Nordale, Fairbanks, and Joe Josephson, Anchorage.

Members of Bartlett's staff were flown to Fairbanks by the Air Force. In the group was Mary Lee Council, for many years administrative assistant to the senator.

The senator's body was flown to Fairbanks Thursday evening from Washington, D.C., where Senate colleagues had paid tribute as Bartlett's body lay in state at St. Patrick's Episcopal Church.

Bartlett's widow, Vide, and daughters, Mrs. Doris Riley of Juneau and Susan Bartlett of Washington, D.C., were aboard the Air Force jet that returned the senator's body to Fairbanks.

Only the family and a few close friends were to be present for Bartlett's burial in Northern Lights Memorial Park on the northern outskirts of Fairbanks.

[From the Anchorage Daily News, Dec. 13, 1968]

**KENNEDY PAYS HIS RESPECTS TO BARTLETT—  
BODY DUE TONIGHT IN FAIRBANKS FOR  
SATURDAY FUNERAL**

Funeral services for Alaska's Sen. E. L. "Bob" Bartlett will be conducted Saturday at 1 p.m. at Sacred Heart Catholic Cathedral in Fairbanks.

At the same time, a memorial service will be held here at All Saints Episcopal Church.

Bartlett's body will lie in state from 10 a.m. to noon Saturday at the cathedral. The body is to arrive at Fairbanks International Airport tonight, accompanied by Bartlett's widow, Vide, and their two daughters, Doris Ann Riley and Susan.

Today, Massachusetts Sen. Ted Kennedy was one of the senators who passed by the bier as Bartlett's body lay in state in St. Patrick's Episcopal Church in Washington, D.C.

The plane bearing Bartlett's body was to leave the nation's capital this afternoon. Another plane carrying senators and members of Bartlett's staff was scheduled to land at Fairbanks at 11 a.m. Saturday.

President Lyndon B. Johnson, who has often attended funeral services for senators, was in Texas today. The White House said it had no word as to whether the President might fly to Fairbanks for the service. Many times, the President's travel plans are not announced in advance.

The Rev. William T. Warren of St. Matthew's Episcopal Church, where the Fairbanks services originally were scheduled, will officiate. The service was moved to the cathedral because it is larger.

The service will follow the office of burial of the dead from the Episcopal Book of Common Prayer. The service will be simple and brief with no eulogies. A number of U.S. senators will be honorary pallbearers, including Warren G. Magnuson of Washington, Norris Cotton of New Hampshire, Phillip Hart of Michigan, Henry Jackson of Washington and Edmund S. Muskie of Maine, Democratic candidate for vice president in the recent election.

Gov. Walter J. Hickel and Secretary of State Keith H. Miller will be among the dignitaries attending the funeral. Political, business and civic leaders from around the state are planning to attend.

When Consolidated Airlines and Alaska Airlines said Friday and Saturday flights to Fairbanks are crowded, but no special flights are planned.

The memorial service at All Saints here will be conducted by Father Norman H. V. Elliott of All Saints, Father Bob Jones of St.

Christopher's and Father Alexander Zabriskie of St. Mary's.

The service will duplicate as nearly as possible the service to be held in Fairbanks, where the senator's body will be buried.

The senator's widow, Vide, today received expressions of sympathy from the Alaska Federation of Natives. Directors of the federation sent her a wire saying, "His commitments for a better break in housing, education and employment for Alaska's native people will be missed by us all."

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

**TOMATO EMBARGO AGAINST  
MEXICO**

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on February 4 I drew the attention of this body to a situation which I felt was working an extreme economic hardship on West Mexico and the southern area of Arizona. At that time I spoke in some detail about a tomato embargo ordered by former Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman as one of his last acts before leaving office. I pointed out that this order banned from importation into the United States medium-sized, vine-ripened tomatoes from Mexico.

And at that time, also, Mr. President, I expressed the hope that the new administration and its Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Clifford M. Hardin, would speedily issue the necessary order to rescind the embargo and thereby restore a measure of the friendly relations which heretofore existed between our Government and that of Mexico. I am today very unhappy to report that the situation along the American-Mexican border, particularly Sonora and Nogales, has not been corrected and that it daily grows more troublesome and destructive of sound, hemispheric relations.

Mr. President, there is no longer any reason, economic or otherwise, for keeping this embargo in force. According to the "Daily Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Reports" of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the demand for tomatoes is greater than the supply. As a result—and I might say that my remarks on February 4 indicated that this might happen—the price of tomatoes to the American housewife is moving higher and the consumption of tomatoes is being depressed. Because of the embargo, which you will recall was levied under a little-used marketing act of 1937, the large chainstores in the United States which usually run "specials" on tomatoes at this time of year have not done so because of the short supply of the embargoed product.

Mr. President, while this embargo is costing the economy of the Nogales area in excess of \$105,000 a day, I am more concerned with the damaging effect it is having on our already-strained relations with our neighbors to the south.

During the Lincoln birthday recess, I had occasion to visit the southern part of Arizona and to talk with some of the Mexican people directly involved. They originally blamed what they regarded as a completely arbitrary and unfair ruling by Washington on the outgoing Democratic administration. They put it down to what I think it actually was—lame-duck mischief-making by a retiring Secretary of Agriculture. However, today the Mexican officials are placing this blame on the doorstep of President Nixon and Secretary Hardin. The Mexicans, quite understandably, regard the tomato embargo as another action in a series of U.S. actions which have eroded the good neighbor policy between our governments along the border. In 1964, you will remember, the U.S. Government arbitrarily ended the bracero work program, much to the anger and distress of people on both sides of the border. Prior to that time thousands of Mexicans had been permitted to cross the border and work in this country under closely supervised conditions. When that program was ended, Mexico suffered substantial economic losses. And the Mexicans, especially nearly 100,000 of them living south of the border near the Colorado River, are denied adequate coverage at Algodones to allow them to use their "green cards" for full implementation of travel to and from the United States, as can be done in other crossing towns. What is involved here is just an insufficient number of United States personnel to handle the problem. I am sure I do not have to explain to anyone acquainted with the abrasive nature of these actions what it means to United States-Mexican relations to have the costly and seemingly unreasonable tomato embargo piled on top of them.

Sometimes, Mr. President, I feel that our overgrown bureaucracy loses complete sight of the larger scope of our national interests. Here, for the sake of a highly technical marketing agreement involving only a fraction of an inch in the diameter size of tomatoes, our Government is endangering relations with a country whose trade represents a favorable balance of payments for the United States. You might not understand how unusual this is, but one glance at the depressing state of our international balance of payments over the past 8 years will convince even the greatest skeptic of how much we should prize relations with a country whose trade balance is in our favor.

I believe, Mr. President, that it would not hurt to include here some little-known facts about Mexican trade with the United States as published by the American Chamber of Commerce of Mexico. These facts show that Mexico imports \$1.09 billion worth of goods from the United States every year. In the same period, it sells to the United States \$619.4 million worth of goods. These figures exemplify the Mexican economic thesis which says "we want fair trade—not foreign aid from the United States." This attitude also is dramatically unusual and could well be used as an example for the rest of the world, and especially for those people living south of Mexico. But I as-

sure you that we will not continue to have a strong, friendly, economically sound neighbor to our south if we continue making trouble along the border.

In conclusion, I want to say that we have nothing to gain and a great deal to lose by imposing trade restrictions on a friendly neighbor. Believe me, there are

no winners in this country when the United States has an unfavorable trade balance with other nations. Business loses and labor loses. So I plead for reason and speed to prevail in a way that will bring a conclusion to the unfair tomato embargo against Mexico.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous con-

sent to have printed in the RECORD at this point several tables to illustrate the situation of which I am speaking, which were compiled by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

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

TOMATOES, FRESH MARKET—RAIL AND TRUCK SHIPMENTS FOR FLORIDA AND MEXICO, 1967-69, BY DAYS, PLUS FLORIDA AND MEXICO COMBINED

(Carlo, equivalents)

Florida, rail and truck						Mexico, rail and truck				Florida and Mexico, rail and truck combined			
1968		1967		1968		1967		1968		1967			
Dec. 1	41	151	12	3	53	154	Dec. 18	41	74	55	17	96	91
Dec. 2	51	149	16	5	67	154	Dec. 19	54	101	44	20	98	121
Dec. 3	95	80	12	3	107	83	Dec. 20	72	136	54	7	125	143
Dec. 4	86	73	14	5	100	78	Dec. 21	79	104	51	23	130	127
Dec. 5	80	147	13	4	93	151	Dec. 22	53	110	41	31	94	141
Dec. 6	77	151	18	14	95	165	Dec. 23	43	86	35	42	78	128
Dec. 7	60	103	15	10	75	113	Dec. 24	78	37	63	31	141	68
Dec. 8	44	116	13	12	57	128	Dec. 25	26	15			26	15
Dec. 9	51	88	16	16	67	104	Dec. 26	40	27	113	34	153	61
Dec. 10	95	53	24	16	119	69	Dec. 27	71	98	53	34	124	132
Dec. 11	114	51	50	17	164	68	Dec. 28	121	80	73	36	194	116
Dec. 12	84	114	40	11	124	125	Dec. 29	51	83	66	30	117	113
Dec. 13	87	80	45	19	132	99	Dec. 30	60	60	82	34	142	94
Dec. 14	109	75	43	16	152	91	Dec. 31	109	60	87	37	196	97
Dec. 15	49	97	32	15	81	112	Total	2,116	2,824	1,260	553	3,376	3,377
Dec. 16	50	146	34	7	84	153							
Dec. 17	45	79	47	4	92	83							

  

Florida, rail and truck		Mexico, rail and truck		Florida and Mexico, rail and truck combined		
1969	1968	1969	1968	1969	1968	
Jan. 1	58	20	2	60	20	
Jan. 2	54	21	127	38	181	59
Jan. 3	74	94	82	46	156	140
Jan. 4	100	92	87	52	187	144
Jan. 5	45	103	68	42	113	145
Jan. 6	22	112	51	48	73	160
Jan. 7	45	66	75	46	120	112
Jan. 8	34	46	71	31	105	77
Jan. 9	34	114	83	44	117	158
Jan. 10	60	113	86	60	146	173
Jan. 11	51	75	67	53	111	128
Jan. 12	38	89	73	54	111	143
Jan. 13	20	82	68	35	88	137
Jan. 14	49	46	72	62	121	108
Jan. 15	63	23	77	47	140	70
Jan. 16	46	74	84	65	130	139
Jan. 17	67	80	85	84	152	164

  

Florida, rail and truck		Mexico, rail and truck		Florida and Mexico, rail and truck combined		
1969	1968	1969	1968	1969	1968	
Jan. 18	79	73	94	79	173	152
Jan. 19	39	58	82	76	121	134
Jan. 20	27	70	74	77	101	147
Jan. 21	50	31	74	61	124	92
Jan. 22	40	23	102	46	142	69
Jan. 23	35	57	90	49	125	105
Jan. 24	35	61	100	62	135	123
Jan. 25	64	34	94	48	158	82
Jan. 26	27	40	87	44	114	84
Jan. 27	21	61	79	52	100	113
Jan. 28	60	33	84	33	144	66
Jan. 29	66	28	119	41	190	69
Jan. 30	66	97	103	89	169	186
Jan. 31	49	72	114	87	163	159
Total	1,523	1,988	2,554	1,671	4,077	3,659

Note: Data subject to revision.

TOMATOES, FRESH MARKET—RAIL AND TRUCK SHIPMENTS FOR FLORIDA AND MEXICO, 1968-69, BY DAYS, PLUS FLORIDA AND MEXICO COMBINED

Florida, rail and truck		Mexico, rail and truck		Florida and Mexico, rail and truck combined		
1969	1968	1969	1968	1969	1968	
Feb. 1	79	64	115	99	194	163
Feb. 2	62	101	58	87	120	188
Feb. 3	21	84	61	84	82	168
Feb. 4	70	61	70	71	140	132
Feb. 5	59	38	72	73	131	111
Feb. 6	53	97	78	81	131	178
Feb. 7	47	81	76	92	123	173
Feb. 8	64	51	74	86	138	137
Feb. 9	46	48	79	80	125	128
Feb. 10	25	58	52	75	77	133
Feb. 11	70	37	77	38	147	75
Feb. 12	63	29	90	50	153	79
Feb. 13	48	91	83	51	131	142
Feb. 14	72	61	69	111	141	172
Feb. 15	74	51	99	100	173	151
Feb. 16	60	54	115	50	175	104
Feb. 17		69		92		161
Feb. 18		36		86		122
Feb. 19		36		58		94
Feb. 20		50		62		112
Feb. 21		71		66		137
Feb. 22		66		60		126
Feb. 23		60		69		129
Feb. 24		80		67		147
Feb. 25		43		84		127
Feb. 26		22		80		102
Feb. 27		76		85		161
Feb. 28		75		100		175
Feb. 29		65		97		162
Total	1,755			2,233		3,989

  

Florida, rail and truck		Mexico, rail and truck		Florida and Mexico, rail and truck combined		
1969	1968	1969	1968	1969	1968	
Mar. 1		95		102		197
Mar. 2		98		126		224
Mar. 3		34		122		156
Mar. 4		24		104		128
Mar. 5		77		63		140
Mar. 6		72		51		123
Mar. 7		77		83		160
Mar. 8		71		133		204
Mar. 9		82		136		218
Mar. 10		31		101		132
Mar. 11		40		77		117
Mar. 12		87		70		157
Mar. 13		99		67		166
Mar. 14		95		52		147
Mar. 15		71		52		123
Mar. 16		90		42		132
Mar. 17		52		46		98
Mar. 18		40		42		82
Mar. 19		112		59		171
Mar. 20		99		87		186
Mar. 21		88		73		161
Mar. 22		84		72		156
Mar. 23		133		61		194
Mar. 24		58		43		101
Mar. 25		31		40		71
Mar. 26		108		40		148
Mar. 27		51		44		95
Mar. 28		79		50		129
Mar. 29		68		67		135

TOMATOES, FRESH MARKET—RAIL AND TRUCK SHIPMENTS FOR FLORIDA AND MEXICO, 1968-69, BY DAYS, PLUS FLORIDA AND MEXICO COMBINED—Continued

	Florida, rail and truck		Mexico, rail and truck		Florida and Mexico, rail and truck combined			Florida, rail and truck		Mexico, rail and truck		Florida and Mexico, rail and truck combined	
	1969	1968	1969	1968	1969	1968		1969	1968	1969	1968	1969	1968
	Mar. 30		66		77			143	Apr. 15		25		56
Mar. 31		34		83		117	Apr. 16		71		50		121
Total		2,246		2,265		4,511	Apr. 17		80		39		119
Apr. 1		37		65		102	Apr. 18		54		46		100
Apr. 2		77		72		149	Apr. 19		71		53		124
Apr. 3		80		78		158	Apr. 20		86		64		150
Apr. 4		80		83		163	Apr. 21		41		69		110
Apr. 5		92		81		173	Apr. 22		35		55		90
Apr. 6		124		85		209	Apr. 23		84		77		161
Apr. 7		51		72		123	Apr. 24		108		96		204
Apr. 8		37		73		110	Apr. 25		101		91		192
Apr. 9		95		78		173	Apr. 26		105		80		185
Apr. 10		95		78		173	Apr. 27		158		83		241
Apr. 11		85		70		155	Apr. 28		78		82		160
Apr. 12		85		69		154	Apr. 29		82		70		152
Apr. 13		93		44		137	Apr. 30		124		81		205
Apr. 14		55		55		110	Total		2,389		2,095		4,484

Note: Data subject to revision.

MEXICAN TOMATO PRICES—VINE RIPES, F.O.B. NOGALES, ARIZ., 1968-69

1968-69 (1st report)	2-layer (20 lbs.)			3-layer (30 lbs.)			4-layer (40 lbs.), 7 x 8	Cherry-type, 12 pts.	
	5 x 6 and larger	6 x 6	6 x 7	6 x 6	6 x 7	7 x 7		Standards	Large
Dec. 11, 1968	\$5.50	\$5.00		\$7.50	\$6.75	\$5.50	\$4.50-\$5.00	\$3.00-\$3.50	\$3.50-\$4.00
Dec. 12, 1968	5.50	5.00		7.00	6.50	5.50	4.50-5.00	3.00-3.25	3.50
Dec. 13, 1968	5.50	4.00		7.00	6.50	5.50	4.50-5.00	1.30	3.50
Dec. 16, 1968	1.50	\$4.25-4.50		\$6.50-7.00	\$6.00-6.50	\$5.00-5.50	4.50-5.00	2.50-3.00	3.00-3.50
Dec. 17, 1968	\$5.00-5.50	4.50-5.00		6.50-7.00	6.00-6.50	5.00-5.50	4.75-5.00	2.50-3.00	3.00-3.25
Dec. 18, 1968	1.50	1.45		6.50-7.00	6.00-6.50	5.00	4.50-5.00	2.50-3.00	3.00-3.25
Dec. 19, 1968	5.00	1.45		1.60	6.00-6.50	5.00	4.50-5.00	2.50-3.00	3.00-3.25
Dec. 20, 1968	5.00	4.00-4.50		6.00-6.50	6.00-6.50	4.50-5.00	4.25-5.00	2.50-3.00	3.00-3.50
Dec. 23, 1968	4.50-5.00	(?)		1.60	1.50	4.55-5.00	4.25-5.00	2.50-3.00	3.25-3.50
Dec. 24, 1968 <sup>2</sup>									
Dec. 25, 1968 <sup>2</sup>									
Dec. 26, 1968	1.30	3.00-3.50		4.50-5.00	1.40	3.00-3.50	3.00	2.50-3.00	3.00-3.50
Dec. 27, 1968	1.30	(?)		4.00-4.50	3.50-4.00	3.00-4.00	3.00-3.50	2.25-2.50	3.00-3.25
Dec. 30, 1968	3.00	(?)		3.50-4.00	1.30	2.50-3.00	2.50-3.00	2.00-2.25	2.50-2.75
Dec. 31, 1968	2.50-3.00	(?)		1.30	1.30-3.50	2.50-3.00		1.20	1.20
Jan. 1, 1969 <sup>1</sup>									
Jan. 2, 1969	2.00-2.50			1.30-3.25	1.25-3.00	2.00-2.50		1.75-2.25	
Jan. 3, 1969	2.00-2.50			3.00-3.25	1.25-3.00	1.25		1.50-2.00	1.20-2.25
Jan. 6, 1969	2.75-3.00			3.50-4.00	3.00-3.50	2.50-3.00		1.75-2.25	
Jan. 7, 1969	1.30			3.50-4.00	3.00-3.50	2.75-3.00		1.50-2.00	1.20-2.25
Jan. 8, 1969	1.30			3.50-4.00	3.00-3.50	2.75-3.00		1.75-2.00	1.25
Jan. 9, 1969	3.00			3.75-4.00	3.25-3.50	3.00		1.75-2.00	1.25
Jan. 10, 1969	1.30			1.45		3.00-3.50		1.75-2.00	1.25
Jan. 13, 1969	3.50-4.00			4.50-5.00				2.00-2.25	2.25
Jan. 14, 1969	1.30-3.75			4.50-5.00				1.20	2.25
Jan. 15, 1969	1.30-3.75			4.75-5.00				1.20	1.25
Jan. 16, 1969	1.30			4.50-5.00				1.20	1.25
Jan. 17, 1969	1.30			1.45				1.20	1.25
Jan. 20, 1969	1.25-2.75			1.45				1.20	2.25
Jan. 21, 1969	2.50-2.75			1.45				1.20	1.25
Jan. 22, 1969	3.00			1.45				1.75-2.00	2.25
Jan. 23, 1969	2.50-3.00			1.45				1.75-2.00	2.25
Jan. 24, 1969	1.25-3.00			1.45				1.75	2.00-2.25
Jan. 27, 1969	1.25-3.00			1.45				1.75	2.00-2.25
Jan. 28, 1969	1.25-3.00			1.45				1.75	2.00-2.25
Jan. 29, 1969	2.50-2.75			4.50				1.75	2.00-2.25
Jan. 30, 1969	1.25			1.45				1.75	2.00-2.25
Jan. 31, 1969	1.25			1.45				1.75	2.00-2.25
Feb. 3, 1969	1.25			1.45				1.75	2.00-2.25
Feb. 4, 1969	1.30			1.45				2.00-2.25	2.25-2.50
Feb. 5, 1969	3.25-3.50			4.75-5.00				2.00-2.25	2.50-2.75
Feb. 6, 1969	1.30			1.50				1.25	2.50-2.75
Feb. 7, 1969	1.40			5.00-5.50				2.25-2.50	2.50-3.00
Feb. 10, 1969	1.40			5.50-6.00				2.50-2.75	2.75-3.25
Feb. 11, 1969	1.40			5.50-6.00				1.75	2.75-3.25
Feb. 12, 1969	1.40			1.50				1.25	2.75-3.25
Feb. 13, 1969	1.40			5.50-6.00				1.25	2.75-3.25
Feb. 14, 1969	4.00-4.50			1.60				1.25-3.00	3.00-3.25
Feb. 17, 1969	1.40			1.60				1.25-3.00	3.00-3.25

<sup>1</sup> Mostly.  
<sup>2</sup> Too few.  
<sup>3</sup> Prices to be established later.

<sup>4</sup> Holiday.  
 Source: Daily reports of F. & V. Market News Branch, C. & M.S., USDA.

TOMATOES, FRESH MARKET—F.O.B. PRICES DADE COUNTY, FLA., 1968-69 SEASON

[Dollars per carton, f.o.b. shipping point

Date, 1968-69	Greens, 40-lb. cartons, 85 percent or more U.S. No. 1				Greens, 40-lb. cartons, U.S. No. 2			Greens, 40-lb. cartons, 65 to 80 percent U.S. No. 1			
	6x6 and larger	6x7	7x7	5x6	6x6 and larger	6x7	7x7	5x6	6x6 and larger	6x7	7x7
Dec. 16, 1968 <sup>1</sup>		6.00	3.50		5.35-5.50	3.50-4.00	2.00-2.35				
Dec. 17, 1968	8.00	5.00	3.00-3.50	9.00	5.00-5.50	3.00	2.00				
Dec. 18, 1968	8.00	5.00	3.00	9.00	5.35-5.50	3.25-3.50	2.00				
Dec. 19, 1968	8.00	5.00	3.00	8.00-9.00	5.50	3.00-3.50	1.50-2.00				
Dec. 20, 1968	8.00	5.00	3.00								
Average	8.00	5.25	3.20	8.75	5.39	3.39	1.98				

See footnotes at end of table.

TOMATOES, FRESH MARKET—F.O.B. PRICES DADE COUNTY, FLA., 1968-69 SEASON—Continued

[Dollars per carton, f.o.b. shipping point]

Date, 1968-69	Greens, 40-lb. cartons, 85 percent or more U.S. No. 1				Greens, 40-lb. cartons, U.S. No. 2			Greens, 40-lb. cartons, 65 to 80 percent U.S. No. 1			
	6x6 and larger	6x7	7x7	5x6	6x6 and larger	6x7	7x7	5x6	6x6 and larger	6x7	7x7
Dec. 23, 1968	8.00	5.00	2.75-3.00	2.90	5.50	3.00-3.50	1.50-2.00				
Dec. 24, 1968	8.00	5.00	2.25-3.00	2.90	5.35-5.50	3.00-3.35	1.50-2.00				
Dec. 25, 1968 <sup>1</sup>											
Dec. 26, 1968 <sup>2</sup>											
Dec. 27, 1968	7.00	4.00	2.00	7.00-8.00	4.50-5.00	2.25-2.65	1.00-1.35				
Average	7.67	4.67	2.60	8.75	5.17	2.96	1.56				
Dec. 30, 1968 <sup>3</sup>											
Dec. 31, 1968	5.00-5.50	3.50	3.50	5.00-6.00	3.65	2.25-2.35					
Jan. 1, 1969 <sup>4</sup>											
Jan. 2, 1969		3.50	1.75		2.25-2.35		1.35-1.50				
Jan. 3, 1969	4.50-5.00	3.50	1.75	6.00	3.35-3.50	2.25-2.35	1.25-1.40				
August	5.00	3.50	2.33	5.67	3.50	2.30	1.38				
Jan. 6, 1969 <sup>5</sup>											
Jan. 7, 1969 <sup>6</sup>											
Jan. 8, 1969 <sup>7</sup>											
Jan. 9, 1969	7.00	5.00			3.35-3.65	2.25-2.65		6.00	5.00	3.50	1.75-2.00
Jan. 10, 1969 <sup>8</sup>											
Jan. 13, 1969 <sup>9</sup>											
Jan. 14, 1969	7.00-8.00	5.00-6.00		9.00	4.65-5.00	3.35-4.00					
Jan. 15, 1969	7.50	5.00-6.00			4.65-5.50	3.35-4.00					
Jan. 16, 1969	7.50-8.00	5.50-6.00			5.00-5.35	3.50-4.00					
Jan. 17, 1969	7.50	5.50-6.00			5.00-5.35	3.50-4.00					
Jan. 20, 1969 <sup>10</sup>											
Jan. 21, 1969	7.00	5.00-6.00				5.00	3.35-4.00				
Jan. 22, 1969	7.00-8.00	6.00-7.00				5.00-5.35	3.35-4.65				
Jan. 23, 1969	6.00-7.00	5.00-5.50				5.00	3.50-4.00				
Jan. 24, 1969	7.00	5.00-6.00				5.00	3.50-4.00				
Jan. 27, 1969 <sup>11</sup>											
Jan. 28, 1969 <sup>12</sup>											
Jan. 29, 1969		6.00					3.50-4.00				
Jan. 30, 1969		6.00					4.00				
Jan. 31, 1969		6.00					3.50-4.00				
Feb. 3, 1969 <sup>13</sup>											
Feb. 4, 1969		6.00					4.00				
Feb. 5, 1969		6.00					4.00				
Feb. 6, 1969		6.00					4.00				
Feb. 7, 1969		7.00					4.50				
Feb. 10, 1969 <sup>14</sup>											
Feb. 11, 1969	8.00	6.00-7.00				5.35	4.65				
Feb. 12, 1969	7.00-8.00	6.00				4.65-5.35	4.00				
Feb. 13, 1969	8.00	6.00				5.35	4.00				
Feb. 14, 1969	8.00	6.00				4.65-5.00	4.00				
Feb. 17, 1969 <sup>15</sup>											

<sup>1</sup> Prices not established.

<sup>2</sup> Mostly.

<sup>3</sup> Holiday.

<sup>4</sup> Most booked open; prices to be established later.

<sup>5</sup> Prices generally not established.

<sup>6</sup> Very few.

<sup>7</sup> Weekend rains; no packing, insufficient.

<sup>8</sup> Offerings light; prices to be established later.

<sup>9</sup> Few.

<sup>10</sup> Insufficient quantity (slightly stronger tendency).

<sup>11</sup> Offerings light; prices not established.

<sup>12</sup> Prices generally unsettled.

<sup>13</sup> Offerings increasing; prices mostly not established.

<sup>14</sup> 6 x 7 and larger.

<sup>15</sup> Prices generally unsettled and billed open bases—f.o.b. prices established Tuesday.

<sup>16</sup> Prices to be established later.

<sup>17</sup> Best mostly.

Source: Daily reports of Fruit and Vegetable Market News Branch, C. & M.S., U.S.D.A.

TOMATOES, FRESH MARKET—F.O.B. PRICES IN THE POMPANO, FLA., AREA, 1968-69 SEASON

[Dollars per carton, f.o.b. shipping point, at packinghouses.]

Date, 1968-69	Vine ripens, 20-lb., 2-layer cartons, 85 percent or more U.S. No. 1			Vine ripens, 20-lb., 2-layer cartons, "lower" in 10 lots			8-lb. carton
	6x6 and larger	6x7	7x7	6x6 and larger	6x7	7x7	
Dec. 16, 1968 <sup>1</sup>							
Dec. 17, 1968 <sup>2</sup>							
Dec. 18, 1968	6.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	3.00-3.25	
Dec. 19, 1968	6.00	5.00	3.50-4.00	4.50-5.00	4.00	3.00-3.25	
Dec. 20, 1968	6.00	5.00	3.50-4.00	4.50-5.00	4.00	3.00-3.50	
Average	6.00	5.00	3.80	4.80	4.00	3.17	
Dec. 23, 1968	5.50-6.00	4.50-5.00	3.50-4.00	4.00-4.50	3.00-3.50	2.00-2.50	
Dec. 24, 1968 <sup>3</sup>							
Dec. 25, 1968 <sup>4</sup>	5.50	4.50	3.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	
Dec. 26, 1968	5.00	4.25	3.00	3.50-3.75	3.00		
Dec. 27, 1968	5.25	4.25	3.00	3.75	3.00	2.00	
Dec. 30, 1968	4.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	1.50	
Dec. 31, 1968	3.50	3.00	2.00	2.50-2.75	2.00	(*)	
Jan. 1, 1969 <sup>5</sup>							
Jan. 2, 1969	3.50	2.50-3.00	1.50-2.00	2.50-2.75	(10)	(10)	
Jan. 3, 1969	3.50	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00		
Jan. 6, 1969	3.62	2.90	1.90	2.75	2.00	1.50	
Jan. 7, 1969	3.50	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00		
Jan. 8, 1969	3.50	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00		
Jan. 9, 1969	3.50			3.00			
Jan. 10, 1969	3.50-4.00			3.00			
Average	3.57	(11) 2.97	(11)	3.00	(11)	(11)	
Jan. 13, 1969	4.00			3.00			
Jan. 14, 1969	4.00			3.00			
Jan. 15, 1969	4.00			3.00			
Jan. 16, 1969	4.00			3.00			
Jan. 17, 1969	4.00			3.00			
Jan. 20, 1969	4.00			3.00			
Jan. 21, 1969	4.00			3.00			
Jan. 22, 1969	4.00			3.00			
Jan. 23, 1969	4.00			3.00			
Jan. 24, 1969	4.00			3.00			
Jan. 27, 1969	4.00			3.00			
Jan. 28, 1969	4.00-4.50			3.00-3.50			1.90
Jan. 29, 1969	4.00			3.00			
Jan. 30, 1969	4.00			3.00			

See footnotes at end of table.

TOMATOES, FRESH MARKET—F.O.B. PRICES IN THE POMPANO, FLA., AREA, 1968-69 SEASON—Continued

[Dollars per carton, f.o.b. shipping point, at packinghouses]

Date, 1968-69	Vine ripens, 20-lb., 2-layer cartons, 85 percent or more U.S. No. 1			Vine ripens, 20-lb., 2-layer cartons, "lower" in 10 lots			8-lb. carton
	6x6 and larger	6x7	7x7	6x6 and larger	6x7	7x7	
Jan. 30, 1969	4.00			\$ 3.00			
Jan. 31, 1969	\$ 4.00			\$ 3.00			
Feb. 3, 1969	4.00			3.00			1.70
Feb. 4, 1969	4.00			3.00			
Feb. 5, 1969	4.00			3.00			
Feb. 6, 1969	4.50			3.50			
Feb. 7, 1969	4.50			3.50			
Feb. 10, 1969	5.00			\$ 4.00			
Feb. 11, 1969	5.00			\$ 4.00			
Feb. 12, 1969	5.00			\$ 4.00			
Feb. 13, 1969	5.00			\$ 4.00			
Feb. 14, 1969	5.00			\$ 4.00			
Feb. 17, 1969	\$ 5.00			4.00			

- <sup>1</sup> Harvest curtailed due to low temperatures.
- <sup>2</sup> Offerings very light; too few to quote prices.
- <sup>3</sup> Mostly.
- <sup>4</sup> Few.
- <sup>5</sup> Too few sales.
- <sup>6</sup> Holiday.
- <sup>7</sup> Few sales; mostly.
- <sup>8</sup> Insufficient.

- <sup>9</sup> Few sales.
- <sup>10</sup> Too few to quote.
- <sup>11</sup> Not permitted.

Source: Daily reports of Fruit and Vegetable Market News Branch, Consumer and Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture; Vegetable Branch, Fruit and Vegetable Division, Consumer and Marketing Service, Jan. 16, 1969.

DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE  
DAVID PACKARD

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, last month when the Senate was considering confirmation of the nomination of Mr. David Packard to be Deputy Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Melvin Laird, advised the Senate that he would issue an order that matters affecting the Hewlett-Packard Co., of which Mr. David Packard was the largest stockholder and proposed to continue so to be, would be diverted to some other official for decision, so that, as Senators understood it, Deputy Secretary Packard could not participate in a decision affecting the Hewlett-Packard Co., which company has vast multimillion-dollar contracts to furnish electronic equipment to the Defense Department.

On yesterday, according to press reports, Secretary Laird announced the assignment of Deputy Secretary David Packard to a key role in the decision upon the deployment or nondeployment of the anti-ballistic-missile proposal.

I know of no matter that will come before the Defense Department that will so vitally affect the prosperity and value of the stock of electronics companies, including the Hewlett-Packard Co., as this one. This leads me to wonder whether Secretary Laird did, in fact, issue such an order, and if so, what the contents of the order were.

This is not to imply, Mr. President, that the senior Senator from Tennessee thinks that Secretary Packard will give preference to his personal interests in making such a decision. That is not the question. It was not the question with respect to the confirmation of his nomination. Indeed, on page S837, the RECORD shows that in the debate I made the following statement:

This is not to question the honesty and integrity of Mr. Packard. That is not the question. It is not to allege or even to suspect wrongdoing. That is not the case.

In dealing with the question of conflict of interest, in considering the nomination of an appointee to a high Government position, we are not dealing with wrongdoing. We are dealing with public confidence. We are dealing with appearances. We are dealing

with circumstances which, conceivably, could constitute a conflict on the part of the official between his personal interest and the public interest on the one hand, or circumstances which, on the other, would give rise to suspicion and loss of confidence on the part of the people.

Mr. President, many people will wonder, unfortunately, how objective a judgment can be and will be, by one whose career, whose success, whose involvement, whose environment have been surrounded by success in and association with the very heart of the industrial-military complex on a question involving deployment of anti-missile-missile systems.

I repeat, this is a question of appearances. It does not look good, and it will not look good to millions of Americans. It is not a question of wrongdoing, but a question of circumstances that can give rise to doubt or suspicion, circumstance that could shake the confidence of many people in the Defense Department.

Public officials should abstain from appearances of evil, as well as from evil itself.

Incidentally, it was only last week that Miss Willie Mae Rogers, formerly of Jackson, Tenn., was asked, according to published reports, to give up her livelihood, a job with a magazine, in order to remove her conflict of interest with respect to a position of public trust for which she had been selected.

NATO ALTERS POLICY AFTER CZECH  
INVASION

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the invasion of Czechoslovakia last August was a sobering demonstration that freedom and communism are incompatible.

The citizens of the free world who believed that there was a new spirit of cooperation between the Soviet Union and the West had their illusion dispelled. The era of détente was revealed in Czechoslovakia as little more than a glittering delusion for a harsher reality, and in Eastern Europe détente still meant detention and the bars of the Iron Curtain remained intact.

After the invasion of Czechoslovakia, I called on the floor of the Senate for a revitalizing of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. In those remarks on September 5, 1968, I said in part:

Mr. President, the deliberate, indefensible attack on Czechoslovakia has shown each of the premises (of détente) to be wrong or misinterpreted. The conclusion drawn from them was a miscalculation. Russia has not been forced to follow peaceful ways.

It is these premises, nonetheless, that have guided the détente mentality of our relations with the Soviet Union in recent years. Always fearing to offend, we pursued foreign relations and national security from a position of self-effacing courtesy rather than a position of strength and firmness.

It is under the protective umbrella of détente that we have allowed NATO to deteriorate, that we have redeployed military forces in Europe, and that we have considered substantial troop reductions.

It is under the protective umbrella of détente that our nation has announced and pursued a program and policy of building bridges from West to East.

On August 20, 1968, it became fatefully obvious that the umbrella was illusory. The premises on which our détente policy was based were swept away when Warsaw Pact troops crossed the borders of Czechoslovakia.

As a member of the U.S. delegation to the Atlantic Assembly meeting in Brussels in November of last year, I felt that a new spirit had been generated in NATO. The Assembly adopted a number of resolutions demonstrating a renewed determination to maintain a strong military deterrent in Europe and a willingness to accept a more equitable sharing of the costs of a strengthened NATO force.

President Nixon's decision to visit West Berlin and the capitals of our allies in Europe this month, shows his clear determination to rebuild our neglected relations with our European allies and to strengthen NATO. This courage and conviction of our President is another welcome sign that as the United States enters, in the words of President Nixon, the "era of negotiation," it will do so with a clear view of reality and from a position of strength.

Mr. President, a feature article appeared in the Omaha World-Herald on

February 12, 1968, entitled, "Tanks and Terror" Weakened West." The World-Herald military affairs editor, Mr. Howard Silber, wrote this excellent and detailed study of the possible rebirth of NATO. Mr. Silber is a responsible, competent, and thorough journalist, and his article deserves the attention of my colleagues in the Senate.

Mr. Silber comments, in part:

Just as the Soviet takeover of Czechoslovakia in 1948 helped make the Marshall Plan a reality, the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968 shoved Article 13 of the North Atlantic Treaty out of the minds of Western diplomats.

Article 13 would open the way for any of the original signatory countries to withdraw from the alliance after 20 years—after April 4, 1969. Now none is expected to withdraw.

The situation today is comparable to the post-World War II period which gave birth to NATO.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this informative, well-reasoned article by Mr. Silber be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

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

**"TANKS AND TERROR" WAKENED WEST: NATO ALTERS POLICY AFTER CZECH INVASION**  
(By Howard Silber)

**BRUSSELS, BELGIUM.**—The North Atlantic Treaty Organization was in an unhappy state last summer. The 15-nation alliance appeared to be dissolving in a pool of indifference and false security.

France had withdrawn its military forces from the NATO high command as President Charles de Gaulle continued to pursue his go-it-alone policy and his determination to weaken American influence in Europe.

The United States, traditionally the principal supporter of NATO, was pumping more of its resources into Southeast Asia, and was faced with an unchecked outflow of gold. So the Pentagon was withdrawing some 35 thousand troops from Europe.

Britain decided to pull about six thousand troops from the continent as part of its economy campaign.

There was bickering. France, which continues its political participation in the alliance, never missed an opportunity to fling barbs at the United States. Denmark and Norway were increasingly critical of the military dictatorship in Greece. Portugal, because of its African policies, was all but ostracized.

**BLISSFUL THEME**

But, in spite of the surface disharmony, the alliance was busily pursuing its new policy of combining detente with defense. The blissful theme was co-existence with the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact partners.

The sweetness-and-light attitude was manifested last June when the NATO foreign ministers, meeting at Reykjavik, Iceland, invited the Warsaw Pact nations to negotiate mutual and balanced military force reductions in Europe.

Then, on the night of August 20, 1968, United States and West German defense radar operators suddenly found their "views" of large areas behind the Iron Curtain blocked.

Communist aircraft were dropping curtains of chaff, the metallic ribbons which resemble Christmas tree tinsel, to mask activities. Czechoslovakia was being invaded.

By breakfast time on August 21 it was clear to most NATO leaders that the Soviet Union and others of the Warsaw Five were not willing to accept detente.

Detente, an almost untranslatable French word, is described by Harlan Cleveland,

United States Ambassador to NATO, as the process of building bridges.

"Only when the Western Europeans and their transatlantic NATO partners began to talk in earnest about bridge-building, did it begin to dawn on the leaders of Russian communism that detente was bound to be deeply disruptive to the status quo in Europe," Cleveland said.

"The more the Eastern Europeans learn about Western Europe, the more they want some of that freedom, too. The more the East Germans learn about the miracle of West Germany, the more the Easterners want some of that Western prosperity.

**TANKS AND TERROR**

"Since the Soviets didn't want change," Cleveland declared, "they decided that real detente was too dangerous.

"And in August in Prague they made it plain with tanks and terror that the efforts of Dubcek's regime to build a 'socialist humanism' at home and freer relations abroad went well beyond the narrow limits of Soviet tolerance for change in Eastern Europe."

To say that the invasion of Czechoslovakia and the resulting presence of Soviet forces across the border from Bavaria was the catalyst which reversed the dissolution of NATO might not be the whole truth.

But disintegration does appear to have been halted. NATO is adding to its military strength. NATO countries are taking a fresh look at their alliance. With the possible exception of France, there is a renewed belief in the need for a closeknit, powerful Allied military force in Europe. More men and more money are being invested.

No longer is there any real doubt here that NATO, which will observe its twentieth anniversary April 4, will move into its twenty-first year. There was serious doubt until last August 20.

Uncertainty had spread to Washington, where it was nourished by the arguments of two influential members of Congress, Senator Mike Mansfield of Montana, the majority leader, and Senator Stuart Symington of Missouri, who wanted to withdraw all American troops from Europe. August 20 put an end to the argument.

Just as the Soviet take-over of Czechoslovakia in 1948 helped make the Marshall Plan a reality, the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968 shoved Article 13 of the North Atlantic Treaty out of the minds of Western diplomats.

Article 13 would open the way for any of the original signatory countries to withdraw from the alliance after 20 years—after April 4, 1969. Now none is expected to withdraw.

The situation today is comparable to the post-World War II period which gave birth to NATO.

When the United States and other countries of the West were doing everything possible to return to the ways of peace, the Soviet Union of Josef Stalin remained on a wartime footing.

**STRONG REACTION**

In late 1946, Allied forces in Europe had been reduced to 880 thousand. But the Soviet Union had more than four million men in uniform. Two years later, the Kremlin had control of 390 thousand square miles and more than 90 million people outside Russia. Albania, Bulgaria, Romania, Poland, Hungary, East Germany and Czechoslovakia had come under Soviet domination.

The reaction of the West was strong.

NATO was formed by 12 countries—the United States, Canada, Belgium, France, The Netherlands, Britain, Denmark, Norway, Portugal, Italy, Luxembourg and Iceland. The 12 agreed that "an armed attack against one or more of them . . . shall be considered an attack against them all." Turkey and Greece joined the alliance in 1952. West Germany was admitted in 1955.

The treaty was implemented in 1950 when the NATO Council of Ministers announced plans to create "under a centralized command, an integrated force capable of deterring aggression and insuring the defense of Western Europe."

The command was established in April, 1951, with Supreme Headquarters-Allied Powers Europe at Rocquencourt near Paris.

**FIFTY-FOUR DIVISIONS**

After de Gaulle announced his decision to withdraw France from the NATO integrated military command, SHAPE was moved to a new 32-million-dollar facility in a French-language rural district about 30 miles southwest of Brussels. NATO's own separate administrative headquarters is at the edge of Brussels.

The various units committed to NATO remain under the control of their own governments. Only during periods of emergency would the forces shift to the command of United States Army Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, Supreme Allied Commander.

NATO lists about 54 army divisions, 24 of them in or near West Germany. There are believed to be about 125 Warsaw Pact divisions arrayed against the West.

But not all divisions are alike. NATO divisions have about 50 per cent more men than their Communist counterparts.

The quality of NATO units varies. Some of the Greek and Turkish outfits are considerably weaker than units of Norway's small but excellent army and air force. By the same token, NATO military men speak much more respectfully of the Soviet military than of the armies and air forces of other Warsaw Pact countries.

The emphasis today is on better and consequently stronger NATO forces.

Ambassador Cleveland warned that "if the Soviets are ready, NATO had better be ready." He pointed out that "every NATO ally has lately been below NATO standards of manning, equipment and training."

**SUBSTANTIAL INCREASES**

After August 20, every major NATO defense participant agreed to attempt to meet the standards requested by General Lemnitzer.

The NATO mobile force, one of the command's biggest sticks, is to be enlarged. The NATO-committed tactical air forces, which were largely prepared for the use of nuclear weapons, are being converted more rapidly for non-nuclear roles.

Reforger I and Crested Cap, the United States Army and Air Force redeployment exercises which were highlighted by war games near the border between West Germany and Czechoslovakia, were part of the NATO muscle-flexing program.

Last year, the major participants in NATO spent about 4.5 per cent of their gross national product on defense needs. The United States committed about 10 per cent. Much of that, of course, went to meet the burdens of the Southeast Asia war. Last November the European Allies pledged substantial increases.

**HAND STILL OFFERED**

What about detente? Is the concept obsolete in the face of the Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia and NATO's resulting body-building program?

Cleveland said he is still hopeful that bridges can be built and used.

"The Soviet action in Czechoslovakia was a deep wound to the agreed Western policy of pursuing detente between East and West," he observed. "During the last 10 days of August every NATO country hastened to dampen contacts, postpone political visits and generally defer the building of East-West bridges.

"The Minnesota Band did not visit the Soviet Union, and the Red Army Choir was not heard in England. The Mayor of Moscow

was shipped hurriedly out of The Hague. Ministers in half a dozen Western countries who had been preparing trips designed to bolster their personal contributions to peace suddenly discovered urgent business at home.

"Diplomatic parties celebrating Polish Army Day, the Bolshevik Revolution, and the like, were boycotted by all but minor Western officials.

"The Italian Fair in Moscow went on, but when, in a show of business-as-usual, the top Soviet leaders turned up as visitors, they found that no Italian official of comparable rank had made the trip."

Cleveland said that "on August 20, NATO's hand was outstretched, holding a proposal to talk seriously with the Eastern allies about arms control in Europe.

"The desire for detente is so deep," he continued, "that this welcoming hand will probably not be leached into a fist. But the staff work on 'balanced and mutual force reductions,' the building of models, the development of concrete proposals are bound to be accorded a low priority within Western governments and in NATO until the Soviets give some sign that they are thinking about them, too."

#### LESSON IN FEAR

The Ambassador said "the most far-reaching lesson of the brutal action in Czechoslovakia is that Soviet leaders are afraid of detente, afraid of the contagion of competition with the West—still, after 50 years of communism, afraid of bringing out the best, which means the freest, in their own people."

In short, said Cleveland, "it takes two to tango and the Soviet Union is still a wall-flower."

Until Russia agrees to dance, NATO is prepared to maintain a strong defense umbrella over the 520 million people of the West.

#### RE-REFERRAL AND CORRECTION OF BILL

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have S. 121, a bill relating to the recognition of Vincent J. Burnelli for his contributions to the growth of aeronautical science and technology in the United States, re-referred from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences to the Judiciary Committee.

This has been cleared with the chairman of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, and it meets with his approval.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I also ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill, the award to Mrs. Hazel Burnelli, widow of Vincent J. Burnelli, a typographical error be corrected at line 9 to provide the sum of \$100,000 in lieu of \$10,000 which appears in the bill as a typographical error.

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

#### THE REORGANIZATION OF THE OEO

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the President today has issued a statement making known his intentions with regard to the Office of Economic Opportunity and the war on poverty.

Some in my State will recall that I made it clear in my campaign last fall that I would have to oppose rigorously even a new President from my own party if he set out on a course which I

thought damaging to the antipoverty programs which are so critical in solving the crisis of the cities.

Accordingly, I reviewed the President's statement today with some anxiety and great care. Having analyzed the statement, I can now say that I believe many of the previous fears have proved to be unfounded and that statesmanship and foresight characterize the President's message. Indeed, the President's statement is far more important for its positive approach and tone than for the relatively few organizational changes it makes.

With regard to these organizational changes, or spinoffs of programs to other agencies, the statement is far more important for what it leaves intact than for what it takes away.

In other words, I think it may be properly said that this statement is vital not only for what it does, but also for what it says. And it is also vital for what it does not do.

The President's statement today gives much needed stability to the antipoverty program and puts these fears that have been raised at rest. The heart of the statement is, I believe, the commitment of the new administration to retain the central community action program and to seek an immediate extension of the present authority for the OEO for an additional year beyond its June 1969 expiration date. If there is one thing that the OEO and the community action program have lacked it has been a sense of some life expectancy and confidence in their own future. This they now have.

The President proposes to send up more detailed legislative recommendations to Congress in the late spring, to take effect at the beginning of fiscal year 1971. But, by coupling that with a 1-year extension of the present authority, he gives Congress the opportunity to act with deliberate speed without, at the same time, interrupting program operations.

In this statement, the President announces his intention to delegate the Headstart and Job Corps programs as of July 1, 1969, to the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare and Labor, respectively. There will be people who will seize upon this act as deleterious to the war on poverty.

But this is no more than the original plan called for in the war on poverty, for it was then thought that mature programs would be spun off to established agencies for continued operation and that the innovation would continue to be left in the Office of Economic Opportunity. There is no truer adage in the Federal Government than that which states that program operations drive out planning and innovation. So if we want the OEO to innovate—and we certainly do—then we have to take mature programs and put them in other agencies.

I would further remind critics of what President Nixon is about to do that they did not object when President Johnson took the much more serious step of delegating the antipoverty program's manpower training efforts to the Department of Labor some years ago, when it was not nearly as ready for transfer as these programs are now.

I raise two items of caution in regard to the President's message.

First, I am concerned with his instruction that "preparations be made for the transfer" of the comprehensive Health Center program to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Health Center program, incidentally, has been a very special care of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY). That program is not yet well enough established, in my judgment, and involves the need for extensive community organization support. I would hope that the President, notwithstanding his message, would reconsider and still leave it in the OEO for a time.

Second, I would hope that the assignment to the Vice President's Office of Intergovernmental Relations of the working out of antipoverty roles for State and local officials will not hamstring the independence of the OEO. Under the Green amendment, Congress made it possible for State and local governments to assume a much greater role in community action programs; and I do not believe that any greater legislative authority is necessary in this regard.

Finally, I point out that the President has wisely protected the role of the community action agencies in continuing operation of Headstart. I am very pleased to note that the community action agencies which have any such programs in hand like Headstart will be permitted to continue to operate them.

Mr. President, the real payoff in the entire message, in my judgment, is the degree of stability and recognition which it gives to the OEO. For example, the President wishes to give the OEO a seemingly expanded important role in the area of community-based economic development.

He also promises, which I believe is clearly extremely important, I should like to read this into the RECORD:

From the experience of OEO we have learned the value of having in the Federal Government an agency whose special concern is the poor.

He also indicates very clearly—and this should be very reassuring to the program—that to do the job which he expects to have done by the OEO takes money. He recognizes that, and that is critically important.

Mr. President, the President not only provides an innovative role for the OEO but also points out that it is a natural home for economic development activities. I join with the President in that regard, and also in his determination to which I pledge my own very best efforts, to tighten up on management and integrity. As the President says, when money is lost to the program because of defalcation or even inefficiency, that is the worst blow to the poor, because they are deprived of that money hence, the critical importance of keeping a tight rein in respect of management and other techniques.

So I close, Mr. President, as I opened: I believe that the fears of many that President Nixon and the new administration would dismantle the antipoverty program have proved to be baseless. I believed they would be, and I am glad

to see that they have been proved to be baseless.

The first step is a reasonable one. The assurances given of the continuance of the OEO, of its assured role in the anti-poverty program, and that the war on poverty will continue and will be financed—these stand out as the most critical aspects of the message and should be very reassuring to the country.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR DOMINICK ON THE PRESIDENT'S POVERTY MESSAGE

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement by the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK) be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Mr. DOMINICK. The President's message on poverty brings a measure of reassurance to both the general public and the poor.

Change in this area is long overdue, and certainly welcome.

While I have reservations about the future of the Job Corps, I congratulate President Nixon for his decisiveness in moving immediately in some areas of the poverty program, but holding other recommendations in abeyance pending further review.

His statement recognizes and breathes new life into the original congressional intent that the Office of Economic Opportunity was designed for the purpose of innovation, to develop new programs, test them, and once underway, place them with a permanent agency more equipped for their efficient administration.

Under minority sponsorship, we were successful in 1967 in adding an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act requiring the General Accounting Office to make a full investigation of the poverty program and report to Congress. That report is due next month, and I concur in the wise judgment of the President that legislative recommendations should await the findings of that office.

Let me turn briefly to a program I strongly support—Headstart.

Senators will recall my particular interest in this program, and authorship of the amendment which passed the Senate last year by a vote of two to one transferring it to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Thirty Republican Senators and thirty Democratic Senators expressed the will of the Senate that Headstart be operated by the Office of Education in that Department. When House Democratic conferees, most of whom were absent and represented by proxies, refused to go along, the compromise language requiring the Presidential study was placed in the Vocational Education Act amendments of 1968.

In delegating Headstart to HEW, the President has made clear his intent that community action agencies can continue to be involved in the operation of this program at the local level. This coincides with the intent and express language of the Dominick amendment.

I note that the President States:

"Pending a final decision by the Secretary of HEW on where within the department responsibility for Head Start would be lodged, it will be located directly within the Office of the Secretary."

It is my understanding that guidelines for the operation of Head Start during the one year delegation period commencing July 1, 1969, will be developed by OEO and HEW, and that legislative recommendations to accomplish a permanent transfer will be sent to Congress later this spring.

I pledge my full cooperation to the Secretary and to the President during the development and formulation of a final decision as to where Head Start is to be placed in HEW.

This is a fine program, and I certainly want to see the full range of its education, health, and welfare services preserved while aiming for greater coordination with our school systems.

I am delighted to support the President's suggestions, and feel this is a significant step in the direction of overcoming the problems with which we have been faced in the past.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am pleased that the President's message on the Economic Opportunity Act grapples directly with this pressing problem. The President asked to extend the life of the Office of Economic Opportunity, but made it clear that he will ask for views of a wide range of those legislating or administering the poverty program or affected by it, before he makes more detailed recommendations. President Nixon has, in my judgment, made the wisest possible recommendations in this message.

As one who voted for funding OEO in 1968, I am pleased to see that the office is being retained and that it is being evaluated. As one who voted to transfer the Headstart program to the Office of Education within HEW from OEO, I can only applaud the President's move in that direction, and to acclaim his stated reasons for the preliminary steps toward transfer to HEW.

The future of Headstart will be brighter for having all of the related resources of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare at its disposal, under the monitoring eye of the Secretary, Bob Finch, of HEW. I hope that the functioning and scope of the Headstart program can be expanded and made more effective.

Headstart is of particular interest to me. We have seen in Philadelphia, where children younger than the normal Headstart age are included in a program called Get Set, how important the earliest possible involvement of children in such a program can be. Therefore, I was particularly heartened to note that the President, in discussing early childhood development said:

So crucial is the matter of early growth that we must make a national commitment to providing all American children an opportunity for healthful and stimulating development during the first five years of life.

As he pledged himself to that commitment, I am sure Congress will also.

I am personally very persuaded by the logic that Headstart—and hopefully such attendant programs as Get Set—will benefit greatly by association with other child development programs within HEW and with the many research programs through various institutes under the command of HEW.

I accept the President's invitation to make suggestions on Headstart, Get Set, and possibly other programs heretofore administered under the OEO, and I may have more to say on that subject in the near future.

#### NEW TERRORIST ATTACK ON ISRAELI AIRLINER FURTHER IMPERILS MIDDLE EAST PEACE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, yesterday's attack by Arab terrorists upon a loaded, fully fueled Israeli commercial airline at

Zurich's Kloten Airport—the third such attack in recent months—once again inflames the passions of the Middle East and threatens again to explode the present Arab-Israeli "whisper war" into a full-scale conflagration. Once again, the act of a handful of terrorists could bring the United States and the Soviet Union a step closer to the military confrontation both sides are seeking to avoid in this tortured area.

The gravest mistake the world could now make would be to regard this latest attack on an El Al passenger plane as just another isolated incident in the chain of so-called incidents that have violated the cease-fire agreement negotiated in the Security Council to end the 1967 6-day war.

The world reacted in silence to the Arab attack 2 months ago on the Israeli airliner in Athens, only to find its voice in declarations of outrage over the Israeli retaliatory raid upon Beirut International Airport. This made a very bad impression, because it was so onerous in adopting the Security Council resolution.

There are two lessons to be learned, in my judgment, from the first incident in Athens. The first lesson is that the Israeli Government regards an attack on its commercial airline as an attack on its major lifeline with the outside world. Surrounded on three sides by enemies and on the fourth side by the sea, Israel must regard threats to the survival of its airline as threats to its survival as a nation.

The second lesson was the December 31 U.N. Security Council resolution, for which the United States voted, which condemned Israel for its attack on empty aircraft in Beirut, but completely ignored the Arab attack in Athens aimed at destroying an Israeli commercial airliner and all its passengers. This U.N. action obviously did nothing to discourage these outrages, because here we have another, again imperiling passengers and wounding six of them, one very seriously.

What is to be done? I suggest the following. The U.N. Security Council must take a hard and realistic look at the attack in Zurich and must be prepared to act rather than react with discriminatory impotence, as it did before. U.N. Secretary General U Thant has thus far limited himself to a denunciation of the terrorist action and an expression of hope that it "will not be followed by an act of retaliation." He has said terrorist attacks should be condemned by all governments if civil aviation is to be saved "from chaos and anarchy." But he is still to reveal what role, if any, he believes the United Nations can play in bringing this about.

Are we to wait again for the Israelis, angered and frustrated by the silence and inaction of this world body, perhaps to strike out with another retaliatory blow? Or are we ready to confront the Security Council with the full measure of the dilemma of Arab terrorism, including the direct responsibility of the Arab governments for the acts of these terrorist bands?

If we are to have any hope of the Israel Government displaying the restraint asked for by U Thant in the face

of this latest attack, we must choose, in my judgment, the course of action of facing the Security Council of the United Nations—and perhaps the General Assembly, if the Security Council will not act—with the situation.

The Israelis must be encouraged to bring their grievance before the Security Council, a body which, incidentally, they now think is a kangaroo court, with six of its 15 seats occupied by nations that do not afford diplomatic recognition to Israel and with a Soviet veto looming over any of its deliberations which might censure any Arab state. If the Security Council proves to be a forum that will not work, then perhaps the General Assembly of the United Nations can do better; and it must be prepared to condemn the Arab governments which give encouragement, financial assistance, and even military training to the terrorist groups.

It must weigh the recent statements of President Nasser and King Hussein in open support of the terrorists against their declarations of seeking a peaceful settlement with Israel. Obviously, a "solution of the Palestine problem," as President Nasser calls it, by illegal terrorist acts, cannot be compatible with sincere peace efforts; and, the support by President Nasser and King Hussein for such acts should be condemned by the United Nations.

The Nixon administration should take the lead both in the U.N. and in the Four Power talks on the Middle East to make an end to terrorist activities an integral part of any move toward a peace settlement suggested to Israel and the Arab States.

It is a tense moment in the Middle East and it is growing more intense. Mr. President, the point I make an effort to show today is that we cannot seek to bring about peace between the parties when there are armed attacks by terrorist bands of organized governments which say they want a peaceful solution. The two do not go together. Nobody is being fooled, because the situation is growing more intense every day.

I invite the attention of our Government and the United Nations, of which we are such an important member, to this situation in the hope that perhaps in the General Assembly, if not in the Security Council, some more constructive move can be made than has been made up to now.

#### SENTINEL ANTI-BALLISTIC-MISSILE SYSTEM

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, nearly 2 weeks ago Secretary of Defense Laird announced that all construction work on deploying the Sentinel ABM system would be halted, pending completion of a Pentagon review of our major weapons system. This was heartening news to those of us who opposed deployment of the Sentinel, for it seemed to indicate a genuine intent to conduct a dispassionate, inclusive, and exhaustive review of the premises underlying the decision to deploy the Sentinel.

From all available indications, however, this review is not dispassionate; not exhaustive; and not inclusive. In fact,

the decision to resume construction on Sentinel deployment seems to have already been made, if it was ever seriously in question within the Pentagon. Today's newspapers carry stories, based on a press conference yesterday by Secretary Laird and Deputy Secretary Packard, that deployment of Sentinel is a virtual certainty, although the form of the system may be somewhat different than that previously planned.

I would point out that as far as I am concerned, it is not the form of Sentinel which so concerns me, as much as it is the substance of it. And a review which urges changes in only the form, as an attempt to mollify those of us concerned with the substance, is really no review at all.

Because of my concern that we in the Congress have as much and as accurate information as possible on the Sentinel system, I have asked two very distinguished Americans to organize and prepare a report for me and my colleagues on all aspects of the Sentinel system. For far too many years, we have not had readily available to the public at large anything but the official administration reports on national defense projects. It is high time, I think, that a non-Pentagon report be made generally available.

The two individuals who will organize this report are Dr. Jerome B. Weisner of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Prof. Abram Chayes of Harvard University. Dr. Weisner was formerly the science adviser to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, and Professor Chayes the legal adviser to the Department of State from 1961 to 1964. I think they bring to a study of this type a unique mixture of scientific and foreign relations experience at the highest levels of our Government. Dr. Wiesner and Professor Chayes will be joined in their work by other distinguished experts in the technical and policy fields, and they will have their report prepared in 3 or 4 weeks.

I have previously here in the Senate set out my objections to deployment of the Sentinel system, as have many of my colleagues.

I believe that were we to move ahead with deployment of Sentinel, we would have spent what now appears to be in the neighborhood of \$10 billion—to provide us not with security, but with false security. I do not think that we should commit, now, these sums to the Sentinel system. We should instead continue our research and development efforts, and seek with greater intensity to begin disarmament talks. For the future of the world lies more surely not in more arms stockpiles, but in less; not in more hostility and distrust, but in greater understanding; not in another round in the arms race, but in cooperative efforts to slow down.

I firmly believe that deploying Sentinel would be a major national error. I shall do what I can to see that it is not deployed.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have followed with some interest, not

on the floor, but through the press, the efforts engaged in by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts in this whole field of antiballistic missiles.

It may come as some surprise to the Senator to find out that I am not married to either the thin or the thick system, should one be suggested. I am trying to listen to both sides, in order to make up my mind.

From what I have been able to read in the past week about the position of the Air Force on the anti-ballistic-missile system—and I have not heard this officially from the Air Force or from any friends connected with that organization—it seems that their approach might well be one of dropping the protection of our cities and protecting our hardened sites. If that is the suggestion of the Air Force, would that change the Senator's attitude toward an ABM system, whether thin or thick?

Mr. KENNEDY. I think that the principal objections stated and the reservations given in my letter of 2 weeks ago to Secretary Laird, and here today, are that the whole concept should be reviewed by the appropriate committees. The distinguished Chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) indicated just about 10 days ago that his committee would have full hearings. I believe also that we should have some judgments in regard to the implications in the field of foreign policy. As the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) pointed out, in the last hearing we had on the Sentinel program, only Administration witnesses were called. Certainly it seems appropriate that other witnesses should be called who can make helpful and useful comments with regard to the total deployment of this weapons system. Certainly it should be an area on which we should gather information.

At noon today, I had an informative luncheon with Mr. George Rathgens, who has recently written for the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace an extensive analysis of the whole ABM system. He is generally recognized as one of our experts on this subject. He has sincere reservations about deploying Sentinel for the protection of hardened sites. He says that such protection can be provided more effectively with other defensive weapons systems, and that we really would be buying very little protection for the hardened sites. This would be precisely the kind of thing I would hope Senators could get information on, to find out whether the best and most effective way to provide for the protection of these hardened sites is through Sentinel or some other means.

There are reasonable questions about it. I think all of us would like to have the best judgments we can get, in order to respond to those questions. The Armed Services Committee, through its chairman, has indicated that they have many questions to ask, and they want not only administration witnesses, but also other witnesses, so that the Senate itself will benefit from their judgments. I think that is really what my comments relate to.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I think that the Senator from Massachu-

setts has made worthwhile contributions to this whole field. Undoubtedly, there will be much debate and discussion on it. I think that any additions we can get from the fields of science, engineering, and physics would be wise.

I recall, 4 or 5 years ago, when the test ban treaty was up for discussion, that we heard testimony before the Subcommittee on Preparedness Investigating which caused, I believe, all but two members of that subcommittee to vote against the test ban treaty.

I might say that the information is still there. Unfortunately, it is not available.

I also recall a specific question I asked relative to the ABM system and the test ban treaty. In fact, I remember the rather facetious way I put it—and it is even more facetious now—as I said to this learned doctor, "Suppose I were President of the United States—" He kind of chuckled. I did, too. I continued, "And I asked you to develop an ABM system for me. Could you guarantee that it would work without being tested?"

He replied, "No, I could not."

Thus, I think all of these things bear. In other words, can we develop an ABM system that will work with knowledge gained only by underground testing? These things are all matters that Senators should know about because Senators have suggested, many times, even a thin system that, frankly, I can not buy because its protection is directed only to one area of our great sphere.

If we get into the full field of protection against all sources of atomic or nuclear weapons, it will be a devilishly costly thing. I would hope that we could hear from all sides on this subject. As I have already said, I am not particularly married even to the need for one, at the present time; but I know that we have some very grave problems to consider in developing one.

I think that the Air Force, the Army, and others in the military and scientific fields connected with the Government who will contribute to this, are already concerned about it. I hope that we can spend a good, long, deliberative period here before we do one thing or the other.

Mr. KENNEDY. I want to comment on the remarks just made by the Senator from Arizona because I know considerations of national security have been something in which he has been deeply interested and concerned.

I think that all of us feel that this country is wealthy enough to support whatever efforts are necessary for our security. There have been, over the course of developing this program, some serious questions raised as to how much security such a system would provide.

It was because of that, I think, that the distinguished Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER) and the distinguished Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), who have been the strong leaders in this field—and many others—were very much appreciative of the indication by Secretary Laird that there would be a total review.

It is because it appears to me, at this time, that such a total review does not appear to be in the cards, that I rose on

the floor of the Senate today to make my comments.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, one bit of information which I should like to suggest, because I think it bears exactly on what both Senators have been saying, in the hearings yesterday, before the Committee on Foreign Relations on the nonproliferation treaty, the issue arose whether article 6 of that treaty imposed an obligation on us to try to negotiate first in good faith with the Soviet Union for disarmament, which everyone admitted, including the Secretary of State included the ABM system. Before we went ahead with it in any way, it is a pertinent and a real question, and not just tautological.

But what the Senator is saying, and the Senator from Arizona as well, puts me in mind of the following: That what we need very quickly—and both Senators agree—is some appraisal by the Defense Department, and before our committees, as to the timing of this which the security of our country requires.

In other words, even for the opponents and the proponents, if we all know that 30, 60, 90, or 120 days are not going to make a basic material difference, I think we would be much more reassured in fighting for and sustaining the respective positions, whatever they may be.

The idea that, "Well, nobody knows; we do not know; maybe it is too late now; maybe we have to decide tomorrow," is a very nagging consideration. So, as a part of this record—and I agree that what both Senators have said is splendid—at the very least we ought to know, from very authoritative sources, what maneuverable time we have to discuss the matter, or does anybody claim we are immediately being prejudiced so we cannot talk about it?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield, so I may answer, in part, the Senator from New York?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I feel sure that when the Armed Services Committee discusses the nonproliferation treaty many of these questions can be answered. Now, whether they can be answered to the point of where we can satisfy the public, or even the Senate, is a different question, because much of it is very classified information. But with reference to the nonproliferation treaty and the timetable, I think the timetable is pretty much up to us.

I think the Soviets have accomplished what they have wanted to accomplish in the field of weapons, for example. They are ahead of us. Whether we are going to get into a race or not is a matter that is up to the Defense Department. We have heard fairly accurate reports, although I would want to field one myself before I would assume it, that they have accomplished an ABM system around their hardened sites, which I would say puts them in a position of being able to bargain.

As far as the timetable is concerned,

they are not going to be hurt in their bargaining from a position of strength, while we would be bargaining from a position of weakness. So I think the timetable can work to our advantage, because if we take time, if we do not rush into this thing, if we take time to hear from the scientists and the military particularly, I think we can stretch it out. I think the longer we stretch the suggestion or consideration of the nonproliferation treaty, the better the understanding will be between the Soviets and ourselves as to what we intend to do and what they intend to do.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, with respect to the pertinent comments that the Senators have made, would it not be of advantage to us to perhaps have the "leap-frogging"? Often it is not a disadvantage if we start a little later and get the benefit of all the mistakes made by the others before us.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I would say, getting into the field of weaponry, that would be a statement that could be substantiated. However, I do not like to see the United States back of any potential enemy. However, we get into a field that has no relation to this, although I feel I have to mention it. In the field of aeronautics we are now definitely behind the Soviets. That is not a matter that we are going to discuss in the treaty as of now. It is a fact. It is a question of whether we are willing to drag on another 8 years without equipment to match them in the air, if we have to do it, over Red China, or the Formosa Straits, or Vietnam. I think this gets into a matter of urgency, whereas I do not think the fact that we are behind the Soviets in weaponry or the ABM makes for any particular need of speedy consideration of a treaty that will have a great bearing on whether we want to catch up with them, and then whether we decide to.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I would like at this time to call attention to the outstanding research and reporting work on the ABM issue done by a newspaper in my home State of Massachusetts.

Mr. Everett S. Allen, assistant to the editor of the New Bedford Standard-Times, has written a 12-part series which examines the ABM issue in great detail. Mr. Allen came to Washington to gather material for this series, and he has presented the entire controversy in depth.

I would like to commend Mr. Allen and the New Bedford Standard-Times for bringing this kind of responsible and pertinent reporting to their readers. I would like as well to call the series to the attention of my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE CASE AGAINST ABM—I: EVEN MILITARY IS SHARPLY DIVIDED

(NOTE.—Deployment of the multibillion-dollar anti-ballistic-missile system called Sentinel, the first battery of which was sched-

uled to be located in Greater Boston, has provoked a nationwide storm of criticism and controversy. As a sequel to its initial in-depth survey of ABM conducted more than two years ago, *The Standard-Times* presents 12 articles, of which this is the first, documenting the case for halting Sentinel deployment.)

(By Everett S. Allen)

WASHINGTON.—“I don't know why a nation that is approaching a trillion dollars in the gross national product can't afford a gadget to protect its civilization,” Rep. L. Mendel Rivers, D-S.C., chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, commented in August 1966, in defending deployment of an antiballistic missile system.

Rivers' comment was made to *The Standard-Times*, which published at that time one of the nation's first in-depth studies of the controversial ABM system and concluded the weapon was too costly, too unreliable and that we should not go ahead with it.

On Feb. 7 of this year, Rivers said he wholeheartedly agreed with the decision of the day before by Defense Secretary Melvin F. Laird to halt work on the Sentinel ABM system, pending high-level review of it.

Said Rivers, “I want to be sure that (it) is the best system and that there isn't a system less costly.”

This about-face by the House Armed Services Committee chairman is a direct reaction to the growing tide of broadly based objection to ABM deployment.

That objection was evident on Jan. 29 in Reading, when Greater Boston residents booed Brig. Gen. Robert P. Young of the Army Engineers Corps because he protested, “When you refer to the antiballistic missile system as the Army's program, you must remember it is the nation's program.”

The boozing symbolized the fact that the ABM is the most controversial weapons system in the history of the United States, that its scheduled “thin line” deployment—ostensibly to protect the nation against Communist Chinese intercontinental ballistic missile attacks—has aroused unprecedented opposition among both experts and the general public.

#### MILITARY DIVIDED

Even the military is sharply divided on whether the system would work or add anything to our national security.

ABM promises to be one of the major issues facing the Nixon administration and the Congress.

This *Standard-Times* series, based on interviews with scientists, legislators, records of congressional proceedings and research of Washington files, is designed to define the ABM question and to document the extensive evidence proving that deployment of the system now is a wasteful boondoggle.

The divergent views this subject embraces are made clear in the following comments:

Sen. Russell, D-Ga., urging approval of \$387.4 million in procurement and deployment funds for ABM: “If the world ever has to start over with a new Adam and Eve after a nuclear holocaust, then I want them to be Americans, not Russians.”

Dr. Jerome Wiesner, former science adviser to President Kennedy on weapons systems: “The ABM system planned by the Pentagon is both needless and useless. I don't think we know how to build an ABM system that would really be any good.”

#### THIN-LINE SYSTEM

The system now under reconsideration is a \$6 to \$9-billion “thin-line” defense against a Chinese Communist attack, although Russell and many others have pointed out that this setup, called Sentinel, might well be the cornerstone for a full ABM system against Russia that could cost \$50 billion, or much more.

Thus far, no one, not even limited ABM

proponents, have suggested that the “state of the art” would permit us to build an antimissile system that would be effective against Russia.

The Sentinel system as now planned provides for deployment throughout the United States of from 15 to 20 batteries. The missiles are expected to cost from \$1 million to \$2 million apiece; each of the related radar units would cost an estimated \$100 million, and operating costs for the system have been estimated by the Army at \$500 million a year.

Opponents suggest this figure is low, and would more likely reach \$1 billion a year.

It was expected that the first battery would be operational in the early 1970s and the entire system within five or six years. The three sites thus far selected include Boston, Chicago and Seattle, and mounting public opposition—for a wide variety of reasons—has erupted in each.

#### TWO TYPES OF MISSILES

What is the Sentinel system?

It is composed of two types of missiles and two types of radars, the latter feeding impulses to a computerized central “nervous system.”

One radar is a Perimeter Acquisition Radar (PAR), a long-range detection and tracking instrument capable of scanning the horizon. The other radar is a Missile Site Radar (MSR), designed to track incoming targets at shorter ranges than the PAR and to track U.S. missiles to their encounter with an attacking missile.

The larger of the two missiles is Spartan, a three-staged rocket with a range of several hundred miles. It carries a nuclear warhead and is designed to intercept incoming missiles above the earth's atmosphere.

The smaller missile is Sprint. It also is nuclear-tipped; has two stages and, like Spartan, is fired from an underground silo. It has high speed and limited range and is designed to intercept attacking missiles that have pierced the long-range Spartan defenses.

In theory, the system would begin to function when incoming missiles were spotted by PAR more than 1,000 miles away. PAR would track them for a minute or two, establish their trajectory, and feed the data to a computer.

A Spartan missile would be launched to intercept the attacking missiles hundreds of miles distant in outer space. It would fly at about 5,000 miles an hour and, at its nearest point to the enemy missile, explode its hydrogen warhead with the impact of millions of tons of TNT.

#### BACKUP MISSILE

Any enemy weapons penetrating this nuclear defense would encounter the short-range Sprint, which is capable of climbing thousands of feet in a few seconds, and of making interceptions between 5,000 and 100,000 feet, at ranges between 15 and 25 miles.

Sprint's operation is all within the earth's atmosphere, where it is easier for radar to identify decoys and other devices designed to confuse the defender. Its warhead is smaller than that of Spartan; its explosion probably would be about 20 miles in the air.

Spartan is 55 feet long and 50 times as powerful as the 27-foot interceptor Sprint. As Dr. Ralph E. Lapp, a leading U.S. nuclear scientist, has commented, “(Sprint's) primary purpose is to protect the Sentinel's radar sites, without which the whole system would be useless. In a ‘thick’ system, however, thousands of Sprints would be required to deal with warheads that have evaded the Spartan defenses.”

ABM sites, as demonstrated by that in Greater Boston, the first in the nation, require 180 to 250 acres. In the case of Boston, the PAR would be located in a state-owned forest in North Andover. The remainder of the installation, including the MSR, Sprint

and Spartan missile “farms” and auxiliary equipment, would be located at Camp Curtis Guild, which is in Reading, Wakefield and Lynnfield. The commonwealth also owns the Curtis Guild property.

At the Jan. 29 meeting in Reading High School of largely anti-ABM residents, former presidential aide Richard N. Goodwin declared, in referring to the argument that ABMs could be used to destroy enemy missiles fired by accident, “We are reaching a major point in the nuclear era. For the first time in the atomic age (if ABM is deployed), there will be no reasonable time to reach a presidential or cabinet decision about using nuclear weapons.”

#### THE CASE AGAINST ABM—II: REACTION DELAY PUZZLES BRASS

(By Everett S. Allen)

WASHINGTON.—The leisurely crystallization of Greater Boston opposition to ABM (called by one Reading protester the “bomb in the backyard”) has mystified some government and Army officials who point out that at least some area residents have known for months what was intended.

In the beginning, only the Camp Curtis Guild proposal attracted much opposition. There was concern about the unpleasant appearance of a military facility in the choice suburban area, the threat of lowered property values, higher insurance rates, and radar interference with television reception.

Yet as recently as the middle of January, Sens. Edward W. Brooke, R-Mass., and Edward M. Kennedy, D-Mass., reported no large volume of protesting mail.

This is not the case now; grass-roots opposition is rising rapidly, and one anti-ABM senator predicted that “the initial flow makes me suspect it is going to get very, very heavy.”

#### ASKS FOR HALT

The rise in protest moved Kennedy on Feb. 1 to ask the administration for a halt in ABM site preparation until Congress can reappraise the system.

The same protest prompted the administration to reply a week later by announcing suspension of work on the \$6-\$9 billion Sentinel system.

In part, the delay in opposition may have had little to do with the real issues or—public safety and need for effectiveness of the weapon—but may have stemmed from general lack of information and a belief that an ABM site “in the backyard” would be good for the local economy.

A Sentinel Systems Command official to whom I talked cited the case of the civilian at an antimissile briefing who said, “I thought we'd had antimissile missiles deployed for years.”

As for the economy, and the community relationship generally, this is what a local ABM site amounts to, as demonstrated by the Reading-Wakefield situation:

The Army proposes spending \$100 million on each site. Here in Massachusetts, approximately 1,300 workers would be expected to take two years to complete the project. If the ABM battery is completed, it will be manned by approximately 600 people, including 300 civilians. Barracks would be constructed on the base for an estimated 200 unmarried soldiers.

Electricity and water would be purchased from the town of Wakefield. The payroll for each proposed ABM site has been estimated at from \$2 million to \$3.5 million annually. Some off-base housing would be required. The Army has said there would be less than “one child per class at the elementary level” added to local school systems.

#### NO TALL STRUCTURES

In terms of esthetics, the Army has emphasized there would be no tall structures (the MSR building is 30 feet high and 120 feet on a side, trapezoidal); the missiles would be underground, and has promised

to plant trees in response to protesters who do not want to look at a missile base.

But the opposition rises, in large measure concerned with what is acknowledged by both pro and anti-ABM camps as the "remote" chance of an ABM accidental explosion. Even though there has been no such accident in all of the 24 years since Hiroshima, Chicago ABM opponents called the possibility a "serious safety threat."

What they are immediately concerned about is the proximity of the ABM sites thus far selected to major population areas. David R. Inglis, senior physicist at Argonne National Laboratory, concluded, "There is no serious reason for the Spartans to be close to cities, since their effectiveness must be nearly uniform over the central part of the 600 to 1,000-mile wide region they attempt to defend.

"Designers have worked hard to make the control devices as effective as possible, and they must be good, for the record is very good. However, the Spartan warhead, described as 'in the megaton range,' indicates a weapon approximately a hundred times as powerful as the bomb that destroyed Hiroshima and took 230,000 lives from a half-mile in the air. Its local fallout from an accidental surface blast would be highly lethal."

At the Reading public meeting on Jan. 29, George Rathjens, MIT faculty member and former deputy director of the Defense Department's Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA) under President Kennedy, said the Army feels it must have ABM sites near large cities "for any significant protection against Russia."

Officially, neither the Army nor the government ever has conceded that the present "thin" defense is intended as anything but a shield against the Chinese Communist nuclear threat.

#### ACCIDENT IMPROBABLE

Dr. Rathjens acknowledged that an accidental explosion at an ABM site is "extremely improbable," but added that if the warhead of a Spartan missile, with an explosive power of 1 million tons of TNT, went off accidentally, it would cause nearly total destruction for a radius of five miles.

Fear of such a possibility, remote though it may be, has prompted the Northern Illinois Citizens Against the ABM to file a lawsuit seeking to force the Army to drop its Glenview site near Chicago.

Reacting to this type of pressure, the Army recently conceded that it would be feasible to install ABMs a hundred miles from Chicago and still defend the city against an unsophisticated Chinese missile threat. But the Army insisted that as Peking improves its missile capability, defenses much closer to the city would be required.

The public safety fear, even though the Army, on the basis of its own record, probably can answer this criticism better than others, seems to be the trigger that has fired the strengthening anti-ABM movement.

If opposition to antimissile deployment ever could have been dismissed as a crusade embraced only by the advocates of "make peace, not war," that is no longer accurate.

There is a broad base of protest, ranging from the scientist who says ABM won't work, including the admiral or general who thinks weapon dollars are better spent on offense, to the taxpayer who says, in effect, "I don't think a military base in my community will be an asset, and I don't want to spend every day wondering whether my community will be the first to break the Army's excellent record of no accidental nuclear explosions."

THE CASE AGAINST ABM—III: SHELTER SYSTEM, A QUESTION MARK  
(By Everett S. Allen)

WASHINGTON.—"The presence of an antiballistic missile (site) near a city may re-

quire civil defense shelters in order to protect the city, not merely from incoming bombs, but from atomic bombs used by its own ABM.

"The question of the need for civil defense to accompany ABM is in dispute and has not been frankly discussed by the Department of Defense at any great length."

This is the conclusion of an analysis by the ABM committee of the Seattle Assn. of the Federation of American Scientists, headed by Phillip A. Ekstrom, predoctoral research associate in physics, at the University of Washington.

Advocates of an ABM-oriented shelter system estimate its cost at \$50 billion.

The reference to "atomic bombs used by its own ABM" means the short-range back-up missile, Sprint, designed to explode in the earth's atmosphere, at an altitude of 20 miles or less.

#### DIVIDED ON CIVIL DEFENSE

The diametric difference of opinion among experts as to the importance of civil defense with relation to ABM is a major contributing factor to the rising public uneasiness that may force the government to permanently halt deployment of the system.

For example, Lt. Gen. Alfred D. Starbird, the Army's manager for the Sentinel system, said, "If it ever became necessary to launch, the missile would leave the silo and fly to an exceedingly high altitude. It would be disarmed; it would continue to be disarmed, throughout much of its flight. It would have to stay disarmed; it could not be armed until it was at an altitude where it cannot harm persons or structures or facilities on the ground..."

"I have lived with the design and the safety features in weapon systems for a great many years. It is my personal opinion that there cannot be, it is not possible to have, a harmful nuclear explosion with this system, and with the elements as contemplated for deployment."

A related question was included in an Army fact sheet made available last November:

Q. Does the presence of a Sentinel site near a city increase the possibility that the city will be a target?

A. The major cities, of course, are already prime targets due to their larger population and industrial importance. Whether the presence of Sentinel will further increase the priority of any one in the eyes of an enemy power is a matter that is difficult to assess. However, the presence of Sentinel will significantly increase the protection of the populace and the area from missile attack.

#### SAY REASONS GOOD

However, the Seattle committee concluded that the government's "reticence about including among (ABM site) criteria the fact that the radars and Sprint missiles are to be placed next to cities is understandable because there are good reasons for keeping the sites away from cities."

This view is buttressed by two arguments:

1. The Chinese may attempt to knock out the ABM radar sites in a first-wave of intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM) so that following waves would not be blunted by the long-range Spartan missiles, and so might attack the sites heavily. This suggests that the radar sites could become in Dr. Ralph Lapp's phrase, "megaton magnets," drawing a disproportionately large number of atom bombs to the site and, if the sites are next to cities, to the adjoining cities.

Obviously, if the Sprint missile system should fail, this large number of bombs would explode near the sites and their adjoining cities.

2. Even if the system does not fail and Sprints are detonated in the atmosphere above the radar sites, the committee found that "the resulting heat, light and blast may

cause very great damage in nearby cities, as Lapp and others have pointed out."

Further, the use of increasingly good decoys by the enemy—acknowledged as inevitable by both pro and anti-ABM forces—presumably would mean that these explosions would occur at lower altitudes, nearer people.

#### MUST INCLUDE SHELTERS

The Seattle group found that if any ABM system, even an "austere" anti-Chinese system, is to be effective in saving American lives, then it should also include "an adequate shelter system" for our civilian population.

To build an ABM system without providing blast and fall-out protection for the population, the West Coast scientists concluded, "would remove any aspect of credibility in the argument that ABM is primarily intended to defend the population."

This is an important point because the argument has been made in defense of ABM deployment, by Gen. Earle Wheeler, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, former Defense Secretary McNamara, and former President Johnson.

The Defense Department budget for fiscal year 1969 did, in fact, include \$77 million for the civil defense program, of which approximately \$31 million was for shelter development and acquisition.

However, the Seattle group compared this figure with estimates of costs for "realistic protection" against nuclear attack made by Holmes and Narver, Inc., for the Oak Ridge National Laboratory in 1965.

This study analyzed the tunnel grid blast shelter concept developed by the Project Harbor Civil Defense Study Group, which was directed by Prof. Eugene Wigner of Princeton University. It provides for one month's occupancy by urban populations, against fallout and to withstand blast overpressures up to 100 pounds per square inch. This degree of blast protection, incidentally, is substantially less than that now given to Minuteman missiles in hardened silos.

The cost for such shelters was estimated to be \$515 per person, at 1968 prices. The estimate does not include the cost of land or maintenance and stocking of food and medical supplies. At the estimated price, the cost to afford this degree of protection to our urban population of about 75 million people would be more than \$38 billion.

#### MORE FOR TOWNS

To provide such protection for our population in small towns and rural areas would cost much more. According to this reasoning, protection of our civilian population, which is the principal stated reason for deploying a Chinese-oriented ABM, should cost about 10 times the estimated cost of the ABM hardware (at least \$5 billion).

The Seattle group concluded, "Instead, we find that the present Defense Department budget calls for a total civilian defense outlay in fiscal 1969 of only 6 percent of the ABM allocation.

"At this point, one is forced to ask whether the proponents of the ABM system are indeed concerned with saving American lives."

Congressional concern over the type and number of shelters that ought to supplement an ABM system, even a "thin" one, is mounting.

Sen. Kennedy, D-Mass., Democratic whip and in the forefront of legislators who urged reappraisal of ABM, has concluded the antiballistic missile defense is "not valid" without a shelter system, the initial cost of which has been estimated at at least \$15 billion.

THE CASE AGAINST ABM—IV: WHO SAYS ABM'S WON'T WORK, AND WHY?

(By Everett S. Allen)

WASHINGTON.—Leading American scientists, including all of the science advisers of the last three presidents, oppose ABM de-

ployment because (a) they are convinced we do not yet know how to build an effective antimissile system, and (b) such a defense as we are able to build can be easily and cheaply overcome.

Former Defense Secretary McNamara, who for years resisted pressures to deploy ABM, who was thoroughly familiar with military and technical factors involved, commented, in urging more research and development, rather than deployment. "Let me make it very clear that the cost in itself is not the problem; the penetrability of the proposed shield is the problem."

The weaknesses of the Sentinel ABM system that the Army now had been authorized to deploy have been stressed repeatedly by members of the scientific community, including Richard L. Garwin, director of applied research at the Thomas J. Watson research center of the International Business Machines Corp., and Hans A. Bethe, Nobel prize winner and physics professor at Cornell University, in the March 1968 issue of *Scientific American*.

They are summarized as follows:

1. Spartan interceptors would cost \$1 million to \$2 million. It is reasonable to assume that warheads could be delivered by an attacker for less than it would cost the defender to intercept them.

2. The attacker could concentrate his strike on a few targets so that most of the interceptors would have nothing to shoot at.

#### EXHAUSTED BY DECOYS

3. Several hundred to several thousand relatively cheap decoys launched by a few large vehicles would readily exhaust a Sentinel-like system. The attack with real warheads then could follow.

4. Since the Communist Chinese ICBM system still is in the early research and development state, it can and would be designed to deal with the Sentinel system, whose interceptors and sensors are nearly in production and are rather well publicized, and would not all be in place until 1975.

5. A variety of penetration aids are available to an attacker. These are inexpensive and include balloon decoys shaped like re-entry vehicles that are made of plastic and covered with foil or wire mesh, and fine metal wires of "chaff," scattered in large quantities to confuse the defensive radar.

6. A "blackout" of defensive radar could be caused by the large number of free electrons released by a nuclear explosion. This is because the electrons in an ionized cloud of gas have the property of bending and absorbing electromagnetic waves. This effect can reach such proportions that the defensive radar is prevented from seeing any object behind the ionized cloud.

Such a blackout can be caused both by the defensive nuclear explosions themselves or by deliberate explosions set off at high altitudes by the attacker. The offense might reasonably sacrifice a few early missiles to cause blackout at strategic radar locations.

#### HAVE MANY OPTIONS

Nuclear scientist Ralph E. Lapp has concluded that, "The Chinese have a variety of options they might exercise to outwit a defense shield. A 'thin' ballistic shield is apt to leak badly if attacked by missiles that deploy decoys and other devices to confuse the defense.

"The Chinese might follow our example by fitting a multiplicity of individual nuclear explosives in each ICBM nose cone. (This is called MIRV (multiple independently targeted re-entry vehicles.) It will enable a single ICBM to carry as many as 10 warheads, each of which can be precisely directed at a particular target.

"The use of large numbers of warheads allows us an attacker to saturate a defense system; he simply fires more warheads into certain ballistic corridors than the 'thin' system's antimissile missiles can handle and thereby simply overwhelms the defense.

"A crude and cheap Chinese copy of MIRV, employing a cluster of warheads and a cloud of decoys on a single target could be the downfall of a Sentinel System."

It also is noteworthy that, since the Chinese would have to shoot their missiles 9,000 miles (2,000 miles farther than would the Soviets) in order to reach America, they might choose not to build an arsenal of land-based ICBMs.

If they fired missiles from either surface or submarine vessels at much shorter range, Sentinel would constitute no defense, since it is not built to repel such an attack.

#### COULD SMUGGLE BOMB

The ABM Committee of the Seattle Assn. of Scientists of the Federation of American Scientists has pointed out that China also could:

1. Circumvent the ABM system with "an end run." The most dramatic of these is the smuggled bomb. Said the committee, "We have for at least 10 years had in our arsenal a nuclear warhead six inches in diameter, for use in an artillery shell. Even much larger warheads could be smuggled into the country in innumerable ways and delivered by hand to their targets.

2. Detonate a "dirty" bomb upwind from its target. Such a blast could be delivered by missile to a point far from its real target. Winds would deliver the resulting radioactivity to the desired target. Alternately, a "dirty" underwater burst just off our West Coast would "literally rain destruction on coastal cities."

Concluded the University of Washington scientists' committee, "A missile defense against China, effective even until 1980 (Defense Department estimate) would require far more than the proposed Sentinel deployment and would leave us completely undefended against many unconventional, but highly effective, styles of attack."

#### ALREADY OBSOLETE

Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, provost of MIT and President Kennedy's science adviser, believes the Sentinel System is technically obsolete already.

Dr. Wiesner said, "I have come to the conclusion that any system that depends on projectiles rather than, say, on nuclear rays or electromagnetic beams or laser beams is fighting a losing fight . . .

"I don't think the defender nation is ever to know what to expect. I am convinced that the variety of techniques available to a nation planning an offensive system is great enough to keep an antiballistic missile system of the kind we are talking about totally off balance.

"Just the thought that we might develop an ABM system and, therefore, that the Russians might do the same caused us to develop a whole set of offensive countermeasures that make our Air Force and Navy confident that we do not have to worry about a Russian antimissile system." (These include missiles carrying several warheads (MIRVs) and the possibility of using the blackout attack against Soviet defense radar.)

"One of the interesting things about the ABM arguments is that the purpose seems very slippery. We were told that the Sentinel was to protect us against irrational behavior of the Chinese. Many people would contend that our already existing deterrent system will do this adequately.

"Further, a careful analysis of the Sentinel system cannot be shown to provide protection against Chinese nuclear weapons for very long unless you make some unbelievably naive assumptions about the Chinese—that they do not have access to our newspapers, or to our journals, or that they are not thinking people.

#### TIME TO RESPOND

"Many people do not realize that you cannot snap your fingers and wish into existence

the kind of an ABM system being argued about. They do not realize that if we build an ABM system and the Russians regard it as something they do not like, they have lots of time to respond; or that if they build an ABM system, we have time to respond."

Dr. Wiesner has called the Sentinel system "senseless and totally unnecessary." He noted that he had opposed it from the beginning because "If it were effective at all, it would be only for a very short time, and I believe that it would be only a matter of time before the pressures would develop to expand Sentinel into a very costly and clearly inadequate anti-Soviet system. The Senate debate of last June shows that those pressures have already begun."

Finally, even Dr. Edward Teller, who favors Sentinel deployment, has acknowledged publicly that, although we have tested the ABM's components separately, including the nuclear device underground, we do not know how they would perform "all in one package" and cannot find out, short of war or accident, because of the nuclear test-ban treaty.

#### THE CASE AGAINST ABM—V: ABM DEBATE IN THE SENATE

(By Everett S. Allen)

WASHINGTON.—Underlying last year's Senate battle, unsuccessful yet valiant, to block ABM deployment, was the suggestion that factors other than national security motivated some members to press for construction of the Sentinel sites.

Sen. Margaret Chase Smith, R-Maine, senior GOP member of the Armed Services Committee, said, "There are strong possibilities, if not probabilities, that by the time this so-called 'thin' defense against Red China is completed, it will have become obsolete because of the rapid rate of development and change in the state of the art.

"This program has strong characteristics of being only a sop to those who have insisted on a full-scale ABM system."

#### CAN AFFORD TO WAIT

Her statement was extraordinary because Sen. Smith usually is found on the side of the military, yet strength is added to her conjecture because of the largely unanswered arguments against deployment raised by her colleagues.

They may be summarized as follows:

Sen. Hart, D-Mich.: We can afford to wait because according to Assistant Secretary of Defense Warnke, there has been "at least a one-year slip in the Chinese ICBM program beyond what we expected when we made the deployment decision."

Sentinel is not ready for deployment. Important components have not been adequately tested. Deployment will tend to divert resources from needed additional research and development; a delay may, therefore, result in a more effective system. By postponing the deployment, the ABM program will benefit, if it ultimately develops that deployment is in the national interest.

(In testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee on Feb. 16, 1968, Army Chief of Staff General Harold K. Johnson described the state of development of Sentinel components in terms that hardly suggest the system is ready for deployment.

(Of the first major elements, Spartan and Sprint missiles, perimeter acquisition radar, missile site radar and data processing equipment, only the Sprint had been tested as a unit as of the time of the Senate debate.)

#### PERCY NOTES TEST

In the course of floor debate last April 18, it was brought out by Sen. Percy, R-Ill., that 11 of 14 test firings of the Sentinel system had been successful. Yet to be effective in actual operation, every element of an ABM system must work perfectly every time.)

Sentinel would hamper prospects for U.S.-Soviet arms control agreement since its deployment clearly would cause the U.S.S.R.

to react to some degree against it by developing countermeasures. At the very least, it will make more remote the possibilities of serious negotiations with the Soviets—which they have requested—over strategic armaments.

A worse possibility is that a U.S. ABM deployment will trigger a race of dangerous new armament programs, which will decrease U.S. security rather than enhance it, at enormous added cost to both sides.

Important dollar savings could be realized by postponing deployment. The cost of the system as presently planned is likely to soar beyond the official figure of \$5.5 billion. In addition, in the added time gained, alternative and less costly ways of providing security may be developed, whether in the arms control area or by such means as providing protection for Minuteman ICBMs with increased site hardening. Thus, a decision to spend \$1 billion now could mean wasting \$5.5 billion and probably much more.

(Last January, former President Eisenhower strongly protested the Sentinel deployment decision, asserting that it was only a first step toward a much costlier Soviet-oriented system which would not do the job for which it was intended.)

#### CITES CONTRADICTION

Sen. Symington, D-Mo., former Air Force secretary, and member of the Armed Services Committee: "The original argument was that we did not need any (ABM) system, because our offensive capacity was being developed to the point where we could smash any aggressor.

"Then, for some reason never made clear to me, there was proposed a \$30 billion defense against the Soviet Union and a \$5 billion defense against a possible future threat from Red China; and the Chinese defense was chosen. For reasons I still do not understand, we decided against a defense against the Soviet Union, but did want a defense against a possible threat from China. So we saved \$25 billion, just like that.

"Each year the demand for research and development in the Department of Defense increases to the point where it now amounts to \$8 billion a year. This money has been put up faithfully on the floor of the Senate, year after year. I now challenge the results. What has come out of these vast sums?

"True, we have had missile program after missile program. Then they put them on the shelf, either because they are obsolete, or because they do not think they will be needed, or because they do not work. We have been getting a lot of gadgets and tricks and theories. But where is the modern hardware? You cannot fight with blueprints."

#### QUESTIONS JUSTIFICATION

Sen. McGovern, D-S.D.: "We find the secretary of defense and the administration saying that if we could get some kind of agreement with the Soviet Union whereby they would not deploy their ABM system, then we would not deploy ours. What then happens to the argument that we need one against China? If we do need a defensive missile system against China, and if that is the 'marginal' (former Secretary of Defense McNamara's word) reason for the Sentinel, why would we make a deal with the Soviets not to build it?"

Sen. Symington: "Even if we were able to prevent 98 percent of Soviet nuclear missiles from reaching target in an all-out attack—an impossibility, just as it would be impossible for another country to prevent a substantial portion of our missiles from reaching target—2 percent of Soviet missiles hitting their targets could still destroy our cities.

"For years we have been asked to spend billions on maintaining an 'assured destruction' capability on the theory and with the premise against this gigantic cost that the best defense is a good offense.

"And now, after spending these tens of billions on the basis of that premise, we are told this is still not enough; therefore, we must now spend additional billions on this theoretical and admittedly strictly limited defense, the effectiveness of which even the Sentinel's strongest advocates admit is in doubt."

#### WON'T SIT STILL

Sen. Hart: "The only way I can imagine Sentinel or any other ABM deployment saving lives would be if the Soviet Union—or China, for that matter—do nothing to compensate for the deployment, in order to restore the capability to damage the United States, which had existed before the deployment was undertaken.

"But they could hardly be expected to do nothing; thus, there would be no reason to believe an appreciable number of lives would be saved. In fact, there is good reason to believe that even more lives might well be lost than had the ABM deployment not taken place.

"We must face the very real possibility, if we go ahead with Sentinel, of the Soviets responding with a more than compensating improvement in their offensive systems, especially considering the complexity of the Sentinel system, the fact that it can never be adequately tested short of an actual nuclear exchange, and that it probably will fall far short of performing as well as it is designed to do. The net effect, then, would be an increase, rather than a diminution in damage to the United States in the event war should ever occur."

#### EXAMPLE OF FUTILITY

Sen. Clark, D-Pa.: "I give you one example of the futility of the defense in trying to catch up with the offense. In 1959, the U.S. Army proposed the deployment of the Nike-Zeus system, the father of the present highly touted Nike X system (from which the Sentinel system was developed). The total cost of deploying this system was then estimated at \$13 to \$14 billion.

"This proposal was turned down by President Eisenhower, who said that, 'It is the consensus of my technical and military advisers that the system should be carefully tested before production is begun and facilities are constructed for its deployment.'

"We should also heed the words of Defense Secretary McNamara when he referred to the Nike X system in January, 1968. He said, 'Had we produced and deployed the Nike-Zeus system proposed by the Army in 1959, most of it would have had to be torn out and replaced, almost before it became operational, by the new missiles and radars of the Nike X system.

"By the same token, other technological developments in offensive forces over the next seven years may make obsolete or drastically degrade the Nike X system as presently envisioned."

#### THE CASE AGAINST ABM—VI: LESS DEBATE IN THE HOUSE

(By Everett S. Allen)

WASHINGTON.—Sen. Kennedy, D-Mass., has called the Senate "remiss" for not obtaining full information on the Sentinel system before approving deployment funds, but the manner in which ABM was ramrodded through the House makes the upper chamber's deliberations leisurely by comparison.

Rep. Leggett, D-Calif., protest, "I find it no real credit to our House system to have the other body debate the ABM construction deployment for a week, passing the item by a close vote of 52 to 34, after our House considered the item and passed over the whole issue without an objection being made."

Rep. Bingham, D-N.Y., added, "I am voting against it (ABM deployment) first, because there has been a disgracefully in-

sufficient time for the House to debate a bill of such magnitude and importance and second, because the bill, as described and defended by the chairman (Rep. Rivers, S.C.) and some members of the Armed Services Committee indicates no recognition of the need to reassess our priorities so as to defer essential or questionable expenditures."

#### TWO-HOUR DEBATE

Rep. Scheuer, D-N.Y., complained that, "The members have been allowed a mere two hours to debate a bill which will authorize more than a \$21 billion expenditure in military procurement and research. We have been virtually denied any opportunity of examining its provisions in depth. We now propose to dispense with more than 10 percent of the federal budget in 120 minutes; a rate of \$175 million a minute. The report of this bill, which runs to 91 pages, was made available only three days ago."

Rep. Keith, R-Mass., noted during the July 11 House debate that, "I regret that we have not had an opportunity for a full debate on the ABM question at an earlier date. It would have been far better to have raised these issues back in April when the House authorized construction on the missile sites. That vote was the first step in the commitment to begin work on the Sentinel and the full range of political, technical and economic issues should have been placed before us at that time."

Keith asked, "Is it worth our money to build a system which may be useless against all but a small attack, such as the Chinese might be able to mount, using relatively primitive missiles?"

Rep. Bates, R-Mass., senior GOP member of the Armed Services Committee, replied, "The answer to that is in the affirmative." Bates commented, "It might well be that we might lose money in this effort (the deployment), but I would rather lose some money than lose our country and we can, if we prove to be wrong on this issue."

Paradoxically, those House members who argued against ABM deployment did so on the grounds that to deploy would "prove to be wrong on this issue."

The case against deployment, as presented by Leggett and others, made these points:

There is clear evidence that the system is not technically feasible at this time and, in all probability, will not be feasible in the future.

#### MODERN OUTLAY

The original proposal for the Sentinel ABM system envisaged a "moderate" \$3.5 billion outlay. This "moderate" \$3.5 billion estimate by last summer had risen to a "modest" \$5.5 billion. Leggett predicted that by 1975, the target date for full deployment, "the system will have cost \$15 billion."

(It is noteworthy that January 1969 estimates of cost have risen to \$5.9 billion and Sen. Symington, D-Mo., opponent of deployment, has said he believes it will be closer to \$9.4 billion.)

House opposition stressed that:

The system will be no good against a fractional orbit ballistic system, or a southern orbital ballistic system, or a multiple independent re-entry vehicle system, or a group of multiple independent rockets, or against a submarine close-range missile. It is "fully expected" that by 1975, the Communist Chinese will have a diesel submarine ballistic missile capability against which ABM would be ineffective.

Yearly upkeep of the ABM system will cost "at least \$1 billion." (This is double the Army estimate.) "Mind you," said Leggett, "this is the very basic cost and the basic estimated cost can be easily exceeded in geometric proportions before the first missile site is positioned. These costs do not include extras or operation and maintenance of hundreds of sites around the country and pay for thousands of military personnel."

## WOULD BE USELESS

The California legislator added, "If 20 simple Chinese missiles are launched against a target defended by 50 Spartan ABM's, there is an 81 per cent probability of successful defense. If penetration aids . . . or low-flying missiles (fractional orbital missiles) are employed, the Sentinel system will be useless."

(The June 28, 1968, issue of Congressional Quarterly quoted an unidentified Pentagon official as stating, "for the present time, we can make greater strides (in the direction of an effective ABM) by spending small sums of money to advance technology until we have a really useful capability, rather than spending a lot to produce hardware that we know won't work.")

Rep. Kyros, D-Maine, argued that, "A small fraction of the U.S. missiles surviving a first strike, if directed against China, would destroy half of China's urban population and more than half of its industrial capacity, most of its key governmental, technical, and managerial personnel and a large proportion of its skilled workers would be wiped out."

## SUICIDAL ACT

"For the Chinese to attack or to threaten to attack American cities in the face of our strategic superiority would be a suicidal act."

Kyros also noted that, "Former Secretary McNamara, in his speech announcing the decision to go ahead with a 'thin' anti-Chinese ABM system, said, 'The so-called heavy ABM shield, at the present state of technology, would in no effect, be an adequate shield at all against a Soviet attack.'"

Leggett protested that, "debate on this system in my committee lasted about 45 seconds (when the House took up its version of the military construction bill, the ABM was not debated. The construction bill carried money for sites.), but Rep. Rivers, chairman of the House Armed Service Committee replied, in arguing for deployment, 'This is a beginning. We are late now. We can move into the more sophisticated areas after we make this first step."

"We do not contend that this system can do everything. It will do what we anticipate we will need in the mid-'70s with respect to Red China."

And that note, although it answered none of the questions that had been raised by dissenters, carried the day, and the House approved funds for starting ABM deployment.

THE CASE AGAINST ABM—VII:  
THE ARMY'S VIEW

(By Everett S. Allen)

WASHINGTON.—Major criticisms of the ABM, some of them raised specifically by The Standard-Times, have been responded to by the Army's Sentinel System Command and by Dr. John S. Foster, director of the Pentagon's defense research and engineering.

## Q. Sentinel inability against decoys:

A. Army: Development and production of effective chaff or decoys to operate against our ABM system, which will be deployed in the 1970s, will require significant effort by the Chinese Communists. The effectiveness of ChiCom penetration aids will depend upon rather specific knowledge of the Sentinel system. Even if this knowledge were acquired by the ChiComs, the Sentinel components have a significant robustness that will make the successful use of penetration aids difficult. Examples include the large kill radius of our Spartan missiles, radar diversity, and defense in depth.

Q. Complications of nuclear blast disrupting any radar system:

A. Army: The uncertainties associated with the effects of high altitude nuclear bursts in creating radar blackout would present an attacker great difficulty in confidently planning an attack depending on this effect. In designing Sentinel, we have taken into conservative account the blackout problem and

uncertainties thereto to include geometric diversity of radars and selection of radar frequencies.

## CLAIM UNFOUNDED

Q. Civilian fallout shelters for protection from our own defensive missiles:

A. Army: The inference that a major fallout shelter program was, and is, required because of the detonation of defensive nuclear warheads over our cities is without basis. In fact, the intercept altitudes and defensive yields of the Sentinel antiballistic missile defense system would not cause a significant direct threat to our population by either fallout, thermal or blast overpressure effects.

A civil defense shelter program continues to be a complement to active defense which would further reduce casualties due to enemy nuclear weapons.

Q. Defense against submarine-launched missiles:

A. Army: The Chinese Peoples Republic threat against which the Sentinel system is designed to counter does not dictate that it would counter submarine-launched missiles.

However, inherent capabilities of Sentinel make successful engagement of some such missiles highly probable. Further study on this subject is being conducted by the Department of Defense.

## Q. Cost versus effectiveness:

A. Army: The question of Sentinel effectiveness must be examined in light of the stated objective of the system. Although we cannot predict with certainty exactly what targets in the United States the Chinese might attack, we can be assured that 10, 20 or 30 thermonuclear warheads detonating over our country could produce many fatalities.

The Sentinel system will produce a high assurance of no fatalities in the event of a Chinese attack for at least a decade after the system attains an initial capability. It is not at all clear that ChinCom offense costs will be less than U.S. defense costs. In any event, the key issue is not whether the United States can afford to defend, but rather can we afford not to defend.

## NOT TO TEST VALUE

Q. Why no scheduled Sentinel tests until 1970?

A. Army: These are to "exercise the responses" of the Sentinel ABM system, not an examination or trial to prove value. The Sentinel system represents 12 years of intense research and development effort. A substantial portion of the nation's best scientific and technological abilities have been devoted to its development.

Previous tests have demonstrated that the deployed system can with confidence defend the United States from relatively simple missile attacks commensurate with our estimate of Communist China's capability in this field for the next 10 to 15 years.

(Aviation Week and Space Technology of July 8, 1968, said that in early 1970, it is planned to fire as many as 80 separate Minuteman missiles over a two-year period down-range from Vandenburg Air Force Base into the Kwajalein Atoll in the Pacific.

(It is reported that, "the initial shots in the series are expected to be directed largely at determining whether Sentinel radar can discriminate targets from decoys, and to assess the so-called threat cloud created by warheads and penetration aids.")

## Q. Effectiveness of Sentinel?

A. Foster: We never said that we had a 100 per cent confidence in intercepting all, either in the early stages or in the late stages. Rather, that we have high confidence of being able to intercept. There is scientific disagreement and I'm certainly aware of that. I myself have argued on both sides of this issue before making a recommendation to the secretary of defense.

## DECOYS CONSIDERED

Q. Many well known scientists have said that the Sentinel system can't meet the objectives that have been stated for it and that it will be swamped by an enemy attack and by the use of decoys, chaff and the like. Has all of this been adequately considered:

A. Foster: I can assure you that all of this has been fully and adequately considered. Before the secretary of defense decided on the deployment, he had available to him the best intelligence evaluations that could be secured. We called in the best brains to consult with us, both those who recommended the deployment and those that did not.

Only after considering all facts that were presented did the secretary of defense decide that deployment must go forward and as quickly as possible. I shall point out, too, that there was no disagreement among the senior individuals concerned after all the facts and advice had been made available.

Q. Why deploy against the Chinese Peoples Republic when a deployment is not being made against the Soviet Union?

A. Foster: We are convinced that the Sentinel deployment can meet effectively the CPR emerging threat, for a period of many years, and at acceptable cost. One can argue that the CPR would be afraid to attack us anyway, but this would not be a prudent course considering that even their emerging small capability could kill many millions of our people.

Since our strategic planning must always be conservative, and must take into consideration even the possible irrational behavior of potential adversaries, I believe the only prudent step is to proceed with Sentinel.

The thin scope of the Sentinel system should not upset the balance of strength between the United States and the U.S.S.R. On the other hand, it appears that a much larger effort would be required to counter full potential capability of the U.S.S.R. by an anti-missile system.

Even if that effort were made by the United States, it would be possible for the U.S.S.R. to add to its own force to counter us. For this reason, we continue to count on the deterrent of our existing and improving strategic offensive forces to meet this threat.

## DIFFERENT OPINIONS

At the end of an interview with a Pentagon scientist who requested no attribution, I asked: "Why do you think that, for the first time in our history, all four science advisers of the last three presidents are opposed to what you are doing—deployment of ABM? Advising presidents on the worth of weapons systems was, after all, their specialty?"

He replied, "It is simply a difference of opinion."

Assuredly it is, but what concerns anti-ABM forces is that the difference is one of diametric opposition, that it involves billions of dollars and what Dr. Jerome Wiesner, one of those presidential advisers, has called our ability to maintain "a rational world."

Further, it is inescapable that those who oppose ABM deployment principally have no professional, political or economic affiliations that would influence their opinions.

## THE CASE AGAINST ABM—VIII: THE MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

(By Everett S. Allen)

WASHINGTON.—To a degree that will remain forever unknown, the decision to deploy the Sentinel system was influenced by factors of politics and economics, rather than national security.

In reporting last June 27 that, according to civilian and military sources within the Pentagon, at least \$10.8 billion worth of defense projects could be cut from the current budget without affecting national defense, the respected Congressional Quarterly singled out the ABM for criticism.

Said CQ, "Probably one of the most clear-cut items of (budget) 'fat' in the view of most of our sources, was the ABM system. (They) doubt it will have any chance of working against a realistic attack. . . . Thus far, the United States has been unable to attain acceptable reliability with far simpler missile systems designed for anti-aircraft use. In simulated combat tests, these missiles have shown both a low level of readiness and a poor 'kill' ratio."

Congress should have had this information available, yet a majority of its members approved Sentinel system deployment. Why? In part, for reasons of dollars and jobs.

#### WARNED OF INFLUENCE

In 1961, President Eisenhower warned against "unwarranted influence" with the federal government, and especially the Defense Department, by what he called the "military-industrial complex."

Secretary of Defense McNamara's Sept. 18, 1967, decision to deploy a thin antiballistic missile system has, in the words of CQ, "been widely depicted as one of the greatest victories ever for the 'military-industrial complex.'"

McNamara for years opposed ABM deployment on grounds the system was too expensive and unreliable. However, the more than \$2.4 billion spent on research and development over the last decade built a powerful constituency for the program.

It has been estimated that more than 15,000 companies stand to profit from the decision to deploy the ABM system, including several in Massachusetts.

Last year, when Western Electric Co. received Army contracts totaling \$475.6 million for continued research and production of the Sentinel system, it announced it expected to subcontract more than 60 per cent of the contracts to more than 3,000 companies.

Major subcontractors for the Sentinel project include General Electric Co., Raytheon Corp., McDonnell Douglas Corp., and Martin Marietta Corp., all of whom have contracts totaling \$30 to \$50 million.

#### EMPLOY 1 MILLION

Frederick W. Collins, writing in the New Republic, suggested that 28 of the major contractors for the ABM project employ about one million people in 172 congressional districts in 42 states.

One brokerage firm reportedly told its clients during the summer of 1967 that the expected decision to go ahead with the ABM would be the "day they will shake the money tree for electronic companies."

During the third quarter of 1967, 75 mutual funds sold \$90 million in other stock holdings and invested the proceeds in electronics.

Defense spending in fiscal 1969, apart from costs of the Vietnam war, is expected to be in excess of \$50 billion. The fiscal 1967 Defense Department payroll spread among the 50 states totaled \$9.3 billion for military personnel, and \$8 billion for civilian personnel.

The nation has 991 major private defense plants and defense-oriented government installations, including those owned and operated by or for the armed services, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Atomic Energy Commission. Of these, Massachusetts, for example, has 45, located in every congressional district but one.

#### FORESEE NEW JOBS

The Wall Street Journal on Dec. 31, 1968, noted that: "Construction unions eye new jobs promised by the Pentagon's Sentinel anti-missile system. Military brass tell union chiefs each of the 15 to 20 anti-missile sites will require employment of 900 to 1,375 construction workers for an average of 22 months."

On Jan. 23 of this year, the Morrison-Knudsen Co., Inc. of New York was awarded a \$2.2 million Army contract for construction

work at the site of the nation's first Sentinel ABM in North Andover.

Sen. Thurston B. Morton, R-Ky., said President Eisenhower's warning against undue influence by the "military-industrial complex" is "of more significance today than ever before. . . . With today's big defense payrolls, it's only natural that defense contractors want to develop a better gun, ship or some other defense mechanism. . . . The answer is for the electorate to be aware of this tendency and keep it from getting out of hand."

Writing on the "Growing Threat of our Military-Industrial Complex" in Harvard Business Review, May-June 1968, Jack Raymond warned against the "disparate impulses that go into the military-industrial complex, ranging from a crass desire for profits to honest fear for the safety of the country (that) may coalesce in such a powerful advocacy of more and better weapons and in such potent opposition to arms control that the entire country will be drawn to support this opposition."

#### ANTI-GOP MISSILE

As for the political aspects of the decision to deploy, Sen. Margaret Chase Smith, R-Maine, ranking GOP member of the Armed Services Committee, said she had heard the ABM system referred to as an "anti-Republican missile defense system."

She added that, "I do not like to think that the Executive Branch would waste the \$5-\$6 billion that the installation of this system will cost merely to avoid a response on the merits to charges that the United States is without a ballistic missile defense."

In his 1969 book "The Weapon Culture," nuclear physicist Ralph E. Lapp wrote that following the disclosure late in 1966 that the Soviet Union was deploying an ABM system, "prominent Republicans—presidential hopefuls among them—strongly advocated immediate action on U.S. ballistic missile defense."

(In an Associated Press interview in September 1967, Richard M. Nixon called on the United States to "go ahead at all costs" to build an ABM system. When the Senate first authorized Sentinel deployment last year Nixon, then a presidential candidate, called it "a major step toward candor and clarity.")

"With this issue now given a political slant," continued Lapp, "the White House became vulnerable to a 1968 campaign attack that the incumbent administration had failed to provide adequately for the nation's security. Such Republican 'missile attack' involved political warheads whose punch was measured in megavotes, not megatons."

And Dr. Jerome B. Weisner, former science adviser to President Kennedy, said, "We ought to regard the Sentinel as a bad joke perpetrated on us by Mr. McNamara and Mr. Johnson in an election year. It seems to me that their very rationalization—that it was to defend us against China, but we would stop building it if the Russians agreed not to build one—demonstrates that."

#### THE CASE AGAINST ABM—IX: RECORD OF THE WEAPON BUYERS

(By Everett S. Allen)

WASHINGTON.—Some of the opposition of ABM deployment stems from a civilian skepticism that has been building for several years concerning the military's weapons acquisition processes, its estimates of costs, and its evaluations of what and how much are needed.

Closely allied is the performance of what are known as "high risk" electronics systems, for the Army claims that Sentinel and its radars and computers, a major electronic complexity, are capable of performing the delicately synchronized tasks demanded of an effective antimissile system.

Recently, a report entitled "Improving the Acquisition Process for High Risk Electronics Systems" was made public in Washington.

It was prepared last year to satisfy a course

requirement while the author, Richard A. Stubbing, 38, was attending Princeton University. Stubbing is an examiner in the Budget Bureau, where he has been since 1962.

He is a graduate of Notre Dame and the Harvard Business School and at the bureau, has been the examiner for Air Force ballistic missiles, Navy aircraft, tactical aircraft and strategic offensive forces.

Stubbing studied a sample of 13 major Air Force-Navy aircraft and missile programs with sophisticated electronic systems initiated since 1955 at a total cost of \$40 billion.

#### ONLY FOUR RELIABLE

He concluded that of the 13, only four, costing \$5 billion, could be relied upon to perform at more than 75 per cent of their specifications.

Five others, costing \$13 billion, were rated as "poor" performers, with an electronic reliability of less than 75 per cent.

Two more systems, costing \$10 billion, were phased out for "low reliability" after three years, and the last two were cancelled, after an expenditure of \$2 billion.

Stubbing noted, "(Thus) less than 40 per cent of the effort produced systems with acceptable electronic performance—an uninspiring record that loses further luster when cost overruns and schedule delays are also evaluated."

He also concluded that:

1. Contractors "in almost every instance" advance for new weapon systems high-risk proposals involving new or modified computers and radars, rather than integrating "off-the-shelf" equipment.

He attributes this to a desire to make the proposal attractive and to gain the added sales volume from designing and developing new electronics equipment.

#### PERFORMANCE BAD

2. The performance of the multibillion-dollar weapons systems started in the 1950s was bad; those of the 1960s are worse. Stubbing concluded, "The results already in indicate a retrogression in electronics performance, along with a telescoping of development schedules and continued large cost overruns."

3. The record of electronic systems in 12 important military programs begun in the 1950s indicates that only five perform up to standard or better.

4. The aerospace industry, "with a high wage structure and a reputation for inefficiency in production techniques," still achieves a 12 per cent greater return on equity than the average of all U.S. industrial firms.

5. The recent trend in airborne military electronic programs has been toward highly complex, crash programs with "established technical parameters almost impossible of attainment."

6. Competitive development of high-risk electronics systems, now lacking, offers the best prospect of imposing maximum incentives on management and improving the quality and cost of the final product.

#### COMMENTS ON STUDY

Senator Symington, D-Mo., who noted that "we have a long series of failures in missiles which have cost the American people somewhere between \$7 and \$10 billion dollars," was moved to comment on Stubbing's study.

Symington said, "As a result of this study, I would hope there would be more understanding of why some of us suggested during the last session that this government continue with research and development on the new ABM system, but not place orders for its production."

"The proposed ABM system is far more complicated than any of the systems referred to in this study.

"Over the years, I have been protesting the 'gadgets' aspect of our current defense

procurement as against the obtaining of workable hardware.

On Nov. 6, 1967, National Observer commented, "Military men are rarely as technically proficient as their industrial counterparts. In short, they don't always know what they're buying."

"If they resist, the companies will go over their heads—a retired general on an industrial payroll will ask a high-ranking military colleague to see 'what the fess is all about'—and the company often ends up having its way. In addition, defense contractors are always on the lookout to hire retiring officers."

"The point to remember is that retired high-ranking officers have many friends still in the service. Some, they were influential in appointing. Naturally, the retired officers will be listened to."

#### REMEMBER PRIOR GAPS

Finally, in listening to proponents of the "ABM gap" theory, a fairly large audience remembers the myths of the "bomber gap" from 1955 to 1957, and the "missile gap" from 1957 to 1961.

Both of these alleged "gaps" in American foreign policy proved to be nonexistent, despite the fact that many of the highest strategists in our defense community believed and propagated the greatly erroneous statistics on which the "gap" theory depended.

The fact was that, during the period of the alleged missile and bomber gaps, the Russians produced only four per cent of the missiles and only 20 per cent of the bombers that American Intelligence had claimed they could produce.

The American reaction to these greatly mistaken assessments by "experts" has produced a multibillion-dollar arsenal of nuclear weapons capable of annihilating the Soviet Union as a viable civilization within a day and perhaps within an hour.

Coupled with evidence that the Russians have slowed or halted their limited ABM deployment, our "gap" experience has made Americans less eager to build new weapons every time somebody presses the panic button.

#### THE CASE AGAINST ABM-X: THE RUSSIAN VIEW

(By Everett S. Allen)

WASHINGTON.—One sound reason for not building an American anti-missile system now is that the Russians, traditionally more interested in defensive than offensive weapons, have spent millions trying to establish an ABM setup and may have wasted much of it because of formidable technical difficulties.

One of their own experts has conceded that the problems of ABM presently outnumber the solutions, a factor that has influenced the Soviets in deciding to slow down, if not actually halt, their deployment efforts.

Some clues to the problems with ABM that the Russians have encountered may be found in a treatise on antimissile weapons—ostensibly, an evaluation of Western systems, yet revealing in its objective analysis of ABM generally—by Soviet scientist N. F. Shibayev. This study was translated into English last year, and a copy of it is in the Library of Congress.

#### NOTES PROBLEMS

Shibayev makes these points to emphasize the difficulty of creating an effective antimissile defense:

Missile warheads can be screened to prevent radiation, thereby diminishing their vulnerability.

Their trajectories, when they enter dense atmospheric layers, may be turbulent or smooth, or may change the direction of flight.

Warheads may produce active and passive jamming of defense radar stations.

Apart from the high average speed of flight of the ballistic missile, and the consequent lack of time for counteracting it, it is of small dimensions and presents a smooth, streamlined surface which hinders its detection by radar.

It is necessary to destroy all the attacking missiles, and not merely part of them.

Nose sections of the ballistic missiles are "very solid, a fact which hampers their destruction or demolition."

#### EASILY JAMMED

Radar stations of the antimissile defense are very sensitive and are easily jammed, either by jammers installed in the missile, in a container ejected from the missile, or independently launched jamming sources.

The task of interception would be much more simple if the radar that identified the target were also capable of guiding the interception of the target, but "the two tasks are, in principle, distinct."

The "brain" of the whole system is a high-speed digital computer that provides for the interception of single and group targets and which can carry out 200,000 arithmetical operations per second.

Target identification—that is, identifying warheads on a background of numerous false targets—is considered to be the weak spot of the entire U.S. antimissile system.

Concluded Shibayev, "All these factors, and others, lessen considerably the effectiveness of the antimissile operation, and the problem of antimissile defense is just beginning."

#### MOVED BY UNCERTAINTY

An uncertainty as to what the Soviet Union has done in the ABM field as recently as last June gained congressional supporters for the U.S. move to deploy Sentinel—to "catch up,"—but even this motivation has been diminished by additional intelligence on what the Russians really appear to be doing.

In June, arguing for American deployment of the ABM, Sen. Jackson, D-Wash., declared, "We seem to be assuming that Moscow has not deployed an ABM system. They deployed their first system in 1962 around Leningrad. We have not even deployed one as yet. And the lead time is at least five years for the first battery to be ready."

Yet Sen. Hart, D-Mich., and others, have offered an effective refutation to the simplistic thesis that the Russians have an ABM system and we do not.

Said Mr. Hart, "It is clear that the Soviets have not deployed and are not deploying any ABM system which can protect their country against missile attack."

"It is now clear that the Soviet Union's ABM deployment consists of only a small and essentially ineffective deployment around the city of Moscow, using the so-called Galosh missile.

#### HAVE ABM CAPABILITIES

"Two other systems have been described as having ABM capabilities; one, deployed at the city of Leningrad in the early 1960s, was apparently abandoned when the U.S.S.R. considered it ineffective against the missile threats then in being; the other defensive deployment, called the Tallinn system, after the city of Tallinn where one of the sites was first identified, was for a time considered to have a possible ABM capability.

"By February 1968, however, it was apparent that the Tallinn system does not now have, nor did it ever have, an antiballistic missile capability."

Sen. Jackson has conceded that, "the majority view in the intelligence community—it is not the unanimous view—is that the Russian system is designed primarily as a defense against air-breathing missiles and aeronautical devices (including aircraft) as opposed to a missile defense."

In a letter to former Sen. Monroney, D-Okla., urging a delay in U.S. ABM deploy-

ment, Roswell Gilpatric, former deputy secretary of defense, commented, "It seems generally accepted within our intelligence and scientific community that the ABM system which the Soviets have deployed around Moscow has encountered many technical difficulties and is probably of limited effectiveness."

"Since the Soviets have always excelled in defensive systems, it is reasonable to believe that the ABM problems with which they have been afflicted will, in due course, face our scientists."

"If so, more research and development effort should be expended by the United States before any go-ahead on deployment is given . . ."

Editor John W. R. Taylor wrote in the 1968-69 edition of "Jane's All the World's Aircraft": "The Tallinn defense system being set up across the northwest approaches to the Soviet Union is intended to deal with aircraft, rather than missiles."

#### THE CASE AGAINST ABM—XI: WHAT DID McNAMARA MEAN BY "MARGINAL"?

(By Everett S. Allen)

WASHINGTON.—When former Defense Secretary McNamara reversed a several-year-old stand in 1967 and called for deployment of a "thin" ABM system to defend us against Communist Chinese missiles, he described his decision to do so as "marginal."

The interpretations of what McNamara meant by "marginal," as offered by pro and anti-deployment forces, are as far apart as the forces themselves.

A pro-deployment Pentagon official, who declined to be identified, and who said he participated in the conversations that preceded McNamara's decision, commented, "I am certain that in his use of the word, Mr. McNamara did not refer to doubts about the Sentinel system's effectiveness in protecting us against the Chinese threat, but rather, to the fact that there was a marginal question as to whether the Chinese leadership would be sufficiently irrational as to attack us."

#### CONTRARY EVIDENCE

However, there is contrary evidence that McNamara did have continuing doubts about the ABM's effectiveness and that probably he was at least including this doubt in his use of the word "marginal" if, in fact, he was not referring to the effectiveness exclusively.

In an introduction to a report on the missile shield controversy made public this month by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, a nonprofit educational group, former Vice President Humphrey commented: "I have always been skeptical in my own mind about the security value of deploying an ABM system . . . I share the reservations stated by Secretary McNamara when he announced the ABM deployment in 1967."

Sen. Young, D-Ohio, recalled, "McNamara brought down on his head the wrath of the leaders of the military-industrial complex and the Joint Chiefs of Staff who were calling for a heavy ABM shield, so-called, when he stated that such a continuing expenditure would provide no adequate protection whatever against a Soviet nuclear attack."

"He stated that adding more billions to the billions already wasted in ringing our cities with ABMs furnished only a strong inducement for the Soviet to vastly increase their own offensive forces. Then we would respond and an arms race would rush hopelessly on, to no sensible purpose for either side."

"That was the wise conclusion of our then secretary of defense."

#### MADE CONCESSION

"When I listened to Secretary McNamara concede agreement to a thin system as a defense against a possible missile attack from China in 1978, or thereafter, I knew in my

own mind he had made this concession and compromise against his better judgment.

"I attended a conference attended by a number of my associates in the Senate and there was ample basis for my conclusion."

Dr. George W. Rathjens was, until June 1968 director of the Systems Evaluation Division of the Institute for Defense Analyses; he now is an MIT professor of political science.

In his study, "The Future of the Strategic Arms Race," published under sponsorship of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace this month, Dr. Rathjens notes that:

"In announcing the Sentinel decision former Secretary of Defense McNamara made it clear that he regarded the decision as marginal . . .

"Subsequently, other Johnson administration spokesmen claimed the system could deny damage to the United States from a Chinese nuclear attack. However, to have high confidence in the system one must allay doubts of three kinds:

"1. The question of whether such a complicated system will work at all when called upon to do so . . . while component tests will be possible, it will never be feasible to test the full system against a satisfactory simulation of an operational environment.

"This fact, with the history of initial failures of far less complicated systems, leads many experts to believe that the probability of a catastrophic failure of Sentinel, or any other ABM system is high.

#### COULD DEFEAT SYSTEM

"2. The possibility that the Chinese may develop penetration aids that could defeat the system. This possibility is discussed at some length by Richard Garwin and Hans Bethe (summarized earlier in this series). I am not aware of any convincing rebuttal of their thesis.

"Gen. A. W. Betts, chief of research and development for the Army, in replying to the Garwin-Bethe argument, disputes the contention that development of effective penetration aids would be as easy as claimed. To make his point, he cites American difficulties in developing high-confidence penetration aids. There are, however, two considerations that make this experience largely irrelevant:

"Our program aims at the development of penetration aids effective not only against exoatmospheric defenses, but also against terminal interception. If one has to cope only with the former, which is all that is required in the case of Sentinel, the problem is much less complex.

"Second although the Chinese would probably prefer to have a high-confidence system as a deterrent against the United States, one with a moderate probability of penetrating the Sentinel defenses might be almost as useful to them."

#### DEMANDING TASK

"3. Damage denial is a much more demanding task than simply reducing damage by small amounts . . . Let it be assumed that a given target is defended by 50 interceptors; that the Chinese have 25 ICBMs with a reliability of 80 per cent, and that each interceptor has an 80 per cent chance of destroying an ICBM. According to this scenario, there is no more than about a 50 per cent probability that Sentinel would succeed in preventing all 25 ICBMs from hitting their target.

"The range of the Spartan interceptor, which is used with the Sentinel system, implies that not 50 interceptors, but about 500, would have to be deployed throughout the United States if every important target were to be within the effective defensive range of 50 Spartan missiles (since the offense can choose any target on which to concentrate his attack and the defender must defend all targets.)

"Thus, even with a 20-to-1 superiority in

the number of interceptors over the number of Chinese missiles, the picture is far from comforting.

"When one considers that a single one-megaton warhead detonated over one of the larger U.S. cities would produce about 1 million fatalities, it is clear that those who claim damage-denial or near damage-denial capability for Sentinel are assuming an extraordinary high level of effectiveness."

Twenty-three prominent Americans are listed in the preface to Dr. Rathjens' study and the author comments, "the following persons, who have read the paper and participated in all or part of the discussions, were generally agreed that it presents fairly the facts . . ."

One of the 23 was Robert S. McNamara, former secretary of defense.

#### THE CASE AGAINST ABM—XII: WHAT ARE THE PROSPECTS FOR ABM?

(By Everett S. Allen)

WASHINGTON.—If the Nixon administration does not press for continuing ABM deployment, construction of the Sentinel system may stop permanently, principally because selection of the first three battery sites has made it an issue at the Main Street level.

Congressional opponents of deployment now find their case buttressed by sacks of opposition mail from the voters, whose anxiety over a "bomb in the backyard" already has prompted important federal action, favorable to antideployment forces.

In a letter to Republican Sen. Cooper of Kentucky, Sen. Stennis, D-Miss., new chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, has agreed to the former's request to allow "outside" witnesses to testify on the ABM in open hearings before the committee.

These witnesses will include some of the top-level educators and scientists, including the four former science advisers to U.S. Presidents, who have been outspoken in their opposition to ABM.

#### AWAITS NIXON'S MOVE

Second, Chairman Rivers, D-S.C., chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, in a letter to Defense Secretary Laird, has said, in effect that, because of the rising controversy, his committee will take no action to approve Sentinel sites until the Nixon administration positively expresses an interest in the project.

Laird's reaction to the rising opposition has been to order a halt in ABM work pending an upper-echelon review of the program.

This was precisely what was called for on Jan. 31 in a letter to Laird from Sen. Kennedy, D-Mass., Democratic whip, who wants a congressional debate on continuation of deployment.

Another factor impelling members of Congress to join the anti-ABM ranks stems from the conversation that Sens. Gore, D-Tenn., and Pell, D-R.I., had with Soviet Premier Kosygin last November in Moscow.

In their report to the Senate, they said, "It seems clear to us that the Soviets are interested in beginning talks on limiting offensive and defensive missiles . . ."

#### MODERATE VOICE

Sen. Brooke, R-Mass., mentioned this as one of the reasons for his opposition to ABM. As a new member of the Armed Services Committee, Brooke is expected to add a more moderate tone to the group that traditionally favors erring on the side of greater military spending.

Brooke's anti-ABM thinking, shared by many of his colleagues, is based on the belief that we cannot construct an effective system; it is far better to try to get Russia to come to some agreement to limit nuclear weapons, and finally, that an \$80 billion defense budget is too high, considering the nation's many domestic needs.

"Aren't we really talking about a \$40-\$50-

billion program, rather than simply the expenditure of \$5.5 billion, the figure that has been used?" he was asked by The Standard-Times.

"Experience shows that's the kind of thing that happens," he replied. He added that he had found former Defense Secretary McNamara's decision to deploy "quite a surprise and a disappointment," and said that his votes against ABM had been cast "only after research in depth and consultation with MIT scientists."

#### FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE

Sen. Kennedy, also among the leaders of the anti-ABM group, called the deployment issue a "matter of fundamental importance," citing the enormous cost factor and the fact that "there is always a question of where we are with regard to security" even if we do build such a system.

He noted that a total system cost of \$65 billion had been suggested, and concluded: "With \$65 billion, we could educate every child, unpollute every river, and rebuild every city."

Democratic Senate Leader Mansfield also echoed a growing congressional view when he said, "Usually the Defense Department just has to ask for what it wants, and we give it to them. Last year, for the first time, we questioned the department on various subjects . . . and that time was long overdue."

As of Jan. 31, a Sentinel Systems Command official was willing to guess privately that 48 members of the Senate were opposed to ABM deployment. If this is accurate, it represents a sharp rise in the anti-ABM ranks.

Last year, Senate deployment opponents picked up 10 votes between the first vote April 18—a move to refuse procurement funds—and the Aug. 1 vote on whether to deny construction appropriations. On the April 18 vote, 24 senators went on record against the ABM. On Aug. 1, 34 senators did so—one-third of the membership.

No House rollcall votes on the issue were taken during this period, but on non-record votes, House members upheld ABM funds by a 3-to-1 margin. Rivers' letter to Laird suggests an important erosion of this House margin.

#### MORE CONSERVATIVE

On Jan. 31, leaders of the Senate anti-ABM effort were slightly more conservative than the Army in estimating their strength. A senator's aide suggested they had 13 Republicans and 26 Democrats, with at least four more—Eagleton, D-Mo.; Cook, R-Ky.; Packwood, R-Ore., and Harris, D-Okla., "leaning our way."

This represents a considerable gain in view of the fact that last year the total of 34 ABM opponents dropped to 25 in the wake of the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia.

What will the administration do?

Defense Secretary Laird is not opposed to ABM systems in principle. As spokesman for GOP members of the House Defense Appropriations Committee in 1966, he declared critically that a "flaw in the present American strategy is the lack of aggressiveness in the development of an ABM defense system."

On Jan. 30, Laird said the United States, by moving ahead with the Sentinel system, would strengthen its bargaining position in possible talks with the Soviet Union on limiting missiles.

#### FELT McNAMARA ERRED

Yet sources close to Laird indicate he felt McNamara made a mistake in deploying a "thin," possibly obsolete system as opposed to a more advanced "thick" ABM system such as more research and develop might make possible. Thus, the defense secretary might be willing to suspend Sentinel deployment.

Further, although President Nixon came out strongly for deployment of the Sentinel before his election, he is said not to be irrevocably committed to the ABM concept.

In part, this may reflect the fact that former President Eisenhower is not convinced of ABM's worth, and opposed its deployment.

There appears a very reasonable chance that the administration will choose not to continue deployment of the ABM system at this time, and the overwhelming weight of evidence indicates this is the course the nation should follow.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I would also like to ask unanimous consent that an article which appeared in the National Observer on Monday, February 10, also be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

**THE COMPLEXITIES OF THE SENTINEL PROGRAM: ARGUING THE PROS AND CONS OF THE MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM**

The ins and outs of emplacement of antiballistic-missile (ABM) systems are not simple—as the following arguments illustrate.

They were made in a symposium sponsored by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions at Santa Barbara, Calif. The symposium members discussed the "thin" Sentinel system for defense against China and also the possible "thick" system for defense against Russia as well as the general philosophies surrounding the whole subject of ABMs.

A panel of four men presented papers at the symposium—two in favor of ABMs and two against. Speaking in favor were Dr. Donald G. Brennan, former president of the Hudson Institute, a private study group that often researches questions of public policy, and Leon Johnson, a retired Air Force general who also was director, Net Evaluation Subcommittee, National Security Council, 1961-65. Speaking against the ABM were Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, a former science adviser to President Kennedy and provost of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Sen. George S. McGovern of South Dakota.

Among the participants in a following discussion were Adolph A. Berle, Jr., former assistant Secretary of State; Charles M. Herzfeld, technical director for the Defense Space Group, I. T. & T.; and I. I. Rabi, Nobel Laureate and professor of physics at Columbia University. These are excerpts from the papers and remarks which are to be published this month by the Center and Hill & Wang in a book, "Anti-Ballistic Missile—Yes or No?"

**AGAINST: JEROME B. WIESNER**

Dr. Karl Compton's sister, when living in India, watched a handyman driving a nail in a wall of her house, tearing up a lot of plaster in the process. In desperation, she finally grabbed the hammer and nail and said: "My God, man, let me do that. Why don't you use some common sense?" He drew himself up in all his dignity and said: "Madam, common sense is a gift of God. I've only got a technical education."

What I have found hardest to learn in 20 years of dealing with military technology and international security problems is how to add a measure of common sense to them.

Many other people have this problem, too. The whole issue of ABM, I believe, ends up as a conflict of judgment rather than one of analysis. Making the analysis is very important because it provides the raw material for judgment; it gives some feeling for what is possible and what isn't. But very often it turns out that analyzing a complex situation offends plain common sense or defies understanding. In studying a complex problem like ABM, certain assumptions have to be made, and if the assumptions are bad, the analysis will simply conceal them.

This happens frequently, and is happening now in the debates about the antiballistic missile. We do not have adequate knowledge

about many aspects of an antiballistic-missile duel because we lack vital data about the attacking missiles and about ABM performance. So we just pick some numbers that seem rational and we use them to make whatever point serves our purpose. . . . One man's assumptions give one set of conclusions; another man's assumptions give a different set. . . .

Of course, it gets ever worse than that. When we design a system like the Sentinel and then analyze it, we assume almost idealized conditions. We assume it is going to work as specified, or we quite arbitrarily use some reliability estimate like .95. But we can't know whether that is even close to correct because we have never built or operated anything like the Sentinel before. . . . Here it is, the most elaborate, sophisticated, dynamic combination of rocketry, radars, computers, electronics, and other technology ever proposed, and we are expecting that it will work and work well and not just well but perfectly the first time it is tried in a large-scale test. All kinds of mock tests can be invented for it, but the first genuine one will be when it is used in earnest. . . .

To judge an ABM defense system we must know its purpose. Is it supposed to provide an area defense, or defense of missile sites, or defense of a fleet, or defense of a few cities? It has to have some specific purpose, but one of the interesting things about the argument for the ABM is that its purpose seems very hard to grasp.

We were told at one point that the Sentinel system was intended to protect us against any irrational behavior on the part of the Chinese, though many people would contend that our existing deterrent system will do this adequately now. A careful analysis of the Sentinel system, however, does not show that Sentinel would provide protection against Chinese nuclear weapons for very long unless we make some unbelievably naive assumptions about the Chinese.

We should look at the more general question of large antiballistic-missile systems and concentrate on what the military and the congressional enthusiasts for ABM would like to build, if they could get us to agree. What they have in mind is a much more sophisticated and elaborate antiballistic-missile system that would have the capability of intercepting missiles fired at the United States. The question is: does it make all that much difference to our security if an ABM system can shoot down some fraction of the ballistic missiles aimed at our cities? What, in fact, is the general, over-all effect on our security of creating an ABM system? How does it change our deterrent posture? How much protection, if any, will it give the country at large, or the military installations? What is its effect on our efforts to achieve a more rational world? What does it do to a variety of other military objectives we might have?

Before we approach such questions, there is one important generalization I would like to stress, one that should always be kept in mind while examining strategic-weapons systems but that people almost always forget to take into account. It is that these developments take a long time from conception to effective operational deployment. . . . This whole cycle takes about 10 years.

Some weapons systems are obsolete in the conception, and I think this is probably true for the antiballistic-missile system before us. I have, in fact, come to the conclusion that any system that depends on projectiles—rather than, say, nuclear rays or electromagnetic beams or laser beams—is futile.

An antiballistic-missile system attempts to intercept and destroy ballistic missiles coming in very fast, very high, from long distances. It requires that the defenders fire their own intercepting missiles from the ground after they have detected the incoming missiles with the long-range radar. Detection normally occurs when the attacking

missiles are several hundred miles away if their trajectories are normal. They can be detected farther away if forward radars are employed. After detection one makes a rough projection or prediction of the trajectory of the incoming missile and launches an anti-missile, usually a rocket carrying a nuclear warhead, in the direction of the incoming device. The missile-tracking radar on the ground must follow the incoming warhead and it tells the anti-missile rocket where to go. When the defensive rocket gets close enough to the incoming missile its nuclear warhead is exploded and, in principle, destroys the attacking object. This has been demonstrated both by analysis and in field tests to be possible. No one questions that if you set up this kind of system it will work in an ideal situation. . . .

The defender sits and guesses about the attackers' tactics. If he guesses that one thing is going to happen, he invents a technology to deal with it. If he guesses that something else is going to happen, he invents another technology. But there is always the possibility that something quite unexpected will happen. I do not think the defender is ever going to know really what to expect; the variety of techniques available to a nation planning an offensive system is great enough to keep an antiballistic-missile system of the kind we are talking about totally off balance.

As a matter of fact, just the thought that we might develop an antiballistic-missile system, and therefore that the Russians might do the same thing, caused us to develop a whole new set of offensive countermeasures that make our Air Force and Navy confident that we do not have to worry about a Russian antimissile system. We have some new missiles that, instead of a single warhead, carry several and with high accuracy. We have available, and so do they, the possibility of using the black-out attack. One can develop very different kinds of offensive rockets that come in at low altitudes and do various elaborate maneuvers. We can shield against X rays. The choices are endless.

So, as I said in the beginning, anyone who makes calculations about what his defense system can do must make and proceed from a series of assumptions that do not seem to be warranted. But, of course, this does not stop people from making them.

In his 1967 "defense posture" speech, for example, former Defense Secretary McNamara cited some figures still widely quoted. He said a nuclear exchange with Russia in 1967 would cause 120,000,000 American deaths. He then postulated two antimissile defense systems for the United States—one, Posture A, would cost \$10 billion, and the other, Posture B, would cost \$20 billion. His calculations indicated that the \$10-billion system would reduce American fatalities to 40,000,000 deaths, while the \$20-billion system would reduce American fatalities to 30,000,000. These are numbers I find hard to grasp, but they obviously are meant to indicate a very substantial improvement in the fatality ratio if we were to build a defense system.

However, more questions were left unanswered than were answered in the calculations. First, Mr. McNamara, I believe, assumed the system would work as planned. But, let me repeat, I have serious reservations about the effectiveness of such an ABM system even if a potential enemy were not devising things to undo its effectiveness. I do not think its performance would be anywhere near the advertised predictions because of its very complexity. Second, Mr. McNamara said he had made his calculations on the basis of the 1967 Soviet offensive missile deployment. But that was not a Soviet deployment the Russians told us about; it was only McNamara's guess, or somebody's guess, about the Soviet deployment. So our defense planners must have had to make certain assumptions not only about our own system's weakness and accuracy but also about how

fast the Russian missiles would come in, how well they would be protected, and whether they would bear one warhead or two or more. Maybe Mr. McNamara knew all these things. But I suspect there were a lot of assumptions in his calculations, that might not hold up. Even if they had held up in 1967 when they were made, I doubt that they would be of much use today . . .

Unfortunately, many people do not read the fine print. They do not realize that you cannot snap your fingers and wish into existence [the] kind of antiballistic-missile system being argued about. They do not realize that if we build an antiballistic-missile system and the Russians regard it as something they do not like, they have plenty of time to respond and to figure out how to get their missiles past it, or that if they build an ABM system, we can respond in the same way.

In essence, then, my judgment is that we are just as likely to wind up a captive in the arms race if we start going the way of ABM defense as if we continue to build more and more offensive missiles.

There are people who say that it is better to spend your money on ABM defenses than on more destructive power. If one could do this—that is, freeze the offensive power on both sides and build only defensive systems—this might make ABM a good thing. If Congress, the military, and the manufacturers were happy to build only defenses and did not press us to add to the offensive forces, maybe ABM would be a good buy.

But I do not believe that this is a tenable situation, and this is the reason for one basic disagreement on the ABM. I think we would reach a point in the growth of the ABM defensive system where people would argue that improved defenses mean that the offenses no longer can guarantee deterrence and that we must therefore increase our offensive capability even more.

This is not a matter that anybody can settle with numbers and calculations. It is a judgment. But judgments of this kind are at the heart of the decision to build or not to build an ABM system, not the statistics, the calculations about "cost-effectiveness," or how many people will be killed. These factors are important in the decision, of course. What is most important, however, is the total dynamics and the likely interaction of the policymakers on both sides. I come back to where I began and ask: Can we play this game, which certainly will not buy us real defense, and at the same time achieve a rational world? My answer is no.

FOR: DONALD BRENNAN

On the whole I accept Jerome Wiesner's technical characterizations. I accept, more or less, his characterizations of Sentinel as it was originally envisaged. The views I present here are in support of a defense that would make a substantial difference against a Soviet missile attack, a system of a character and capacity missing in the original conception of Sentinel.

Here is what I deem to be the critical factor: Most of the studies of performance of heavier deployment now possible of ABM defenses against major Soviet attacks—assuming that the Soviets do not make a major increase in their offensive forces in response to our improved defense—have shown that fatalities in the United States might be reduced from a figure in the range of 80 to a 100 to 120,000,000 down in perhaps 20 or 30 or 40,000,000. Using the period of the mid 1970s as a statistical base, this might change the fatality level from half the population to something on the order of 10 per cent. Obviously the remaining prospect of losing 10 percent of our citizens is hardly likely to make one dance. But these calculations could make a great difference in the kind of United States that would exist after an act of nuclear war.

By the same process that might save as much as 90 percent of the populace, we would very likely be saving an even higher percentage of the country's productive capacity, communications, and transportation system. This makes a very great difference in the ability of the society to recover from such a blow . . .

I concede that the ABM systems are large, complicated, and untested in any final sense. There is some chance they may fail if subjected to the ultimate test of war, in ways that we did not foresee. This is a technical problem, as Dr. Wiesner says, and any scientist must agree it exists. But there is another side to this technical interaction that he did not mention and I would emphasize; that is, the offensive forces that may be fired against this defensive system also are large, complicated, untested systems—untested against the environment in which they are supposed to work . . .

And if we are talking about the possibility of buying national survival insurance, the fact that there is a degree of risk that the insurance wouldn't pay off under some circumstances does not necessarily negate its value.

This brings us to the technical question of how difficult it is for the offense to nullify an ABM defense. The war-outcome estimates made by Secretary McNamara should obtain, at least if the Soviets do not work very hard at nullifying our defense. If they work very hard at counteracting our ABM system, then they conceivably could cancel the insurance value we expected to purchase with the new defenses. However, it turns out that, as far as we can see, it is difficult for them to shift the balance by further offensive development. This is a point I wish to stress.

One of the considerations that killed Nike-Zeus (and I was among those opposed to deploying it) was that the system looked easy to nullify. It had mechanically slewed radars; it did not have much tracking capability. The conclusion was that it would be fairly easy to design attack systems that would penetrate it. However, the best kinds of defenses that developed in the last several years do not suffer these deficiencies. While I agree with Dr. Wiesner that economic factors do not dominate here, one wants to have some sense of the costs.

If the Soviets could nullify one of these \$10 billion or \$20 billion ABM defense systems by spending only an additional 1 percent as much on their offensive force, then I, among many others, would agree that ABM is a very bad buy. It seems, however, not likely to be any such minor economic matter . . .

I would offer a more technical argument on behalf of the future prospect of defenses. Although, as Dr. Wiesner said, there are many ways one can think of to penetrate a defense, there also are more and more potential ways of building up a defense. I believe that, essentially, all the possible means of penetration are known and openly discussed—warheads that maneuver, that can come in at low angles, or high angles, or in special trajectories; more warheads can be put in, more chaff, more decoys, more jammers.

However, there is a much larger array of technical possibilities in improving the defense. Dr. Wiesner alluded to some of them in passing, like lasers and X rays, and other mechanisms that have been studied for specific application to defense systems. No one of a fairly large catalog of diverse developments may work at the moment, but there is at least some likelihood of contributing to a major breakthrough on the defensive side.

Agreeing that these technical estimates cannot be exact, I believe they are nevertheless very important in establishing ranges for decision-making. For example, if I were convinced that improved ABM defenses could be neutralized for a minor fraction of their

cost, or that they would only make a 10 per cent difference in the fatalities in case of nuclear attack, I would lose interest in technical estimates of this kind. As it is, they seem to me to make a case that cannot be ignored.

What Dr. Wiesner refers to as questions of judgment, as opposed to analysis, do intrude when it comes to the ultimate consideration of the requirements of deterrence. If the Soviets begin building up a heavy defense, our military strategists would be apprehensive about the ability of our offense to penetrate it; and this, therefore, would soon upset any understanding about stabilization of offensive forces and would launch a new arms race.

I do not myself believe, as I am sure Dr. Wiesner does not believe, that the United States requires as a fundamental part of its national security some fixed destruction capability—the capacity to destroy, say 74,000,000 Russians, or 78 per cent of Soviet industrial capacity, to cite two figures Mr. McNamara has used in his discussion of requirements for what he calls an assured destruction capacity for our deterrent force.

As a matter of fact, I do not believe that the United States has any fixed requirement for any large number of Soviet hostages. It seems to me that our basic military requirement is simply to make sure that we are not in an unfavorable position vis-a-vis the Soviets at any given or predictable time. If we are confident we are in a fair military position vis-a-vis the Soviets, there is no fundamental law of nature that requires that we should be able to destroy 74,000,000 Russians. I think that we could begin to work back toward a state in which defenses begin to look more and more effective—and, as far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing that defenses should look effective on both sides . . .

The policy of the offensive deterrent theory has been increasingly persuasive over the past years. The technical prospects for defense in the later 1950s were rightly judged to be poor. As a result many of us assimilated the doctrine that, since the United States and the Soviet Union could not effectively defend against each other, each had to deter the other with large nuclear capability. As long as there was no really good alternative to a standoff of this kind, the way was open for the emergence of a distorted form of this doctrine of deterrent; i.e., since we must deter, we cannot defend. That, I suggest, is a non sequitur. I believe the United States is coming to a judgment of what Soviet capabilities actually are; and I see nothing in this to preclude deployment of ABM defenses . . .

I find it very difficult to follow the reasoning that holds that the likelihood of war will go up if missile defenses are deployed. I am among those who argue the other way: We contend that if ABM defenses are deployed, they will at the very least considerably complicate the planning of an attack, and so a rather substantial addition barrier to the initiation of war arises.

The argument is most usually couched in traditional terms of an offenses-defense arms race. ABM becomes a ploy in an unending spiral of defense followed by offense, followed by defense, followed by offense, followed by defense, and so on. I can only say the same thing here I said in relation to the arguments on the fundamental requirements of deterrence: It ain't necessarily so.

The question is basically one of attitude. If the American body politic defines as a fundamental objective for the Department of Defense that it must have an offensive force capable of killing 74,000,000 Russians, and if the Soviets then start building a missile defense that looks as if it would reduce our capability to destroy Russians below that threshold, then, of course, there will be an offensive force response on our side . . .

But as I have said, it is not a fundamental

law of nature that we must be able to maintain a fixed kill ratio of Russians. A much more sensible United States posture, it seems to me, which is in accordance with the dictate of keeping in a good military position vis-a-vis the Soviets, is to deploy ABM defenses instead. From many points of view, as Dr. Wiesner perceived, we should have much more interest in deploying defenses than in deploying offensive forces. I think the policy process in the United States will acquire that perspective sooner or later.

I cannot discern any fundamental necessity for the United States to respond to Soviet defense build-up with increased offensive force increments on our side. As far as one can see, Soviet attitudes are themselves already favorable to a defensive posture. In recent years they have been substantially and sharply increasing their offensive forces, but it is still probable that they have more of a doctrinal emphasis on defense as a way of military life than the United States has had in quite a few years.

I do not want to treat lightly the prospect of an offense-defense arms race, but I believe there is a better way of dealing with it than by abstaining from defense systems, which, as Premier Kosygin rightly put it, will not kill people. The ABM is not intended to kill anything but lethal offensive missiles; it is intended to preserve human lives. Insofar as both we and the Russians cultivate that judgment, we can temper the prospects for an arms race, and in the process buy plenty of insurance for both the superpowers.

FOR: LEON JOHNSON

The strategy of assured destruction, or deterrence through a balance of terror, means that we must have the capability to destroy the Soviet Union as a viable nation even after suffering a surprise first strike.

This is a radically new military concept. Only since the early 1950s have we believed that we must maintain a force in being capable of destroying a potential enemy. Prior to that time the planners held that we needed only sufficient force in being to defend the country while greater forces were created in order to carry the war to the enemy.

Under those circumstances we never insisted that our forces had to be sufficient to devastate an entire country. The ultimate objective was only to muster sufficient strength to defeat the enemy's forces and destroy his war-making potential. The war would end when the enemy sued for peace, surrendered, and accepted defeat. We assumed that victory would come well short of total destruction; and it has been our practice to lend moral and physical assistance to our enemies in rebuilding and resuming their places in the family of nations. We pride ourselves on being builders, not destroyers.

When the most knowledgeable authorities charged with the defense of our country can say that our strategic offensive and defensive forces have the capability to blunt any enemy attack, to keep the damage to our country to an acceptable level, and to permit us to continue as a viable nation, then we can change back from a strategy of assured destruction to the earlier concept of measured damage. It would no longer be essential to destroy an enemy as a viable nation. It would be necessary to inflict only sufficient damage to ensure that he recognized that the employment of armed force against us was not rewarding, and that there are better ways to settle international disputes. . . .

Should the Soviets deploy an ABM system around Moscow and their major cities in the early 1970s, such a condition could be exceedingly destabilizing. Certainly we would not test those defenses. Should the Soviets believe, even mistakenly, that their defenses could blunt an attack of ours, it would be almost as bad for us as if it were true. Should

they believe they could blunt an attack, with acceptable losses, and so announce to the world, the world would be prone to believe them. It could be expected that many U.S. citizens would also believe them, and the uproar could be much worse than the cry of "missile gap" we experienced in 1960. If we had in the meantime lost the six years of time necessary to build and install a defensive system of our own, there would be no way to redress the balance. We would be subject to that Soviet nuclear blackmail we avoided for the past 20 years. . . .

It is time to recall that a strategy based on self-interest includes, *ipso facto*, the defense of population regardless of the other side's statements, intentions, or reactions. Failure to realize this will in the long run be tremendously constraining, destabilizing, and costly to our foreign policy and could cause the death of our great country. . . .

AGAINST: GEORGE S. MCGOVERN

The antiballistic missile is a most remarkable device, to say the least. It is remarkable for its technology and for its capacity to devour large sums of money. But most remarkable of all is its political effect—an effect so potent that our country is about to embark on the deployment of this defensive missile system before it has been carefully evaluated, and at a time in our national life when we ought to be most interested in reducing both the costs and the hazards of the arms race.

I believe that an ABM deployment by the United States would actually decrease our security and our capacity to conduct an intelligent and rational foreign policy. It would do this not only because it would be easily penetrated by the Soviet Union at less cost, if they chose to do so, but also because it would lead to a further escalation of the arms race and a worsening of Soviet-American relations.

Beyond these considerations, the allocation of billions of dollars of public funds in ABM at this time would actually threaten our internal national security in a peculiarly painful manner, depriving us of funds urgently needed to cope with the explosive social and economic needs of our own society and of the world in ferment around it.

We could, as a precaution, do what I assume we would do, if we had the good judgment to back away from the actual deployment of this missile system—that is, continue with research and development, even to the prototype stage, on defensive missile systems. Then, if new breakthroughs should occur on the technical front, or if new information comes to us about what our potential enemies are up to, we would be in a position, if necessary, to consider deployment of the system. . . .

Politically, the ability to get support for highly dubious multi-billion-dollar projects such as the ABM rests on two factors: first, exploitation of the national feeling of insecurity that comes any time we debate a proposal with a defense label attached to it; and second, the perfectly legal and very substantial rewards the military sector can bestow upon communities and states whose congressmen are co-operative. . . .

So, let us face it, the antiballistic-missile system is little more than a gigantic make-work welfare project sponsored by the military-industrial complex. I charge that this kind of artificial and unimaginative public spending is degrading rather than strengthening our society, and that it is doing so to an extent that more than offsets any temporary military advantage we may gain from it. . . .

A DISCUSSION

Mr. BERLE. I do not think the antiballistic-missile system should be deployed. The research on it should be done and the information acquired but then we should stop there. I can find no technician who is pre-

pared to say that an antiballistic-missile defense could be airtight. One argument for deploying an ABM system is that it could reduce the number of our fatalities to 10,000,000 or 15,000,000, but we have no way of determining whether we could sustain 10,000,000 or 15,000,000 deaths without having our whole social, governmental, and political system smashed and our country so disorganized that it would be brought to the point of defeat. . . .

Dr. BRENNAN. The technically informed people tell us that if we spent from \$10 to \$20 billions for ABM it would reduce fatality levels from perhaps 50 per cent of the population to 10 or 15 per cent, and it probably would save an even greater percentage of our industrial resources. This would be true in the kind of war that could happen in the middle or late 1970s, pitting ABM against advanced technology skillfully employed against the United States. It is a combination of these two reductions that would make the difference between having a country that could reconstitute itself within some relatively short number of years (say, 5 or 10) after the war, and having a country whose recovery in any time period would be highly problematical. . . .

Mr. MCGOVERN. What is the evidence that the Soviets are going beyond (a) very limited defensive system deployed around Moscow, and their apparent aircraft defenses around Leningrad? Do we have credible evidence that they are moving ahead on a nationwide defensive missile system?

Dr. BRENNAN. I think the evidence is both ambiguous and undiscussable.

Dr. WIESNER. But mostly negative.

Mr. HERZFELD. Their system around Moscow is comparable to a thin defense.

Dr. WIESNER. No, it is only a small piece of a thin system.

Mr. HERZFELD. It's not all that small.

Dr. WIESNER. It is.

Mr. BERLE. While, as I have said, I am against ABM deployment because I do not think it will be effective, I do not agree with some critics of ABM who say that economically the country cannot afford it. That is nonsense. The maximum estimate is that ABM would cost \$50 billion. The United States can afford that, and more. This year, the gross national product will be about \$860 billion and the best estimate for the 1969 GNP is \$910 billion. We can assume that before ABM would be fully deployed three or four years from now, the GNP would be about a trillion dollars. To detach \$50 billion for ABM could be done. It could be done even while we're spending great amounts of money for the social and economic reconstruction of the country. It is true that this would require a political mood of urgency the country does not now have. But, economically, ABM is a manageable proposition. . . .

Mr. RABl. There is no question that we can afford both guns and butter, no question to be put in cold economic statistics. But I am not so sure that economic statistics are a sufficient measurement of what a country can afford. . . .

A country is more than its economic capacity or its material possessions. It has a personal, spiritual, psychological side—it is a culture.

Those of us who are teachers and close to young people know the degree to which they have been alienated by all this expenditure on military things.

When they see the Government putting out tremendous sums of money for military purposes, and then observe the Government's reluctance to invest in the solution of domestic human problems, they see a reorientation of our national policy which they believe is turning us into a garrison state. . . .

I have to say that I find all these statistical arguments, all this war-gaming, rather obscene. It has nothing to do with the mean-

ing of security on a much more profound level. While we are trying to assure the safety of the country, we may be undermining it. . . .

When Mr. Eisenhower was president of Columbia University, he said something that struck me. He had never been interested in defending property, or even lives, he said, as much as he had in defending a way of life. When you look at the proposition inherent in a nuclear exchange, you realize that even minimal losses—such as taking out New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles, and letting everything else stand—would spell the end of the American dream as we know it. . . .

When Russia invaded Czechoslovakia last summer there was no violent resistance by the Czechs. You might ask whether this was wise or not. In one view, the Czech people were "chicken" for not standing up even though the odds were hopeless. But is the survival of a people and their culture not more important than a "heroic" gesture? . . .

Mr. HERZFELD. I am quite aware that even to contemplate the kind of calculations one must make in matters of military security causes real and valid revulsion in many people, and not just among the young. I must point out, however, that this revulsion is the kind that any nonmedical person feels when he accidentally walks into an operating room while an operation is going on. His reaction is valid, but it does not help him understand the problem of medicine very much.

#### ORDER FOR PRINTING EULOGIES OF SENATOR BARTLETT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that eulogies of Senator BARTLETT be printed as a Senate document for later distribution.

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

#### AUTHORIZATION DURING ADJOURNMENTS FOR SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, during the ad-

jourments of the Senate between today and next Tuesday, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President of the United States and the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, did I understand the Senator to say from adjournment now until next Tuesday?

Mr. KENNEDY. I am about to make that request.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY NEXT AT 10 A.M.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, upon the completion of its business today, the Senate adjourn until 10 a.m. on Friday.

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

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY TO TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1969

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately upon the conclusion of the reading of the Farewell Address on Friday, the Senate adjourn until noon, Tuesday, February 25, 1969.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY AT 10 A.M.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 a.m. on Friday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.) the Senate took an adjournment until Friday, February 21, 1969 at 10 a.m.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 19, 1969:

##### IN THE AIR FORCE

Grant Hansen, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

##### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

G. Warren Nutter, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

##### IN THE AIR FORCE

John L. McLucas, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force.

Curtis W. Tarr, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

##### IN THE ARMY

Thaddeus R. Beal, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of the Army.

Eugene M. Becker, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army.

William K. Brehm, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army.

##### IN THE NAVY

James D. Hittle, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

##### DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

John G. Veneman, of California, to be Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

James E. Allen, Jr., of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

##### COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

James E. Allen, Jr., of New York, to be Commissioner of Education.

##### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL

Gilbert Hahn, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be Chairman of the District of Columbia Council for the term expiring February 1, 1972.

Sterling Tucker, of the District of Columbia, to be Vice Chairman of the District of Columbia Council for the term expiring February 1, 1972.

Jerry A. Moore, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the District of Columbia Council for the term expiring February 1, 1972.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, February 19, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Ignatius L. Urbonas, pastor of St. Casimir Church, Gary, Ind., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who created all men free and equal, bless this country whose flag is a symbol of freedom to all nations.

God bless our President, our Government, and the Members of this Congress for their efforts in preserving this land free, and bless them for their endeavors for the freedom of other nations.

God bless all nations that seek freedom among which is Lithuania. In the sorrow of her enslavement she commemorates today the 51st anniversary of her declaration of independence.

Almighty God, we beseech You to aid all those who are oppressed and deprived of their freedom, to become free again and live in peace. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

#### ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-74)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

The blight of poverty requires priority attention. It engages our hearts and challenges our intelligence. It cannot and will not be treated lightly or indifferently, or without the most searching examination of how best to marshal the resources available to the Federal Government for combatting it.

At my direction, the Urban Affairs Council has been conducting an intensive study of the nation's anti-poverty programs, of the way the anti-poverty effort is organized and administered, and of ways in which it might be made more effective.

That study is continuing. However, I can now announce a number of steps I intend to take, as well as spelling out some of the considerations that will guide my future recommendations.

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is now scheduled to expire on June 30, 1970. The present authorization for appropriations for the Office of Economic Opportunity runs only until June 30, 1969. I will ask Congress that this authorization for appropriations be extended for another year. Prior to the end of the Fiscal Year, I will send Congress a comprehensive proposal for the future of the poverty program, including recommendations for revising and extending the Act itself beyond its scheduled 1970 expiration.

How the work begun by OEO can best